The Impact of Artificial Intelligence Tools on Enhancing English Language Acquisition among Undergraduates at Omar ALMukhtar University, Department of English Language, Faculty of Arts, Albeida, Libya

Fariha Mohamed Ali [1] [*], Asma Mousa Bader [2]

[1, 2] Department of English Language, Faculty of Arts, Omar Al mukhtar University, Albeida, Libya

أثر أدوات الذكاء الاصطناعي في تعزيز اكتساب اللغة الإنجليزية لدى طلاب مرحلة البكالوريوس تخصص لغة إنجليزية بجامعة عمر المختار، كلية الآداب، البيضاء، ليبيا

فريحة محمد علي1*، أسماء موسى بدر 2

1، 2 قسم اللغة الانجليزية، كلية الآداب، جامعة عمر المختار، البيضاء، ليبيا

[*]Corresponding author: shahat999@yahoo.com

Abstract:

Artificial Intelligence [AI] technologies have recently surfaced in the context of English Language Learning [ELL] in the forms of AI chatbots, speech recognition pronunciation tools, and adaptive learning platforms. The present study sets out to explore the role that AI plays in supporting EFL at Omar ALMukhtar Albeida, Libya. Focusing on undergraduates' engagement, autonomy, and perceived improvement in key language skills, with particular emphasis on speaking and pronunciation. A mixed methods design was used, combining a questionnaire to capture broad patterns of AI use and learner perceptions with semi structured meetings (interviews) to explore learners' experiences, benefits, and concerns in more depth. This included items addressing the frequency and purpose of using different AI tools, how useful and easy such tools were to use. These meetings examined how AI feedback is interpreted by learners, how AI moderates confidence and anxiety, and limitations such as the reliability of feedback, real conversational authenticity, and reliance on automated guidance The results integrated from the two strands of the mixed methods research indicate that learners regard AI systems for their immediate feedback mechanisms, flexibility in practice schedules out of class time, and for being able to practice speaking in a non-pressure context. The benefits of AI systems have already been mentioned in previous discussions in terms of language learning assistance provided by chatbots and other AI systems, Haristiani (2019), Han (2019), Karsenti (2019), and Mukhallafin (2020).

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence (AI), English Language Learning, Chatbots, Pronunciation, Autonomy, Mixed Methods Research.

الملخص

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى استقصاء دور تقنيات الذكاء الاصطناعي في دعم تعلّم اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية لطلاب المرحلة الجامعية في جامعة عمر المختار (مدينة البيضاء)، من خلال التركيز على أدوات مثل روبوتات المحادثة(Chatbots) ، وتطبيقات النطق المعتمدة على التعرّف الآلي على الصوت، والمنصات التكيفية. اعتمدت الدراسة منهجًا مختلطًا يجمع بين

استبيان لقياس أنماط الاستخدام واتجاهات المتعلمين، واجتماعات/مقابلات شبه منظمة لفهم خبراتهم بصورة أعمق، خصوصًا فيما يتعلق بالتغذية الراجعة الفورية، والتحفيز، وتنمية الاستقلالية في التعلم.

تشير نتائج الدمج بين التحليل الكمي والكيفي إلى أن المتعلمين يقدّرون أدوات الذكاء الاصطناعي لأنها تتيح ممارسة مرنة خارج الصف، وتقدم تغذية راجعة فورية تشجع على التكرار وتحسين الأداء، كما تُسهم في تقليل قلق التحدث عبر بيئة تدريب أقل تهديدًا. في المقابل، تظهر قيود مرتبطة بدقة التغذية الراجعة في بعض الحالات، ومحدودية عمق المحادثة من حيث المعنى والسياق، إضافة إلى حاجة المتعلم إلى إرشاد المعلم لتقييم مخرجات الذكاء الاصطناعي وعدم الاعتماد الزائد عليها. وتخلص الدراسة إلى أن أفضل أثر للذكاء الاصطناعي يتحقق عندما يُدمج ضمن تصميم تعليمي موجّه يوازن بين التدريب الذكي والتفاعل الإنساني داخل الفصل وخارجه، مع تدريب المعلمين على الاختيار والتوظيف التربوي للأدوات.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الذكاء الاصطناعي، تعلم اللغة الإنجليزية، روبوتات المحادثة، النطق، التعلم الذاتي، منهج بحث مختلط.

Introduction

The evolution of Artificial Intelligence AI in the education sector has led to the transformation of digital education from the provision of static contents to adaptive systems with the potential to respond to learners and provide feedback for improvement. Within the realm of ELL, the influence of Artificial Intelligence has become apparent in the form of chatbots for simulated interaction, speech applications for pronunciation support, and the use of analytics in determining the sequence for practice. The appeal in using AI in ELL can be attributed to the historical challenges in oral practices in the classroom.

Several educational discussions emphasize AI's potential to support personalization and provide real world classroom value, while also raising questions about implementation and teacher readiness, Marr (2018), Karsenti (2019). From a language learning perspective, conversational agents have been framed as tools that may extend interaction opportunities beyond the classroom, allowing learners to practice repeatedly and privately, Fryer & Carpenter (2006) and Haristiani (2019). Meanwhile, AI based autonomous learning environments especially those targeting college learners suggest that AI can facilitate self-directed learning if learners are motivated and able to use tools strategically, Han (2019).

However, the role of AI in ELL is not uniformly positive, Learners may struggle to judge the accuracy or pedagogical appropriateness of automated feedback, and AI-mediated conversations may lack the authenticity and pragmatic richness of human interaction. Thus, AI's educational impact depends not only on the technology itself but also on how it is integrated into learning design and guided by teachers, Shin (2018), Karsenti (2019) .This study therefore examines AI's role in ELL through a mixed methods approach that captures both broad learner perceptions and detailed learner experiences. The research targets answering the following questions:

1. How do EFL learners perceive the advantages, ease of use, and learning value of AI technologies?
2. How do learners describe AI's influence on speaking practice, confidence, and autonomous learning behaviors?
3. What limitations and risks do the learners report with using AI tools for ELL?

2- Literature Review

2.1 Basics of AI and its relationship with educational settings

AI is generally defined as the development of computer systems that can perform tasks that fall under the category of intelligent activities, involving learning, problem solving, and natural language processing. Traditional views of foundational knowledge emphasize AI as the pursuit of rational behavior and problem solving, and more contemporary views focus on machine learning and deep learning in order to identify patterns and make predictions. The development of machine learning approaches has allowed AI to proliferate in various sectors, including learning, where personalization and automated feedback are regularly noted Joshi (2019). AI has been depicted in educational literature as a toolbox that can aid teaching decisions, Marr (2018) and Karsenti (2019) remark to employ AI in teaching, understandings and expertise by combining educational objectives, quality of feedback, and teacher capability to integrate activities.

2.2 AI applications in English language learning: from practice to personalization

AI's role in ELL can be examined through three prominent application families: (a) conversational agents (chatbots), (b) pronunciation and speaking tools using speech recognition, and (c) adaptive platforms that structure learning and assessment.

2.2.1 Chatbots and conversational agents as language learning media

The use of chatbots has been discussed for almost two decades as tools that could support language learning by allowing interaction and repeated practice. Current research continues along these lines, often framing chatbots as a language learning medium that can support autonomous practice and learner engagement. Mobile implementations of English learning chatbots further demonstrate practical feasibility in terms of bringing AI interaction into everyday learning contexts. Often, the emphasis here is on accessibility and continuous opportunities for practice from a pedagogical perspective, chatbots could aid language learning through increasing time on task, immediate responses, and a low stakes environment in which to try things out. These affordances are especially germane to speaking confidence because learners can practice without the risk of negative peer evaluation. However, chatbot conversations may be limited by scripted patterns, insufficient pragmatic nuance, and quality variation in error correction, indicating that the educational value of chatbots depends in part on how learners and teachers frame their use.

2.2.2 AI tools for pronunciation and speaking development

Speaking and pronunciation remain challenging areas in EFL instruction, partly because they require individualized feedback and extensive practice. Technology supported approaches have therefore been explored as a way to extend training beyond classroom limits. Research on the use of the Oral application in teaching pronunciation reported the pedagogical potential of app based speaking practice, especially when learners engage in repeated attempts and self-monitoring, Jegede (2024). Similarly, broader discussions of AI in ELL point to speech recognition systems as tools that can offer immediate feedback, encourage practice, and support learner autonomy. Information about industry related reports on the development of speaking apps for artificial intelligence and their increase in popularity, for example, Kannadhasan (2024) indicates that there is a market reaction that requires flexible speaking practice support.

2.2.3 Autonomous learning through AI assistance

One of the major promises of the use of AI in learning is the support of autonomous learning by tracing the progress of the learner and advising based on the progress. In the field of EFL, studies on autonomous English learning among college students have indicated the potential value of the use of AI in improving autonomous learning behaviors among learners with learning goals and positive perceptions towards the technology, Han (2019). Studies on the use of platforms based on AI for the learning of the IELTS exam have indicated the potential value in structuring learning practice, Li (2020).

However, autonomy is not automatically achieved through AI availability. Learners must be able to set goals, interpret feedback, and sustain motivation. Therefore, the pedagogical design surrounding AI tool use shows how tasks are introduced, what reflection is required, and how feedback is discussed and plays a decisive role in transforming tool use into meaningful learning behaviors, Mukhallafi (2020) and Shin (2018).

2.3 Teacher readiness and the necessity of pedagogical mediation

One of the most recognizable trends in the literature of applying AI in educational settings is the pressing need for teacher training. Teachers need to analyze the capabilities and limitations of AI applications, as well as ensure the harmonization of the applications within the context of educational designs that facilitate, rather than automate, human engagement and instruction, Karsenti (2019)

In the context of the ELL classroom, very useful best practices for applying AI have been identified, focusing on the teacher's need to provide the right applications for the students, applying the applications within the context of educational objectives, and preventing the over-reliance of the learners on the applications' feedback, rather than considering them infall, Shin (2018).

2.4 Learner perspectives: Benefits, constraints, and trust in AI feedback

From a learning perspective, AI applications can be a tempting choice considering factors like convenience and instant feedback and engagement options. The analytical approach with a focus on university students' perspectives reveals that students generally view AI applications as useful for English learning development, yet have concerns with regard to accuracy and dependency on AI applications for support. Mukhallafi, (2020).

2.5 Synthesis gap

The literature indicates strong potential for AI to expand practice opportunities, especially for speaking and pronunciation, and to support autonomous learning. Yet gaps remain in understanding how learners negotiate AI feedback in authentic contexts and how mixed method evidence can clarify not only whether learners like AI tools, but also why certain AI affordances translate into perceived improvement while others do not, Haristiani

(2019), Han (2019) and Mukhallafi (2020). The present study addresses this gap by combining questionnaire insights with meeting based qualitative evidence.

3. Methodology
3.1 Research plan

This study uses a mixed methods design combining quantitative survey data with qualitative meeting (interview) data. The quantitative strand captures patterns of AI tool use and perceived learning outcomes, while the qualitative strand explains those patterns by exploring learners' interpretations of AI feedback, emotional experience, and contextual constraints. Mixed methods are appropriate because AI in ELL is simultaneously a behavioral phenomenon (frequency of use) and a meaning making phenomenon (how learners experience feedback and interaction, Peel (2020).

3.2 Participants

The participants for this study are EFL learners at Omar ALMukhtar University, department of English Language, Faculty of Arts, Albeida, Libya who have experience with at least one AI based tool for English learning such as a chatbot, a pronunciation tool, and/or an AI learning platform. One method for selecting participants is convenience sampling within the context of university English learning classes, and then more targeted sampling for meetings with representatives with varying levels of experience such as heavy vs. light AI use.

3.3 Instrumentation

For this study, the research questionnaire consists of four sections:

1. Demographic and prior knowledge characteristics: age, gender , optional, proficiency self-assessment, goals.
2. Patterns of AI usage: What tools, how often, how long.
3. Views on artificial intelligence advantages , ease of use, satisfaction, trust of feedback.
4. Self-assessed learning impact: speaking confidence, clarity of pronunciation, vocabulary, motivation, autonomy.

Items are assessed using the five points of Likert scale :Strongly disagree to Strongly agree, Braun and Clarke's guidelines (2006). Survey content is informed by the literature on chatbots, autonomous learning, and classroom use of AI, Haristiani (2019), Han (2019), and Shin (2018).

Meetings (Semi structured Interviews) Meeting's cover

- Which artificial intelligence-based capabilities students use most (scoring, repetition, dialogue functions for chatbots).
- How students confirm or question the authenticity of the results provided by Emotional effects (confidence, anxiety, motivation).
- Perceived limitations (for example, unnatural conversation, incorrect corrections).
- How practice in AI affects teaching practice.

3.4 Procedure

The participants are to fill out the questionnaires first. The initial descriptive analysis helps to inform meeting recruitment. The interviews are to be conducted either individually or in small groups and are to be tape recorded. Reports are written up to aid in thematic analysis. The two sets of data are to be combined in interpretation.

4 Ethical considerations

The survey is voluntary, with the informants giving their consent. The use of the anonymized data is in aggregate form. The survey avoids the collection of sensitive financial data associated with AI applications. The use of guidance from the teacher is advocated to ensure the proper use, including the avoidance of overdependence on the AI feedback system, Karsenti (2019).

5- Data analysis

The study sample consisted of English language learners from Omar Almukhtar University with varying proficiency levels and academic backgrounds. The distribution below illustrates the characteristics of participants who engaged with AI powered learning tools.

Table 1: Participant Demographics and English Proficiency Distribution.

Demographic Variable	Category	Frequency (n=120)	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	48	40.0%
	Female	72	60.0%
Academic Level	First Year	22	18.3%
	Second Year	35	29.2%
	Third Year	38	31.7%
	Fourth Year	25	20.8%
Self-Reported Proficiency	Beginner (A1-A2)	19	15.8%
	Intermediate (B1-B2)	74	61.7%
	Advanced (C1-C2)	27	22.5%

The majority of participants identified as intermediate level learners (61.7%), which aligns with typical university English learners who possess foundational skills yet require substantial practice to achieve fluency. Female participants outnumbered males by a ratio of 3:2, reflecting enrollment patterns commonly observed in humanities programs across Libyan universities. Understanding how frequently learners interact with AI technologies provides insight into their reliance on these tools as supplementary learning resources.

Table 2: Patterns of AI Tool Adoption and Usage Frequency.

Usage Pattern	Category	Number of Users	Percentage (%)
Type of AI Tool Used	Chatbots (ChatGPT, Replika, etc.)	87	72.5%
	Pronunciation Apps (ELSA, Speechling)	65	54.2%
	Adaptive Platforms (Duolingo, Babbel)	53	44.2%
	AI Writing Assistants (Grammarly)	71	59.2%
	Translation Tools with Learning Features	42	35.0%
Frequency of Use	Daily	34	28.3%
	4-6 times per week	41	34.2%
	2-3 times per week	28	23.3%

Usage Pattern	Category	Number of Users	Percentage (%)
	Once per week	11	9.2%
	Less than once per week	6	5.0%
Duration per Session	Less than 15 minutes	15	12.5%
	15-30 minutes	52	43.3%
	30-60 minutes	38	31.7%
	More than 1 hour	15	12.5%

Chatbots emerged as the most widely adopted AI tool (72.5%), which corroborates existing literature highlighting conversational agents as accessible practice partners. Over 62% of participants engaged with AI tools at least four times weekly, demonstrating consistent integration into learning routines. The predominant session length ranged between 15-30 minutes (43.3%), suggesting learners prefer focused, manageable practice intervals rather than extended sessions. This table captures participants' agreement levels regarding the advantages of AI technologies in facilitating language acquisition.

Table 3: Learner Perceptions of AI Tool Usefulness and Benefits.

Perception Statement	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Neutral (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)	Mean Score
AI tools enable more frequent practice than traditional classrooms	3.3	5.8	12.5	46.7	31.7	3.98
Allows learning at personal pace without pressure	2.5	4.2	10.0	50.0	33.3	4.07
gives instant feedback for rapid learning	1.7	3.3	8.3	48.3	38.4	4.18
Reduces embarrassment when practicing speaking	4.2	6.7	14.2	42.5	32.4	3.92
Creates more opportunities for outside-class practice	2.5	2.5	7.5	51.7	35.8	4.16
Overall usefulness for improving English skills	3.3	4.2	11.7	49.2	31.6	4.02

The data reveals strong positive perceptions, with mean scores consistently exceeding 3.90 out of 5.00. Immediate feedback received the highest mean score (4.18), indicating learners value the ability to identify and correct errors instantaneously a feature unavailable in traditional delayed-feedback models. Over 80% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that AI tools expand practice opportunities beyond classroom constraints, emphasizing their role in addressing limited contact hours with instructors. Participants evaluated their perceived improvement in specific competencies after incorporating AI tools into their learning routines.

Table 4: Self Assessed Learning Outcomes Across Language Skills.

Learning Outcome Domain	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Neutral (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)	Mean Score
Speaking Confidence	-	-	-	-	-	-
Increased confidence in speaking English	5.0	8.3	16.7	44.2	25.8	3.77
Decreased anxiety about spoken English	4.2	9.2	18.3	41.7	26.6	3.77
Greater willingness to speak in class	6.7	10.8	20.0	39.2	23.3	3.62
Pronunciation Improvement						
Pronunciation has improved	3.3	7.5	15.0	47.5	26.7	3.87
Spots certain pronunciation mistakes	2.5	5.8	11.7	52.5	27.5	3.97
Can monitor pronunciation progress	3.3	6.7	13.3	50.0	26.7	3.90
Motivation & Autonomy						
Makes English learning more engaging	4.2	7.5	16.6	45.8	25.9	3.82
Motivates regular practice	3.3	8.3	18.4	44.2	25.8	3.81
Promotes independent learning	2.5	5.0	12.5	52.5	27.5	3.97

Learning Outcome Domain	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Neutral (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)	Mean Score
Facilitates personal goal setting	4.2	6.6	15.0	48.4	25.8	3.85

Pronunciation improvement garnered notably high ratings, with 80% of learners acknowledging enhanced ability to identify specific phonetic errors (mean = 3.97). This finding validates the effectiveness of speech recognition technology in providing targeted feedback on articulatory precision. Speaking confidence outcomes, while positive, displayed slightly lower means (3.62-3.77), suggesting AI tools reduce performance anxiety but may not fully replicate the confidence-building effects of authentic human interaction. The autonomy dimension received strong endorsement (mean = 3.97), confirming AI's capacity to foster self-directed learning behaviors when learners possess clear objectives. Assessing learners' confidence in AI-generated feedback is critical for understanding adoption barriers and technological acceptance.

Table 5: Trust, Reliability, and Ease of Use Perceptions.

Perception Category	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Neutral (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)	Mean Score
Trust & Reliability						
Trust AI feedback on language performance	7.5	15.8	25.0	38.3	13.4	3.34
Corrections and suggestions are usually accurate	6.7	14.2	26.6	40.0	12.5	3.37
Sometimes question whether AI feedback is correct	4.2	10.8	15.0	45.8	24.2	3.75
Feel need to verify AI feedback with teacher	3.3	8.3	12.5	48.4	27.5	3.88
Ease to utilize	-	-	-	-	-	-
Artificial intelligence tools are easy to utilize	2.5	4.2	9.2	52.5	31.6	4.06
Interface and characteristics are user friendly	3.3	5.8	12.5	50.8	27.6	3.94
Can you easily understand different functions	4.2	6.7	13.3	49.2	26.6	3.87
Satisfaction	-	-	-	-	-	-

Perception Category	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Neutral (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)	Mean Score
Satisfied with AI learning experience	3.3	5.0	15.8	50.0	25.9	3.90
Will you recommend AI tools to others	2.5	4.2	11.7	53.3	28.3	4.01

Trust and reliability scores reveal cautious optimism rather than unconditional acceptance. Only 51.7% expressed trust in AI feedback accuracy, with 70% acknowledging they sometimes question automated corrections. Notably, 75.9% felt compelled to verify AI outputs with human instructors, highlighting an important finding: learners engage in "trust calibration" where they strategically evaluate rather than blindly accept algorithmic recommendations. This behavior demonstrates critical thinking and underscores the necessity of teacher-mediated AI integration. Conversely, ease of use received overwhelmingly positive ratings (mean = 4.06), indicating user interface design poses minimal adoption barriers. Recognizing shortcomings is essential for balanced technology implementation and realistic expectations regarding AI capabilities.

Table 6: Identified Limitations and Concerns.

Limitation Statement	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Neutral (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)	Mean Score
Feedback sometimes seems inconsistent or confusing	3.3	9.2	18.3	47.5	21.7	3.75
Chatbot conversations feel repetitive or unnatural	2.5	8.3	15.0	50.8	23.4	3.84
Cannot understand context or cultural aspects like human teachers	1.7	5.8	10.0	49.2	33.3	4.07
Concerns on becoming so dependent on AI tools	5.0	12.5	20.8	41.7	20.0	3.59
Limited in providing deep, meaningful conversations	2.5	7.5	13.3	50.0	26.7	3.91
Still need teacher's guidance even when using AI	1.7	3.3	8.3	48.3	38.4	4.18

Limitation Statement	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Neutral (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)	Mean Score
Unable to fully replace human interaction	0.8	2.5	6.7	42.5	47.5	4.33
Technical problems sometimes interfere with use	4.2	10.8	22.5	43.3	19.2	3.62

The most strongly endorsed limitation concerned AI's inability to replicate human interaction (mean = 4.33), with 90% agreeing or strongly agreeing that technology cannot substitute for authentic communicative engagement. Similarly, 82.5% recognized cultural and contextual understanding gaps inherent in algorithmic systems (mean = 4.07). Over 86% emphasized the continued necessity of teacher guidance (mean = 4.18), reinforcing the complementary rather than replacement role of AI. Interestingly, 74.2% perceived chatbot exchanges as repetitive or lacking natural conversational flow, suggesting current dialogue systems struggle with pragmatic depth and spontaneous topic negotiation limitations acknowledged in computational linguistics research. Understanding why learners choose specific AI functions illuminates which competencies they perceive as most challenging or amenable to technological support.

Table 7: Primary Purposes for AI Tool Utilization.

Purposes for Utilizing AI Tools	Number of Users	Percentage (%)
Practicing conversation and speaking	95	79.2%
Improving pronunciation	88	73.3%
Building vocabulary	76	63.3%
Grammar practice and correction	82	68.3%
Writing assistance	69	57.5%
Preparing for standardized exams	47	39.2%
Getting quick answers to language questions	91	75.8%

Speaking practice dominated usage purposes (79.2%), consistent with the study's emphasis on AI's role in addressing oral skill development challenges. The prominence of pronunciation improvement (73.3%) and quick query resolution (75.8%) underscores learners' appreciation for immediate, on-demand support affordances unavailable in asynchronous traditional learning materials. Grammar correction ranked fourth (68.3%), suggesting learners leverage AI for mechanical accuracy checks while prioritizing communicative competencies for deeper engagement. This analysis examines whether increased engagement with AI tools correlates with stronger self-reported improvements across language domains.

Table 8: Correlation Between Usage Frequency and Perceived Learning Outcomes.

Usage Frequency	Mean Speaking Confidence Score	Mean Pronunciation Improvement Score	Mean Autonomy Score	Overall Satisfaction Score
Daily (n=34)	4.12	4.24	4.18	4.21
4-6 times a week (n=41)	3.89	4.03	4.07	4.05
2-3 times a week (n=28)	3.54	3.71	3.78	3.76
Once per week (n=11)	3.18	3.36	3.45	3.41
Less than once/week (n=6)	2.83	3.00	3.17	3.08

A clear positive relationship emerges between usage intensity and perceived benefits. Daily users reported substantially higher speaking confidence (4.12) compared to infrequent users (2.83), representing a 45% differential. This pattern persists across all measured outcomes, suggesting that consistent engagement rather than sporadic experimentation drives meaningful skill development. The autonomy dimension displays particularly strong correlation, indicating regular AI interaction cultivates self-regulatory learning behaviors. Although causality remains ambiguous, motivated learners may naturally use tools more frequently while simultaneously experiencing greater improvement through combined effort and intrinsic drive. Interview transcripts were coded to identify recurring experiential themes expressed by participants regarding AI-mediated language learning.

Table 9: Qualitative Themes from Semi Structured Interviews (Frequency Analysis).

Thematic Category	Number of Mentions	Percentage of Participants (n=30)	Representative Sub-themes
Immediate Corrective Feedback	28	93.3%	Real-time error identification, pronunciation scoring, instant grammar suggestions
Low-Stakes Speaking Rehearsal	26	86.7%	Practice without judgment, reduced performance anxiety, privacy in error-making
Flexibility and Accessibility	27	90.0%	Anytime practice, location independence, self-paced progression
Uncertainty About AI Accuracy	23	76.7%	Questionable corrections, inconsistent feedback, difficulty evaluating reliability
Shallow Conversational Depth	21	70.0%	Repetitive exchanges, limited topic range, lack of pragmatic nuance

Thematic Category	Number of Mentions	Percentage of Participants (n=30)	Representative Sub-themes
Need for Teacher Confirmation	25	83.3%	Verification of AI outputs, preference for human validation, hybrid learning model
Increased Motivation	22	73.3%	Gamification elements, progress tracking, sense of achievement
Technical Difficulties	17	56.7%	Speech recognition errors, app crashes, internet connectivity issues

The qualitative findings triangulate with quantitative data, revealing that while learners value immediate feedback (93.3%), they simultaneously harbor skepticism regarding accuracy (76.7%). This duality characterizes the "trust calibration" phenomenon identified in the literature. Low-stakes rehearsal emerged as a critical psychological benefit (86.7%), supporting theories that anxiety reduction facilitates language production. The persistent demand for teacher confirmation (83.3%) reinforces that AI functions optimally as a pedagogical supplement rather than standalone solution, necessitating blended instructional designs. Participants were asked to indicate their preferred approach for incorporating AI technologies within formal educational frameworks.

Table 10: Preference for AI Integration Models in English Instruction.

Integration Model	Number Selecting as Preferred	Percentage (%)
AI as supplementary practice outside class, with classroom focused on human interaction	68	56.7%
Balanced combination: 50% AI-mediated practice, 50% teacher-led instruction	31	25.8%
Primarily AI-based learning with occasional teacher guidance	8	6.7%
Primarily teacher-led with minimal AI integration	13	10.8%

The majority (56.7%) advocated for AI serving as supplementary homework or independent practice, preserving classroom time for communicative activities requiring human facilitation discussions, debates, collaborative projects, and pragmatic instruction. Only 6.7% endorsed AI centric models, reflecting awareness that technology cannot replicate the socio-cultural dimensions of language acquisition. This preference distribution aligns with pedagogical consensus that effective technology integration enhances rather than replaces human teaching, leveraging each modality's comparative advantages. Analyzing whether AI's impact varies across proficiency stages illuminates differential effectiveness for diverse learner populations.

Table 11: Comparison of Learner Outcomes by Proficiency Level.

Proficiency Level	Mean Pronunciation Improvement	Mean Speaking Confidence	Mean Autonomy Development	Mean Satisfaction
Beginner (n=19)	4.21	3.95	3.68	4.16

Proficiency Level	Mean Pronunciation Improvement	Mean Speaking Confidence	Mean Autonomy Development	Mean Satisfaction
Intermediate (n=74)	3.89	3.76	4.03	3.91
Advanced (n=27)	3.52	3.59	4.15	3.70

Beginners derived greatest benefit in pronunciation (4.21) and satisfaction (4.16), likely because speech recognition tools effectively address foundational articulatory errors. Advanced learners, conversely, rated pronunciation gains lower (3.52), possibly because automated systems struggle with subtle phonetic distinctions or idiomatic speech patterns that characterize proficiency refinement. Interestingly, autonomy scores increased with proficiency (3.68 → 4.15), suggesting advanced learners possess metacognitive skills enabling more strategic, self-directed AI utilization. This finding implies differentiated pedagogical approaches: structured guidance for novices, autonomous exploration for advanced students.

6- Recommendations

1. support teachers' preparation and professional development in AI affordances, limitations, and strategies for integrating into the classroom, Karsenti(2019) and Shin (2018).
2. Tool evaluation criteria, that is to adopt assessment rubrics developed for AI tools that can be used to assess the validity of the feedback provided, the usability of the tool, transparency, and alignment to Learning Outcomes, Mukhallafi (2020) and Marr (2018).
3. Balanced learning design, that is using AI for rehearsal and feedback, pronunciation, speaking drills, and chatbot warm ups, then reinforce with human led communicative tasks and reflective activities, Haristiani, (2019) and Jegede (2024).
4. Learner AI literacy that is by training learners to check AI feedback against other references, avoid dependency on scores or automated corrections, Karsenti (2019).

7. Conclusion

The role of AI technologies in learning English languages has been examined in this mixed methodology study to identify the perceptions of English language learners in contracting AI technologies such as chatbots, glossa pronunciation analysis tools. Overall, the implication of the study shows that AI has been beneficial by providing immediate feedback, opportunities for frequent practices, and promoting autonomy in English language learning, especially in speaking aspects. The limitations of AI technologies in terms of feedback reliability, in depth discussion abilities, and over reliance by English language learners suggest that AI technologies can be effectively used to supplement pedagogically supported learning rather than relying entirely upon expertise in English AI applications, It seems to be crucial to prepare educators and learners to utilize AI technologies effectively to tap their full benefits and mitigate their adverse impacts.

References

1. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101.
2. Fryer, L., & Carpenter, R. (2006). Bots as language learning tools. *Language Learning & Technology, 7*.
3. Han, B. (2019). Application of artificial intelligence in autonomous English learning among college students. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (iJET), 14*(06), 63–74. https://online-journals.org/index.php/i-jet/article/view/10157
4. Haristiani, N. (2019). Artificial intelligence (AI) chatbot as language learning medium: An inquiry. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 1387*, 012020. https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1387/1/012020

5. Jegede, O.O. (2024). Artificial Intelligence and English Language Learning: Exploring the Roles of AI-Driven Tools in Personalizing Learning and Providing Instant Feedback, *Universal Library of Languages and Literatures*, Volume 01, Issue 02

6. Joshi, A. V. (2019). *Machine learning and artificial intelligence*. Springer Nature.

7. Kannadhasan, M. (2024) ."Use of Technical Intelligence in English Teaching and Learning*", International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Modern Education,* Volume 10, Issue 2, July - December, Page Number 25-27, 2024

8. Karsenti, T. (2019). Artificial intelligence in education: The urgent need to prepare teachers for tomorrow's schools. *Formation et Profession, 27*(1), 105. https://doi.org/10.18162/fp.2019.a166

9. Li, R. (2020). Using artificial intelligence in learning English as a foreign language: An examination of IELTS LIULISHUO as an online platform. *Journal of Higher Education Research, 1*. https://doi.org/10.32629/jher.v1i2.178*Vision, Image and Deep Learning (CVIDL)* (pp. 285–290). https://doi.org/10.1109/CVIDL51233.2020.00-84

10. Marr, B. (2018). How is AI used in education—Real world examples of today and a peek into the future. Forbes Magazine. https://www.forbes.com/sites/bernardmarr/2018/07/25/how-is-ai-used-in-education-real-world-examples-of-today-and-a-peek-into-the-future/

11. Mukhallafi, T. R. A. (2020). Using artificial intelligence for developing English language teaching/learning: An analytical study from university students' perspective. *International Journal of English Linguistics, 10*(6), 40. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v10n6p40

12. Peel, Karen L. (2020) "A Beginner's Guide to Applied Educational Research using Thematic Analysis," *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation*: Vol. 25 , Article 2.

13. Shin, M.-H. (2018). How to use artificial intelligence in the English language learning classroom. *Indian Journal of Public Health Research & Development, 9*(9), 557. https://doi.org/10.5958/0976-5506.2018.01058.6