

THE ROLE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN ENHANCING ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING AND LEARNERS' COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE

Sultanova Nargiza Nigmatovna

Associate Professor, Department of English, Uzbekistan State World Languages University (O'zMPU)

DOI: [https://doi.org/10.63001/tbs.2026.v21.i04.S.I\(4\).pp314-320](https://doi.org/10.63001/tbs.2026.v21.i04.S.I(4).pp314-320)

KEYWORDS

*artificial intelligence,
English language teaching,
communicative competence,
computer-assisted
language learning,
generative AI,
language learning,
Uzbekistan*

Received: 16/09 /2026

Accepted :03/10/2026

Published: 13/10/2026

Abstract

This article examines the potential role of artificial intelligence (AI) in English language teaching, with particular attention to learners' communicative competence. Using a qualitative, literature-based approach, the article synthesizes selected research on communicative language teaching, computer-assisted language learning, and the use of AI in education. The analysis identifies opportunities for AI-supported speaking practice, individualized feedback, vocabulary development, reading and listening support, writing revision, and the preparation of differentiated teaching materials. It also highlights limitations, including inaccurate outputs, context-insensitive feedback, privacy concerns, unequal access to technology, and the risk of learner overdependence. The article argues that AI is most beneficial when its use is guided by clear learning outcomes, teacher supervision, critical verification, and opportunities for interaction with real people. The discussion also considers the relevance of established Uzbek scholarship on foreign-language teaching methodology. It concludes that AI should complement, rather than replace, teachers and human communication in English language education.

1. INTRODUCTION

The rapid development of artificial intelligence (AI) is reshaping educational practice, including the teaching and learning of English as a foreign language. AI-supported applications can provide learners with conversational practice, adaptive exercises, immediate feedback, pronunciation support, vocabulary development activities, and access to authentic language input. These opportunities are particularly relevant in contexts where learners have limited exposure to English outside the classroom or where large class sizes restrict the amount of individual speaking practice available to each student.

Communicative competence is a central goal of contemporary English language teaching. It involves more than grammatical accuracy: learners must also understand how to select language appropriate to a situation, organize coherent discourse, interpret meaning, and use communication strategies when difficulties arise. Canale and Swain (1980) conceptualized

communicative competence through grammatical, sociolinguistic, and strategic components, while later work has emphasized discourse competence and the interactional nature of communication. From this perspective, technology is educationally valuable when it creates meaningful opportunities to use language rather than simply delivering isolated language rules.

AI tools may support this goal by simulating conversations, tailoring tasks to proficiency levels, identifying recurring language errors, and enabling repeated practice without the social pressure that some learners experience in front of classmates. Generative AI systems can also help teachers develop role-plays, reading texts, discussion questions, writing prompts, and differentiated learning materials. Nevertheless, the presence of an AI tool does not automatically produce better learning. Outputs may contain inaccurate information, feedback may overlook context or pragmatic nuance, and excessive reliance on automated assistance can reduce learners' independent effort. Effective

integration therefore requires clear pedagogical aims, teacher guidance, and critical evaluation of AI-generated content.

The Uzbek educational context makes this issue especially important. English is studied for academic mobility, professional communication, access to international research, and participation in a global knowledge economy. Uzbek-language scholarship on foreign-language teaching methodology has long emphasized the relationship between learning objectives, classroom practice, learners' age and proficiency, and the development of communicative skills. Jalolov (2012), as well as Hoshimov and Yoqubov (2003), provide methodological foundations for understanding how instructional techniques should be selected in relation to educational goals. Current AI-supported approaches should be examined in continuity with these principles rather than treated as a replacement for established language-teaching expertise.

Although research on AI in education has expanded rapidly, practical questions remain for English language teachers: which aspects of communicative competence can AI support most effectively; how should AI activities be combined with teacher-led interaction; what risks must be addressed; and how can teachers evaluate whether the technology contributes to learning rather than merely making tasks easier? These questions call for an approach that connects recent international research with the methodological priorities of English language education in Uzbekistan.

The purpose of this article is to examine the potential contribution of AI-supported learning to English language teaching and learners' communicative competence. The article has four objectives: (1) to identify major ways AI tools can support speaking, listening, reading, writing, vocabulary, and grammar; (2) to consider how these tools may contribute to communicative

competence; (3) to identify pedagogical, ethical, and practical limitations; and (4) to propose principles for responsible integration into English language classrooms.

The article is guided by the following research questions: (1) What learning opportunities can AI-supported tools provide for the development of English communicative competence? (2) What limitations may reduce their educational value? (3) What principles can help teachers integrate AI in a way that preserves human interaction, learner agency, and academic integrity? The article addresses these questions through a structured review and thematic synthesis of selected literature rather than through a new classroom experiment.

2. METHODS

This article uses a qualitative, literature-based research design. It synthesizes established work on communicative competence and computer-assisted language learning with selected recent publications concerning artificial intelligence in education and language learning. A literature-based design is appropriate for the present objective because the article seeks to identify pedagogical possibilities, risks, and implementation principles rather than to claim a measured causal effect from a newly conducted intervention.

The literature was selected purposively according to three criteria: relevance to English language teaching or communicative competence; contribution to understanding AI-enabled or computer-supported learning; and usefulness for formulating classroom-level recommendations. Foundational works were included to establish the theoretical basis of communicative competence and technology-mediated language learning. More recent research and policy guidance were considered to address generative AI, feedback, personalization, teacher roles, and responsible

use. Methodological works by Uzbek authors were also included to connect the discussion with local traditions of foreign-language teaching methodology.

The analysis proceeded in three stages. First, the selected literature was read to identify recurring claims about the potential educational functions of AI, including individualized practice, feedback, conversational simulation, and material development. Second, the claims were grouped into thematic categories aligned with language-learning outcomes: oral communication, receptive skills, written communication, linguistic accuracy, and learner autonomy. Third, the themes were examined alongside implementation concerns, including reliability, privacy, bias, accessibility, academic integrity, and the importance of teacher mediation.

A thematic synthesis was used to compare areas of agreement and tension across the sources. For example, AI may increase the quantity of practice available to learners, but the quality of that practice depends on task design, the relevance of feedback, and opportunities to transfer learning to real communication. Similarly, automated feedback can help learners notice errors, yet a fluent-looking AI response should not be treated as authoritative without verification. The analysis therefore distinguishes between potential benefits supported by the literature and outcomes that would require direct empirical testing in a particular classroom.

The study has several limitations. It does not report original participant data, experimental results, or statistical measurements. The AI tools discussed differ in design and change over time, so conclusions should not be interpreted as evaluations of every available platform. The review is selective rather than exhaustive, and its recommendations should be adapted to learners' proficiency, institutional policy, technological access, and the objectives of a specific course.

Future empirical research in Uzbek higher education could test these recommendations through classroom observation, learner assessments, interviews, and comparison of learning outcomes over time.

3. RESULTS

The thematic synthesis identified five principal areas in which AI may support English language learning: opportunities for low-pressure speaking practice, individualized feedback, support for receptive and productive skills, teacher assistance with instructional design, and learner autonomy. These opportunities are conditional rather than automatic; their value depends on how activities are designed and integrated into a broader course.

3.1. Speaking practice and interaction. AI chatbots and voice-enabled systems can provide repeated conversational practice on familiar topics, such as introducing oneself, asking for directions, discussing study plans, or participating in a simulated interview. Learners can repeat an exchange, request clarification, or adjust the difficulty of a task. Such practice may be useful for students who need additional rehearsal before speaking in front of peers. AI can also support role-play preparation by assigning roles and communication goals. However, simulated dialogue cannot fully reproduce the social, cultural, and emotional complexity of interaction with real people. Consequently, AI conversation is best used as preparation for, or reinforcement of, pair work, group discussion, presentations, and authentic communication.

3.2. Feedback on language use. AI systems can identify possible grammatical errors, suggest vocabulary alternatives, offer paraphrases, and explain differences between expressions. When feedback is understandable and learners are asked to revise their own work, it can support

noticing and self-correction. Feedback is most useful when it addresses a defined learning objective rather than rewriting an entire response. For example, a learner may be asked to improve verb tense consistency, replace repeated vocabulary, or make a short argument more coherent. Teachers should encourage learners to compare AI suggestions with course materials and explain which changes they accept and why. This process keeps responsibility for learning with the student.

3.3. Support for listening, reading, and vocabulary. AI can generate level-adjusted reading passages, glossaries, comprehension questions, and summaries. It may help teachers prepare multiple versions of a text for learners with different levels of proficiency. Listening activities can be supplemented with transcripts, vocabulary previews, comprehension checks, and follow-up discussion prompts. Learners may also use AI to create example sentences or contrast near-synonyms. Nevertheless, generated texts and explanations should be checked for factual accuracy, natural usage, and appropriate cultural context. Simplification should preserve the main meaning and should not deprive learners of all exposure to authentic language.

3.4. Writing and discourse development. AI can assist with brainstorming, outlining, cohesion, paragraph organization, and revision. In an English writing course, a teacher might ask students to draft a paragraph independently, use an AI tool to receive feedback on coherence, and then submit both the original and revised versions with a short explanation of their decisions. This approach makes the learning process visible and discourages unacknowledged substitution of generated text for the learner's own work. Writing tasks should assess the learner's ability to plan, formulate, support, and revise ideas—not simply the polish of the final product.

3.5. Teacher preparation and differentiation. AI can reduce the time needed to draft supplementary exercises, design role-play scenarios, generate question banks, or adapt a text to a specified proficiency level. It can provide a starting point for differentiated instruction, but teachers remain responsible for checking correctness, aligning tasks with curricular outcomes, and ensuring that examples are culturally and linguistically appropriate. AI-generated materials should be treated as drafts requiring professional review, not as ready-to-use educational resources.

Across the themes, the synthesis also identified recurring risks: inaccurate or fabricated information; feedback that is grammatically plausible but pragmatically unsuitable; uneven performance across accents and varieties of English; privacy concerns when learners enter personal information; unequal access to devices or stable internet; and overdependence on automated answers. These risks indicate that AI literacy and clear classroom rules are necessary components of effective integration.

The results suggest that AI is most pedagogically promising when it expands opportunities for practice and reflection while leaving communicative purpose, evaluation, and final decision-making within a teacher-guided learning process. The reviewed literature does not justify a universal claim that AI independently improves communicative competence in every context. Instead, it supports a conditional conclusion: carefully designed AI activities may contribute to language development when they are aligned with learning outcomes and complemented by human interaction and feedback.

4. DISCUSSION

The findings reinforce the view that AI should be understood as a pedagogical resource

rather than a substitute for a language teacher. Communicative competence develops through the coordinated use of linguistic knowledge, discourse organization, sociolinguistic awareness, and communication strategies. AI can provide additional opportunities to rehearse selected elements of this competence, but effective communication also requires learners to interpret intentions, negotiate meaning, respond to unexpected contributions, and adapt to the needs of real interlocutors. For this reason, classroom interaction remains essential.

The potential of AI for speaking practice is particularly significant where learners have few opportunities to use English beyond formal lessons. A student may practice a dialogue with an AI system before completing the same task with a classmate. The teacher can then compare the learner's preparation with performance in a live interaction and focus feedback on fluency, turn-taking, intelligibility, and appropriate language choices. This sequence combines the privacy and repeatability of individual practice with the unpredictability and social demands of human communication.

The role of feedback deserves careful attention. Automated suggestions can make revision more immediate, but feedback is not useful merely because it is fast. Learners need to understand the reason for a correction, determine whether it fits the intended meaning, and transfer the principle to later tasks. If AI rewrites a learner's work without explanation, the final product may improve while learning remains limited. Teachers can avoid this problem by asking students to identify patterns in their errors, justify selected revisions, and produce a second example independently.

These conclusions are compatible with established principles of foreign-language teaching methodology. Jalolov (2012) emphasizes the importance of aligning methods and classroom activities with learning

objectives, while Hoshimov and Yoqubov (2003) discuss the methodological foundations of English teaching. AI integration should therefore begin with a pedagogical question—what should learners be able to do?—rather than with the capabilities of a particular application. If the goal is to negotiate a disagreement politely, for instance, an activity should focus on language for expressing disagreement, acknowledging another viewpoint, and reaching a conclusion. Generating a large number of unrelated sentences would be less useful, even if the tool performs the task efficiently.

AI can also support differentiated instruction, especially in classes where students have varied levels of proficiency. Teachers may adapt a task by changing the complexity of a text, providing vocabulary support, or adding optional challenge questions. Yet differentiation should not become permanent separation into narrow levels. Learners need opportunities to work with authentic language and collaborate with peers whose strengths differ from their own. Teacher review is also necessary to ensure that generated materials do not reproduce stereotypes, exclude local perspectives, or introduce inaccurate cultural information.

Ethical and institutional considerations are inseparable from pedagogy. Students should be told which uses of AI are permitted, when AI assistance must be acknowledged, and which assignments require independent work. They should avoid entering sensitive personal information into public systems and should understand that generated answers can be incorrect. Institutions should provide clear guidance on data protection, accessibility, academic integrity, and acceptable use. These measures are more effective when framed as AI literacy—the ability to use, question, verify, and appropriately disclose AI assistance—rather than as a simple prohibition or unrestricted permission.

For Uzbek higher education, a balanced approach can connect international developments with local teaching priorities. English courses may use AI for additional conversation practice, formative feedback, and the preparation of supplementary resources, while retaining teacher-led discussion, peer collaboration, presentations, and assessment. Teacher training should include prompt design, output verification, task alignment, privacy awareness, and methods for evaluating learning. Access should also be considered: an instructional plan that assumes every student has a modern device, a paid subscription, and reliable connectivity may widen rather than reduce educational differences.

The article's literature-based design means that its conclusions are analytical rather than experimental. It does not establish that a specific AI application produces a measured improvement in Uzbek learners' communicative competence. Future research could investigate this question using pre- and post-course speaking assessments, comparison groups where appropriate, learner reflections, classroom observations, and teacher interviews. Studies should distinguish between increased confidence, greater practice time, improved linguistic accuracy, and demonstrable improvement in real interaction. They should also consider whether benefits persist after learners no longer have access to AI support.

In practical terms, teachers can use a simple cycle: define a communicative outcome; select or create a focused AI-supported activity; ask learners to complete the task and examine the feedback; verify key suggestions; and transfer the target skill into a human interaction. The cycle ensures that technology serves the curriculum and that students remain active participants. It also creates opportunities to evaluate whether AI use is genuinely helping learners become more independent and effective communicators.

In conclusion, artificial intelligence offers useful possibilities for expanding English language practice, personalizing support, and assisting teachers with materials development. Its contribution to communicative competence, however, depends on instructional design, teacher mediation, learner reflection, and responsible use. AI is most effective as part of a blended approach in which automated practice complements rather than replaces human communication. For English language education in Uzbekistan, the priority should be not simply to adopt new tools, but to use them critically and purposefully in pursuit of clear language-learning outcomes.

REFERENCES

- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1–47. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/I.1.1>
- Chapelle, C. A. (2003). *English Language Learning and Technology: Lectures on Applied Linguistics in the Age of Information and Communication Technology*. John Benjamins.
- Council of Europe. (2020). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment—Companion Volume*. Council of Europe Publishing.
- Godwin-Jones, R. (2023). Emerging spaces for language learning: AI bots, ambient intelligence, and the metaverse. *Language Learning & Technology*, 27(2), 6–19.
- Hoshimov, O'. H., & Yoqubov, I. Y. (2003). *Ingliz tili o'qitish metodikasi*. Sharq.
- Jalolov, J. J. (2012). *Chet til o'qitish metodikasi*. O'qituvchi.
- Kasneci, E., Sessler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F.,

Gasser, U., Groh, G., Günnemann, S., Hüllermeier, E., Krusche, S., Kutyniok, G., Michaeli, T., Nerdel, C., Pfeffer, J., Poquet, O., Sailer, M., Schmidt, A., Seidel, T., ... Kasneci, G. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 103, 102274. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274>

UNESCO. (2023). *Guidance for Generative AI in Education and Research*. UNESCO.

Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V. I., Bond, M., & Gouverneur, 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, Article 39. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0>