



AI-Powered Tools in English Language Education: Opportunities, Limitations, and Ethical Concerns

Dr. V. V. Malinee

Assistant Professor of English
Saveetha Engineering College
E-Mail: malineevv25@gmail.com

Abstract

The increasing integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into English language education has introduced significant changes in teaching methodologies, learner engagement, assessment practices, and the development of linguistic competencies. AI-powered tools, including intelligent tutoring systems, generative language models, automated writing evaluation platforms, adaptive learning applications, speech-recognition technologies, and conversational agents, are creating opportunities for personalized instruction, immediate feedback, autonomous learning, and interactive language practice. However, their educational benefits are accompanied by substantial limitations and ethical concerns involving algorithmic bias, inaccurate linguistic feedback, data privacy, academic dishonesty, digital inequality, cultural representation, and excessive technological dependence. This study critically examines the opportunities, limitations, and ethical implications of AI-powered tools in English language education through a qualitative, literature-based analytical approach. Drawing upon contemporary scholarship, including research published in the Stanzaleaf International Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies, the paper explores how technological assistance can support linguistic development without compromising creativity, critical thinking, learner independence, or the responsibilities of educators. The study proposes a Human-Centred Ethical AI Integration Framework that integrates pedagogical relevance, learner autonomy, teacher mediation, digital equity, and ethical accountability. The analysis suggests that AI-assisted English language education is most defensible when technological systems enhance rather than replace human interaction, contextual understanding, and independent language production. The paper concludes that the sustainable integration of AI requires comprehensive digital literacy, transparent institutional policies, professional development, and learner-centred pedagogical practices.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, English Language Education, Generative AI, English Language Teaching, Digital Pedagogy, Personalized Learning, Academic Integrity, Algorithmic Bias, Educational Ethics, Learner Autonomy.

1. Introduction

English language education has experienced substantial changes as digital technologies increasingly influence how linguistic knowledge is acquired, practised, evaluated, and applied. Traditional classroom instruction, which frequently depends upon textbooks, direct teacher explanations, scheduled assessments, and relatively uniform learning activities, is now complemented by interactive digital platforms capable of generating instructional content and responding to individual learners. Among these technological developments, Artificial Intelligence has attracted particular attention because of its capacity to process natural language, generate written responses, identify linguistic patterns, and provide automated instructional assistance.



The emergence of generative AI has extended the possibilities of computer-assisted language learning. Unlike earlier software systems that primarily provided predefined exercises or rule-based corrections, contemporary generative systems can produce contextualized explanations, simulated conversations, writing suggestions, reading passages, and differentiated learning materials. Consequently, AI is becoming relevant not merely as a supplementary educational resource but as a technology that may influence pedagogical decisions, classroom expectations, and learner behaviour.

Crompton et al., in their systematic review of forty-two studies, identify opportunities associated with AI in speaking, writing, reading, pedagogy, and self-regulated learning. However, they also report challenges involving technological reliability, restricted capabilities, anxiety, and linguistic standardization. Their findings demonstrate that the effectiveness of AI cannot be evaluated simply through its technological sophistication; it must also be examined in relation to the learning experiences it creates.

Wiley Online Library

Within the Indian higher education context, AI-supported tools have potential relevance for learners who encounter difficulties with grammatical accuracy, oral fluency, academic writing, vocabulary acquisition, and communicative confidence. Classroom environments frequently contain students with varying levels of language proficiency, making differentiated instruction an important challenge. AI applications can provide additional opportunities for individual practice, but the availability of personalized feedback does not necessarily guarantee meaningful linguistic development.

Brindha et al., in their study on AI-driven personalized learning, examine how adaptive technologies can support differentiated instruction, language proficiency, and classroom practice while emphasizing teacher supervision and responsible implementation. Their discussion supports the argument that technological adaptation must be connected to identifiable learning needs rather than adopted simply because automated tools are available.

Similarly, Chandrika and Malinee examine the relationship between AI-supported pedagogy, assessment innovation, and learner engagement, identifying the importance of combining technological possibilities with responsible instructional decisions. These studies demonstrate the growing scholarly attention given to AI integration in English language teaching.

Nevertheless, the expansion of AI presents fundamental educational questions. Does automated correction strengthen learners' grammatical understanding, or does it encourage passive acceptance of suggestions? Can conversational chatbots develop authentic communicative competence? How should institutions distinguish legitimate AI assistance from academic misrepresentation? Do commercially developed language models adequately recognize regional varieties of English and culturally diverse expressions?

These questions suggest that AI-assisted education cannot be treated exclusively as an issue of efficiency or technological progress. It must be examined through linguistic, pedagogical, social, and ethical perspectives.

The central argument of this paper is that AI-powered tools can improve opportunities for English language learning when they are integrated through human-centred pedagogy, but uncritical adoption may weaken independent learning, reproduce linguistic inequalities, and undermine educational accountability.

The research therefore examines AI as a conditional educational resource whose effectiveness depends upon instructional design, institutional governance, technological accessibility, and the critical engagement of teachers and learners.

2. Review of Literature

Contemporary scholarship on Artificial Intelligence in English language education reveals an expanding interdisciplinary discussion involving language development, educational technology, learner psychology, digital literacy, and technological ethics. The existing literature generally recognizes opportunities associated with AI-assisted instruction while emphasizing the risks of treating automated systems as reliable substitutes for human teaching.

2.1 Artificial Intelligence and English Language Pedagogy

Crompton et al. (2024) conducted a systematic review examining the educational affordances and challenges associated with AI in English language teaching. The authors identified potential applications across multiple language skills and classroom practices. Their review also revealed technical and pedagogical limitations, including problems associated with system reliability and the standardization of language. These findings highlight the need to evaluate AI within real instructional contexts rather than accepting technological promises as evidence of educational success.

Chandrika and Malinee (2026), in “Artificial Intelligence in English Language Teaching: Transforming Pedagogy, Assessment, and Learner Engagement,” examine the integration of intelligent tutoring systems, automated writing evaluation, speech-recognition applications, and generative language models into teaching practices. Their study emphasizes differentiated instruction, formative feedback, and increased learning opportunities while acknowledging the challenges of academic integrity, technological dependency, digital access, and teacher preparedness.

Moulieswaran et al. (2026) investigate AI-powered digital pedagogy as a component of twenty-first-century English language education. Their article highlights the need to associate emerging technologies with critical thinking, creativity, collaboration, communication, and digital literacy. Their discussion suggests that AI-based instruction should be evaluated according to broader educational outcomes rather than the speed of automated content production.

2.2 Personalized Learning and Learner Autonomy

Brindha et al. (2026) examine AI-driven personalized learning in English language teaching and discuss how technological systems may adjust educational content, feedback, and learning activities to individual needs. The authors recognize the potential of AI to support writing, pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, and learner autonomy. They also identify the importance of institutional support, teacher training, and ethical implementation.

Shabharishwaran et al. (2026), in “Artificial Intelligence in English Language Learning: Redefining Teaching Methods and Student Performance,” discuss the relationship between AI-assisted instruction, learner responsiveness, formative assessment, and independent language development. Their proposed PERFORM-AI framework emphasizes personalization, engagement, feedback, originality, reflection, monitored AI use, and independent transfer. This approach is particularly relevant because it distinguishes improvement in automated task performance from the development of language competence that learners can demonstrate independently.

2.3 AI-Assisted Academic Writing

Mohideen Abdul Kadir et al. (2026) investigate the influence of AI-powered writing tools on English language learning and academic writing practices. Their study identifies potential benefits involving grammatical correction, vocabulary development, and writing assistance while recognizing concerns relating to originality, critical thinking, academic honesty, and overdependence.

The educational significance of automated writing assistance is therefore not limited to its capacity to produce grammatically polished text. The central pedagogical issue concerns whether students understand and can independently apply the corrections offered by technological systems.

2.4 Critical Thinking and Cognitive Independence

Liu et al. (2025), in their systematic review of generative AI and critical thinking in English as a Foreign Language education, analyze fifteen selected studies published between 2022 and 2025. They identify a dual possibility: generative AI can support critical thinking through structured educational engagement, but it can also discourage independent reasoning when learners become excessively dependent upon generated responses.

This distinction is essential because linguistic competence includes the ability to interpret meaning, evaluate alternatives, construct arguments, and respond creatively. A technologically sophisticated response does not automatically reflect the cognitive abilities of the learner who submits it.

2.5 Ethical and Institutional Concerns

Miao and Holmes (2023), in UNESCO's Guidance for Generative AI in Education and Research, advocate a human-centred approach to AI integration, emphasizing privacy, inclusion, human agency, and appropriate educational governance. Their recommendations establish an ethical foundation for examining AI beyond its immediate classroom applications.

UNESCO's subsequent report, AI and Education: Protecting the Rights of Learners (2025), similarly emphasizes equitable access, data protection, and the responsibility of educational institutions to safeguard learners in increasingly digitized environments.

The literature collectively indicates that effective integration depends upon a combination of educational relevance, technological literacy, ethical safeguards, and human oversight.

2.6 Research Gap

Existing studies provide valuable insights into AI-assisted writing, personalized learning, pedagogical transformation, learner engagement, and critical thinking. However, these dimensions are often examined separately.

A continuing need exists for an integrated conceptual framework that connects the opportunities of AI-assisted English language education with technological limitations, linguistic diversity, learner independence, academic integrity, and institutional accountability.

The present study addresses this need by proposing a human-centred model in which the educational value of AI is determined not by its ability to generate language but by its contribution to meaningful, independent, inclusive, and ethically responsible learning.

3. Research Objectives

The study is guided by the following objectives:

1. To investigate the opportunities created by AI-powered tools for English language teaching and learning.
2. To analyze the technological, cognitive, pedagogical, and linguistic limitations of AI-assisted education.
3. To examine ethical concerns surrounding privacy, academic integrity, algorithmic bias, accessibility, and learner autonomy.
4. To evaluate the changing responsibilities of English language teachers within AI-supported learning environments.
5. To propose a human-centred ethical framework for the responsible integration of AI into English language education.



4. Research Questions

The study addresses five research questions:

1. How can AI-powered tools support the development of English language competencies?
2. What limitations affect their reliability and educational effectiveness?
3. What ethical issues emerge from the use of generative AI and automated educational systems?
4. How can teachers preserve independent reasoning, authentic communication, and learner agency?
5. What principles should guide institutional implementation of AI-assisted English language education?

5. Research Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative, conceptual, and critical literature-review methodology. It synthesizes selected academic publications and educational policy documents to investigate the opportunities, limitations, and ethical implications of AI-powered tools in English language education.

The source material includes peer-reviewed research on artificial intelligence in English language teaching, AI-assisted writing, personalized learning, learner autonomy, critical thinking, and digital pedagogy. Relevant articles published in the Stanzaleaf International Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies are considered alongside international publications and UNESCO guidance.

Sources were selected for their relevance to the research questions, identifiable publication information, and contribution to the discussion. The analysis is organized into four thematic categories: instructional opportunities, technological and pedagogical limitations, ethical challenges, and principles for responsible implementation.

A comparative interpretive approach is employed to identify agreements, differences, and unresolved questions across the selected literature. Particular attention is given to the distinction between automated performance and genuine learning, since a student's ability to obtain accurate AI-generated content cannot by itself establish mastery of the language.

The study does not involve surveys, interviews, classroom experiments, or the collection of learner performance data. Therefore, its conclusions represent conceptual interpretations and recommendations based on existing scholarship rather than original empirical measurements. It is not presented as an exhaustive systematic review or a meta-analysis.

6. Opportunities of AI-Powered Tools in English Language Education

6.1 Personalized and Adaptive Language Learning

One of the most significant opportunities offered by Artificial Intelligence is the possibility of adapting instruction to individual learning needs. Conventional classrooms frequently contain learners with differing linguistic backgrounds, vocabulary knowledge, pronunciation abilities, grammatical understanding, and levels of communicative confidence. Providing individualized attention to every student within a limited instructional period can be challenging.

AI-powered applications may address this difficulty by generating exercises of varying complexity, suggesting alternative explanations, and allowing students to practise according to their individual learning requirements.

For example, a beginner learning English sentence construction may receive simplified grammatical explanations and elementary exercises, while an advanced learner may engage in argumentative writing, discourse analysis, or professional communication activities. This flexibility can make language-learning resources more responsive to different stages of proficiency.

Brindha et al. emphasize the importance of personalized learning systems in supporting classroom instruction and learner autonomy. Their work indicates that technological personalization should remain connected to teacher supervision and educational objectives rather than operating independently of classroom pedagogy.

However, personalized content should not be confused with personalized understanding. A technological system may respond to the linguistic characteristics of a student's input without fully recognizing the learner's emotional condition, cultural background, educational experience, or motivation. Consequently, the effective use of adaptive learning requires continuous teacher involvement.

6.2 Development of Academic Writing Skills

Writing represents an important area in which AI-assisted technologies can provide educational support. English language learners often experience difficulties with sentence construction, grammatical accuracy, vocabulary selection, paragraph organization, coherence, and academic expression.

AI-powered writing applications can identify possible grammatical problems, suggest alternative sentence constructions, and provide explanations concerning clarity and organization.

Mohideen Abdul Kadir et al. examine such opportunities in their study of AI-assisted academic writing. Their discussion identifies potential benefits while also raising concerns about originality and learners' independent writing abilities.

A pedagogically productive approach involves encouraging students to compare their original writing with AI-generated suggestions. Instead of automatically accepting every correction, learners should explain why a particular grammatical or stylistic change is appropriate.

For example, a student might initially write:

The students was not understand the explanation given by teacher.

An AI application may suggest:

The students did not understand the explanation given by the teacher.

The educational benefit does not arise solely from obtaining the corrected sentence. It emerges when the learner understands subject-verb agreement, auxiliary verb usage, tense formation, and the function of articles.

Accordingly, AI-assisted writing instruction should emphasize the processes of revision, explanation, reflection, and independent application.

6.3 Speaking and Pronunciation Development

Speaking proficiency is essential for academic participation, workplace communication, interpersonal interaction, and professional mobility. Nevertheless, English language learners may hesitate to speak because of anxiety, limited vocabulary, fear of grammatical mistakes, or insufficient opportunities for conversation.

AI-powered conversational applications and speech-recognition tools can provide additional opportunities for oral practice beyond the classroom.

Students may engage in simulated interviews, professional discussions, everyday conversations, presentations, and pronunciation exercises. Such activities offer possibilities for repeated practice without requiring the continuous availability of a human conversation partner.

However, AI-based conversations cannot completely reproduce the social complexity of authentic human communication.

Human communication involves emotional interpretation, culturally appropriate responses, nonverbal behaviour, turn-taking, interpersonal relationships, and situational awareness. An

automated conversational system may generate grammatically appropriate responses without accurately understanding the social implications of a particular expression.

Therefore, AI-assisted speaking activities should supplement real conversations, group discussions, classroom debates, and collaborative communication tasks.

6.4 Reading Comprehension and Vocabulary Acquisition

AI systems can assist reading instruction by generating comprehension questions, explaining unfamiliar vocabulary, simplifying complex passages, and producing contextual examples.

A student studying an advanced academic passage may request explanations of unfamiliar expressions or clarification of difficult sentence structures. Teachers may also use AI to prepare activities appropriate to different levels of reading proficiency.

Nevertheless, reading comprehension requires more than identifying the apparent meaning of individual words or sentences. It involves inference, interpretation, evaluation, contextual understanding, and recognition of the relationship between language and meaning.

In literary education, for instance, a generated interpretation of a poem or novel should not become a substitute for close reading.

Students must be encouraged to examine textual evidence, recognize ambiguity, and formulate interpretations that emerge from their own engagement with literary works.

This distinction is especially important because AI-generated literary interpretations may appear confident even when they are insufficiently supported or factually inaccurate.

6.5 Automated Assessment and Formative Feedback

Assessment plays a central role in English language education by identifying learning progress, instructional difficulties, and areas requiring improvement.

AI-supported assessment systems can assist teachers in preparing formative exercises, generating individualized comments, identifying recurring grammatical errors, and organizing feedback.

Chandrika and Malinee identify automated assessment and learner engagement as important dimensions of AI-supported English language pedagogy.

The educational value of these systems is particularly significant when feedback is provided during learning rather than exclusively after the completion of a course or examination.

Nevertheless, automated assessment must be evaluated carefully. A system that identifies surface-level errors may not adequately recognize creativity, argumentative sophistication, cultural meaning, rhetorical intention, or originality.

Human assessment remains essential when evaluating complex written expression, literary interpretation, and communicative performance.

6.6 Teacher Support and Instructional Efficiency

AI-powered tools can also assist educators in lesson preparation, instructional material development, classroom activity design, and the differentiation of learning resources.

Teachers may use generative applications to prepare model dialogues, vocabulary exercises, grammar explanations, comprehension questions, and classroom discussion prompts.

Moulieswaran et al. emphasize the relationship between digital pedagogy and broader competencies such as creativity, collaboration, critical thinking, and communication.

Their discussion reinforces the importance of evaluating AI-generated materials according to educational objectives.

Reducing preparation time may offer practical advantages, but instructional efficiency should not become the principal measure of pedagogical quality.

A productive AI-assisted lesson must still promote meaningful participation, linguistic understanding, interpersonal communication, and intellectual independence.

7. Limitations of AI-Powered English Language Education

7.1 Inaccurate and Misleading Information

AI-generated responses may contain factual inaccuracies, unsuitable grammatical suggestions, invented academic references, or misleading explanations.

A particularly significant problem emerges when inaccurate information is presented in fluent and authoritative language.

English language learners may find it difficult to distinguish between a grammatically polished response and an academically reliable explanation.

This is especially concerning in academic writing and literary studies, where fabricated quotations, incorrect interpretations, or nonexistent citations can undermine scholarly credibility.

Teachers should therefore encourage students to verify factual statements, textual references, and academic sources independently.

7.2 Excessive Dependence and Reduced Cognitive Engagement

The convenience of AI-generated content creates the possibility that learners may gradually depend upon technological systems for tasks they should develop the ability to complete independently.

A student who repeatedly uses AI to generate essays, summaries, presentations, and explanations may submit linguistically sophisticated material without possessing equivalent writing or analytical competence.

Shabharishwaran et al. distinguish between improvements in task performance and transferable learning. Their conceptual approach emphasizes the importance of assessing what learners can accomplish independently rather than evaluating only the quality of AI-assisted output.

Liu et al. likewise identify both opportunities and risks associated with generative AI and critical thinking.

These discussions suggest that language learning should preserve productive intellectual effort.

The objective of education is not merely to produce an accurate response but to develop the ability to construct, evaluate, revise, and communicate ideas.

7.3 Lack of Emotional and Contextual Understanding

Language learning is closely connected to human interaction, cultural interpretation, emotional expression, and social identity.

Although AI systems can imitate conversational patterns, they cannot be assumed to possess the interpersonal understanding required for every communicative situation.

A learner discussing grief, discrimination, identity, or cultural conflict may require sensitivity that extends beyond conventional linguistic correction.

Similarly, classroom communication often depends upon gestures, facial expressions, shared experiences, and interpersonal trust.

Consequently, replacing human interaction with automated communication may restrict certain dimensions of social and communicative development.

7.4 Linguistic Standardization

Another limitation concerns the possibility that AI-supported language instruction may privilege particular forms of English while treating other legitimate varieties as inferior.

English functions as an international language with diverse regional, cultural, and institutional uses. However, automated writing and speech systems may favour linguistic patterns that correspond to dominant training data or standardized expectations.

Crompton et al. identify language standardization among the challenges associated with AI in English language teaching.

An educational system that automatically encourages uniform linguistic expression may weaken students' awareness of the relationship between language, identity, culture, and communicative context.

English language education should therefore distinguish between correcting errors that obstruct communication and suppressing meaningful linguistic variation.

7.5 Digital Inequality and Unequal Access

The benefits of AI-assisted education are not distributed equally. Students may experience differences in internet connectivity, access to digital devices, technological literacy, subscription affordability, and institutional infrastructure. Rural and economically disadvantaged learners may face additional difficulties in accessing advanced educational applications. These inequalities are particularly important when AI-supported activities become compulsory components of teaching or assessment. UNESCO's rights-based approach highlights the importance of preventing educational technologies from reinforcing existing inequalities. Institutions should provide alternatives where necessary and avoid assuming that all learners possess equivalent access to technology.

8. Ethical Concerns in AI-Assisted English Language Education

8.1 Academic Integrity and Originality

Academic integrity is among the most significant ethical concerns associated with generative AI. Students may use automated systems to produce essays, assignments, project reports, literature reviews, and examination responses without acknowledging the assistance received.

Such practices complicate the assessment of independent learning.

Malinee et al., in their research on generative AI in English language teaching, identify academic dishonesty, technological dependence, privacy, and algorithmic bias as central ethical concerns.

However, not every form of AI assistance should be categorized as academic misconduct.

For instance, using an application to identify grammatical errors differs from submitting a completely AI-generated essay as independently written work.

Educational institutions must therefore establish clear distinctions between acceptable assistance, acknowledged collaboration, and prohibited substitution.

8.2 Data Privacy and Learner Protection

AI-powered learning systems may collect, store, or process personal information, writing samples, recorded speech, learning histories, and behavioural data. Without adequate safeguards, the use of such information may create privacy and security risks. Students may be unaware of how their data are processed or whether uploaded material could be retained or used for other purposes. Miao and Holmes emphasize the importance of privacy protection and human-centred governance in educational AI systems. Institutions should therefore evaluate the privacy policies, data-retention practices, and security arrangements of applications before recommending their classroom use.

Sensitive student information should not be uploaded to unapproved systems, and learners should receive understandable information about how their data may be processed.

8.3 Algorithmic Bias and Cultural Representation

AI technologies are developed using data that may reflect existing social, cultural, linguistic, and institutional inequalities.

Consequently, their responses may reproduce stereotypes, privilege dominant perspectives, or inadequately represent marginalized communities.

In English language education, this issue can influence the selection of examples, interpretations of literary texts, cultural assumptions, and judgments about language proficiency.

Teachers should encourage learners to question whose linguistic and cultural experiences are represented by AI-generated materials.

Critical digital literacy must therefore include the ability to recognize possible bias and examine alternative perspectives.

8.4 Copyright and Intellectual Property

Generative AI raises complex questions regarding authorship, intellectual ownership, originality, and the reuse of protected material. AI-generated passages may resemble existing works, while students and researchers may mistakenly assume that all automated outputs can be reproduced without restriction. Academic institutions should promote responsible citation, source verification, and respect for intellectual property. Learners must understand that using AI does not eliminate their responsibility to acknowledge borrowed ideas, verify references, and comply with applicable copyright requirements.

8.5 Transparency and Accountability

Ethical AI integration requires transparency concerning the use of technological assistance.

Teachers should communicate whether AI applications are permitted for brainstorming, language correction, research assistance, translation, or content generation.

Students should also understand that they remain accountable for the accuracy and originality of submitted work.

An institutionally consistent disclosure policy can reduce confusion and support fair assessment.

Importantly, AI-detection software should not be treated as definitive proof of misconduct because automated classifications may be inaccurate. Academic judgments should consider evidence, context, institutional procedures, and students' opportunities to explain their work.

9. Proposed Human-Centred Ethical AI Integration Framework

This study proposes the Human-Centred Ethical AI Integration Framework (HCE-AI) as a conceptual model for responsible AI-supported English language education.

The proposed framework is organized around six interconnected principles.

Dimension	Central principle	Educational application
Pedagogical alignment	AI must serve defined learning objectives	Select tools according to the targeted language skill
Cognitive independence	Learners must retain responsibility for thinking	Require independent writing and explanation
Human mediation	Teachers remain responsible for instructional judgments	Review AI-generated materials and feedback
Ethical accountability	AI use must respect honesty, privacy, and transparency	Implement disclosure and data-protection policies
Linguistic inclusivity	Educational technology must respect language diversity	Recognize regional and culturally situated English varieties
Reflective evaluation	Learning must be assessed beyond automated performance	Compare assisted and independent work

The framework distinguishes between technological assistance and educational achievement.

Its central proposition is that AI contributes most meaningfully to English language education when it supports a sequence of independent effort, guided assistance, critical reflection, and demonstrated transfer.

A suggested instructional cycle comprises five stages:

1. Independent engagement: The learner attempts a language task without AI assistance.
2. Guided technological support: AI provides feedback, explanations, or practice opportunities according to a clearly identified purpose.
3. Critical evaluation: The learner examines the accuracy, relevance, and limitations of the generated suggestions.
4. Human interaction: Teachers and peers discuss the task through feedback, conversation, or collaborative activity.
5. Independent transfer: The learner completes a related task without AI assistance to demonstrate acquired competence.

This model seeks to avoid the assumption that a polished AI-assisted product automatically represents meaningful learning.

For example, a student preparing for a job interview may first construct answers independently, use an AI application to practise follow-up questions, discuss responses with classmates, and subsequently participate in a teacher-assessed mock interview.

The success of the activity would be determined not by the quality of the simulated conversation alone but by the student's ability to communicate effectively in an authentic interpersonal setting. The framework is a conceptual proposal developed through literature-based analysis. Its effectiveness must be tested through future classroom research before claims of measurable educational improvement can be established.

10. Discussion

The findings of the literature-based analysis suggest that AI-powered English language education should be understood through the relationship between technological capability and educational responsibility. A major opportunity lies in the flexibility of automated learning systems. Students can access additional practice, receive immediate explanations, and engage with diverse learning materials. These features may support individualized instruction and address some practical limitations of conventional classrooms. However, an equally important concern is the relationship between convenience and independent intellectual development.

Language proficiency develops through practice, interpretation, communication, feedback, and revision. When technological systems automatically perform these functions on behalf of learners, the resulting educational benefits become uncertain. The distinction advanced by Shabharishwaran et al. between improved task performance and genuine learning is especially relevant. A student may produce a coherent essay through technological assistance without demonstrating the ability to organize a similar argument independently. The present analysis therefore argues that educational institutions should evaluate AI-assisted learning through evidence of transferable competence. Furthermore, ethical concerns should not be treated as separate administrative problems. Privacy, academic integrity, cultural representation, and technological access directly influence the quality and fairness of educational experiences. An AI-supported classroom cannot be considered educationally successful if improved efficiency is achieved at the expense of learner independence or equitable participation. The role of the English language teacher consequently becomes more complex rather than less important. Teachers must evaluate generated materials, design meaningful activities, clarify acceptable technological assistance, support critical thinking,

and preserve opportunities for authentic communication. This interpretation aligns with the human-centred perspectives advanced by Moulieswaran et al., Chandrika and Malinee, and UNESCO.

An additional issue concerns linguistic diversity. English language education should prepare learners to communicate across academic, professional, social, and cultural contexts. Therefore, AI-generated language should not be presented as an unquestionable standard of correctness.

Teachers must help students recognize the differences between grammatical accuracy, contextual appropriateness, rhetorical choice, and cultural expression.

The broader implication is that responsible AI integration requires a shift from technology-centred teaching toward pedagogically governed technological assistance.

11. Major Findings

The thematic analysis produces the following principal findings.

First, AI-powered tools offer meaningful opportunities for personalized instruction, automated feedback, speaking practice, vocabulary development, reading assistance, and academic writing support. Second, the availability of immediate feedback may strengthen learning opportunities, but its educational effectiveness depends upon whether learners understand and independently apply the suggestions they receive. Third, excessive technological dependence presents a potential threat to cognitive independence, originality, and the development of transferable language skills.

Fourth, AI-generated content may contain inaccurate information, unreliable references, inappropriate suggestions, or culturally limited interpretations. Human verification therefore remains necessary. Fifth, ethical challenges involving academic integrity, privacy, copyright, algorithmic bias, and unequal access must be considered essential aspects of AI-assisted pedagogy. Sixth, teachers remain central to effective implementation because automated systems cannot replace all the interpersonal, contextual, evaluative, and ethical responsibilities involved in language education. Finally, the proposed HCE-AI framework suggests that responsible integration should combine independent learning, guided technological support, critical evaluation, interpersonal interaction, and assessment of independent transfer.

These are interpretive findings arising from the selected literature; they should not be interpreted as statistically established results from a classroom experiment.

12. Recommendations

The analysis supports several recommendations for English language educators, academic institutions, and educational policymakers.

Teacher professional development: Institutions should provide training that enables educators to understand AI capabilities, evaluate generated responses, identify technological limitations, and design appropriate classroom activities.

Transparent academic policies: Colleges and universities should establish understandable guidelines that distinguish acceptable language assistance from prohibited forms of automated assignment production.

Assessment reform: English language assessment should incorporate oral examinations, reflective writing, classroom discussions, supervised writing activities, and independent performance tasks alongside conventional written submissions.

Protection of learner privacy: Educational institutions should evaluate AI applications before adoption and establish procedures for protecting student information.

Inclusive access: AI-supported learning activities should be designed to accommodate students with limited connectivity, technological access, or digital literacy.



Development of critical AI literacy: Students should receive explicit guidance on verifying information, recognizing bias, questioning automated suggestions, and acknowledging technological assistance.

Preservation of human communication: AI conversation practice should complement rather than replace face-to-face interactions, group discussions, presentations, collaborative tasks, and authentic communication.

These recommendations collectively recognize technological innovation as a means of improving education rather than an end in itself.

13. Future Scope of the Study

Future research should examine the effectiveness of AI-assisted English language education through controlled classroom studies, longitudinal observations, teacher interviews, and student performance assessments.

Particular attention should be given to differences between AI-assisted task completion and independent language proficiency.

Comparative research could investigate whether learners who receive structured AI feedback demonstrate greater long-term grammatical understanding than those who depend upon automated corrections without reflective activities.

Further studies may explore the influence of AI-powered pronunciation systems on learners from different linguistic backgrounds, especially where regional accents are involved.

Research is also necessary to understand how students from economically disadvantaged backgrounds experience unequal access to AI-supported educational resources.

The proposed HCE-AI framework could be evaluated in undergraduate classrooms through pre-intervention and post-intervention assessments, independent writing tasks, oral proficiency evaluations, and qualitative learner feedback.

Such research would help determine whether human-centred instructional approaches produce sustained educational benefits across diverse learning environments.

14. Conclusion

Artificial Intelligence has introduced significant opportunities for transforming English language education by supporting personalized instruction, automated feedback, interactive communication, academic writing, and differentiated learning practices. Its applications can extend educational opportunities beyond conventional classroom boundaries and provide additional learning support for students with varying linguistic abilities. Nevertheless, the integration of AI must be evaluated critically. The technological capacity to generate accurate language does not necessarily correspond to meaningful learning, cognitive independence, or authentic communicative competence. Excessive dependence upon automated systems may restrict originality, independent reasoning, and students' ability to formulate ideas without technological assistance.

Furthermore, ethical issues involving academic integrity, data privacy, linguistic bias, copyright, accessibility, and institutional accountability demonstrate that AI-assisted education requires comprehensive governance and informed pedagogical decisions.

The present study therefore emphasizes the importance of treating AI as a supportive educational resource rather than a replacement for teachers, interpersonal communication, or independent learning. The proposed Human-Centred Ethical AI Integration Framework provides a conceptual approach through which technological assistance may be aligned with educational objectives, cognitive engagement, inclusive practices, ethical accountability, and reflective assessment.

Ultimately, the future of AI-powered English language education should not be determined exclusively by improvements in automated language generation. Its educational significance must



be evaluated through the extent to which learners become more capable of interpreting, questioning, creating, and communicating independently.

The central conclusion is that Artificial Intelligence should strengthen the human capacity to learn and communicate rather than diminish the intellectual and interpersonal foundations of language education.

Works Cited

- [1] MLA 9th Edition — alphabetized by the first author's surname. Apply double spacing and a 0.5-inch hanging indent in the final manuscript.
- [2] Brindha, R., et al. "AI-Driven Personalized Learning in English Language Teaching: Enhancing Language Proficiency and Classroom Practice." *Stanzaleaf International Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, vol. 2, no. 3, 2026, pp. 22–33. <https://doi.org/10.67313/slijms.2026.30>.
- [3] Chandrika, M. Leena, and V. V. Malinee. "Artificial Intelligence in English Language Teaching: Transforming Pedagogy, Assessment, and Learner Engagement." *Stanzaleaf International Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, vol. 2, no. 3, 2026, pp. 65–76. <https://doi.org/10.67313/slijms.2026.33>.
- [4] Crompton, Helen, et al. "AI and English Language Teaching: Affordances and Challenges." *British Journal of Educational Technology*, vol. 55, no. 6, 2024, pp. 2503–29. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13460>.
- [5] Liu, Jing, et al. "How Do Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) Tools and Large Language Models (LLMs) Influence Language Learners' Critical Thinking in EFL Education? A Systematic Review." *Smart Learning Environments*, vol. 12, article 48, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-025-00406-0>.
- [6] Malinee, V. V., et al. "Generative Artificial Intelligence in English Language Teaching: Pedagogical Innovations, Ethical Concerns, and Future Prospects." *Stanzaleaf International Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, vol. 2, no. 3, 2026, pp. 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.67313/slijms.2026.28>.
- [7] Miao, Fengchun, and Wayne Holmes. *Guidance for Generative AI in Education and Research*. UNESCO, 2023. <https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/guidance-generative-ai-education-and-research>.
- [8] Mohideen Abdul Kadir, K. J., et al. "The Impact of Artificial Intelligence Writing Tools on English Language Learning and Academic Writing Practices." *Stanzaleaf International Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, vol. 2, no. 2, 2026, pp. 30–41. <https://doi.org/10.67313/slijms.2026.25>.
- [9] Moulieswaran, N., et al. "AI-Powered Digital Pedagogy in English Language Education: A Framework for Twenty-First Century Learning." *Stanzaleaf International Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, vol. 3, no. 1, 2026, pp. 60–76. <https://doi.org/10.67313/slijms.2026.40>.
- [10] Shabharishwaran, C., et al. "Artificial Intelligence in English Language Learning: Redefining Teaching Methods and Student Performance." *Stanzaleaf International Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, vol. 3, no. 1, 2026, pp. 90–106. <https://doi.org/10.67313/slijms.2026.42>.
- [11] UNESCO. *AI and Education: Protecting the Rights of Learners*. UNESCO, 2025. <https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/ai-and-education-protecting-rights-learners>.