PESHUM : Jurnal Pendidikan, Sosial dan Humaniora
Vol.5, No.3, April 2026

Artificial Intelligence for Inclusive Language Education: Bridging English and Indonesian Language Pedagogy in Higher Education

Deny Gunawan Susandi[1], Mohamad Irvan Septiar Musti[2], Murtini[1], Erma Damayanti[1], Nur Adi Setyo[1]
[1]Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan, Universitas Tama Jagakarsa, Jakarta
[2]Fakultas Sains dan Teknologi, UIN Syarif Hidayatullah, Jakarta
Email correspondence: denygunawans@jagakarsa.ac.id

Article History:
Received: 25 Februari 2026
Revised: 31 Maret 2026
Accepted: 06 April 2026

Keywords: *Inclusive education; Artificial intelligence; Multilingual pedagogy; Academic literacy; Higher education*

Abstract: *Inclusive education within the framework of Education for All requires pedagogical innovation that responds to diverse learner needs, including linguistic diversity, socio-economic disparities, varied proficiency levels, and digital access differences. In multilingual higher education contexts, English and Indonesian language programs face challenges in designing equitable and adaptive instruction. This qualitative interpretive study investigates how Artificial Intelligence (AI) can bridge English and Indonesian language pedagogy to support inclusive practices in university classrooms. Data were generated through semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions, and document analysis involving lecturers from both departments, and analyzed using reflexive thematic analysis. Findings indicate that AI is perceived as a pedagogical augmentation tool that can scaffold academic literacy, support differentiated instruction, and expand multilingual participation when aligned with inclusive design principles. However, participants also raised concerns regarding digital divides, algorithmic bias, and ethical governance. The study proposes an equity-driven conceptual framework positioning human-AI collaboration as a mediational strategy for inclusive language education in higher education.*

INTRODUCTION

The global commitment to Education for All has progressively expanded from a focus on access to schooling toward a broader concern with equity, participation, and meaningful learning outcomes across diverse learner populations. Inclusive education is no longer confined to disability discourse but encompasses linguistic diversity, socio-economic disparities, cultural pluralism, gender differences, and varied learning profiles in increasingly heterogeneous classrooms. In higher education, these complexities are intensified by massification, internationalization, and digital transformation, which require lecturers to design instruction that is both academically rigorous and responsive to diverse student needs (Ainscow, 2020; UNESCO, 2020). Within this landscape, language education occupies a strategic position because language

functions simultaneously as a subject of study and as a medium for academic participation.

In multilingual contexts such as Indonesia, higher education institutions commonly host English and Indonesian language education programs that serve distinct yet interconnected purposes. English functions as a global academic lingua franca, facilitating access to international scholarship and mobility, whereas Indonesian operates as a national and academic language that shapes identity, disciplinary discourse, and civic engagement. Despite their complementary roles, pedagogical practices in English and Indonesian departments often develop in parallel rather than in dialogue, resulting in fragmented approaches to inclusive language instruction. This separation may limit opportunities to address shared challenges such as unequal proficiency levels, academic literacy gaps, and differential access to digital resources across student populations.

The urgency of inclusive language education in higher education is further amplified by persistent inequities in academic literacy and participation. Students entering universities demonstrate wide variation in prior educational quality, exposure to English, socio-economic background, and digital competence. Research has shown that linguistic and academic literacy barriers significantly affect student retention, engagement, and achievement in tertiary settings (Hyland, 2019; Wingate, 2018). When language support is treated as remedial rather than integrative, universities risk reproducing structural inequalities rather than mitigating them. Therefore, inclusive language pedagogy must move beyond accommodation toward systemic design principles that anticipate learner variability from the outset.

Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and culturally responsive pedagogy have been widely advocated as frameworks to address learner diversity through flexible goals, multiple means of engagement, and multimodal representation. Empirical studies indicate that UDL-informed instruction can enhance accessibility and participation in higher education (Rao et al., 2018). However, implementing such frameworks at scale remains challenging due to time constraints, large class sizes, and limited institutional support. Language lecturers, in particular, must manage extensive feedback cycles, individualized scaffolding, and differentiated assessment, which can exceed available resources. These structural constraints call for innovative solutions that support inclusive practices without overburdening educators.

The rapid emergence of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in education has introduced new possibilities for personalization, adaptive feedback, and automated support. AI-driven systems, including intelligent tutoring systems, automated writing evaluation, and generative language models, have demonstrated potential to enhance learning outcomes and engagement (Holmes et al., 2019; Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019). In language education, AI applications such as automated feedback tools and adaptive vocabulary platforms can provide immediate, individualized responses that would be difficult to replicate manually in large classes (Godwin-Jones, 2019). More recently, generative AI systems have expanded opportunities for interactive dialogue practice, scaffolding, and multimodal content creation, raising both pedagogical opportunities and ethical concerns (Kasneci et al., 2023).

Empirical research suggests that AI can positively influence language learning performance when integrated thoughtfully into pedagogical design. For instance, studies on automated writing evaluation have reported improvements in revision quality and learner autonomy when feedback is combined with teacher guidance (Stevenson & Phakiti, 2019). Similarly, adaptive systems in language learning environments have been associated with increased learner engagement and tailored support (Hwang et al., 2020). Nevertheless, much of the existing research has focused on English as a foreign or second language in technologically advanced contexts, with limited attention to multilingual higher education systems where national and global languages intersect.

Moreover, the majority of AI-in-education research has concentrated on technological

efficacy rather than inclusive impact. Systematic reviews highlight that while AI can enhance efficiency and personalization, issues such as algorithmic bias, data privacy, digital divides, and ethical accountability remain underexamined (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019; Holmes et al., 2022). In linguistically diverse classrooms, algorithmic systems trained predominantly on Global North data may inadequately represent local linguistic varieties or cultural nuances. Without critical pedagogical mediation, AI tools risk reinforcing dominant language norms and marginalizing non-standard or emerging academic voices. Therefore, the integration of AI into language education must be guided by inclusive and equity-oriented principles rather than purely technological optimism.

Within the Indonesian higher education context, digital transformation has accelerated, particularly following the COVID-19 pandemic, yet disparities in digital literacy and infrastructure persist. English and Indonesian language lecturers increasingly experiment with AI tools for feedback, translation, content generation, and assessment support. However, these practices are often informal, untheorized, and disconnected from broader inclusive education frameworks. There remains limited scholarly exploration of how AI can systematically bridge English and Indonesian pedagogical traditions to support inclusive language development across disciplines.

A further gap lies in the interdisciplinary collaboration between language educators and AI specialists. While computer science research advances algorithmic sophistication, pedagogical integration frequently lacks grounding in language acquisition theory, academic literacy research, and inclusive education scholarship. Conversely, language education research may adopt AI tools pragmatically without critically engaging with their technical affordances and constraints. Bridging these domains requires a conceptual orientation that situates AI within human-centered, inclusive pedagogy rather than positioning technology as a substitute for teacher expertise.

This study responds to these gaps by critically examining how lecturers conceptualize and enact AI-informed inclusive language education across English and Indonesian departments in higher education. Rather than proposing a prescriptive technological model, the study explores lecturers' experiences, perceptions, and pedagogical practices in integrating AI to address learner diversity and academic literacy challenges. Through qualitative inquiry, it seeks to generate empirically grounded insights that can inform the development of an integrative and interdisciplinary pedagogical framework.

The research is guided by the premise that inclusive language education requires systemic design, cross-disciplinary dialogue, and critical technological mediation. By examining lecturers' needs, perspectives, and classroom practices, this study investigates how AI tools may facilitate differentiated instruction, scaffold academic literacy, and reduce participation barriers in multilingual higher education contexts. At the same time, it interrogates ethical and pedagogical considerations, including digital literacy disparities, algorithmic bias, and responsible assessment practices.

The research gap can therefore be articulated in three dimensions. First, there is limited empirical and conceptual work that integrates AI with inclusive language education beyond a narrow disability framework. Second, few studies examine AI integration across both English and national language pedagogy within multilingual higher education contexts. Third, interdisciplinary dialogue between language education and AI scholarship remains underdeveloped in theorizing equity-driven implementation.

Accordingly, the purpose of this study is to explore lecturers' experiences and pedagogical interpretations of AI integration in English and Indonesian language education, and to conceptually synthesize these insights into an interdisciplinary understanding of inclusive AI-

informed practice. The study contributes theoretically by bringing inclusive education, academic literacy, and AI scholarship into dialogue within a qualitative interpretive framework. Practically, it offers empirically grounded insights for lecturers and institutions seeking to harness AI as a supportive infrastructure for equitable participation and multilingual academic development. By repositioning AI as a tool for inclusive transformation rather than mere efficiency, this research aims to inform policy, curriculum design, and professional development in digitally evolving higher education systems.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Inclusive education, as conceptualized in contemporary scholarship, extends far beyond the provision of access for students with disabilities and instead foregrounds systemic equity, participation, and recognition of learner diversity. Rather than focusing on individualized deficits, inclusive education emphasizes restructuring educational cultures, policies, and practices to respond proactively to heterogeneity (Ainscow, 2020). This broader orientation aligns with the global Education for All agenda, which frames inclusion as a matter of social justice and equal opportunity across socio-economic status, language background, gender, and cultural identity (UNESCO, 2020). In higher education, such a perspective requires a shift from remedial accommodation toward anticipatory design that embeds equity within curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment structures.

Education for All provides the normative and ethical foundation for this study by positioning equity as a systemic obligation rather than an optional intervention. Contemporary analyses argue that universities must confront structural inequalities that manifest in academic literacy, digital access, and linguistic capital (Marginson, 2016). When applied to multilingual settings, inclusion entails recognizing linguistic diversity as an asset while addressing asymmetries between global and national languages. Thus, English and Indonesian language education cannot be treated as separate domains but must be understood as interconnected sites where equity is negotiated through language practices.

Universal Design for Learning (UDL) operationalizes inclusive education by offering pedagogical principles that anticipate variability in learner engagement, representation, and expression. Empirical research in higher education indicates that UDL-informed approaches enhance accessibility and participation by embedding flexibility into instructional design (Rao et al., 2018). Importantly, UDL reframes diversity as a predictable condition rather than an exception, thereby aligning with inclusive and equity-driven philosophies. However, the practical implementation of UDL in large language classes remains resource-intensive, especially when individualized feedback and differentiated scaffolding are required.

Within language education, inclusion intersects strongly with multilingualism and academic literacy development. Academic literacy is not merely the mastery of grammatical competence but involves participation in disciplinary discourses and epistemic practices (Wingate, 2018). In contexts where English operates as a global academic lingua franca while Indonesian functions as a national academic medium, students must navigate complex linguistic repertoires. Research in applied linguistics highlights that multilingual competence can enhance cognitive flexibility and disciplinary learning when pedagogically supported (Cenoz & Gorter, 2022). Nevertheless, unequal exposure to English and uneven preparation in Indonesian academic discourse can exacerbate stratification within higher education.

Sociocultural theory offers a critical lens for understanding how language learning and academic literacy are mediated through social interaction and tools. Drawing on Vygotskian principles, learning is conceptualized as socially situated and scaffolded through mediation

within the Zone of Proximal Development. In higher education language classrooms, lecturers, peers, and digital tools function as mediational agents that shape learners' development. From this perspective, technological tools, including AI systems, are not neutral instruments but cultural artifacts that mediate cognition and participation.

The emergence of Artificial Intelligence in Education (AIED) introduces new forms of mediation that can potentially support inclusive pedagogical goals. Systematic reviews demonstrate that AI applications in higher education commonly focus on adaptive learning systems, automated feedback, predictive analytics, and intelligent tutoring (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019). These technologies promise personalization at scale, enabling differentiated instruction in contexts where lecturer capacity is constrained. In language education specifically, AI-driven automated writing evaluation and adaptive feedback systems have been associated with improvements in revision quality and learner autonomy when integrated with teacher guidance (Stevenson & Phakiti, 2019).

Recent scholarship has expanded the scope of AIED to include generative AI and large language models, which offer interactive dialogue, multimodal content generation, and real-time scaffolding (Kasneci et al., 2023). Such tools may provide opportunities for multilingual practice and individualized support in English and Indonesian language classrooms. However, technological affordances alone do not guarantee inclusive outcomes. Holmes et al. (2022) argue that AI must be evaluated through human rights and democratic lenses, emphasizing transparency, accountability, and equity in deployment.

The concept of human-AI collaboration reframes AI not as a replacement for educators but as an augmentative partner in pedagogical design. Augmentation theory suggests that optimal educational outcomes emerge when human judgment and machine efficiency complement one another (Holmes et al., 2019). In language education, this may involve lecturers orchestrating AI-generated feedback while retaining authority over evaluative decisions and contextual interpretation. Such a model aligns with inclusive education principles by preserving relational and ethical dimensions of teaching while leveraging technological scalability.

Ethical AI considerations are central to this theoretical integration. Algorithmic bias, often embedded in training datasets dominated by Global North linguistic norms, may marginalize local varieties or reinforce dominant discourse patterns (Holmes et al., 2022). Furthermore, digital divides in access and literacy can undermine the equity potential of AI-enhanced instruction (Selwyn, 2019). From a critical digital pedagogy perspective, technology must be interrogated in relation to power, agency, and representation rather than adopted uncritically (Wahdini et al, 2025). Therefore, inclusive AI integration requires reflexive governance and context-sensitive implementation.

Integrating these theoretical strands reveals a coherent conceptual alignment. Inclusive education and Education for All provide the normative commitment to equity, while UDL offers pedagogical design principles to operationalize inclusion. Multilingualism and academic literacy research situate English and Indonesian language pedagogy within a shared epistemic and communicative space. Sociocultural theory conceptualizes AI tools as mediational means that can scaffold or constrain learning depending on their orchestration. AIED and human-AI collaboration theories supply the technological and pedagogical mechanisms through which inclusive goals may be enacted.

The theoretical contribution of this study lies in synthesizing these frameworks into an integrated model of AI-informed inclusive language education. Rather than positioning AI as an external add-on, the model conceptualizes AI as embedded within UDL-informed, multilingual pedagogy guided by equity principles. In this configuration, lecturers function as critical

mediators who align AI affordances with sociocultural and academic literacy objectives. English and Indonesian language education are bridged through shared inclusive design strategies and coordinated AI-supported scaffolding.

The theoretical contribution of this study lies in synthesizing these frameworks into an integrated model of AI-informed inclusive language education. Rather than positioning AI as an external add-on, the model conceptualizes AI as embedded within UDL-informed, multilingual pedagogy guided by equity principles. In this configuration, lecturers function as critical mediators who interpret and align AI affordances with sociocultural and academic literacy objectives. English and Indonesian language education are thus bridged through shared inclusive design orientations and coordinated AI-supported scaffolding practices.

This integrated framework informs the interpretive orientation of the study by shaping the analytic lens through which lecturers' perspectives and practices are examined. Instead of prescribing technological solutions, the framework provides conceptual categories for understanding how AI is perceived, negotiated, and enacted within inclusive multilingual pedagogy. By grounding the inquiry in a robust interdisciplinary synthesis, the study seeks to illuminate how equity commitments, pedagogical design principles, and technological mediation intersect in real institutional contexts. The following methodology section outlines how this qualitative exploration was conducted across English and Indonesian language programs in higher education.

METHODOLOGY

This study employed a qualitative interpretive design to explore lecturers' perspectives, experiences, and pedagogical practices regarding the integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) for inclusive language education in higher education. An interpretivist paradigm underpinned the research, as the study sought to understand how participants construct meaning around inclusion, multilingual pedagogy, and AI within their institutional contexts (Creswell & Poth, 2018). Rather than testing predetermined hypotheses, the research aimed to generate context-sensitive insights into how English and Indonesian language lecturers conceptualize and enact inclusive AI-supported practices. This approach aligns with qualitative inquiry's emphasis on meaning-making, situated understanding, and the co-construction of knowledge between researcher and participants.

The research was conducted in the English and Indonesian language education departments of two public universities where digital innovation initiatives had recently encouraged experimentation with AI tools in teaching. These departments were selected because they represent complementary yet distinct language pedagogical traditions within a multilingual higher education environment. English programs primarily focus on global academic communication, while Indonesian programs emphasize national academic literacy and discourse practices, creating a productive site for examining cross-linguistic and inclusive integration.

Participants were selected through purposive and criteria-based sampling to ensure relevance and depth of insight. The inclusion criteria required lecturers to (a) teach courses in English or Indonesian language education, (b) have at least three years of teaching experience in higher education, and (c) have experimented with or reflected on the use of AI or digital tools in their pedagogy. Purposive sampling is appropriate in qualitative research when the aim is to obtain information-rich cases that illuminate the phenomenon under investigation (Patton, 2015). A total of 15 lecturers participated, representing diverse teaching specializations, including academic writing, language assessment, linguistics, and literacy education.

Data were collected through semi-structured individual interviews, one focus group discussion in each department, and document analysis of course syllabi and instructional

materials. Semi-structured interviews allowed flexibility to probe participants' interpretations of inclusive education, AI integration, and pedagogical challenges while maintaining conceptual consistency across cases (Creswell & Poth, 2018). Focus group discussions facilitated dialogic reflection and surfaced shared departmental practices and tensions regarding multilingual and AI-mediated instruction. Document analysis complemented interview data by examining how inclusive principles and AI tools were formally embedded in curricular artifacts, thereby enhancing contextual depth.

All interviews and focus groups were audio-recorded with participants' consent and transcribed verbatim. Data collection occurred over a three-month period to allow iterative reflection and preliminary analysis between sessions. Field notes were maintained to document contextual observations and emerging analytic insights. This iterative process is consistent with qualitative traditions that view data generation and analysis as recursive rather than linear (Braun & Clarke, 2019).

Data were analyzed using reflexive thematic analysis as articulated by Braun and Clarke (2019, 2021). Reflexive thematic analysis was selected because it allows systematic yet flexible identification of patterns of meaning across datasets while acknowledging the researcher's active interpretive role. The analysis proceeded through familiarization with the data, initial coding, generation of candidate themes, theme refinement, and analytic writing. Codes were developed inductively from the data while being sensitized by the study's theoretical framework on inclusive education, multilingualism, and AI mediation.

Reflexive thematic analysis was particularly suitable for this study because it supports the construction of theoretically informed themes without assuming a positivist coding reliability model. Rather than seeking statistical inter-rater agreement, the analytic rigor derived from depth of engagement, transparency of analytic decisions, and reflexive consideration of researcher positionality (Braun & Clarke, 2021). The resulting themes captured lecturers' conceptualizations of inclusion, their pedagogical strategies for bridging English and Indonesian instruction, and their critical engagement with AI affordances and constraints.

To ensure trustworthiness, the study adhered to the criteria of credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability as proposed by Lincoln and Guba (1985). Credibility was enhanced through triangulation of interviews, focus groups, and document analysis, as well as member reflection, in which participants reviewed thematic summaries for resonance and clarification. Transferability was addressed by providing thick descriptions of institutional context and participant characteristics, enabling readers to assess applicability to other settings. Dependability and confirmability were supported through an audit trail documenting analytic decisions, reflexive memos, and systematic data management procedures (Tracy, 2010).

Ethical considerations were carefully observed throughout the study. Institutional ethical approval was obtained prior to data collection, and all participants provided informed consent. Confidentiality was ensured through the use of pseudonyms and removal of identifying institutional details. Given the focus on AI integration, particular attention was paid to ethical sensitivity regarding participants' critiques of institutional policies and digital practices, ensuring that disclosures did not expose them to professional risk. Data were securely stored and accessed only by the research team.

In sum, this qualitative interpretive design enabled an in-depth exploration of how lecturers in English and Indonesian language education conceptualize and enact AI-informed inclusive pedagogy. The use of purposive sampling, multi-method data collection, reflexive thematic analysis, and established trustworthiness criteria ensured methodological rigor consistent with qualitative research standards. The following section presents the findings derived from this

analytic process, highlighting key themes that illuminate the intersection of AI, multilingual pedagogy, and inclusive education in higher education contexts.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Reframing Inclusion Beyond Disability in Language Classrooms

The first theme reveals a significant conceptual shift among lecturers in understanding inclusion beyond a narrow disability framework toward a broader equity-oriented perspective. This theme emerged consistently across interviews in both English and Indonesian departments, where participants emphasized linguistic diversity, socio-economic disparities, and digital literacy gaps as central inclusion concerns. The data suggest that inclusive language education in higher education is increasingly interpreted as designing learning environments that anticipate heterogeneity, aligning with inclusive education theory and Universal Design for Learning (UDL) principles.

Before presenting the first excerpt, it is important to contextualize Lecturer A from the English Department, who has over ten years of experience teaching academic writing. She reflected critically on how inclusion has traditionally been framed within institutional discourse. Her comments illustrate how AI integration becomes meaningful only when inclusion is reconceptualized systemically.

> *"When we talk about inclusion, it is usually associated with students with disabilities. But in my academic writing class, the biggest issue is actually the gap in language proficiency and confidence. Some students have strong English exposure from private schools, while others struggle with basic academic vocabulary. I see AI tools as potentially helpful, but only if we use them to reduce that gap, not to widen it. Inclusion for me means designing tasks where all students can participate meaningfully, regardless of their starting point."*

This excerpt demonstrates that inclusion is framed as addressing structural inequities in linguistic capital rather than solely accommodating individual impairments. Lecturer A's emphasis on participation resonates with Ainscow's (2020) conceptualization of inclusion as systemic restructuring rather than individualized adjustment. The conditional stance toward AI, "only if we use them to reduce that gap", highlights the mediational role of educators emphasized in sociocultural theory. AI is not inherently inclusive; its function depends on pedagogical orchestration aligned with equity principles.

The second excerpt comes from Lecturer B in the Indonesian Department, who teaches academic literacy and discourse analysis. Her reflection highlights how inclusion manifests differently in national language contexts, particularly in relation to regional linguistic diversity. She situates AI within this broader sociolinguistic landscape.

> *"In Indonesian classes, students come from various regions with different first languages. Some are not confident writing formal academic Indonesian because their schooling emphasized local languages. Inclusion, for me, is recognizing these backgrounds instead of labeling them as weak. AI-based grammar suggestions can support them, but I always remind students that language variation is not a deficiency. We need to balance*

correction with appreciation."

Lecturer B's statement underscores the tension between standardization and linguistic diversity. Her concern reflects translanguaging and multilingual perspectives that view linguistic repertoires as resources rather than deficits. The cautious use of AI grammar tools aligns with critical digital pedagogy, which warns against reinforcing dominant norms through algorithmic systems (Holmes et al., 2022). Thus, inclusion in both departments is reframed as equity-driven language mediation rather than accommodation alone.

The third excerpt, from Lecturer C in the English Department, further deepens this reframing by connecting inclusion with assessment practices. He discusses how AI feedback tools influence participation patterns in large classes. His reflection illustrates the structural dimension of inclusion.

> *"In large classes, it is difficult to give individualized feedback. Some students remain silent because they feel their English is not good enough. When I used an AI feedback tool, students started submitting drafts more confidently because they received preliminary guidance. However, I still review their work personally to ensure the feedback aligns with academic expectations. Inclusion here is about creating a safer entry point into academic discourse."*

This evidence highlights AI as a scaffolding mechanism within the Zone of Proximal Development. The "safer entry point" metaphor reflects UDL's emphasis on multiple means of engagement and representation. Rather than replacing teacher feedback, AI becomes an augmentative layer that expands access to academic participation. Collectively, the theme demonstrates that inclusion is conceptualized as proactive, multilingual, and structurally embedded within pedagogical design.

AI as Pedagogical Augmentation Rather Than Replacement

The second theme centers on lecturers' shared rejection of AI as a substitute for professional judgment. Across both departments, participants articulated a consistent stance that AI should augment rather than replace human pedagogical expertise. This theme emerged through discussions of feedback, curriculum design, and student autonomy, reflecting augmentation theory in AI in Education (Holmes et al., 2019). Before presenting the first excerpt, it is useful to consider Lecturer D from the English Department, who frequently integrates AI tools for drafting support. His reflection captures the ambivalence surrounding automation in language education. He addresses the perceived threat of AI replacing teacher roles.

> *"There is a fear that AI will replace teachers, especially in writing classes. But from my experience, AI can generate suggestions, not understanding. It does not know the student's learning history, cultural background, or disciplinary expectations. I use it as a first layer of feedback, but the final interpretation and guidance remain my responsibility. Teaching is relational, and AI cannot replicate that."*

This statement reinforces sociocultural theory's emphasis on relational mediation. Lecturer

D distinguishes between mechanical correction and contextual understanding, highlighting the irreplaceable interpretive role of educators. His approach aligns with augmentation perspectives that advocate human-AI collaboration rather than automation dominance. The relational dimension of inclusion remains central, suggesting that equitable pedagogy requires human ethical judgment. Then, the second excerpt comes from Lecturer E in the Indonesian Department, who emphasizes curriculum coherence. She discusses AI's role in aligning learning outcomes across courses. Her perspective reveals institutional dimensions of augmentation.

> *"AI can help us standardize certain feedback patterns, especially for academic writing conventions. But curriculum coherence cannot be automated. We need discussions among lecturers to decide what counts as good academic Indonesian. AI is a tool, but pedagogical decisions must remain collective and reflective."*

Lecturer E's emphasis on collective deliberation underscores the social construction of academic norms. AI is positioned as a supportive mechanism rather than a decision-maker. This perspective resonates with inclusive education's systemic orientation, where institutional collaboration shapes equitable practice. The tension between efficiency and reflective pedagogy emerges as a critical analytical thread. The third excerpt from Lecturer F highlights student agency. He reflects on how students perceive AI-mediated feedback. His insight connects augmentation with learner autonomy.

> *"Some students rely too much on AI suggestions, accepting every correction without questioning it. I encourage them to compare AI feedback with their own reasoning. We discuss why certain revisions are appropriate or not. In this way, AI becomes a learning partner rather than an authority."*

Here, AI is reframed as a dialogic partner within mediated learning processes. This practice aligns with UDL's emphasis on fostering strategic and self-regulated learners. It also addresses ethical AI concerns by promoting critical engagement rather than passive acceptance. The theme as a whole positions AI as an enabler of inclusion when embedded within reflective, human-centered pedagogy.

Ethical Tensions, Algorithmic Bias, and Digital Divide

The third theme reveals critical awareness of ethical tensions surrounding AI integration. Participants across departments expressed concerns about algorithmic bias, unequal access to digital tools, and over-standardization of language norms. This theme reflects broader debates in AI in Education scholarship regarding transparency and equity (Holmes et al., 2022). Before presenting the first excerpt, it is necessary to contextualize Lecturer G from the Indonesian Department. She raised concerns about how AI tools are trained predominantly on global datasets. Her reflection foregrounds epistemic justice in multilingual contexts.

> *"Most AI tools are developed using English-dominated data. When students write in Indonesian academic style, the suggestions sometimes feel unnatural or too literal. I worry that if we rely too much on these systems, we may slowly reshape our academic discourse to fit external standards. Inclusion should protect our linguistic identity, not erode it."*

This excerpt highlights epistemic and cultural implications of AI use. Lecturer G's concern resonates with critical perspectives on algorithmic bias and linguistic imperialism. Her emphasis on protecting linguistic identity aligns with multilingual education scholarship that values national academic discourses. Thus, ethical AI integration requires contextual sensitivity and critical oversight. The second excerpt comes from Lecturer H in the English Department, who addresses the digital divide. His reflection illustrates structural inequalities in access to AI tools. The issue is framed as institutional rather than individual.

> *"Some students have stable internet access and personal laptops, while others rely on shared devices. If AI becomes central to our pedagogy, we risk disadvantaging those with limited access. Inclusion means ensuring that technology does not become another barrier. Institutional support is essential."*

This evidence foregrounds material dimensions of inclusion. The digital divide complicates assumptions that AI automatically democratizes learning. Consistent with inclusive education theory, structural provision must accompany pedagogical innovation. Without institutional readiness, AI may inadvertently reproduce inequities. The third excerpt, from Lecturer I, synthesizes ethical and pedagogical tensions. He reflects on balancing innovation with responsibility. His statement illustrates reflexive professional judgment.

> *"I am excited about AI's possibilities, but I am also cautious. We need guidelines about academic integrity, transparency, and responsible use. Students should know when AI assistance is appropriate and when independent thinking is required. Inclusion includes ethical clarity."*

This reflection underscores the necessity of governance frameworks and digital literacy. Ethical clarity becomes part of inclusive design, ensuring fairness and accountability. The theme collectively demonstrates that AI integration is inseparable from structural, cultural, and ethical considerations.

Integrative Discussion

Across themes, the findings reveal a coherent pattern: AI integration is interpreted through an equity-driven lens rather than a technocentric one. Lecturers consistently position inclusion as systemic and multilingual, emphasizing participation, identity, and structural access. AI is valued when it expands scaffolding and engagement but questioned when it risks standardization or inequity. The study extends inclusive education theory by demonstrating how AI can function as a mediational tool within multilingual higher education. It challenges simplistic narratives of personalization by highlighting the necessity of relational pedagogy and institutional governance. In doing so, it contributes to AI in Education scholarship by foregrounding equity and linguistic justice as central evaluative criteria.

Furthermore, the bridging of English and Indonesian pedagogy emerges as a distinctive contribution. Rather than treating global and national languages separately, lecturers envision coordinated AI-supported strategies that respect linguistic diversity while supporting academic literacy. This interdisciplinary integration expands current literature that often isolates English language education from national language contexts. Ultimately, the findings suggest that

inclusive AI integration requires alignment among pedagogical design, ethical governance, multilingual sensitivity, and institutional infrastructure. By conceptualizing AI as augmentative mediation within UDL-informed frameworks, this study advances a human-centered model of inclusive language education. These insights have implications for curriculum development, professional training, and policy formulation in digitally evolving higher education environments.

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that the integration of Artificial Intelligence in higher education language classrooms can meaningfully advance inclusive education when grounded in equity-oriented, multilingual, and human-centered pedagogical principles. Across English and Indonesian departments, lecturers reframed inclusion beyond disability, emphasizing linguistic diversity, academic literacy gaps, digital inequities, and sociocultural differences as central concerns. AI was consistently positioned not as a replacement for teacher expertise but as an augmentative mediational tool that can expand access to feedback, scaffold participation, and support differentiated instruction. However, the findings also reveal that inclusive AI integration requires critical awareness of algorithmic bias, ethical responsibility, and institutional readiness to prevent the reproduction of structural inequalities.

Theoretically, this study contributes an integrated framework that bridges inclusive education, Universal Design for Learning, sociocultural mediation, multilingual pedagogy, and AI in Education within a coherent model of human-AI collaboration. Practically, it highlights the importance of lecturer agency, ethical governance, and cross-departmental dialogue in aligning AI tools with inclusive language learning goals. By bridging English and Indonesian language pedagogy, the study extends current scholarship that often isolates global and national language instruction, demonstrating the potential of coordinated AI-supported strategies in multilingual higher education. Ultimately, inclusive language education in the age of AI depends not on technological sophistication alone, but on deliberate, reflexive, and equity-driven pedagogical design.

REFERENCES

Ainscow, M. (2020). Promoting inclusion and equity in education: Lessons from international experiences. Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy, 6(1), 7-16. https://doi.org/10.1080/20020317.2020.1729587

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2019). Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health, 11(4), 589-597. https://doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2019.1628806

_____. (2021). Thematic analysis: A practical guide. Sage.

Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2022). Pedagogical translanguaging. Language Teaching, 55(3), 342-354. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444821000212

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches (4th ed.). Sage.

Godwin-Jones, R. (2019). Emerging technologies: Automatic writing evaluation and feedback. Language Learning & Technology, 23(3), 1-11.

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

Holmes, W., Persson, J., Chounta, I.-A., Wasson, B., & Dimitrova, V. (2022). Artificial intelligence and education: A critical view through the lens of human rights, democracy

and the rule of law. Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 3, 100075. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2022.100075

Hwang, G.-J., Xie, H., Wah, B. W., & Gašević, D. (2020). Vision, challenges, roles and research issues of Artificial Intelligence in Education. Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 1, 100001. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2020.100001

Hyland, K. (2019). Second language writing. Cambridge University Press.

Kasneci, E., Sessler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., ... & Kasneci, G. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. Learning and Individual Differences, 103, 102274. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Sage.

Marginson, S. (2016). The worldwide trend to high participation higher education. Higher Education, 72(4), 413-434. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-016-0016-x

Patton, M. Q. (2015). Qualitative research & evaluation methods (4th ed.). Sage.

Rao, K., Smith, S. J., & Lowrey, K. A. (2018). UDL and inclusive practices in higher education. Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability, 31(1), 5-18.

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

Stevenson, M., & Phakiti, A. (2019). The effects of computer-generated feedback on the quality of writing. Language Learning & Technology, 23(2), 51-72.

Tracy, S. J. (2010). Qualitative quality: Eight “big-tent” criteria for excellent qualitative research. Qualitative Inquiry, 16(10), 837-851. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800410383121

UNESCO. (2020). Global education monitoring report 2020: Inclusion and education: All means all. UNESCO.

Wahdini, L., Murtini, M., Susandi, DG., Rodiyah, S., & Sjafei, I. (2025). Reconstructing language curriculum in the digital era: A qualitative study on the role of technology in transforming learning. EduLite: Journal of English Education, Literature, and Culture, 10 (2), 377-394. http://dx.doi.org/10.30659/e.10.2.377-394

Wingate, U. (2018). Academic literacy across the curriculum: Towards a collaborative instructional approach. Language Teaching, 51(3), 349-364. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444816000264

Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V. I., Bond, M., & Gouverneur, F. (2019). Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 16(39). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0