SLOVENIAN TOURISM STUDENTS' VIEWS ON THE USE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN LSP LEARNING

TILEN SMAJLA, Ph.D., Assistant Professor
University of Maribor,
Faculty of Criminal Justice and Security,
Kotnikova 8, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia
Phone: 00386 41 673 628
E-mail: tilen.smajla@um.si
Juraj Dobrila University Pula, Faculty of Humanities,
Department of English Studies
Ulica A. Negrija 6, 1. Kat
52100 Pula, Croatia
Phone: 00386 41 673 628
E.mail: tsmajla@unipu.hr

MOJCA KOMPARA LUKANČIČ, Ph.D.,
Associate Professor
University of Maribor, Faculty of Tourism,
Cesta prvih borcev 36, 8250 Brežice, Slovenia
Phone: 00386 8205 40 10
E-mail: mojca.kompara@um.si
Faculty of Criminal Justice and Security,
Chair of Social Studies, Humanities, and Methodology
Kotnikova 8, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia
Phone: 00386 1 3008 300
E-mail: mojca.kompara@um.si

Abstract

Purpose – This study investigated Slovenian tourism students' perspectives on using artificial intelligence (AI) tools in Language for Specific Purposes (LSP) courses to uncover the extent of AI adoption, perceived benefits, and associated challenges.
Methodology – An anonymous online survey was conducted with 387 students from two major Slovenian universities, capturing quantitative and qualitative data on usage patterns, familiarity, and attitudes towards AI integration in LSP.
Findings – Descriptive analysis revealed that two-thirds of respondents occasionally use AI tools for language learning, with ChatGPT being the most popular (used by 90%), followed by Grammarly (30%) and AI Writer (10%). Students primarily leveraged these tools to prepare assignments, refine written expression, correct grammatical errors, and acquire new skills. While appreciating the time-saving benefits of AI tools, concerns about discouraging independent thinking and relying on potentially inaccurate data were prevalent.
Contribution – This research provides valuable insights into the evolving role of AI in modern pedagogy, informing educators on responsible integration while fostering critical thinking and ethical awareness, thereby contributing to understanding how AI tools reshape educational practices and highlighting their potential to transform education while addressing key concerns.
Keywords artificial intelligence, views, language for specific purposes, learning and teaching, foreign languages, tourism students

Original scientific paper
https://doi.org//10.20867/tosee.08.9

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, higher education institutions (HEIs) have seen a notable shift toward digitalisation, a trend that has transformed the educational environment (Alenezi 2023). This digital transformation encompasses a wide range of developments, from using online learning platforms to incorporating advanced data analytic tools (Shard & Koul 2024). At the centre of this change lies artificial intelligence (AI), an inventive force that is redefining educational processes. The use of AI in education is not surprising given its numerous potential benefits, such as innovation in the teaching-learning process, personalised learning entailing specific strategies tailored to each student's needs and abilities (Wang et al. 2024), efficient administrative tasks, increased access to education via the expansion of educational resources, and improved engagement (Suryanarayana et al. 2024). Officially, AI originates from 1956 during a summer workshop organised by four American researchers: John McCarthy, Marvin Minsky, Nathaniel Rochester and Claude Shannon at Dartmouth College in New Hampshire, United States (McCarthy et al. 2006). The term "artificial intelligence", most likely invented to make a strong impression, has grown in popularity to the point that today almost everyone is familiar with it. Over time, efforts to design tools aimed at learners were assisted in the 1970s and 1980s when computers became more easily available (Dimulescu & Nechifor 2021). Modern AI applications, such as ChatGPT, Grammarly, and AI Writer, are being increasingly utilized to help students learn foreign languages by improving their writing abilities, correcting grammatical errors, and enhancing the overall learning experience (Almashy et al. 2024). The research presented in this article focused on Slovenian students' impressions of AI technologies in foreign language teaching, particularly for learning foreign languages for specified purposes (LSP). The use of AI in language acquisition has been especially notable in the area of LSP. While that has gradually happened in the last 20 years (Fleischhauer & Friedrich 2024), it has particularly occurred following ChatGPT's introduction in late November 2022 (Huang et al. 2023). In Slovenia, known for its multilingual population and efforts towards foreign language instruction, the implementation of AI technologies in language acquisition brings both potential and difficulties (Zong & Yang 2025). Slovenian tourism students, who often must master several languages for academic and professional purposes, are increasingly relying on AI-powered language learning technologies to augment traditional language instruction. However, the usefulness of these tools and their effects on the learning process are still being researched and debated. By investigating students' perspectives, use patterns, and perceived benefits and downsides of AI-assisted language learning, we intend to give useful information for educators, lawmakers, and educational technology developers. The findings will add to the growing body of research on the integration of AI into education and help guide future initiatives for enhancing language learning achievements in Slovenia and elsewhere. The study aimed to understand Slovenian tourism students' views on AI use in the learning and teaching of foreign languages and their views of their teachers' reactions to the use of AI in language learning.

Research questions

1. How do respondents' age and gender influence their use of AI tools in their LSP course?
2. How do respondents' age and gender impact their perception of their LSP teachers' influence on learning using AI tools?

Based on the above research questions and overall study aims described in the introduction, three hypotheses were posited:

H1: Statistically significant age-based differences exist in respondents' views on the use of AI tools in foreign language teaching and learning.

H2: Statistically significant gender-based differences exist in respondents' views on the use of AI tools in foreign language teaching and learning.

H3: Statistically significant age- and gender-based differences exist in respondents' views on the influence of their LSP teachers.

1. LITERATURE REVIEW

Recent studies investigated how AI can improve foreign language learning with AI-powered writing aids, adaptive learning platforms, and automated feedback. Focused on the pedagogical consequences, Alharbi (2023) thoroughly reviewed automated writing support technologies in foreign language classes. By offering immediate, individualised feedback, automated writing assessment systems have shown the potential to enhance students' writing abilities (Khan et al. 2024).

According to Fleckenstein, Liebenow and Meyer (2023), AI-powered automated writing assessment tools give students instant feedback on their learning progress, thus adding to their writing abilities.

AI technologies are increasingly embedded in tourism education, offering personalized, adaptive learning experiences that mirror the demands of the tourism industry. For instance, Angelaccio and Hajiyeva (2023) describe the use of AI-assisted self-learning platforms in digital tourism courses, enabling students to digitalize cultural routes and develop practical skills as smart tourism guides. These platforms leverage generative AI and machine learning to provide tailored feedback, adaptive content, and interactive resources, fostering self-regulated and lifelong learning-key competencies for future tourism professionals. Language proficiency is critical in tourism education, and AI tools are increasingly used to enhance language learning processes. A study at the University of Zaragoza evaluated ChatGPT's effectiveness in simulated tourism industry scenarios, finding that students valued its capacity for interactive conversation, error correction, and scenario-based practice. Such tools can personalize learning, adapt to individual student needs, and provide instant feedback features that respondents in the current study identified as key advantages. These findings support the research objective of mapping students' preferences and perceived value of specific AI tools in LSP (Language for Specific Purposes) courses.

The reactions of LSP and/or English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers to AI aids in language instruction have been mixed. Some voice worries about ethical issues, like plagiarism and data privacy, while others welcome new technologies for their ability to enhance learning (Rahardyan et al. 2024). AI's role in tourism education extends beyond language learning to encompass the digital transformation of the sector. AI-powered applications as chatbots, virtual agents, recommender systems, and big data analytics-are now integral to tourism operations, and their use in educational settings prepares students for industry demands. Kirtil and Aşkun (2021) note that AI enhances productivity, operational efficiency, and personalized service experiences in tourism and hospitality, mirroring the skills students must acquire for future employment. The integration of AI into curricula is seen as essential for developing not only technical proficiency but also critical thinking, adaptability, and ethical awareness. This aligns with the study's objectives to assess how AI adoption in education supports students' industry readiness and the development of relevant competencies.

Despite its advantages, AI adoption in tourism education is not without challenges. Faculty readiness, ethical considerations (such as data privacy and academic integrity), and resource allocation remain significant hurdles. As noted by Knani, Echchakoui, and Ladhari (2022), the rapid digital transformation driven by AI requires multifaceted engagement from both educators and students, as well as institutional support to ensure responsible and effective integration.

2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

2.1. Research design

The study adopted a survey approach to investigate Slovenian students' views on the use of AI in foreign language learning and the impact of professional language teachers on AI-assisted learning. To that end, the 1KA web application was utilised to distribute an anonymous online survey. The questionnaire contained 15 items.

2.2. The study participants

Participants included students from the two Tourism faculties in Slovenia: the Faculty of Tourism Studies – Turistica at Portorož, part of the University of Primorska, Koper, and the Faculty of Tourism at Brežice, part of the University of Maribor. The study concentrated on bachelor's, university, and master's degree students. Students attending a foreign language course in the 2023/2024 academic year were selected for the study.

2.3. Data gathering

Students were invited to complete the online survey during their LSP course. Students were invited by their lecturer to complete the online survey during their LSP course. Students had access to the online survey in March and April of 2024. At the end of this period, 239 valid responses had been gathered.

2.4. Description of the sample

Among the 239 valid answers from respondents, 19.7% of them did not report their gender and were excluded from further statistical analysis; 64.6% were female, 34.9% were male, and 0.5% were non-binary. The respondents' mean age was 24 years (standard deviation of 6.8) while their median age was 21 years. The majority of respondents were 20 years old, ranging in age from 17 to 58 years.

2.5. Data analysis

The collected data were analysed using descriptive statistics to determine students' attitudes, use patterns, and views on AI tools in foreign language learning. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov, Mann-Whitney U-, Kruskal-Wallis, and Shapiro-Wilk tests, and Spearman's correlational coefficients were used to examine the research hypotheses.

3. RESULTS

The instrument consisted of two sections, one focused on perceptions of students regarding their use of AI tools, where the number of items reached 8, in which case the item-total statistics point to a high reliability of the questionnaire (see Appendix 1). The reliability of this section of the instrument was checked, with the result of the Cronbach Alpha coefficient being .875, computed for 8 items (see Table 1), which indicates a high reliability of this part of the instrument. The second section of the instrument, composed of 7 items, focused on the students' perceptions regarding their LSP teachers' actions concerning AI tools use on their teaching. In this case, the 7-item-total statistics pointed to a highly reliable instrument, with the value of the Cronbach Alpha coefficient being .829 (see Appendix 2).

Table 1: **Test of reliability of the questionnaire used in the survey**

Reliability Statistics		
Cronbach's Alpha	**Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardised Items**	**No. of Items**
.874	**.875**	**8**

The respondents were also asked to state how often they used AI tools for different purposes on a 5-point Likert scale, where 1 meant never and 5 always. Descriptive statistics are presented in Table 2 below.

Table 2: **Descriptive statistics on the use of AI tools by purpose**

Statistic	Preparing homework and seminar papers	Producing written documents for evaluation	Editing or embellishing written assignments	Discovering new knowledge	Communicating with fellow students	Communicating with lecturers	Communicating on other formal occasions	Comparative reference analysis	Editing a bachelor's, master's, or doctoral dissertation
N	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239
Minimum	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Mean	2.73	2.68	2.68	2.52	1.82	1.62	1.67	2.15	1.84
Std. Dev.	1.22	1.22	1.24	1.18	1.09	0.98	1.01	1.28	1.16

Table 2 shows that, on average, respondents hardly ever use AI tools for communicating with their fellow students, lecturers, or on other formal occasions, for comparative reference analysis or editing a bachelor's, master's, or doctoral dissertation (scores from 1.62–2.15). With ratings ranging from 2.52 to 2.73, respondents frequently use AI tools to prepare homework and other seminar papers, produce written documents for evaluation, edit or embellish their written assignments, and discover new knowledge.

As concerns Hypothesis 1, the normality of the distribution was checked using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. See Appendix 3 for statistical analysis of the normality of the data distribution by age.

In Appendix 3, all p-values are less than 0.05, which means the data are statistically significantly different from a normal distribution. The distribution is therefore non-normal, which led us to consider non-parametric alternatives to parametric tests, hence a a correlation analysis was performed to determine the interconnectedness of the variables listed in Appendix 3. See Appendix 4 for the results of Spearman's correlation test.

The non-normal distribution of the data caused us to select Spearman's test instead of Pearson's test for the correlation analysis. Each association has a low correlation coefficient, which is often not significant. However, the fact that the p-values always exceed the 0.05 level of statistical significance indicates that no statistically significant relationship exists between the variables. Note that a statistically significant correlation does not exist if the p-value is greater than 0.05.

Regarding Hypothesis 2, the normality of the distribution was checked using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. See Table 3 for statistical analysis of the normality of the data distribution by gender.

Table 3: **Results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test for the normality of the data distribution for the variable gender.**

Gender Statistics		**Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]**		
		df	***p***	
Communication	**M**	**0.193**	**52**	**0.000**
	F	**0.252**	**91**	**0.000**
Preparing and correcting written assignments	**M**	**0.104**	**52**	**.200***
	F	**0.119**	**91**	**0.003**
Learning new facts	**M**	**0.155**	**52**	**0.003**
	F	**0.215**	**91**	**0.000**
Comparative analysis of resources	**M**	**0.202**	**52**	**0.000**
	F	**0.240**	**91**	**0.000**
Preparing my bachelor's, master's or PhD thesis	**M**	**0.272**	**52**	**0.000**
	F	**0.306**	**91**	**0.000**
a. Lilliefors' significance correction				

The results shown in Table 3 show that the data variables for each gender mostly have a non-normal distribution after running normality tests on them. Although the data for the "Preparing and revising written assignments" variable are normally distributed for the male gender, this is not enough to justify the use of a parametric test in the subsequent steps.

Following the previous analyses, the Mann-Whitney U test was chosen to compare two independent samples of the variable gender (male students vs female students). As a non-parametric version of the t-test for two independent samples, it is not based on mean values but on ranks (see Table 4 below).

Table 4: **Results of the Mann-Whitney U test of independent samples for the variable gender**

Gender		N	Average rank
Communication	**M**	**59**	**88.08**
	F	**101**	**76.07**
	Total	**160**	
Preparing and correcting written assignments	**M**	**59**	**86.74**
	F	**99**	**75.19**
	Total	**158**	
Learning new facts	**M**	**53**	**78.81**
	F	**93**	**70.47**
	Total	**146**	
Comparative analysis of resources	**M**	**52**	**81.89**
	F	**92**	**67.19**
	Total	**144**	
Preparing my bachelor's, master's, or PhD thesis	**M**	**52**	**80.03**
	F	**93**	**69.07**
	Total	**145**	

Table 4 shows the results of the Mann-Whitney U test for comparison of ranks by gender. We observe that the rank and average are comparable in that a higher range corresponds to a higher score in the survey. According to the analysis, male students are more likely than female students to use AI for communication.

Notwithstanding the differences displayed in Table 4, only the Test Statistics table indicates whether they are statistically significant (i.e., if they can be extrapolated to the whole population at a risk level of 5%). Following the Mann-Whitney U test to determine the scores, further statistical analysis (see Table 5 for results) was performed to examine the statistical significance.,

Table 5: **Results of the statistical significance of the Mann-Whitney U test for the variable gender**

	Communication	Preparing and correcting written assignments	Learning new facts	Comparative analysis of resources	Preparing my bachelor's, master's, or PhD thesis
Mann-Whitney U	**2532.000**	**2493.5**	**2183.000**	**1903.500**	**2052.5**
Z	**-1.658**	**-1.546**	**-1.182**	**-2.121**	**-1.623**
P-value (2-way)	**0.097**	**0.122**	**0.237**	**0.034**	**0.105**

The statistics presented in Table 5 reveal that only the dimension "Comparative analysis of resources" demonstrates statistically significant differences. Regarding the elements listed in Table 6, in theory, no statistically significant differences exist between genders. The item Comparative study of resources, where gender inequalities exist, is the lone exception. One may thus infer that male students use AI technologies for this purpose more often and to a statistically significant degree.

Concerning Hypothesis 3, the normality of the data distribution was checked using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test (see Appendix 5 for the results).

The results presented in Appendix 5 show that the distribution is non-normal. All p-values in the table are below 0.05, indicating that they are statistically different from a normal distribution; hence, non-parametric tests were used instead of parametric ones. To that end, Spearman's correlation was applied to determine the interconnectedness of the variables (see Table 6 for the results).

Table 6: **Spearman's correlation analysis for the variable LSP teacher's influence on the variable age**

			Age
Spearman's rho	**Warnings of LSP teachers regarding the risks**	**Correlation coefficient**	**-0.118**
		p-value	**0.175**
		N	**133**
	Encouragement of LSP teachers to ethically use AI tools for various purposes	**Correlation coefficient**	**-0.072**
		p-value	**0.411**
		N	**133**
	Encouragement of LSP teachers to cite AI tools	**Correlation coefficient**	**-0.004**
		p-value	**0.961**
		N	**131**

The results shown in Table 6 reveal that each association has a modest correlation coefficient, often marginal. Nonetheless, since the p-values always exceed the 0.05 level of statistical significance, no relationship between variables is statistically significant.

Accordingly, there is no correlation between any two variables. This allows us to state that age has no discernible impact on either Hypothesis 1 or 2.

Although the above results indicate no statistically significant difference in how students view the impact of their LSP teachers' opinions on AI tool use concerning respondent age, we decided to additionally run a test to verify whether any other association can be established regarding the variable age (see Table 7 for results).

Table 7: **Spearman's test results for the variable age**

			Age
Spearman's rho	Age	Correlation coefficient	1.000
		p-value	
		N	167
	Encouraged AI use to compare AI text with your text	Correlation coefficient	-0.056
		p-value	0.525
		N	133
	Encouraged to use AI tools to write your homework or other written assignments	Correlation coefficient	-0.005
		p-value	0.952
		N	132
	Encouraged AI to learn more about written composition	Correlation coefficient	-0.062
		p-value	0.479
		N	132
	Warned about the risk of cheating	Correlation coefficient	-.190*
		p-value	0.029
		N	132
	Warned about plagiarism	Correlation coefficient	-0.083
		p-value	0.347
		N	132
	Encouraged to cite the AI tool as a reference in your written assignments	Correlation coefficient	-0.004
		p-value	0.961
		N	131
	Warned about the high risk of untrue statements	Correlation coefficient	-0.070
		p-value	0.420
		N	133

The results shown in Table 7 revealed a correlation between age and one item: "Warned of the possibility of cheating". While it is a weak and negative connection, it is nevertheless statistically significant. A negative correlation means that one variable falls as the other rises. It may hence be concluded that the older the respondent, the more their impression of LSP teachers' influence on their use of AI technologies decreases in terms of the potential for cheating. However, as already noted, age still has a very modest impact on this variable.

Regarding Hypothesis 3, statistical analysis for the variable gender was performed. First, the normality of the data distribution was checked using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test (see Appendix 6 for the results).

A non-normal distribution is found everywhere according to normality tests performed on the data for each gender, as shown in Appendix 6.

We eliminated the non-binary group, as in H1, since it is an unrepresentative group, because this hypothesis also takes gender into account.

In order to investigate further associations between two independent groups, we decided to apply the Mann-Whitney U test (see Table 8 for the results).

Table 8: **Results of the Mann-Whitney U test for independent samples regarding LSP teachers' influence on the respondents' use of AI tools and their gender**

Gender		N	Average rank
Warnings of LSP teachers regarding the risks	**M**	**50**	**57.97**
	F	**82**	**71.70**
	Total	**132**	
Encouragement of LSP teachers to ethically use AI tools for various purposes	**M**	**50**	**70.11**
	F	**82**	**64.30**
	Total	**132**	
Encouragement of LSP teachers to cite AI tools	**M**	**50**	**63.21**
	F	**80**	**66.93**
	Total	**130**	

Here, we looked for differences in the average rank of the chosen variables that were statistically significant. We computed the average rankings based on the second (independent) variable that splits the chosen variables. We observed variations in average score, but to determine if they are statistically significant, we chose to additionally perform a statistical analysis of the Mann-Whitney U test (results in Table 9).

Table 9: **Results of the Mann-Whitney U test statistics analysis for the influence of LSP teachers on the respondents' use of AI tools according to the variable gender**

	Warnings of LSP teachers regarding the risks	Encouragement of LSP teachers to ethically use AI tools for various purposes	Encouragement of LSP teachers to cite AI tools
Mann-Whitney U	**1623.500**	**1869.500**	**1885.500**
Z	**-2.014**	**-0.861**	**-0.567**
P-value (2-tailed)	**0.044**	**0.389**	**0.571**

The table test results show that exclusively the "Warnings of LSP teachers regarding the risks" variable reveals a significant difference between men and women.

Therefore, we deduce that only the aspect "Warnings of LSP teachers regarding the risks" exhibits statistically significant variations between genders. This, along with the findings in Appendix 6, reveals that female students perceive a statistically significantly stronger influence of LSP teachers regarding AI-related warnings (71.70) than male students do (57.97).

DISCUSSION

This study fills the research vacuum by offering insightful information on how Slovenian tourism students are using AI technologies in their LSP learning. Two-thirds of respondents use AI infrequently, mostly for useful activities like assignment preparation, writing improvement, and information discovery, indicating a modest degree of acceptance, according to the data. This supports research that shows AI can improve language proficiency and productivity (Alharbi 2023; Fleckenstein et al. 2023), but it also shows that AI is not yet widely incorporated into every facet of students' LSP learning processes. The overwhelming preference for ChatGPT (90 percent usage) is indicative of its broad accessibility and adaptability, supporting worldwide trends since its introduction (Huang et al. 2023).

The results largely rejected Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 2, indicating that age and gender generally do not play a statistically significant role in how frequently students use AI tools for most LSP-related tasks. This suggests that AI usage patterns in this cohort may be driven more by course demands, accessibility, or perceived utility rather than demographic factors. This contrasts somewhat with research suggesting socio-cultural factors can influence AI attitudes (Kim & Lee 2024), implying that within this specific academic context, other variables might be more dominant. The exception found – males using AI significantly more for "Comparative analysis of resources" – warrants further investigation, perhaps reflecting different research strategies or confidence levels with analytical AI applications.

Hypothesis 3 received partial support, specifically regarding gender differences in perceiving teacher influence. The finding that female students perceive a significantly stronger influence from teachers' warnings about AI risks is intriguing. This could relate to differing sensitivities to cautionary advice, varying levels of risk perception, or potentially different interactions with instructors. The weak negative correlation between age and perceiving teacher influence on cheating warnings suggests that older (possibly more experienced or independent) students might feel less swayed by such warnings. The general lack of significant influence perceived from teachers across most dimensions suggests either that teachers are not strongly communicating their views on AI or that students do not perceive these views as highly influential on their own usage decisions.

The students' usage patterns (high for writing/assignments, low for communication/analysis), combined with cited concerns about dependency and accuracy (AbdAlgane & Othman, 2023), paint a picture of pragmatic but cautious adoption. Students leverage AI for efficiency gains in core academic tasks but seem hesitant to rely on it for interpersonal communication or complex analytical work, possibly reflecting awareness of AI's limitations or a preference for human interaction in these areas. The prevalent concerns about discouraging independent thinking align with ethical discussions in the literature (Abimbola Eden et al. 2024).

These findings have significant implications for LSP education in tourism. Educators need to acknowledge that AI tools are already part of the students' learning ecosystem. Instead of ignoring or banning them, integrating AI literacy and ethical use guidelines into the curriculum seems necessary (Azzam & Charles 2024). Strategies could focus on leveraging AI for specific tasks (e.g., draft generation, grammar checking) while emphasizing critical evaluation of AI output and developing higher-order thinking skills that AI cannot replicate. The low use for communication suggests opportunities to explore AI tools that simulate real-world tourism interactions, potentially enhancing practical language skills.

CONCLUSION

The findings of this study provide a nuanced understanding of Slovenian tourism students' engagement with AI tools in LSP education, revealing both the transformative potential and the complex challenges that accompany AI integration in tourism and language learning contexts. This section critically analyses the results in light of contemporary scientific literature, highlighting key themes such as the pedagogical impact, ethical considerations, digital divides, and the evolving role of educators.

The moderate but growing adoption of AI tools among Slovenian tourism students aligns with broader trends in tourism and hospitality education, where AI is increasingly leveraged to personalize learning, provide instant feedback, and simulate real-world scenarios. As shown in this study, students predominantly use AI for assignment preparation, language refinement, and knowledge discovery, which echoes the findings of Fleckenstein et al. (2023) and Khan et al. (2024) regarding AI's effectiveness in enhancing writing skills and supporting individualized learning. However, the data also suggest that AI's use remains largely utilitarian and focused on written tasks, with limited application for communication or analytical purposes. This may indicate a lack of awareness or confidence in the broader capabilities of AI, or perhaps a preference for human interaction in areas requiring nuanced communication phenomenon.

A key concern raised by both students and the literature is the risk of overreliance on AI, which can undermine critical thinking and deep learning. As Purnama et al. (2025) highlight, students who habitually use AI to generate answers or complete assignments may develop only a superficial understanding and struggle to build foundational knowledge. This challenge is particularly acute in language learning, where authentic engagement and cognitive effort are essential for long-term proficiency. The present study's findings- that students appreciate AI's efficiency but worry about dependency- mirror these concerns and underscore the need for pedagogical strategies that position AI as a supportive tool rather than a substitute for active learning.

The integration of AI in tourism education raises significant ethical issues, including data privacy, academic integrity, and algorithmic bias. Students' concerns about the accuracy and reliability of AI-generated content are well-founded, as generative models can produce plausible but factually incorrect or culturally insensitive outputs. Purnama et al. (2025) emphasize the importance of transparency in AI systems-students and educators must understand how data is collected, processed, and used to inform learning. Moreover, the risk of plagiarism or uncritical acceptance of AI-generated text complicates assessment and calls for new forms of evaluation that prioritize original thought and process over product.

The study's results, when situated within the broader literature, suggest that AI holds significant promise for enhancing tourism education by supporting personalized, experiential, and industry-relevant learning. AI-powered simulations, chatbots, and adaptive learning platforms can prepare students for the realities of a rapidly digitizing tourism sector, where customer experience and operational efficiency are increasingly mediated by intelligent systems. However, the transition to AI-enhanced education must be managed carefully to avoid unintended consequences as skill atrophy, ethical lapses, or cultural insensitivity, to ensure that all students are equipped to thrive in the future workforce.

To maximize the benefits of AI in tourism education, institutions must develop robust ethical guidelines, provide comprehensive training for both staff and students, and foster a culture of critical engagement with technology. In summary, while AI tools are increasingly embraced by tourism students for their practical advantages, their integration into education must be guided by a critical, ethical, and inclusive approach. The findings of this study reinforce the importance of ongoing research, adaptive

pedagogy, and stakeholder collaboration to ensure that AI enhances rather than undermines the core objectives of tourism education-namely, the development of skilled, thoughtful, and culturally competent professionals for a global industry.

Challenges and Opportunities

Notwithstanding the advantages, integrating AI into tourism education entails certain difficulties and future studies should concentrate on establishing frameworks that tackle these issues while optimising AI's capacity to improve academic results. To give students the analytical abilities required for sustainable practices, this involves investigating AI's function in sustainable tourist education (Neophytou et al. 2025).

Final remarks

By understanding students' perspectives and addressing the ethical and pedagogical implications of AI integration, educators can harness AI to enhance language learning while fostering critical thinking and ethical awareness. As AI continues to evolve and permeate educational landscapes, ongoing research and dialogue are vital to make sure that its integration supports, rather than undermines, the goals of education.

Ultimately, the future of AI in LSP education depends on our ability to navigate these complexities responsibly, leveraging AI to create more effective, personalised, and inclusive learning environments that prepare students for success in an increasingly interconnected world. By doing so, we can ensure that AI adds to the educational experience without taking away the essential human elements of learning and teaching.

Moreover, as AI technologies continue to advance, educators must stay updated on the latest developments and best practices in AI integration.

Limitations of the study

The study has several limitations that should be considered when interpreting its findings. First, the research sample was a specific group of students from Slovenian universities, which may limit its generalisability to other contexts. Future studies should aim to include a broader range of participants from different countries and educational backgrounds to provide a more comprehensive understanding of AI adoption in LSP education.

Second, the study relied on self-reported data from an online survey, which may be subject to biases like social desirability bias. Future research could benefit by combining survey data with observational studies or interviews to better understand students' experiences with AI tools.

Finally, the study focused primarily on students' perspectives and did not explore educators' views in depth. Including teachers' perspectives in future studies would provide a more balanced view of how AI is perceived and used in LSP education.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors wish to thank Mint International House (Murray Bales) for language editing this paper.
The presented research was supported by Erasmus+ grant number 2024-1-RO01-KA220-HED-000248845 funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the ANPCDEFP. Neither the European Union nor the ANPCDEFP can be held responsible for them. ¶

REFERENCES

AbdAlgane, M. and Othman, K.A.J. (2023), "Utilizing Artificial Intelligence Technologies in Saudi EFL Tertiary Level Classrooms", *Journal of Intercultural Communication*, Vol. 23, No. 1, pp. 92–99. https://doi.org/10.36923/jicc.v23i1.124

Abimbola Eden, C., Onyebuchi Nneamaka, C. and Idowu Sulaimon, A. (2024), "Education policy and social change: Examining the impact of reform initiatives on equity and access", *International Journal of Science and Research Archive*, Vol. 11, No. 2, pp. 139–146. https://doi.org/10.30574/ijsra.2024.11.2.0372

Alenezi, M. (2023), "Digital Learning and Digital Institution in Higher Education", *Education Sciences*, Vol. 13, No. 1. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13010088

Alharbi, W. (2023), "AI in the Foreign Language Classroom: A Pedagogical Overview of Automated Writing Assistance Tools", *Education Research International*, 2023. https://doi.org/10.1155/2023/4253331

Almashy, A., Ahmed, A.S.M.M., Jamshed, M., Ansari, M.S., Banu, S. and Warda, W.U. (2024), "Analyzing the Impact of CALL Tools on English Learners' Writing Skills: A Comparative Study of Errors Correction", *World Journal of English Language*, Vol. 14, No. 6, p. 657. https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v14n6p657

Angelaccio, M. and Hajiyeva, U. (2023), "Slow Tourism Project to Redistribute Tourist Demand in Lazio: Cost–Benefit Analysis Using Monte Carlo Simulation", *Athens Journal of Tourism*, Vol. 10, No. 4, pp. 243–258. https://doi.org/10.30958/ajt.10-4-1

Azzam, A. and Charles, T. (2024), "A Review of Artificial Intelligence in K–12 Education", *Open Journal of Applied Sciences*, Vol. 14, No. 8, pp. 2088–2100. https://doi.org/10.4236/ojapps.2024.148137

Dimulescu, C. and Nechifor, A. (2021), "Accommodating English for Specific Purposes to Computer Assisted Language Learning", *Bulletin of the Transilvania University of Braşov. Series IV: Philology and Cultural Studies*, Vol. 14 (63), No. 2, pp. 5–18. https://doi.org/10.31926/but.pcs.2021.63.14.2.1

Ekstrom, S. (2024), *Unleashing the Power of AI: Transforming Tourism, Destination Marketing, and Economies with a Glimpse into the Learn Tourism's Cutting-Edge Tools*, viewed 04 March 2025, https://blog.learntourism.org/unleashing-the-power-of-ai-transforming-tourism-destination-marketing-and-economies-with-a-glimpse-into-the-tourism-academys-cutting-edge-tools

Fleckenstein, J., Liebenow, L.W. and Meyer, J. (2023), "Automated Feedback and Writing: A Multi-Level Meta-Analysis of Effects on Students' Performance", *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 4. https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2023.1162454

Fleischhauer, K. and Friedrich, K. (2024), "Factors Determining the Efficacy of AI-Generated Word Problems for Content-Specific Math Language Courses in Higher Education", *Scripta Manent*, Vol. 19, No. 1, pp. 4–24. https://doi.org/10.4312/SM.19.1.4-24

Huang, X., Zou, D., Cheng, G., Chen, X. and Xie, H. (2023), "Trends, Research Issues and Applications of Artificial Intelligence in Language Education", *Technology & Society*, Vol. 26, No. 1, pp. 112–131. https://doi.org/10.2307/48707971

Khan, N., Khan, Z., Koubaa, A., Khan, M.K. and Salleh, R.B. (2024), "Global insights and the impact of generative AI-ChatGPT on multidisciplinary: A systematic review and bibliometric analysis", Connection Science, Vol. 36 No. 1, Article 2353630, https://doi.org/10.1080/09540091.2024.2353630

Kim, S.W. and Lee, Y. (2024), "Investigation into the Influence of Socio-Cultural Factors on Attitudes toward Artificial Intelligence", *Education and Information Technologies*, Vol. 29, No. 8, pp. 9907–9935. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-12172-y

Kirtil, I.G. and Aşkun, V. (2021), "Artificial Intelligence in Tourism: A Review and Bibliometrics Research", *Advances in Hospitality and Tourism Research (AHTR)*, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 205–233. https://doi.org/10.30519/ahtr.801690

Knani, M., Echchakoui, S. and Ladhari, R. (2022), "Artificial Intelligence in Tourism and Hospitality: Bibliometric Analysis and Research Agenda", *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 107, 103317. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2022.103317

McCarthy, J., Minsky, M.L., Rochester, N. and Shannon, C.E. (2006), "A Proposal for the Dartmouth Summer Research Project on Artificial Intelligence", *AI Magazine*, Vol. 27, No. 4. https://doi.org/10.1609/aimag.v27i4.1904

Neophytou, R., Liasaidou, S., Pipyros, K. and Christofi, A. (2025), "Artificial Intelligence Driven Adaptive Learning Methods in Sustainable Tourism Education", *Worldwide Hospitality and Tourism Themes*, Vol. 17, No. 1, pp. 120–131. https://doi.org/10.1108/WHATT-12-2024-0308

Purnama, M., Adnyana, I., Sogen, A., Indrawan, G. and Santosa, M. (2025), "Teachers' Readiness toward Artificial Intelligence in the Schools of North Bali", *Jurnal Paedagogy*, Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 23–32. https://doi.org/10.33394/jp.v12i1.13707

Rahardyan, T.M., Susilo, C.H., Iswara, A.M.N. and Hartono, M.L. (2024), "ChatGPT: The Future Research Assistant or an Academic Fraud? A Case Study on a State University Located in Jakarta, Indonesia", *Asia Pacific Fraud Journal*, Vol. 9, No. 2, pp. 275–293. https://doi.org/10.21532/apfjournal.v9i2.347

Shard, D.K. and Koul, S. (2024), "Digital Transformation in Higher Education: A Comprehensive Review of e-Learning Adoption", *Human Systems Management*. https://doi.org/10.3233/HSM-230190

Suryanarayana, K.S., Kandi, V.S.P., Pavani, G., Rao, A.S., Rout, S. and Krishna, T.S.R. (2024), "Artificial Intelligence Enhanced Digital Learning for the Sustainability of Education Management System", *Journal of High Technology Management Research*, Vol. 35, No. 2. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hitech.2024.100495

Wang, S., Wang, F., Zhu, Z., Wang, J., Tran, T. and Du, Z. (2024), "Artificial Intelligence in Education: A Systematic Literature Review", *Expert Systems with Applications*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2024.124167

Zong, Y. and Yang, L. (2025), "How AI-Enhanced Social–Emotional Learning Framework Transforms EFL Students' Engagement and Emotional Well-Being", *European Journal of Education*, Vol. 60, No. 1. https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12925

APPENDIX 1: ITEM-TOTAL STATISTICS

Item-Total Statistics					
	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
What do you use AI software, A: Communication with my lecturers or on other formal occassions	16,02	30,248	,580	,466	,864
What do you use AI software, A: Communication with my peers (fellow students)	16,22	29,902	,577	,490	,864
What do you use AI software, A: Homework and various seminar papers	15,15	29,120	,622	,598	,860
What do you use AI software, A: Preparing written documents for assessment	15,33	26,932	,769	,727	,843
What do you use AI software, A: Correcting or embellishing my written assignments	15,27	27,928	,653	,635	,856
What do you use AI software, A: Learning new facts	15,30	28,337	,575	,420	,866
What do you use AI software, A: Comparative analysis of references	15,73	27,747	,703	,552	,851
What do you use AI software, A: Preparing my diploma paper, master`s thesis, doctoral dissertation	15,91	28,084	,596	,454	,863

APPENDIX 2: ITEM-TOTAL STATISTICS FOR THE SECOND SECTION OF THE INSTRUMENT AND THE CRONBACH ALPHA COEFFICIENT

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Did any of your language profe: Incouraged AI use to compare AI text with your own text	16,01	26,961	,527	,568	,811
Did any of your language profe: Incouraged AI use to write your homework or other written assignments	16,11	28,333	,459	,621	,821
Did any of your language profe: Incouraged AI USE to learn more on written composition	16,12	27,708	,539	,549	,811
Did any of your language profe: Warned about the risk of cheating	14,75	24,175	,644	,748	,792
Did any of your language profe: Warned about plagiarism	14,76	23,997	,597	,696	,801
Did any of your language profe: Incouraged to cite the AI tool as a reference in your written assignments	15,65	25,122	,591	,430	,801
Did any of your language profe: Warned about the high risk of untrue statements	14,92	24,108	,663	,600	,788

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
,827	,829	7

APPENDIX 3: RESULTS OF THE KOLMOGOROV-SMIRNOV TEST OF THE NORMALITY OF THE DATA DISTRIBUTION FOR THE VARIABLE AGE

	Kolmogorov-Smornov [a]		
	Statistics	**df**	**p**
Communication	**0.229**	**144**	**0.000**
Preparing and correcting written assignments	**0.114**	**144**	**0.000**
Learning new facts	**0.194**	**144**	**0.000**
Comparative analysis of resources	**0.206**	**144**	**0.000**
Preparing my Bachelor's, Master's, or PhD. thesis	**0.296**	**144**	**0.000**
A Lilliefor's significance correction			

APPENDIX 4: SPEARMAN'S RHO CORRELATION TEST RESULTS FOR THE VARIABLE AGE

			Age
Spearman's rho	**Communication**	**Correlation coefficient**	**0.036**
		p-value	**0.668**
		N	**145**
	Preparing and correcting written assignments	**Correlation Coefficient**	**-0.020**
		p-value	**0.809**
		N	**147**
	Learning new facts	**Correlation coefficient**	**-0.024**
		p-value	**0.771**
		N	**147**
	Comparative analysis of resources	**Correlation coefficient**	**-0.044**
		p-value	**0.603**
		N	**145**
	Preparing my bachelor's, master's, or PhD thesis	**Correlation coefficient**	**0.129**
		p-value	**0.120**
		N	**146**

APPENDIX 5: RESULTS OF THE KOLMOGOROV-SMIRNOV TEST OF THE NORMALITY OF THE DATA DISTRIBUTION FOR THE VARIABLE LSP TEACHERS' IMPACT

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]		
	Statistics	df	*p*
Warnings of LSP teachers regarding the risks	**0.096**	**131**	**0.005**
Encouragement of LSP teachers to ethically use AI tools for various purposes	**0.175**	**131**	**0.000**
Encouragement of LSP teachers to cite AI tools	**0.215**	**131**	**0.000**
a. Lilliefors significance correction			

APPENDIX 6: RESULTS OF THE KOLMOGOROV-SMIRNOV TEST FOR THE NORMALITY OF THE DATA DISTRIBUTION

Gender Statistics		Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a] df	*p*	
Warnings of LSP teachers regarding the risks	**M**	**0.126**	**50**	**0.044**
	F	**0.125**	**80**	**0.003**
Encouragement of LSP teachers to ethically use AI tools for various purposes	**M**	**0.152**	**50**	**0.005**
	F	**0.193**	**80**	**0.000**
Encouragement of LSP teachers to cite AI tools	**M**	**0.203**	**50**	**0.000**
	F	**0.216**	**80**	**0.000**
a. Lilliefor's significance correction				