



Exploring Ethical Criticism and AI Applications in Literature Education Through TAM, TPACK, and AI Tools

Mirzana Pašić Kodrić¹, Seniha Krasniqi²

¹ University of Sarajevo, Faculty of Pedagogy, 72 Skenderija St., BIH-71000 Sarajevas, Bosnia and Herzegovina, mpkodric@pf.unsa.ba

² University of Prishtina, Faculty of Philology, George Bush St., Prishtina, Republic of Kosovo, seniha.krasniqi@uni-pr.edu

Annotation. This paper inquires about the attitude and competence of educators in terms of AI inclusion in the literature classroom. The research offers findings of the survey with its quantitative and qualitative results from fractional items of the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) and partial Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPCK) framework. Sequentially, the paper includes testing of the Teachy app for textual analysis, interpretations, critical discussions, and activities in the frame of ethical criticism.

Keywords: *AI tools, literature classroom, ethical criticism, TAM, TPACK.*

Introduction

Technological development in recent years has affected life in every field, and this has not surpassed literature classrooms. As such, literature could not resist the movement that required innovation in its delivery; hence, it strived for adaptability. Since the early 1980s, a range of disciplines have been developed in education and technology (Rienties et al. 2020), and these disciplines are constantly being shaped because technology has made a significant impact on today's society and human beings. It

has greatly changed the way we think, feel, act, communicate, and interact with each other (Chen et al. 2020), specially during the last decade. Applications of artificial intelligence (AI) methods in various academic fields have significantly increased due to the rapid development of data processing and computing technologies (Ouyang et al. 2023). As per Chen et al. (2020) AI applications in education (AIED) with its variety of tools found its place in high schools and higher education from teaching robots to the learning system.

To some degree, AI made its entrance in the literature classrooms over numerous utopian and dystopian narratives. Namely, oral literature has always nurtured such narratives, denoting that it was precisely children's literature, through non-human beings that possess intelligence, autonomy, and excellence, that set the framework criteria and motivation for the development of AI, which was developed after oral and written for developed by the film industry. Therefore, historically speaking, from oral literature to today's various prose genres and fiction, the motif of AI is highly prevalent in various forms, including children's literature. The reference to the fairy tales "The Steadfast Tin Soldier" (1838) by Hans Christian Andersen, "Alice in Wonderland" (1865) by Lewis Carroll, "The Wizard of Oz" (1900) by L. Frank Baum, "Pinocchio" (1883) by Carlo Collodi (1883), "The Iron Giant" (1968) by Ted Hughes, "Conrad: The Factory-Made Boy" (1975) by Christine Nöstlinger would suffice, to today's picture books for children such as "A Kids Book About AI" (2025) by Neha Shukla, among others. Therefore, children's literature has always had the need to deviate from the mimetic concept of reality of the literary text to discover other and unreal beings, exploring the spaces of the possible and the impossible, while portraying the universal themes of love, betrayal, justice, wisdom, and courage

Precisely for the aforementioned circumstances, AI represents a huge challenge for the world of literature in general, and especially for its use among educators of children's literature and its application in teaching. Rather than avoidance, the focus should lie on the future incorporation of technology in literature classrooms. Hence, the study employed the Technology Acceptance Model TAM by Davis (1989) and the Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge TPCK frameworks by Mishra and Koehler (2006) to address educators' receptiveness, willingness, and ability to incorporate AI tools in their teaching practice.

Previous studies, such as Tan et. al. (2025), focus on the opportunities AI tools offer and the needs of the educators, while Kshetri (2023) concentrates on the benefits it offers for both educators and students. Güçlü (2025), exploring the metadiscursive perspective in AI, advocates ChatGPT's support in education, considering it worthy of academic inquiry due to its focus on stance over structure in argumentative essays. Tandon and Sharma focus on the ethical consequences of AI in literature, emphasizing balance in their combination rather than competing for the pivotal role. While Zawacki-Richter et al. (2019) praise the benefits of the Institute for Ethical AI in Education established

in the UK, Nie Zhenzhao (2024) focuses on Ethical Literary Criticism. Furthermore, Ted Underwood (2018; 2020) expresses his belief in the subjectivity of the interpretations by AI, which, as a bottom line, comes from an algorithm prepared by humans. This claim is opposite to Daniel Sinykin et al.'s (2019) stance, who believe in emotional detachment of the AI.

Adding to the rising number of studies of AI use in the literature classroom, this study, besides examining the attitude of the educators' on the issue, it aimed to test the possibility of incorporation of AI-generated ethical criticism in the literature classroom through TAM and TPACK frameworks, aiming to test the accuracy and suitability of the use of AI-generated content and its role in the incorporation as a supportive or key instructional tool, hence defining the outcomes of this pedagogical practice. Consequently, it comprised the following research questions.

1. What is the educators' approach, experience, and willingness to include AI tools in their literature classroom (assessment partially conducted with the idea of TAM and TPACK frameworks)?
2. What are the limitations and accuracy of AI-generated lesson plans in terms of ethical criticism (evaluating emotional intelligence and ethical reasoning)?

Literature Review

Notwithstanding the fact that artificial intelligence has become a reality in our lives, there is still a clear fear, resistance, suspicion, and belief in teaching circles that the use of artificial intelligence will greatly disrupt educational, social, psychological, and many other civilizational trends of the world. The hype surrounding AI has given rise to all kinds of speculations about the future of AI and indeed the future of what it is to be human (Coeckelbergh, 2020) in a world where the line between the human mind and machines becomes indistinct, which offers potentials once confined to science fiction. This is not some far-off future; it is happening now, intricately woven into the fabric of our fast-evolving technology (Future Ethics Press, 2024). Psychology formerly gave answers to the definition of fear as one of the primary human emotions, typically directly related to the unknown and unexperienced; hence, it causes resistance to many novelties. The idea that superintelligence and machines will take over, will master us rather than the other way around.

Furthermore, in terms of AI and literature relations, Homes et al. (2022) are supporters praising their combination in thematic analysis, character analysis, various creative activities, and instructions. Similarly, Tan et al. (2023) focus on the professional development of educators in AI use. Tandon and Sharma (2025) mention their concern about the prejudice that the algorithm of AI tools carry, hence supporting traditional

learning, similar to Yaday, who writes that “the richness of human interpretation, rooted in cultural and historical contexts, remains irreplaceable” (2024, p.563).

Being focused on a more specific theoretical framework of Ethical Literary Criticism, initiated by Nie Zhenzhao, apart from ethical criticism, they further elaborate developments in annual Conventions of the International Association for Ethical Literary Criticism, which discussed the transformations in literary research that lie in the alliance with digitalization. This is even more fortified through Future Humanities Lab established at Guangdong University of Foreign Studies, which “aims to...explore interdisciplinary development between AI learning and humanities disciplines, and seek scientific methods and approaches for reconstructing literary theory” (2024, p. 559).

Ted Underwood is likewise considered a suitable reference with his work “Machine Learning and Human Perspective” since he treats the objective/subjective viewpoint offered by AI, in which he states that numbers do not have equal value in literature in comparison to the interpretation of the literary works, adding “it may be time to reexamine the assumption that numbers are useful only for objective description. Machine learning algorithms are actually bad at being objective and rather good at absorbing human perspectives implicit in the evidence used to train them” (Underwood, 2020, p.92).

Alternatively, Hui, among others, emphasizes Ganascia for finding the middle ground between humanism and digital science (2023), the opinion we agree with since Ganascia is the most realistic in unfolding what the opportunities and refined methodologies offered by technology can bring to the humanities, thus literature.

Conceptually, it is of research interest to be based on Davis (1989), who developed the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), which served for inquiry into the educators’ acceptance and use of AI tools. The model is further divided into Perceived Usefulness (PU), Perceived Ease of Use (PEOU), and Behavioral Intention (BI), which measure educators’ belief in the effectiveness of technology, their belief in the ease rather than complexity while using technology in their classroom, as well as their willingness to use technology in their instructions.

On the other hand, Mishra and Koehler, who do not claim that they are the first to treat the issue of TPCK (Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge) mention that “good teaching requires an understanding of how technology relates to the pedagogy and content (and was previously treated by: Hughes, 2005; Keating & Evans, 2001; Lundeborg, Bergland, Klyczek, & Hoffman, 2003; Margerum Leys & Marx, 2002; Neiss, 2005; Zhao, 2003)” (Mishra & Koehler, 2006, p. 1026).

The blend of content, pedagogy, and technology reflects educators’ ability to use technology productively during the content/lecture delivery. Additionally, to find the most suitable strategies in the combination of these three components and not isolating them, creating ‘dynamic equilibrium’ between them makes one updated.

Methodology

Research Design

This study includes two key parts, where the first part was based on a survey with educators to assess AI integration in literature education using a mixed method approach with qualitative and quantitative techniques, aiming to clearly justify the offered calculations, as well as a descriptive-evaluative research design approach for the aim of exploration and evaluation of AI tools. The preference of method combination enables cross-verification of statistical results with interpretive output.

The focus group of the survey, which was involved with literature in an academic capacity, was selected through convenience sampling, which was deemed suitable considering the scarcity of AI use in the literature classroom. The survey was opened with an ethical statement where respondents were informed of their volunteering, the matter, and the research purposes of the survey. All data were collected anonymously, and participants were assured that their responses would remain confidential and would be used solely for academic purposes.

The second part of the study employed an AI-assisted lesson plan for “Little Red Riding Hood,” which offered a study plan on ethical aspects of the fairy tale hence, enabled content analysis.

Participant demographics for the survey

Participants were selected among 22 educators, with the gender distribution of 17 female (77.30%) and 5 male (22.7%). The majority, 17 participants, come from Bosnia and Herzegovina (77.3%), and 5 participants from Kosovo (22.7%). Regarding experience levels of the participants, they belong to junior (6; 27.3%), experienced (9; 40.9%), and a smaller number of senior level (7; 31.8%). Current teaching institutions include elementary/middle schools with 12 educators (54.5%), high schools with 7 educators (31.8%), and universities with 3 educators (13.6%), who had middle school teaching experience. The average age of the participants is 38.5, with a standard deviation of 8.3.

Instrumentation details:

With the content based on TAM, its components, and the complementary TPCK framework, the survey investigated the general attitude of the educators through close-ended questions, which further encouraged the respondents to elaborate on their answer. Questions required information on educators’ use of AI tools, their flexibility for the integration of the AI tools, and the fear of addiction to AI tools.

Subsequently, thematic analysis was conducted through additional open-ended questions since they “are subjected to thematic analysis to “identify, analyze, and report patterns (themes) within data” (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 79 in Karlsdóttir 2024, p. 15). Hence, three open-ended questions were integrated in the survey, aiming to gain additional insight from the educators’ experience on the accuracy of AI tool results in ethical criticism, the supposed ethical implications, and the tools they

apply in their classroom, which enriched the research with their views, challenges, and recommendations.

Multiple choice questions identified educators' points of using the AI tools, starting from the lesson planning to teaching method recommendation, and accordingly, revealed their experience in the classroom.

On the other side, the second part of the study includes the Teachy app, which was instructed with the input to prepare a lesson plan on the Ethical Aspects of the Fairy Tale "Little Red Riding Hood".

Data Collection and Data Analysis Procedure

Data was collected through an online questionnaire over two weeks, created in Google Forms with closed-ended, multiple-choice questions, and open-ended questions to provide respondents' qualitative input.

While the first section of the survey evaluated general attitude and experience of the educators with the incorporation of the AI tools in the classroom, the second part focused on their opinion regarding the suitability of ethical criticism offered by AI tools.

The statistics of the survey were analyzed and complemented with thematic analysis of the open-ended responses. Although not strictly abiding, the survey was based on theoretical framework of Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) and its Perceived Usefulness (PU), Perceived Ease of Use (PEOU) and Behavioral Intention (BI) items, striving to reveal educators' use of AI and their attitude with the complementary part of TPCK (Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge) which measures their knowledge and practices in combining content, pedagogy, and technology, thus understand 'how' it can be practiced.

Correspondingly, the second part of the study, which is the AI offered lesson plan, offered content analysis for its accuracy and adequacy for pedagogical purposes, comparing it to the traditional approach.

Descriptive-Evaluative Approach

By means of a descriptive-evaluative approach, AI app Teachy was tested, which provided insight into the usefulness of the tool during lesson planning in the fairy tale "Little Red Riding Hood". The measures evaluated were the accuracy in the offered materials, the pedagogic benefits, and the effectiveness of being included in the literature classroom.

This survey-based approach was applied to examine the amount of use, the manner of use, the addiction to, and appropriateness of artificial intelligence in literature courses, with its emphasis during ethical criticism discussions.

On the other side, the Teachy-generated lesson plan was treated through descriptive analysis for its effectiveness in the objectives, procedure, discussion, assessment, and activities suggested for classroom use.

Validity and Reliability

Quantitative Method: Cronbach's Alpha coefficients were calculated for the TAM and TPCK survey items. The TAM scale achieved 0.87, and the TPCK items 0.84, indicating good internal consistency and reliability of the quantitative data.

Qualitative Method: Open-ended questions were developed based on a literature review and expert consultation. Trustworthiness was ensured through inter-coder reliability (agreement = 0.91), member checking with selected participants, and maintaining a detailed audit trail of coding and analysis decisions.

Results

Literature depicts cultural values, social, moral, and ethical norms through literary works, which consequently demand critique of them by the reader. Readers, as a part of a society with its own norms and values, project their criticism, in particular, ethical criticism based on their background. Nevertheless, in the 21st century, technological developments demand inclusion of AI in the classrooms, which simultaneously require lesson planning, teaching material preparation with AI tools, aiming to enhance learning and maintain up-to-date teaching.

Descriptive Analysis

The presence of AI in education does not mean a suitable and sufficient application of technology in the classroom. An empirical research deficiency is noticed regarding the integration of AI in literature classrooms. Hence, this survey on Ethical Criticism in Literature and the Use of AI Tools initially measured educators' uses of AI tools and their openness towards the idea, their fear of addiction, and reliance on AI solutions in ethical criticism through close-ended questions (see Table 1) which reflect Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) and partially TPCK models.

Table 1

Statistics of Closed-Ended Questions on Ethical Criticism in Literature and the Use of AI Tools

Question	Yes	No	Maybe
Do you use AI tools?	76.5	23.5	
Do you know any other applications besides ChatGPT?	64.7	35.3	
Would you like to learn other AI tools?	60	13.3	26.7
Do you think you will become addicted to AI tools?	5.9	94.1	0
Does the addiction to AI tools frighten you?	6	88.2	5.8
Do you think that AI-offered solutions/answers are suitable for ethical criticism?	5.9	41.2	52.9
Do you think that a reader's ethical/moral thinking is more accurate than AI?	58.8	11.8	29.4

Table 1 presents educators’ practices, skills, digital competence, and attitudes in using AI in their classrooms. A significant number (76.5%) of educators state that they use AI tools in their classrooms, and a similar moderate level (64.7%) shows their awareness of applications beyond ChatGPT, such as Teachy, Microsoft Copilot, Grammarly, Turnitin, DeepSeek, Microsoft Copilot, and Donna.

60% of the respondents express their willingness to learn additional AI tools, while more than 13% are closed their professional development in AI use. A high percentage of over 94% do not fear AI and its controlling abilities, believing that they will not become “addicted”. Alhur et al. (2025) and Mazzoni (2017) lean on the consequences of excessive AI use, such as the risk of ethical use and harmful impact on critical thinking. While Zawacki-Richter et al. (2019) speak of insufficiency of published papers on the new ethical implications that come with AI use in higher education in general.

Moving closer to exploring the compatibility of AI tools during ethical criticism of literary works, the results reveal the reserved approach of the educators, with 52.9%. The moderate proportion of 58.8% bases their trust on the accuracy of human ethical criticism over the AIs, with a few responses of 29.4% or vagueness on the matter. The issue was likewise delved by Montfort (2021), Elkins and Chun (2019), who question ‘psychological depth’ and ‘emotional resonance offered by AI’; while Noble (2018) promotes skepticism in use of AI due to its limited emotional, psychological, and historical background, such as “combination of private interests in promoting certain sites, along with the monopoly status of a relatively small number of Internet search engines, leads to a biased set of search algorithms that privilege whiteness and discriminate against people of color, specifically women of color” (Noble, 2018, p. 56).

Multiple choice question of the survey, presented in Table 2, examines the items in which AI tools. The preference for multiple-choice questions enables respondents to specifically express their use of AI tools in various contexts.

Table 2
Where Do You Use an AI Tool?

Options	Percentage
Creation of the lesson plan	23.5%
Recommendation of learning material/sources	47.1%
Recommendations for the teaching methods	0
Interpretation of the themes/symbols/character analysis	0
Preparation of presentation, graph, video, etc.	29.4%

The results of Table 2, indicating variation in frequency of the AI usage, show that slight majority of respondents from 47.1% use AI tools for the recommendations of the learning material proving educators’ openness for inclusion of novelty material in their classroom, which partially corresponds with first and third point of Zawacki-Richter et al.,

who mention four areas of AIED application use in academic services as, “1. profiling and prediction, 2. assessment and evaluation, 3. adaptive systems and personalisation, and 4. intelligent tutoring systems” (2019, p.1). 29.4 % of respondents report their readiness to use AI in preparation of the teaching presentations, graphs, or videos, which is a less than moderate percentage. Similarly, a low percentage of 23.5% respondents stated that they use AI for lesson plan creation, which aligns with Hsu et al.’s (2024) writing on the much more widespread use of AI tools for other academic tasks but less for lesson planning. Respondents are not ready to use AI tools for the *Recommendations of the teaching methods* nor in the *Interpretation of the thematic analysis/symbols/character analysis*, expressing their reluctance, which similarly comes with a warning that “uncritical use of AI carries with it the danger of slipping into problematic discourses” (Clark & Van Kessel, 2024, p.169).

For a deeper insight into educators’ perspectives regarding ethical implications that fear them while using AI, open-ended questions were offered, where they stated their concerns that it can cause plagiarism, validity of information, dehumanization, manipulation, lack of empathy/emotions, copyright infringement, and intellectual property infringement. The responses also expressed fear of AI due to educators’ lack of knowledge about the proper use of AI tools, which can subsequently “open the door to unwilling sharing of the data or information; correspondingly, reliance on AI may make me less inquisitive, critical, or interested in doing research” (Respondent X). Only a few of the respondents expressed confidence in their use of AI tools, stating, “I don’t serve AI, AI serves me” (Respondent Y).

With the open-ended responses, educators state their concern about the AI-offered solutions referring to the biases reflected through AI algorithm and distortions about marginalized groups. Otherwise, despite his doubtful stance to AI, Underwood (2019) does not deny the helping hand which AI can provide. This was reinforced with a respondent’s analogy “why would we handwash if washing machine exists” (Respondent x).

Ethical criticism of “Little Red Riding Hood” through the AI app Teachy Education

The application Teachy Education – Free AI Assistant for Educators is presented as “Personalized study plans, AI-powered question answers, intelligent mock exams, and much more” (Teachy, 2025), which is intended for educators and students. It is a user-friendly app which offers the possibility of creating lesson plans, slide presentations, assessments, automatic grading, and similar. The application has a free-of-charge option, with an additional commercial character and a Premium edition, including various possibilities of obtaining credits for use. Considering the topic of this paper, it was strived to examine the use of the platform and its reliability in ethical criticism in the literature classroom, choosing the free-of-charge lesson plan on the topic of Ethical Aspects of the fairy tale “Little Red Riding Hood”. Through this testing, the aim was to objectively highlight both the positive and negative aspects of the application, including hubs that require educator supervision and potential areas for

improvement. In the first step, upon entering the desired title, the application created a lesson plan on the topic of Ethical Aspects of the fairy tale “Little Red Riding Hood” in less than one minute, which proves the simplification of educators’ work. The offered results are listed below, which are followed by content analysis, worth discussing solutions/options the application offered. The mentioned topic was chosen for two reasons: a) to examine the emotional intelligence of AI tools, and b) to examine the ethical components of AI devices in terms of ethical reasoning. There was a particular interest in whether AI tools see ethical criticism only as a positive moral discussion, or whether can recognize the inevitable reinterpretation of already established ethical settings – the so-called ethical reinterpretations behind which children’s literature often hides different ideologies of adults, rather than positive moral lessons (Pašić Kodrić & Pečenković, 2021).

Teaching of the children’s literature in primary school is carried out from subjects, which include the national language and literature (English language and literature, Italian language and literature, Bosnian language and literature, and so forth). Thus, although “it should be clear” from the title that this unit is primarily about teaching literature, the application did not recognize it – the application in the field of ‘Subject’ does not offer ‘literature’ option, which is an indication of the requirement of an educator’s supervision and caution.

Lesson Plan

Ethical Aspects of the Fairy Tale “Little Red Riding Hood” (Teachy, n.d.)

Subject: Language Arts/Social Studies

Grade Level: 6th grade

Time Allotment: 100 minutes

Objectives:

- Identify the main characters and plot of “Little Red Riding Hood”.
 - Discuss the importance of following the listening and guidance of parents/guardians.
 - Analyze the consequences of making poor choices in the story.
 - Explore themes of danger of unknown/strangers and deception.
 - Apply ethical reasoning to evaluate the characters’ actions.
-

It is commendable that the application supports the selection of lesson creation from preschool age to university level. This is notably beneficial for most educators who teach in different grades. Since in most European countries the primary and elementary lessons last from 45 to 50 minutes, the selection for this lesson plan is 100 minutes, i.e., two academic hours. It is commendable that the App offers different time frames – 30, 50, 100, 120, 150 minutes, in addition to a Custom option where the educator chooses the time frame themselves.

This component is an essential for every educator; it attention to the nature and explanation the verbs according to Revised Bloom’s taxonomy, which the application offers in the ‘Objectives’. (See Table 3).

Table 3
Bloom’s Revised Taxonomy (Meda & Swart, 2017)

Verb	Bloom’s Level(s)	Order of Thinking
to identify	1st level: Remember	Lower-order
to discuss	2nd and 5th levels: Understand / Evaluate	Mixed (can be low or high depending on depth)
to analyze	4th level: Analyze	Higher-order
to explore	4th, 5th, or 6th: Analyze / Evaluate / Create	Higher-order
to apply	3rd level: Apply	Middle (transition to higher-order)

Considering the abovementioned points, it can be deduced that the application supports the same cognitive level 4 – high order (verbs to analyze and to explore) by selecting the 4th level twice, which could eventually be changed; nonetheless, it is commendable that supports the Revised Bloom Taxonomy and that it offered varied levels of objectives.

Materials (Teachy, n.d.)
• Copies of “Little Red Riding Hood” (various versions are acceptable) • Whiteboard or projector • Markers or pens • Chart paper • Worksheet with discussion questions • Art supplies (optional)

It is worth noting that the application offers the possibility of processing different versions of “Little Red Riding Hood”, since it is useful for children to learn in the 6th grade that the fairy tales they have heard since preschool education, even if they come from different national oral traditions, and sometimes are the same by title, they can be written by different authors in different versions. Specifically, children must learn that the classic authors of “Little Red Riding Hood” are Charles Perrault (“Le Petit Chaperon Rouge”, 1697) and Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm (“Rotkäppchen”, 1812); nevertheless, the application did not mention the names of the authors, where accountability lies with the educator. The application offers a wide selection of other materials that do not need further comment.

Procedure (Teachy, n.d.)

Part 1: Introduction (10 minutes)

1. Begin by asking students if they are familiar with the story of “Little Red Riding Hood”.
2. Engage students by asking them what they remember about the story. Write down their answers on the whiteboard.
3. Briefly introduce the concept of ethics as a set of moral principles that guide our behavior. Explain that in this lesson, we will be exploring the ethical dimensions of the fairy tale.

The introductory part of the class is creatively designed and follows the methodical characteristics both in terms of time frame and meaning. The questions are useful and grounded.

There is a clear flow in the introductory part and what follows, but ethical criticism is, unfortunately, understood in a one-way, only as a context for discussion of positive moral reasoning, without the important idea that ethical criticism in literature must include the ideology of adults with the purpose of manipulation of the young readers in children’s literature.

Part 2: Story Reading and Summary (20 minutes) (Teachy, n.d.)

1. Read aloud a version of “Little Red Riding Hood”, or have students take turns reading sections of the story.
2. After reading, recap the main plot points
3. Ask students to summarize the story in their own words.

In the methodological context, it is extremely relevant to observe that the application, considering the age of the 6th grade of elementary school, offers the option of reading aloud the text of the fairy tale, but too much space in the lesson plan is left for the educator to choose whether he/she will read the text aloud, or whether one or more students will do it in turns. In the curricula, reading aloud in elementary school is an extremely demanding task, and depending on who does it (the educator or the students), it represents one of the fundamental goals of the lesson. Namely, if the educator reads, the students learn to read correctly by following his/her reading, whereas if the students read, it is not only a time of learning, but also a time of assessment.

Part 3: Discussion: Following Directions and Consequences (25 minutes) (Teachy, n.d.)

1. Lead a class discussion using the following questions:
 - Why does Little Red Riding Hood’s mother ask her to stay on the path? What are the potential dangers of straying from it?
 - What happens when Little Red Riding Hood disobeys her mother and talks to the wolf?

- Discuss the importance of following directions from parents or guardians.
 - What are some real-life examples of why it is important to follow rules and directions?
 - What are the consequences of Little Red Riding Hood's actions?
 - What could she have done differently?
2. Write student responses on chart paper.

The Application has unilaterally recognized all the basic ethical nodes of the fairy tale "Little Red Riding Hood"; nonetheless, the possibilities provided for discussion lack something more creative and a deeper discussion that would correspondingly imply the ideology of ethical criticism. Is it important to always follow the rules and listen to the adults? What if adults also make big mistakes, such as, parents abuse their own children? What are the consequences for children when adults make mistakes concerning them? What are the rules? Is it the Law or someone's personal opinion, they call them rules? In which segments of life rules must be respected, then, should we also strive for our own assessments in the sense of when breaking a rule becomes justifiable?

Part 4: Danger of unknown/ strangers and Deception (25 minutes)- (Teachy, n.d.)

1. Explain the concept of "danger of unknown or strangers" and why it is important to be cautious around people we do not know.
2. Discuss how the wolf deceives Little Red Riding Hood.
 - What are some of the tactics which the wolf uses for deception?
 - Why does Little Red Riding Hood trust the wolf?
 - How can we recognize when someone is trying to deceive us?
3. Brainstorm strategies for staying safe around strangers:
 - Never talk to strangers.
 - Never accept gifts or rides from strangers.
 - Always tell a trusted adult if a stranger approach you.

In this section, traces of the ideological nature of ethical criticism are observed, since ethical criticism and feminist literary criticism remind us that the fairy tale of "Little Red Riding Hood" should also be viewed through early learning about the special sensitivity of the female child population in the context of male predators, but also for both genders in general, notably concerning children.

Part 5: Ethical Evaluation and Alternative Endings (20 minutes) (Teachy, n.d.)

1. Ask students to evaluate the characters' actions from an ethical standpoint:
 - Was it ethical for the wolf to deceive Little Red Riding Hood and her grandmother? Why or why not?

- Was it ethical for the woodsman to kill the wolf? Discuss different perspectives on this action.
 - Was Little Red Riding Hood responsible for what happened?
2. Encourage students to think about alternative endings to the story:
 - What if Little Red Riding Hood had not talked to the wolf?
 - What if the grandmother had been able to defend herself?
 - How would these changes affect the ethical implications of the story?

The ideological nature of ethical criticism is observed most deeply, especially in the part of 'the responsibility' of Little Red Riding Hood, but also in the ethical part of killing the wolf. From the field of everything that ethical criticism in children's literature entails, this part of the lesson seems to be the best designed.

Assessment (Teachy, n.d.)

1. Observe student participation in class discussions.
2. Collect the worksheet with discussion questions for review.
3. (Optional) Have students create a drawing or write a short paragraph about what they learned from the story and its ethical lessons.

In a methodological sense, the Assessment part is well organized, and the application supports the optional interdisciplinary activity/assessment, correlation of teaching in literature classroom with other art education, since the Teachy offers 'creation of drawing.' This should not be marked as 'optional' in the lesson plan children's literature; it should be enforced as mandatory. The teaching of children's literature must be syncretistic (e.g., let's try at least 5 minutes to dance/act as Little Red Riding Hood with the music). Syncretism, in art, implies, among other things, the combination of two or more arts in one artistic creation, and in the lesson plan this merging of two types of art – literature and fine art cannot be optional, but it should be highlighted to greater extent because of potential innovations in teaching, from connecting different knowledge about individual arts to the broader, philosophical idea that syncretism is present in almost everything that surrounds us.

Differentiation (Teachy, n.d.):

1. For students who need more support, provide simplified versions of the story or pre-written sentence starters for discussion questions.
2. For advanced students, challenge them to write a short play or story that explores the ethical themes in more depth.

This section is of the plan that supports the different interests and abilities of students, offering personalized learning. Requirements of these options are a reality in every classroom, and therefore, this part of the plan holds substantial value. The fact

that how advanced students are, potentially challenged, demonstrates a high quality of proficiency.

Extension Activities (Teachy, n.d.):

1. Have students create posters about the danger of the unknown.
2. Read and discuss other fairy tales with ethical dilemmas.
3. Invite a guest speaker (e.g., a police officer or community safety expert) to talk about safety and ethical decision-making.

The extension activities offered by the Teachy app may be evaluated as overly ambitious. Despite the fact that they are very practically designed, they mostly require broader analytical knowledge, and the invitation of the guest speaker may represent a challenge.

Discussion and Conclusions

According to the dominant percentage of educators who incorporate AI in the classroom or otherwise, their eagerness to advance their acquaintance with AI tools points to educators' acceptance of the new reality in their profession, which aligns with three of the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) principles. Complementary research with TPCK shows educators' readiness for their professional development. Nevertheless, the incorporation of AI tools in the classroom varies in activities, where educators are ready to integrate the tools for creative tasks and object to its integration in thematic analysis, even less in teaching method recommendations. These responses relate to Alhur et al.'s (2025) writing on the risks that AI can bring to the classroom, starting from affecting critical thinking to plagiarism, warning users of the cunning side of the AI tools. This alert can add to the vigilance of the educators who show their concern due to their lack of AI literacy.

Regarding the AI use in ethical criticism, respondents express their uncertainty, which comes from the dominating internet sources which offer partial results; hence, some groups dominate over unprivileged ones. On the other side, the emotional detachment which a machine can offer neglecting human sentiments can be considered another component in disfavor of AI tools.

In the precise testing of AI tool inclusion in the literature classroom, the Teachy app offered the most important moral nodes of the "Little Red Riding Hood" fairy tale, but it only recognized traces of the ideological components of ethical criticism. All this, the appearance of the so-called ethical upheaval that was legitimized not so long ago in many social and humanistic areas, including in literary theory. In this regard, the so-called ethical criticism focused on ethical preoccupations and moral

messages of the text (Ćurković Nimac, 2012), in addition to the ideology of adults toward children (Pašić et al., 2021). In this context, it seems that AI tools, especially in teaching, are gaining special importance, and their great benefit is unquestionable. AI and applications such as Teachy help educators through a series of excellent possibilities that are most clearly observed in the context of the historical data of literature, besides literary theory, partly in literary criticism, as well as moderately, but significantly, in teaching methodology. Nevertheless, it is the schools that would have to remain, precisely because of the development of AI, places where the role of literature in society, its (non)influence on the individual, and current social changes, issues are discussed live. Literature and its study in classes, despite the rapid development of AI, was and remains a suitable ground for developing and nurturing emotional and social intelligence, empathy, and ethical awareness due to a number of its characteristics, and among the most dominant are certainly learning about the importance of socialization outside the framework of AI and social networks, in accepting otherness and foreignness, getting to know oneself through contact with the foreign, unknown, and different, far from 'othering' by being focused only to one dominant source or mindset.

In light of the points mentioned above, literature educators, through significant assistance from AI in lesson preparation, avoiding the addiction, ought to devote themselves to the most important aspects of teaching literature – the power of its healing character, but also the development of critical thinking, empathy, the beauty of socialization and living words, most of all preserving their integrity, authority, and irreplaceable role in front of the students as a guide and person of influence in their growth. This leads us to the collaborative approach between traditional methods and AI tools in the classroom, with the cautious use of AI involving human judgement in AI-offered material.

The useful insight which is offered by this paper can be complemented with further qualitative studies with the educators' testing the effectiveness of the AI-offered material, providing evaluative and descriptive results.

References

- Alhur, A.A., Khlaif, Z., Hamamra, B., & Hussein, E. (2025). The paradox of AI in higher education: A qualitative inquiry into AI dependency among educators in Palestine. *JMIR Medical Education*, 11. 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.2196/74947>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3 (2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Chan, C.K.Y., & Wong, H.Y.H. (2025). Assessing the ability of generative AI in English literary analysis through Bloom's Taxonomy. *Discover Computing*, 28 (127), 21–30. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10791-025-09572-8>

- Chen, X., Xie, H., & Hwang, G.-J. (2020). A multi-perspective study on artificial intelligence in education: Grants, conferences, journals, software tools, institutions, and researchers. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 1, 100005. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2020.100005>
- Chiu, T. K., Xia, Q., Zhou, X., Chai, C. S., & Cheng, M. (2023). Systematic literature reviews on opportunities, challenges, and future research recommendations of artificial intelligence in education. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 4, 100118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2022.100118>
- Clark, C.H. & Van Kessel, C. (2024). "I, for one, welcome our new computer overlords": Using artificial intelligence as a lesson planning resource for social studies. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Educator Education*, 24(2), 151–183. <https://www.learntechlib.org/primary/p/222459/>
- Coeckelbergh, M. (2020). *AI ethics*. MIT Press.
- Ćurković Nimac, J. (2012). Ethical criticism in literature, *Philosophic Research*, 32 (2), 327–342. <https://hrcak.srce.hr/97189>
- Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly*, 13(3), 319–339. <https://doi.org/10.2307/249008>
- Elkins, J., & Chun, W. H. K. (2019). Aesthetic data and the politics of AI. *Critical Inquiry*, 45(4), 799–827. <https://doi.org/10.3366/jhac.2023.0310>
- Future Ethic Press. (2024). *The ethics of uploading human consciousness*. Future Ethic Press.
- Galindo-Domínguez, H., Delgado, N., Losada, D., & Etxabe, J. M. (2023). An analysis of the use of artificial intelligence in education in Spain: The in-service educator's perspective. *Journal of Digital Learning in Educator Education*, 40(1), 41–56. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21532974.2023.2284726>
- Ganascia, J. G. (2015). The logic of the big data turn in digital literary studies. *Frontiers in Digital Humanities*, 2 (7), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fdigh.2015.00007>
- Güçlü, R. (2025). Does ChatGPT argue through structure or stance? A metadiscourse analysis of English argumentative essays across topics. In H. Aydemir, F. Başbuğ, & O. Çınar (Eds.), *Contemporary Studies in Linguistics I: IMU Linguistics 15th anniversary commemorative volume*, Artsürem. 1, 147–169. <https://doi.org/10.7816/imuling-15-25-01X007>
- Holmes, W., & Tuomi, I. (2022). State of the art and practice in AI in education. *European Journal of Education*. 57 (4). 542–570. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12533>
- Hsu, H.P., Mak, J., Werner, J., White-Taylor, J., Geiselhofer, M., Gorman, A., & Torrejon Capurro, C. (2024). Preliminary study on pre-service educators' applications and perceptions of generative artificial intelligence for lesson planning. *Journal of Technology and Educator Education*, 32(3), 409–437. <https://doi.org/10.70725/897776dkibzu>
- Hui, H. (2023). What can digital humanities do for literary adaptation studies: distant reading of children's editions of Robinson Crusoe. *Digital Scholarship in the Humanities*, 38(4). 1564–1576. <https://doi.org/10.1093/llc/fqad059>

- Karlsdottir, V. (2024). Assessing university students' motivation to choose distance learning and the challenges of distance learning. *Pedagogika*, 156 (4), 5–30. <https://doi.org/10.1093/llc/fqad059>
- Kopeck, A. (2016). The digital humanities. Literary criticism and the fate of a profession. *PMLA. Modern Language Association of America*, 131 (2), 324–339. <https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2016.131.2.324>
- Kshetri, N. (2023). The future of education: Generative artificial intelligence's collaborative role with educators. *IT Professional*, 25 (6), 8–12. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MITP.2023.3333070>
- Mazzoni, G. (2017). *Theory of the novel*. Harvard University Press.
- Meda, L. & Swart, A. J. (2017). Analysing learning outcomes in an electrical engineering curriculum using illustrative verbs derived from Bloom's Taxonomy. *European Journal of Engineering Education*, 1(14), 399–412. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03043797.2017.1378169>
- Mishra, P., & Koehler, M. J. (2006). Technological pedagogical content knowledge: A framework for educator knowledge. *Educators College Record*, 108(6), 1017–1054. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9620.2006.00684.x>
- Montfort, N. (2021). *Computational literature: Theory and practice*. MIT Press.
- Noble, S. U. (2018). *Algorithms of oppression: How search engines reinforce racism*. NYU Press. Scanned using Book ScanCenter 5033.
- Ouyang, F., Jiao, P., Alavi, A. H., & McLaren, B. M. (2022). Artificial intelligence in STEM education: Current developments and future considerations. In F. Ouyang, P. Jiao, A. H. Alavi, & B. M. McLaren (Eds.), *Artificial intelligence in STEM education*, 3–14. Artificial Intelligence in STEM Education: The Paradigmatic Shifts in Research, Education, and Technology. https://doi.org/10.1201/9781003181187-2?urlappend=%3Futm_source%3Dresearchgate.net%26utm_medium%3Darticle
- Pašić Kodrić, M., & Pečenković, V. (2021). Ethical criticism and children's literature. *Lijepa riječ (Kind word)*, University of Sarajevo, Faculty of Pedagogy. 198–209. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/351765789_Eticka_kritika_i_nastava_knjizevnosti_u_osnovnim_skolama
- Rienties, B., K hler Simonsen, H., & Herodotou, C. (2020). Defining the boundaries between artificial intelligence in education, computer-supported collaborative learning, educational data mining, and learning analytics: A need for coherence. *Frontiers in Education*, 5 (128), 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2020.00128>
- Sinykin, D., So, R. J., & Young, J. (2019). Economics, race, and the postwar US novel: A quantitative literary history. *American Literary History*, 31(4), 775–804. <https://doi.org/10.1093/alh/ajz042>
- Tandon, J. K., & Sharma, S. (2025). Artificial intelligence as modern digital approach for the study of English Literature. *UNNAYAN. XVII (I)*, 54–78. [4 Paper 4_Sarita Sharma.pdf](#)
- Tan, X. Cheng, G., & Ling M. H. (2025). Artificial intelligence in teaching and educator professional development: A systematic review. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 8, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100355>

- Teachy. (2025). Teachy Version 2025 [Mobile app]. App Store / Google Play. <https://www.teachyapp.com>
- Underwood, T. (2019). *Distant horizons: Digital evidence and literary change*. University of Chicago Press.
- Underwood T. (2020). Machine learning and human Perspective. *PMLA/Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*. 135(1), 92–109. <https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2020.135.1.92>
- Yadav, D. (2024). The role of artificial intelligence in literary analysis: A computational approach to understand literary styles. *International Journal of Educational and Knowledge Society*, 3(9), 558–565. <https://doi.org/10.70333/ijeks-03-09-006>
- Younis, E. (2020). New horizons of digital literary criticism. *Digital Scholarship in the Humanities*, 36(2), 501–508. <https://doi.org/10.1093/llc/fqaa026>
- Zawacki-Richter, O. Marín, V.I., Bond, M. & Gouverneu, F. (2019). Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education – where are the educators?. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education* 16(39), 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0>

Etinės kritikos tyrinėjimas literatūros pamokose naudojant TAM, TPCK ir dirbtinio intelekto įrankius

Mirzana Pašić Kodrić¹, Seniha Krasniqi²

¹ Sarajevo universitetas, Pedagogikos fakultetas, Skenderija g. 72, BIH-71000 Sarajevas, Bosnija ir Hercegovina, mpkodric@pf.unsa.ba

² Prištinos universitetas, Filologijos fakultetas, George Bush g., Priština, Kosovo Respublika, seniha.krasniqi@uni-pr.edu

Santrauka

Nors dirbtinio intelekto (toliau – DI) priemonių įtraukimo į švietimą svarba yra neabejotina, šiame straipsnyje nagrinėjamas DI panaudojimas per literatūros pamokas, atsižvelgiant į pedagogų požiūrį, norą ir kompetenciją. Tyrimas grindžiamas kiekybiniu vertinimu taikant 2 modelius: technologijų priėmimo (angl. *Technology Acceptance Model*, TAM) ir dalinį technologinio pedagoginio turinio žinių (angl. *Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge*, TPCK). Įtraukus papildomus kokybinius metodus buvo siekiama aiškiai pagrįsti pateiktus skaičiavimus, o aprašomasis vertinamasis tyrimo dizainas buvo skirtas DI įrankiams tirti ir vertinti. Toks metodų derinio pasirinkimas leidžia kryžmiškai patikrinti gautus statistinius rezultatus su interpretaciniais. Antroje tyrimo dalyje, naudojantis DI, sukurtas pamokos

planas „Raudonkepūrė“, kurį taikant sudarytas pasakos etinių aspektų tyrimas, tai leido atlikti turinio analizę.

Apibendrinant galima teigti, kad straipsnyje keliamas DI įrankių pateikiamos etinės kritikos patikimumo klausimas ir apskritai pedagogų pasitikėjimas DI technologijomis, ypač jas naudojant veiklose, susijusiose su etine kritika. Pabrėžiama, kad DI turėtų būti naudojamas kaip papildoma priemonė, o ne kaip pagrindinis ugdymo elementas, dėl jo ribotų galimybių atkartoti emocinį ir kultūrinį kontekstą.

Esminiai žodžiai: *TPCK, TAM, DI įrankiai, literatūros pamoka, etinė kritika.*

Gauta 2025 08 04 / Received 04 08 2025
Priimta 2025 12 15 / Accepted 15 12 2025