CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

This chapter presents the concluding remarks of the research based on the findings and discussion presented in the previous chapter. The conclusions are drawn from the analysis of how three English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers at SMA Negeri 1 Kuningan utilized Artificial Intelligence tools in lesson preparation, encompassing the types of tools used, the purposes of their use, the processes involved, and the teachers' professional experiences. Following the conclusions, practical suggestions are offered for different stakeholders, including teachers in general, researchers, and English teachers specifically. These suggestions aim to inform future practices, guide subsequent research endeavors, and enhance the pedagogical integration of AI tools in English language teaching contexts.

5.1 Conclusion

This research was conducted to explore how English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers use Artificial Intelligence tools in preparing English lessons and to identify the types of AI tools utilized in the process. The research involved three EFL teachers at SMA Negeri 1 Kuningan who actively integrated AI tools into their lesson preparation practices. Data were collected through semi-structured interviews and document analysis, and analyzed using the interactive model proposed by Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña (2014).

Based on the findings and discussion presented in the previous chapter, several conclusions can be drawn. First, the three participants employed different AI tools based on personal familiarity and perceived functionality. ChatGPT was the most commonly used tool, utilized by 66.7% of the participants (Teachers 2 and 3), while Gemini was used by 33.3% (Teacher 1). Despite the variation in tools, all participants selected platforms that were easy to use, provided quality outputs, and were practically accessible.

Second, the teachers utilized AI tools for varied instructional purposes. Teacher 1 accounted for 60% of the identified purposes (content organization,

media development, and assessment creation), while Teachers 2 and 3 each represented 20% (module development and activity design, respectively). These varied purposes reflected individual pedagogical priorities rather than uniform institutional expectations.

Third, the participants followed distinct yet systematic processes when integrating AI into lesson preparation. Teacher 1 engaged in a comprehensive seven-step process with heavy editing and cross-checking. Teacher 2 adopted a conditional approach, editing when time permitted and copying directly when busy. Teacher 3 utilized a streamlined selection-based process with minimal editing and direct implementation. These processes demonstrated that teachers maintained pedagogical control while leveraging AI for efficiency.

Fourth, the teachers' experiences revealed conditional trust in AI outputs. All participants adapted AI-generated materials to student needs and learning objectives, indicating a student-centered orientation. In terms of frequency, Teacher 1 demonstrated the highest engagement at 76.2% of the total monthly usage (16 times per month), compared to Teacher 2 at 19.0% (4 times per month) and Teacher 3 at 4.8% (2.5 times per month). This variation suggested that AI integration was shaped by workload intensity, teaching experience, and perceived necessity.

Fifth, a significant finding of this research is that AI changed the nature of lesson preparation among the participants. Rather than creating instructional materials entirely from scratch, the teachers shifted toward evaluating, selecting, adapting, and refining AI-generated outputs. The findings revealed that AI-generated materials were not directly implemented in the classroom. Instead, teachers adjusted the outputs to students' needs, proficiency levels, learning objectives, and classroom conditions. Furthermore, the adaptation process began not only after the materials were generated but also during the prompting stage, where teachers incorporated curriculum requirements and instructional goals into their requests. Although AI reduced the time and effort required for lesson preparation, teachers remained responsible for making pedagogical decisions and ensuring the appropriateness of instructional materials for their students.

Overall, this research concluded that AI integration in EFL lesson preparation was characterized by selective, adaptive, and pedagogically grounded practices. The teachers functioned as autonomous professionals who used AI as a supportive tool rather than a replacement for their pedagogical judgment. These findings contributed to a more nuanced understanding of how in-service EFL teachers navigate AI-assisted lesson preparation in secondary education contexts.

5.2 Suggestions

Based on the conclusions drawn from this research, several suggestions are offered for different stakeholders. These suggestions are presented in separate paragraphs to address the distinct needs of English teachers, further researchers, and for schools.

5.2.1 For English Teachers

English teachers should leverage AI tools strategically for language-specific instructional tasks, such as generating authentic reading materials, designing communicative activities, creating differentiated assessments, and developing multimedia resources that cater to diverse proficiency levels. They should focus on using AI to enhance student engagement and language exposure while ensuring that AI-generated content maintains cultural appropriateness and linguistic accuracy. English teachers are also encouraged to collaborate within professional learning communities to share effective AI prompts, evaluation strategies, and adaptation techniques. Finally, they should remain vigilant about the limitations of AI in capturing the nuances of language use and cultural context, and continue to exercise professional judgment in finalizing all instructional materials.

5.2.2 For Further Researchers

Further researchers should expand the scope of investigation by involving larger and more diverse samples across different educational levels and geographical contexts to enhance the generalizability of findings. They are encouraged to investigate the long-term impact of AI integration on teaching quality, student learning outcomes, and teacher professional development. Studies examining the effectiveness of structured AI literacy training programs for in-

service teachers would also contribute valuable knowledge to the field. Additionally, comparative research between pre-service and in-service teachers' AI integration practices could illuminate how teaching experience influences pedagogical decision-making with AI tools.

5.2.3 For Schools

Schools should provide adequate support for teachers in integrating AI tools into their instructional practices, including access to reliable internet connectivity, devices, and professional development opportunities. School administrators are encouraged to establish clear guidelines and policies regarding the ethical and pedagogical use of AI in education, ensuring that teachers understand both the benefits and limitations of these technologies. Furthermore, schools should foster collaborative environments where teachers can share experiences, resources, and best practices related to AI-assisted lesson preparation. By creating supportive infrastructures, schools can maximize the potential of AI tools while maintaining instructional quality and teacher professionalism.