

**Integrating AI-Assisted and Teacher-Localized Materials in Undergraduate ELT and Soft Skills: A Practitioner Study in Remote Jammu and Kashmir**

---

**Vishab Thappa**

Assistant Professor of English, Government Degree College, Bani, District Kathua, Zone D, Jammu and Kashmir

---

**Article Received:** 18/08/2026

**Article Accepted:**20/09/2026

**Published Online:**21/09/2026

**DOI:**10.47311/IJOES.2026.8.09.208

---

**Abstract:**

This practitioner account investigates the integration of artificial intelligence (AI) in designing language teaching and soft skills materials for undergraduate students at Government Degree College, Bani—a remote, Zone D institution in Jammu and Kashmir. Diagnostic classroom observations across Semester I courses under the University of Jammu's National Education Policy (NEP 2020) framework revealed a critical language access gap: while students possessed adequate conceptual reasoning, prescribed academic textbooks presented insurmountable vocabulary and syntactic barriers. To bridge this gap, a multi-stage reflective action research workflow (July 2024–2026) was instituted, evolving from initial plain-text AI prompts to a systematic two-step materials design process: generating initial study drafts using generative AI, followed by rigorous manual teacher localization. This localization included sentence simplification, regional J&K contextualization, structured visual callout boxes, and bilingual translanguaging via Hindi vocabulary glosses. Evaluating this intervention through a 51-student survey (N = 51), findings show that 96.1% of learners recognized active teacher mediation in class, 94.1% reported that bilingual glossing significantly enhanced comprehension, and 88.2% preferred these localized notes over standard textbook prose. Grounded in postcolonial materials critique (Pennycook, 1998; Holliday, 2005), translanguaging theory (García & Wei, 2014), and cognitive load theory (Sweller, 2011), this paper argues that while generative AI accelerates initial drafting, teacher agency, evolving prompt literacy, and localized scaffolding remain indispensable for educational equity in underserved, rural classrooms.

**Keywords:** AI-assisted ELT, Soft Skills, Translanguaging, Teacher Agency, Higher Education in J&K.

**Introduction & Institutional Context**

This practitioner research paper emerges from a specific institutional and geographical location: Government Degree College (GDC), Bani, situated in the remote Zone D region of

---

Kathua district, Jammu and Kashmir. Upon assuming the post of Assistant Professor of English in July/August 2024, diagnostic classroom evaluations across Semester I undergraduate courses revealed a pronounced discrepancy between student reading proficiency and the linguistic complexity of prescribed university literature and ability-enhancement textbooks. This proficiency gap was not an indicator of cognitive or intellectual deficit, but rather a structural language access barrier—a condition pervasive in remote government colleges where students transition from regional-medium schooling with limited exposure to English-medium academic discourse.

The language access barrier was established through three converging lines of diagnostic evidence:

**Internal Assessment Performance:** In the 15-mark internal theory examinations for the Ability Enhancement Course (English I, UAEENT 104) and 10-mark evaluations for the Skill Enhancement Course (Soft Skills, USEENT 106), written answers demonstrated that while students grasped narrative plots and core concepts, their marks were severely constrained by unfamiliarity with low-frequency academic English terms (e.g., Shaw's particularization and division of labour, or Hill's human fallibility).

**2. In-Class Vocabulary Checks:** Diagnostic checks revealed that a majority of undergraduate learners struggled with basic academic expressions and idiomatic phrasing assumed by standard coursebooks.

**3. Observed Spoken Underconfidence:** Students exhibited reluctance during oral tasks, group discussions, and reading aloud, citing anxiety over translating their thoughts directly into complex English syntax.

Recognizing that unmediated prescribed coursebooks functioned as exclusionary barriers rather than pedagogical bridges, a practitioner-led materials intervention was initiated in late 2024. Generative AI tools (Claude, ChatGPT, and NotebookLM) were leveraged to rapidly draft baseline study notes. Over two academic years (2024–2026), the author's prompting strategies and material design workflow evolved iteratively in response to classroom feedback. To convert automated AI drafts into pedagogically viable resources, a manual teacher localization process was instituted—simplifying syntax, integrating regional examples, creating structured visual callout boxes, and embedding bilingual Hindi vocabulary glosses.

This paper documents that two-year reflective workflow, evaluates verified student survey feedback (N = 51), presents a comparative analysis of syllabus artifacts across both ELT and Soft Skills courses, and argues that generative AI can only serve as an equitable teaching resource when actively mediated, iteratively prompted, and contextualized by the practitioner.

## **2. Theoretical Framework & Literature Review**

Contemporary scholarship on English language teaching (ELT) and soft skills materials increasingly challenges the myth of the universal, context-free learner. The

---

evolving discourse explicitly invites engagement with postcolonial, decolonial, and translanguaging lenses to interrogate how materials reproduce or dismantle classroom inequities in state-sector higher education.

### **2.1 Postcolonial Materials Critique and Teacher Agency**

Pennycook (1998) argues that English teaching materials carry embedded cultural and ideological assumptions traceable to colonial discourses—treating Western cultural references, urban contexts, and unmarked 'standard' English as universal norms. When raw generative AI models, trained predominantly on Western, high-resource digital corpora, produce study notes without human intervention, they risk perpetuating this exact colonial imbalance. Generic AI outputs assume an idealized learner who possesses urban cultural capital and advanced L2 fluency.

Holliday's (2005) distinction between BANA (Britain, Australasia, and North America) materials culture and TESEP (tertiary, secondary, and primary education in state sectors worldwide) environments provides a vital framework for rural Indian classrooms. Materials designed under BANA assumptions—small class sizes, high English exposure, abundant digital access—fail when placed directly into a Zone D state college classroom in Jammu and Kashmir. Holliday emphasizes that TESEP educators must exercise active practitioner agency to adapt, reframe, and ground global materials into local realities (see also Banegas, 2018; Gray, 2010).

### **2.2 Translanguaging as a Pedagogical Bridge**

To scaffold language access, this study draws on the translanguaging framework articulated by García and Wei (2014). Rather than viewing a student's first language (L1) as a source of interference or a remedial crutch, translanguaging recognizes that multilingual learners draw upon a unified, integrated linguistic repertoire. In South Asian higher education, embedding L1 vocabulary glosses (Hindi/Hindustani) alongside L2 target terms provides essential cognitive scaffolding (Anderson, 2024; Agnihotri, 2014). It allows students to map complex literary and soft skills concepts directly onto their existing cognitive framework, lowering affective filter barriers and promoting genuine textual engagement.

### **2.3 Generative AI in ELT: Evolving Prompt Literacy vs. Passive Adoption**

Recent scholarship from 2023–2026 highlights both the promise and peril of generative AI in language education. Godwin-Jones (2024) and Moorhouse & Kohnke (2024) observe that while Large Language Models (LLMs) dramatically reduce the time required to draft supplementary materials, raw AI outputs frequently exhibit stylistic repetition, factual imprecision, and a complete absence of local socio-cultural awareness (see also Kohnke, Moorhouse, & Zou, 2023). Landa-Blanco (2026) further underscores that in low- and middle-income country (LMIC) educational contexts, uncritical adoption of AI outputs widens educational inequality.

This argument is empirically supported in the Indian context by Varuvel Dennison et al. (2026), who evaluated an AI-assisted lesson-planning copilot deployed across

---

government schools in Karnataka (1,043 teachers). Their study revealed that while AI-generated English text was syntactically fluent, its reliability dropped significantly when generating regional language content, requiring extensive teacher editing to ensure curricular and contextual fit. Consequently, AI output must be conceptualized not as a finished teaching product, but as an initial raw draft that demands evolving teacher prompt literacy and active human mediation.

## **2.4 Cognitive Load Theory and Visual Signaling**

To optimize visual layout, this study integrates Sweller's (2011) Cognitive Load Theory and Mayer's (2021) Signaling Principle. Unformatted, monochromatic blocks of dense academic English create extraneous cognitive overload for developing bilingual readers. By introducing structured, color-coded callout boxes, materials provide explicit visual signaling—allowing learners to segment L2 vocabulary processing, L1 translation mapping, teacher contextual commentary, and examination strategy into distinct mental channels.

## **3. Methodology & Action Research Cycle**

### **3.1 Context, Course Framework, and Mobile Delivery**

This study was conducted between July 2024 and September 2026 at Government Degree College, Bani (District Kathua, Zone D, J&K). The participant cohort comprised Semester I undergraduate students enrolled in two core courses under the University of Jammu's Four-Year Undergraduate Programme (FYUGP) aligned with the National Education Policy (NEP 2020):

**1. Ability Enhancement Course (AEC): English I** (Course Code: UAEENT 104; 3 Credits; Total Marks: 75 [External University Exam: 60, Internal Assessment: 15]). The prescribed syllabus includes prose (J.C. Hill's Good Manners, G.B. Shaw's How Wealth Accumulates and Men Decay, M.K. Gandhi's To Students), poetry (Tagore, Wordsworth, Frost), short stories (O'Henry, Premchand, Chekhov), and language skills.

**2. Skill Enhancement Course (SEC): Soft Skills** (Course Code: USEENT 106; 2 Credits; Total Marks: 50 [External University Exam: 40, Internal Assessment: 10]). The syllabus covers communication, goal setting (SMART goals), and social consciousness (prescribed text: Sabina Pillai & Agna Fernandez, Cambridge University Press, 2018).

Given the mountainous geography of Zone D Kathua, cellular internet connectivity is frequently erratic, and commercial printing imposes significant financial burdens on rural households. To ensure equitable access, materials were compiled into lightweight, mobile-optimized PDF documents and distributed asynchronously via class WhatsApp groups, enabling offline study on low-cost smartphones.

### **3.2 The Two-Year Action Research & Prompt Evolution Timeline**

Upon joining GDC Bani in July/August 2024, the instructor initiated a reflective action research cycle (Kemmis & McTaggart, 2007; Schön, 1983) that progressed through three distinct phases:

• **Phase 1: Naïve Prompting & Monochromatic Summaries (July – October 2024):** Early AI prompts were basic ('Summarize this essay in simple English'). These produced plain

white-background, unformatted text summaries (The World as I See It, Where the Mind is Without Fear). While simpler than the original textbooks, students still struggled with unglossed L2 terms and monochromatic visual fatigue.

• **Phase 2: Structured Prompting & Initial Bilingual Glossing (November 2024 – Mid 2025):** Recognizing the need for L1 bridges, prompts were modified to request target vocabulary lists with Hindi equivalents. However, raw AI outputs often yielded literal or unnatural Hindi glosses and generic Western examples, requiring significant manual correction.

• **Phase 3: Multi-Layered Prompt Engineering & Annotated Readers (Late 2025 – 2026):** Prompts were engineered to specify structural layout, syntactic constraints, and exam-mapped question structures. This was coupled with intensive teacher localization:

1. **Syntactic Restructuring:** Converting complex compound sentences into clear, accessible clauses.
2. **Bilingual Glossing:** Inserting contextual Hindi/Hindustani word meanings in green text alongside yellow-highlighted English vocabulary (e.g., Hamdardi, Zimmedaari, Aatma-sanyam).
3. **Regional Contextualization:** Adding 'Teacher's Notes' callout boxes connecting abstract text themes (e.g., Gandhi's call for rural service) directly to local student realities (e.g., asking students to reflect on Gandhi's argument in relation to youth from Bani migrating to Jammu or Delhi for employment).
4. **Exam-Oriented Architecture:** Structuring materials with orange callout boxes for 'Important Exam Points' and purple boxes for 'Key Quotations' directly aligned with Jammu University's 7-mark long-answer and 2-mark short-answer question formats.

### 3.3 Artifact Comparative Analysis

To illustrate this transformation, Table 1 contrasts the three iterations of materials used across the 2024–2026 action research cycle.

| Dimension                    | Material Type 1: Unmediated Textbook                                           | Material Type 2: Phase 1 Raw AI Baseline Output (2024)                    | Material Type 3: Phase 3 Teacher-Mediated Annotated Reader (2025–2026)                                                                             |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Visual Architecture</b>   | Dense, unformatted academic text; small print; no visual hierarchy.            | Plain white-background text; basic bullet points; monochromatic layout.   | Multi-layered color-coded design (Yellow: English vocab; Green: Hindi glosses; Green Box: Teacher Notes; Orange: Exam Points; Purple: Key Quotes). |
| <b>Language &amp; Syntax</b> | High syntactic density; complex historical phrasing (e.g., Shaw's 1928 prose). | Moderately simplified English; generic academic tone; unglossed L2 terms. | Syntactically restructured English paired with immediate L1 (Hindi/Hindustani) bilingual glosses.                                                  |

|                                        |                                                                   |                                                                                     |                                                                                                                 |
|----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Cultural &amp; Regional Context</b> | 19th/20th-century British or Western urban assumptions.           | Default Western/urban examples; absence of local Indian or regional J&K references. | Explicit regional bridging (e.g., linking Gandhi's village service to rural Kathua/Bani student migration).     |
| <b>Assessment Scaffolding</b>          | None; assumes prior familiarity with university exam conventions. | General bullet summaries; no alignment with specific university marking schemes.    | Mapped directly onto Jammu University exam structures (UAEENT 104 15-mark internal & 60-mark external formats). |

*Table 1: Comparative Matrix of Classroom Materials Across Action Research Phases*

### 3.4 Evaluation Survey Instrument

Student feedback was gathered via an anonymous Google Form survey (N = 51) administered to Semester I students across UAEENT 104 (Ability Enhancement) and USEENT 106 (Soft Skills). The 15-item questionnaire comprised Likert-scale items, categorical usage questions, multi-select error diagnostic items, and open-ended qualitative prompts.

## 4. Findings

### 4.1 Quantitative Survey Results (N = 51)

Data collected from 51 undergraduate respondents (verified against raw Google Form export records) provides strong empirical support for the teacher-localized materials workflow:

**1. Near-Unanimous Teacher Class Mediation (96.1%):** 64.7% (n = 33) reported that the teacher 'often' explained, corrected, or added to the AI notes in class, while 31.4% (n = 16) reported this occurred 'sometimes.' Only 2 students (3.9%) indicated 'rarely' or 'never.'

**2. High Utility of Bilingual Glossing (94.1%):** 70.6% (n = 36) agreed and 23.5% (n = 12) strongly agreed that Hindi meanings alongside English terms improved comprehension.

**3. Active Reliance on L1 Scaffolding (96.1%):** 47.1% (n = 24) reported using Hindi glosses 'every time as an essential support,' 33.3% (n = 17) used them 'often,' and 15.7% (n = 8) used them 'when stuck.'

**4. Readability & Language Accessibility (88.2%):** 88.2% (n = 45) agreed that simplified language in the annotated readers made content significantly easier to follow compared to traditional textbooks.

**5. Future Materials Preference (88.2%):** 74.5% (n = 38) definitely preferred using teacher-localized AI notes in future classes, with 13.7% (n = 7) somewhat preferring them, and 7.8% (n = 4) remaining neutral.

| Metric / Question              | Primary Response Categories | Frequency (n) | Percentage (%) |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| <b>Teacher Class Mediation</b> | Yes, often                  | 33            | 64.7%          |
|                                | Yes, sometimes              | 16            | 31.4%          |
|                                | No, rarely / never          | 2             | 3.9%           |

|                                    |                              |       |                    |          |         |       |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------|-------|--------------------|----------|---------|-------|
| <b>Hindi Gloss Benefit</b>         | <b>Comprehension</b>         |       | Agree              | 36       | 70.6%   |       |
|                                    |                              |       | Strongly           | Agree 12 | 23.5%   |       |
|                                    |                              |       | Neutral / Disagree | 3        | 5.9%    |       |
| <b>Active Hindi Gloss Usage</b>    | Essential                    | every | time               | 24       | 47.1%   |       |
|                                    |                              |       |                    | Often    | used 17 | 33.3% |
|                                    | Rarely used                  | when  | stuck              | 8        | 15.7%   |       |
|                                    |                              |       |                    | 2        | 3.9%    |       |
| <b>Simplified Language Benefit</b> |                              |       | Agree              | 45       | 88.2%   |       |
|                                    |                              |       | Neutral / Disagree | 6        | 11.8%   |       |
| <b>Future Material Preference</b>  | Yes,                         |       | definitely         | 38       | 74.5%   |       |
|                                    | Yes,                         |       | somewhat           | 7        | 13.7%   |       |
|                                    | Neutral / Prefer Traditional |       |                    | 6        | 11.8%   |       |

*Table 2: Key Survey Indicators (N = 51 Student Survey Responses)*

#### 4.2 Identified Limitations in Raw AI Outputs

While overall satisfaction was high, students actively identified flaws in unmediated AI content:

- **Language Mismatch:** 23.5% (n = 12) noted raw AI text was occasionally too complex or overly simplistic.
- **Repetitive/Generic Content:** 15.7% (n = 8) flagged generic prose lacking depth.
- **Unfamiliar Examples & Errors:** 11.8% (n = 6) noted foreign/non-local examples, while 3.9% (n = 2) spotted minor factual errors in raw AI drafts.

When asked what would most improve the materials, the leading requests were 'Simpler language,' 'More local/relatable examples,' and 'More practice exercises/questions.'

#### 4.3 Qualitative Student Voices

Qualitative feedback provided detailed insights into the rural classroom experience:

- **Highlighting the Language Access Gap:** One student wrote, “Sir, I can understand only about 50% of the English [textbook]... when you give Hindi word meanings and summary points, I can write answers in my own words.”
- **Revealing J&K's Multilingual Complexity:** Another student noted, “If you will adding word meaning then also adding in English, Urdu, Hindi because every student learned different language.”
- **Requesting Syllabus & Unit Depth:** A recent respondent suggested, “I just want to say that improve AI about detailed notes according to unit and topic.”

### 5. Discussion

The empirical findings strongly validate the central thesis of this paper: generative AI cannot function as a standalone instructional resource in under-resourced, rural higher education; it becomes pedagogically effective only through evolving prompt literacy, active teacher mediation, and localized adaptation.

#### 5.1 Re-asserting Practitioner Agency Through Prompt Literacy

The finding that 96.1% of students observed active teacher intervention during class refutes technological determinist claims that AI will replace language educators. As Godwin-

Jones (2024) and Moorhouse & Kohnke (2024) emphasize, AI models generate plausible surface text, but lack pedagogical empathy, ethical judgment, and contextual awareness. In our GDC Bani classroom, manual teacher intervention—adding green 'Teacher's Notes' callout boxes, framing J.C. Hill's Boy Scout joke on literal interpretation, or linking Gandhi's critique of urban industrialism to local mountain life—transformed flat text into an active dialogue. This demonstrates Holliday's (2005) assertion that TESEP practitioners must act as critical localizers of global materials.

### **5.2 Navigating Examination Washback vs. Critical Pedagogy**

In state-sector Indian higher education, university examination structures exert intense evaluative pressure (Hughes, 2003; Messick, 1996). Rural undergraduates cannot afford materials that focus purely on abstract theory while ignoring assessment realities. The color-coded Annotated Readers navigate this washback constructively: Orange ('Important Exam Points') and Purple ('Key Quotations') callout boxes address immediate examination anxiety and supply long-answer thesis structures, while Yellow ('Vocabulary') and Green ('Teacher Notes') boxes foster genuine linguistic comprehension and critical reflection.

### **5.3 Students as Prompt Co-Designers in Participatory Action Research**

Under a Participatory Action Research framework (Reason & Bradbury, 2008), survey feedback was utilized not merely as an evaluation metric, but as an active input into subsequent AI prompt engineering. When students requested 'Urdu word meanings alongside Hindi,' 'unit-wise detailed notes,' or 'more relatable local examples,' the instructor incorporated these constraints into updated prompt templates for subsequent syllabus units. This practice democratizes the materials design process, elevating rural learners from passive consumers to active co-designers of digital prompt architecture.

### **5.4 Nuances of Translanguaging in Multilingual J&K**

The survey data reveals a compelling dynamic regarding translanguaging. While 94.1% of students found Hindi glosses beneficial and 47.1% relied on them as an essential support every time, responses regarding future language balance were split: 47.1% requested more Hindi, 29.4% preferred the current mix, and 19.6% requested less Hindi and more English. This split reflects a healthy within-classroom evolution: as students' baseline comprehension settles, a subset seeks increased target language (L2) exposure to build university exam writing stamina.

Furthermore, the qualitative student request for Urdu glossing alongside Hindi and English reflects the rich, complex multilingual ecosystem of Jammu and Kashmir. In Zone D colleges, students navigate Dogri, Gojri, Pahari, Kashmiri, Urdu, Hindi, and English. Incorporating multilingual glossing aligns precisely with García and Wei's (2014) translanguaging paradigm—validating learners' full communicative repertoires rather than forcing an artificial, monolingual English-only policy.

## **6. Conclusion & Pedagogical Recommendations**

This practitioner study demonstrates that generative AI can serve as a powerful ally for language educators in under-resourced, remote state colleges—provided it is deployed as

an initial draft generator rather than an autonomous teaching authority. By coupling evolving prompt engineering with manual teacher localization over a two-year reflective cycle (2024–2026), educators can produce high-quality, visually structured, and bilingual materials tailored to the specific needs of rural learners.

**Key Recommendations for Rural ELT Practitioners:**

- 1. Adopt a Reflective Action Research Workflow:** Treat materials design as an evolving cycle; refine prompts continuously based on student assessment data and reading challenges.
- 2. Embed Multilingual Glossing:** Utilize translanguaging strategies (yellow vocabulary callouts paired with L1 Hindi/Urdu glosses) to lower affective barriers and bridge language access gaps.
- 3. Build Visual Architecture:** Organize study materials using distinct callout boxes for vocabulary, teacher commentary, exam points, and key quotations to guide independent student study.
- 4. Assert Teacher Agency:** Continuously edit AI drafts to remove Western/urban biases, insert regional examples, and align content with local university examination standards.

**Declarations**

- **AI Ethics Statement:** Generative AI tools (Claude, ChatGPT, and NotebookLM) were used in the classroom as the subject of research for initial study note drafting. The prose of this research paper was authored entirely by the human instructor.
- **Funding & Conflict of Interest:** The author declares no financial or personal conflicts of interest.

**Works Cited**

- Agnihotri, R. K. "Multilingualism and the Teaching of English in India." *Indian Journal of Open Learning*, vol. 23, nos. 1–2, 2014, pp. 1–12.
- Anderson, J. "The Translanguaging Practices of Expert Indian Teachers of English and Their Learners." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, vol. 45, no. 6, 2024, pp. 2233–51.
- Banegas, D. L. "A Call to Spread International Knowledge of ELT." *ELT Journal*, vol. 72, no. 2, 2018, pp. 214–16.
- Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Herder and Herder, 1970.
- García, Ofelia, and Li Wei. *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

- 
- Godwin-Jones, Robert. "Distributed Agency in Language Learning and Teaching through Generative AI." *Language Learning & Technology*, vol. 28, no. 2, 2024, pp. 5–31.
- Gray, John. *The Construction of English Language Teaching Materials: Culture, Ideology and the Commodity*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Holliday, Adrian. *The Struggle to Teach English as an International Language*. Oxford UP, 2005.
- Hughes, Arthur. *Testing for Language Teachers*. 2nd ed., Cambridge UP, 2003.
- Kemmis, Stephen, and Robin McTaggart. "Participatory Action Research: Communicative Action and the Public Sphere." *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry*, edited by Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln, SAGE Publications, 2007, pp. 271–330.
- Kohnke, Lukas, Benjamin L. Moorhouse, and Di Zou. "ChatGPT for Language Teaching and Learning." *RELC Journal*, vol. 54, no. 2, 2023, pp. 537–50.
- Landa-Blanco, M. "Artificial Intelligence in Education: Applications and Limitations for Teachers in Low- and Middle-Income Countries." *Frontiers in Education*, vol. 10, 2026, article 1681836.
- Mayer, Richard E. *Multimedia Learning*. 3rd ed., Cambridge UP, 2021.
- Messick, Samuel. "Validity and Washback in Language Testing." *Language Testing*, vol. 13, no. 3, 1996, pp. 241–56.
- Moorhouse, Benjamin L., and Lukas Kohnke. "Using Generative AI for Language Teaching and Learning: A Guidance Framework for Language Teachers." *System*, vol. 121, 2024, article 103233.
- Pennycook, Alastair. *English and the Discourses of Colonialism*. Routledge, 1998.
- Pillai, S., and A. Fernandez. *Soft Skills and Employability Skills*. Cambridge UP, 2018.
- Reason, Peter, and Hilary Bradbury, editors. *The SAGE Handbook of Action Research: Participative Inquiry and Practice*. 2nd ed., SAGE Publications, 2008.
- Schön, Donald A. *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*. Basic Books, 1983.
- Sweller, John. "Cognitive Load Theory." *Cognitive Load Theory*, edited by J. M. Spector et al., Springer, 2011, pp. 37–76.
- Varuvel Dennison, D., et al. "Teacher-AI Collaboration for Curating and Customizing Lesson Plans in Low-Resource Schools." *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, vol. 10, no. 2, 2026, article CSCW038.