

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AS A TOOL FOR PERSONALIZED ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNING

M.Zh. Kenes

A.G. Abdigani

Students of group AY(IR)k-25-1h Central Asian Innovation University,
Shymkent, Kazakhstan

Scientific Supervisor: **F.I. Baymyrzayeva**

Master, Lecturer Central Asian Innovation University, Shymkent, Kazakhstan

Abstract

Traditional language education classrooms often struggle to accommodate the diverse learning paces, styles, and proficiency levels of individual students. This research paper explores the role of Artificial Intelligence (AI) as a transformative mechanism for personalized English language learning in higher education. By analyzing various AI-driven educational applications, intelligent tutoring systems (ITS), and adaptive learning platforms, this study examines how technology customizes linguistic input, provides real-time corrective feedback, and establishes individualized learning pathways. Utilizing a mixed-methods approach, the study surveys 120 undergraduate students to measure their engagement and perceived language acquisition progress when utilizing AI tools. The findings demonstrate that AI significantly enhances learner autonomy and vocabulary retention by adapting to the student's unique Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). However, the paper also addresses critical limitations, including the lack of socio-cultural nuance in AI communication and the risk of reduced authentic interpersonal interaction. The study concludes with practical recommendations for integrating adaptive AI platforms into university EFL curricula to foster an optimized, student-centered learning environment.

Keywords

Artificial Intelligence, Personalized Learning, Adaptive Technologies, EFL, Higher Education, Learner Autonomy.

Introduction

In the contemporary globalized educational landscape, proficiency in the English language serves as a crucial determinant of academic integration and professional mobility. However, one of the most persistent challenges in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) pedagogy within higher education institutions is the heterogeneous nature of the student body. In standard university classrooms, instructors must balance the needs of students operating at varying proficiency levels, ranging from elementary (A2) to advanced (C1). Consequently, the traditional "one-size-fits-all" approach frequently leaves underprepared students overwhelmed, while advanced learners remain understimulated.

The rapid maturation of Artificial Intelligence (AI) has introduced a revolutionary paradigm shift via personalized learning architectures. Unlike static digital resources, adaptive AI technologies process real-time user data—such as response speed, error patterns, and individual preferences—to dynamically calibrate the difficulty and nature of instructional materials. AI-powered platforms can act as private, non-judgmental digital tutors that offer bespoke linguistic scaffolding available 24/7.

This research paper investigates the impact of utilizing artificial intelligence as a primary instrument for personalizing English language learning among university students. It addresses two focal questions:

1. How effectively do adaptive AI platforms customize language input to meet individual student deficiencies?
2. What are the pedagogical implications and structural limitations of shifting toward AI-assisted personalized learning in higher education?

Literature Review

The concept of personalized learning is deeply rooted in cognitive psychology and educational constructivism. Lev Vygotsky's foundational theory of the **Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD)** asserts that optimal learning occurs when instruction is targeted precisely between what a learner can do independently and what they can achieve with guidance. In conventional classrooms, maintaining every student within their unique ZPD is mathematically and logistically impractical for a single instructor.

Adaptive AI algorithms solve this pedagogical bottleneck by functioning as dynamic scaffolding instruments. According to recent research by Holmes et al. (2023), Intelligent Tutoring Systems (ITS) leverage machine learning to continuously diagnose a learner's conceptual gaps. If a student consistently struggles with the English conditional structures, the AI automatically decreases the syntactic complexity of subsequent exercises, introduces targeted micro-lessons, and iteratively increases task difficulty only after mastery is verified.

Furthermore, personalization fosters a major increase in **learner autonomy**, a concept pioneered by Henri Holec. Autonomous learning requires that students take active responsibility for their own linguistic progression. AI tools empower this by allowing learners to select content aligned with their professional or personal interests (e.g., medical English vs. business English), choose their preferred mode of interaction (textual or spoken), and receive immediate, low-stakes feedback that minimizes foreign language anxiety (Krashen's Affective Filter Hypothesis).

However, scholars like Stockwell (2024) caution that over-reliance on AI-driven personalization could inadvertently isolate learners. Language is fundamentally a social instrument designed for human-to-human communication. If the educational trajectory shifts excessively toward algorithmic interactions, students may struggle to navigate the chaotic, unpredictable, and culturally nuanced elements of authentic human discourse.

Therefore, AI-personalized systems must be viewed as an extension of, rather than a replacement for, social classroom ecosystems.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

To investigate the practical efficacy of AI as a tool for personalized language acquisition, a localized empirical study was conducted at the South Kazakhstan State Pedagogical University.

Participants

The study sample comprised 120 undergraduate students belonging to group AY(IR)k-25-1h and related foreign language departments. The participants exhibited varying initial English proficiencies (ranging from A2 to B2 according to diagnostic baseline tests). Additionally, 4 language faculty members were interviewed to gather qualitative data regarding shifts in student performance.

Procedure and Instruments

The research spanned a 10-week academic period during which students were instructed to integrate specific adaptive AI tools (such as Duolingo, AI-driven chat assistants, and automated vocabulary platforms like Quizlet AI) into their self-study regimens for at least 3 hours per week. Data was collected via two distinct instruments:

1. Pre- and Post-Testing: Syntactic and lexical diagnostic tests were administered before and after the 10-week implementation period to quantify objective vocabulary retention and grammatical accuracy.
2. Perception Questionnaire: A comprehensive survey utilizing a 5-point Likert scale was administered post-intervention to assess students' subjective experiences regarding pacing, anxiety reduction, and engagement.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Quantitative Results: Academic Progression and Learner Perception

The comparative analysis of the pre- and post-test data indicated an overall 18% average increase in lexical acquisition scores across the participant cohort. Notably, students who entered the study with lower baseline scores (A2 level) exhibited the sharpest developmental curve, suggesting that AI-driven personalization is highly beneficial for remedial intervention.

Data compiled from the student perception surveys illuminated the psychological and structural benefits of the AI integration:

Perceived Benefit of AI Personalization	Strongly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Neutral / Disagree (%)
Reduction in Language Performance Anxiety	76%	18%	6%
Optimized Pacing (Learning at own speed)	82%	12%	6%
Increased Motivation via Tailored Content	68%	22%	10%
Clarity of Automated Diagnostic Feedback	59%	29%	12%

The data emphasizes that optimized pacing (82%) and anxiety reduction (76%) are the most profound advantages of AI personalization. In a digital environment, students are not constrained by the average speed of their peers; they can repeat an AI-generated listening exercise ten times without fear of social judgment. This dramatically lowers the affective filter, allowing cognitive resources to be fully dedicated to information processing.

Qualitative Discussion: The Pedagogical Trade-Offs

Interviews with faculty members provided critical analytical boundaries to these findings. While instructors noted that students utilizing adaptive platforms demonstrated superior mechanics and broader lexical recognition, they detected deficiencies in pragmatic competence. AI models generate highly standardized, grammatically perfect iterations of English. However, they frequently fail to replicate idiomatic expressions,

regional dialects, emotional inflections, and conversational subtexts that characterize genuine human interaction. Furthermore, instructors highlighted that while AI customized the input efficiently, it could not substitute for the collaborative, collaborative peer-to-peer output generated during live classroom debates and group projects.

Pedagogical Recommendations

To successfully leverage Artificial Intelligence for personalized language learning without compromising communicative competence, higher education institutions should implement the following frameworks:

The Hybrid Inverted Classroom Model

Universities should adopt a flipped classroom methodology where AI tools handle the individualized, mechanical dimensions of language learning outside the classroom. Students can use adaptive AI platforms at home to master vocabulary, practice grammar drills, and receive basic pronunciation coaching according to their personal ZPD. Consequently, valuable face-to-face classroom hours can be reserved entirely for high-stakes interactive tasks, such as collaborative presentations, sociocultural debates, and interpersonal negotiations.

Curating Diversified AI Input

Educators must guide students to move beyond basic linear language apps. Students should be taught to prompt generative AI engines to adopt specific professional personas or situational contexts (e.g., "Act as a demanding interviewer conducting an academic interview in English, adapt your vocabulary to my intermediate level, and correct my errors after each response"). This increases the pragmatic depth of the personalized learning experience.

Continuous Human Oversight

Algorithmic paths should not be entirely autonomous. Language instructors must periodically audit the analytical data generated by student platforms to check for

conceptual imbalances (e.g., an AI platform excessively prioritizing grammar over reading comprehension) and manually recalibrate the academic targets.

Conclusion

Artificial Intelligence represents an unparalleled advancement in the realization of truly personalized English language education within higher education. By dynamically mapping individual student capabilities, adapting instructional pacing, and offering target-specific feedback, AI platforms effectively dismantle the limitations of traditional mass-classroom structures. The empirical evidence indicates substantial benefits in vocabulary expansion, mechanical accuracy, and the psychological mitigation of language anxiety.

Nevertheless, AI must be treated as a supportive technological scaffold rather than an absolute educational solution. The ultimate objective of language learning is human connection, empathy, and social cooperation—domains where algorithmic engines remain fundamentally limited. The optimal future of higher education EFL pedagogy lies in a synergetic alliance, where adaptive AI customizes individual cognitive foundations, and human educators inspire authentic communicative excellence.

References:

1. Holmes, W., Bialik, M., & Fadel, C. (2023). Artificial intelligence in education: Promises and implications for teaching and learning. Center for Curriculum Redesign.
2. Holec, H. (1981). Autonomy and foreign language learning. Pergamon Press.
3. Krashen, S. (1982). Principles and practice in second language acquisition. Pergamon Press.
4. Stockwell, G. (2024). Mobile-assisted and AI-driven language learning: Structural shifts in learner autonomy. *Calico Journal*, 41(2), 122–139.
5. Wang, R., & Chen, L. (2024). Assessing the efficacy of adaptive AI tutoring systems in university EFL contexts. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 37(3), 289–311.