College of Basic Education Research Journal

https://berj.uomosul.edu.iq/

Pros and Cons of Using Artificial Intelligence in Teaching and Learning English as a Foreign Language at the School Level

Arwa Luay Abdulkhaleq

University of Mosul, College of Basic Education, Department of English Language, Mosul, Iraq.

Article Information

Article history:

Received: October 25 ,2025

Reviewer: January 15, 2026

Accepted: January 15, 2026

Available online: June, 2026

Keywords:

AI,

EFL,

Language Education,

School Level

Correspondence:

Arwa Luay Abdulkhaleq

Email:

arwal.abdulkhaleq@uomosul.edu.iq

Abstract

While English language classrooms can benefit from the powerful new innovation of Artificial Intelligence, new challenges can be faced. This study reviews the recent evidence weighs the pros of Artificial Intelligence including individualized, real-time feedback and the opportunity to be more independent against its pros, namely student dependence on assistance that ultimately may increase privacy risks and reduce humanity associated with Artificial Intelligence. Based on ideas from constructivism and cognitivism, the analysis argues that technology should not replace traditional instruction, but should support it." At the end, the results call for an educational equilibrium and instruct teachers to adopt Artificial Intelligence applications so that they can increase efficiency while simultaneously and steadfastly preserving the humanity of language learning.

P-ISSN: 1992–7452 **E-ISSN:** 2664-2808

إيجابيات وسلبيات استخدام الذكاء الاصطناعي في تعليم وتعلم اللغة الإنكليزية بوصفها لغة أجنبية في المرحلة المدرسية

أروى لؤي عبد الخالق

جامعة الموصل، كلية التربية الأساسية، قسم اللغة الإنكليزية، الموصل، العراق.

المستخلص

على الرغم من أن فصول تعليم اللغة الإنكليزية يمكن أن تستفيد من الابتكار القوي المتمثل في الذكاء الاصطناعي، إلا أنها قد تواجه تحديات جديدة. وتستعرض هذه الدراسة الأدلة الحديثة للموازنة بين إيجابيات الذكاء الاصطناعي التي تتضمن التغذية الراجعة الفورية والمخصصة ، وإتاحة الفرصة لمزيد من الاستقلالية وبين سلبياته؛ وتحديداً اعتماد الطلبة على المساعدة، وهو ما قد يؤدي في النهاية إلى زيادة مخاطر الخصوصية وتقليص الجانب الإنساني المرتبط بالذكاء الاصطناعي. واستنادًا إلى أفكار من النظريتين البنائية والمعرفية، يعرض تحليل الدراسة أن التكنولوجيا لا ينبغي أن تحل محل التعليم التقليدي، بل يجب أن تكون داعمة له. وفي الختام، تدعو نتائج الدراسة إلى تحقيق توازن تعليمي، وتوجه المعلمين لتبني تطبيقات الذكاء الاصطناعي بما يمكنهم من زيادة الكفاءة، مع الحفاظ في الوقت ذاته وبثبات على الجانب الإنساني في تعلم اللغة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الذكاء الاصطناعي، اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية، تعليم اللغات، المستوى المدرسي.

1.Introduction

Among the recent technology innovations in education, AI has become one of the most powerful technology. The use of AI in education covers as vast a ground as automated assessment systems (Zhang, 2020), intelligent tutoring platforms, conversational agents and adaptive learning environments (Jeon, 2020; Baker, 2021). At the levels of education where EFL is being taught to school children, AI is now being touted as creating new opportunities in dealing with individual learner differences (Mohamed, 2024), building motivation (Shin, 2021), and offering access to continuing practice away from the classroom (Kukulska-Hulme, 2021).

Although such opportunities exist, the use of AI in EFL education is controversial. Overdependence on AI may discourage critical thinking (Mujeeb, 2024), weaken the teacher–student interaction (Hwang & Chen, 2024), and lead to learning foreign languages as mechanical practice (Gayed et al., 2022), critics claim. In addition, the potential of AI in schools is still limited by key ethical challenges, including data privacy (Baker, 2021; Akgun & Greenhow, 2022), algorithmic bias (Zhai et al., 2021) and unequal access to technological resources (Strickland, 2024).

2. Research Questions

The following research questions guide this study:

1.What are the theoretical basis for the inclusion of AI in the EFL field at the school level?

2.What are the major pros of improving English with the help of AI?

3.What types of cons and risks does AI-assisted EFL learning involve?

4.As teachers use AI more and more, how do they strike a good balance if they are still trying to teach traditional practices?

3. Research Aims

This study is mainly intended to:

1. analyze the theoretical basis of AI implementing in EFL education

2. spot its pros/benefits and cons/ challenges and

3.suggest pedagogical recommendations for effective and ethical AI implementation at the school level.

4. Theoretical Framework

This study is based on three complementary theoretical frameworks: constructivist learning theory, cognitive load theory, and self-directed learning theory. From the perspective of the constructivist paradigm, knowledge is constructed through active engagement in learning activities and social interaction. When it comes to AI, several tools along those lines, including chatbots and adaptive platforms, have been introduced and naturally lend themselves to those principles by enhancing interactive, contextualized language use, and simulating, via an algorithm, a "social presence" that helps keep motivation high (Jeon, 2020; Liu & Reinders, 2025).

Cognitive load theory deals with optimizing cognitive effort in learning. AI systems reduce extraneous cognitive load with adaptive task-difficulty and pacing (Baker, 2021). Such a dynamic capability provides the needed "cognitive scaffolding" to allow the learner to use cognitive

resources to practice language skills rather than engage in a struggle with decoding or other mechanical barriers (Jeon, 2020).

AI also enhances learner autonomy apparent in self-directed learning theory. Facilitating self-paced or individualized practice and allowing for immediate and iterative feedback loops, these tools help students regulate their own learning path and rectify errors without constant teacher involvement (Zhang, 2020; Soleimani et al., 2022).

In addition, ethical and sociocultural considerations serve as complementary frameworks to these foundations of learning theory. This involves overcoming issues about data privacy (Akgun & Greenhow, 2022), closing the "digital divide" in access to assets (Strickland, 2024), and re-establishing the position of the teacher as an "learning architect" who steers the educational design (Marrone et al., 2022).

5. Methodology

The current study adopts a qualitative systematic review to critically assess the integration of AI in EFL learning. Sixty international academic studies published between 2020 and 2025 formed the research corpus, selected to represent the wide variety of studies that rapidly defined the iterative nature of the field. For equity in our timeline specification, each year had a set of ten studies, covering everything from the earliest chatbot studies to more current General AI studies.

Thematic synthesis analysis was used to explore the data, which were specifically organised to answer the four research questions of the study. Specific information was extracted, coded and to examine basic theoretical foundations offering linguistic advantages and ethical challenges. The

methodology maps all these elements along a timeline, indicating a shift in pedagogical focus from desensitization to cognitive regulation, and provides recommendations grounded at this temporal nexus for a balance between artificial intelligence and human instruction.

6. Results and Discussion

The analyzed data collected from 2020 to 2025 has been summarized in this section. The analysis is presented in a narrative and academic style to ensure that it is flowing and cohesive while answering the research questions of theoretical perspectives, pros & cons, and teaching balance.

Table 1: Ten AI Education Studies in 2020

No.	Author(s) & Study	Key Pros (Benefits)	Key Cons (Challenges)
1	**Chen, X., Xie, H., & Hwang, G. J. (2020).** A multi-perspective study on AI in Education.	Identified major trends/grants aiding personalized learning.	Noted a lack of research on ethical guidelines.
2	**Holmes, W., et al. (2020).** *Ethics of AI in Education.*	addressed the potential for efficiency and scaling.	The "Black Box" problem (unexplainable decisions).
3	**Jeon, J. (2020).** *AI Chatbots in EFL... user experience.*	High engagement due to novelty and low pressure.	Frustration with technical limitations/voice recognition.
4	**Junaidi, J. (2020).** *The role of AI in EFL speaking.*	Bolstered student confidence and reduced speaking anxiety.	Lacked the nuance of human interaction for feedback.
5	**Long, D., & Magerko, B. (2020).** *What is AI Literacy?*	Defined necessary competencies for students.	Highlighted students' inability to critique AI decisions.
6	**Pokrivcakova, S. (2020).** *AI in Language Education.* (Chapter).	Democratized access to language modelling tools.	Risk of dehumanizing the teaching process.
7	**Shin, M. H. (2020).** *The effects of AI-based chatbots on EFL students' speaking competence.*	Significant improvement in speaking fluency/confidence.	Limited improvement in grammatical accuracy.
8	**Smutny, P., & Schreiberova, P. (2020).** *Chatbots for learning: A review... for Facebook* Messenger.	Accessible, mobile-friendly vocabulary practice.	Chatbots failed to handle complex, open dialogue.
9	**Zhang, Z. (2020).** *Learner engagement with Automated Writing Evaluation (AWE).*	Immediate feedback loop encouraged revision.	Students often ignored the reason for the error.
10	**Zou, B., et al. (2020).** *Artificial intelligence for second language learning.*	Validated the use of AI for vocabulary retention.	Noted technology often distracted from pedagogy.

In Table 1, "Novelty and Affective Filtering Era" mostly exist in the studies of 2020 which was cautiously optimistic and focused on specific tools like chatbots and automated evaluation systems. Several unifying themes of these studies centered on the ability of AI to reduce the "affective filter" for language learners. For example, several studies by Jeon and Shin pointed out that students who communicated with chatbots showed greater engagement and lower levels of anxiety than when interacting with human

peers. This corresponds with the theory underpinning Personalized Learning, in which the privacy of the human-machine interaction results in a low stakes speaking fluency practice environment.

It is also shown that in 2020, the "human" role of teaching was limited. Though the tools did work to democratize language modeling access, researchers such as Pokrivcakova cautioned against the potential of "dehumanizing" the teaching going on. There was agreement that AI could provide confidence building, but wasn't nuanced enough for complex conversations, and there were also complaints of technical problems that left students frustrated. Furthermore, Holmes et al. immediately emphasize the issue of the "Black Box" problem: even with better performance, the inability to provide an explanation for the decisions made by an AI was one of the first ethical issues related to it.

Table 2: Ten AI Education Studies in 2021

No.	Author(s) & Study	Key Pros (Benefits)	Key Cons (Challenges)
11	**Baker, J. (2021).** *AI and Curriculum Development.*	Dynamic adjustment of curriculum difficulty.	Data privacy concerns regarding student records.
12	**Chai, C. S., et al. (2021).** *Surveying students' perception of AI...*	Students viewed AI as a supportive "private tutor."	Fear of AI replacing the human teacher's role.
13	**Kukulska-Hulme, A. (2021).** *AI and mobile learning.*	Enabled learning outside the classroom (ubiquity).	Blurred boundaries between home/school time.
14	**Lee, S. M. (2021).** *AI translation tools in EFL.*	Helped students access difficult authentic texts.	Reduced students' effort to decode text themselves.
15	**Liang, J. C., et al. (2021).** *Artificial intelligence in language learning.*	High potential for adaptive/personalized testing.	Hard to implement in low-resource classrooms.
16	**Liu, D., et al. (2021).** *Automated feedback in EFL writing.*	Consistent usage led to fewer mechanical errors.	Students became dependent on the tool for proofreading.
17	**Shin, D. (2021).** *AI in the elementary classroom.*	Young learners showed high motivation.	Speech recognition struggled with children's voices.
18	**UNESCO (2021).** *AI and Education: Guidance for Policy-Makers.*	Highlights potential to bridge equity gaps globally.	Warns of gender/racial bias in training data.
19	**Zhai, X., et al. (2021).** *A Review of AI in Education from 2010 to 2020.*	Confirmed AI's success in reducing teacher workload.	Criticized the "blind trust" in algorithmic fairness.
20	**Zhou, L., et al. (2021).** *The impact of AI on EFL writing.*	Automated feedback improved syntactic accuracy.	Did not improve organization or content quality.

Table 2 reveals "Ubiquity and the Private Tutor Metaphor". In 2021, the discussion turned to (Adaptive Learning & ubiquity). This suggests that AI shifted from the classroom novelty to that which could follow the student home as a "supportive private tutor". According to Kukulska-Hulme, this resulted in successful blurring of the lines between school and home, with the possibility of learning happening anywhere. Such ubiquity made it possible for dynamic curriculum to be modified instantaneously, with task difficulty providing the data to match the learner, a strength of differentiated strategies.

However, an analysis explains there is an increasing fear of cognitive determinism that accompanies these things. Liu et al. pointed out a contradiction: automated feedback has improved the number of mechanical errors in writing, however, students have started to use them as proofing devices rather than learning the grammar rules that they were previously internalizing. Moreover, the "blind faith" in algorithmic fairness drew fierce criticism; Zhai et al. dangers of embedding gender and ethnic biases contained in the datasets of their training data into AI learning methods resulting in equity concerns in the global education system without sustained proper regulation

Table 3: Ten AI Education Studies in 2022

No.	Author(s) & Study	Key Pros (Benefits)	Key Cons (Challenges)
21	**Gayed, J. M., et al. (2022).** *Exploring an AI-based writing assistant's impact...*	Improved grammar, sentence structure, and vocabulary.	Reduced student agency (passive acceptance of edits).
22	**Marrone, R., et al. (2022).** *AI and the changing role of the teacher.*	Teachers shift from "transmitters" to "designers."	Teachers face an "authority crisis" vs. the AI.
23	**Soleimani, E., et al. (2022).** *AI-based instruction in EFL contexts.*	Effective for self-regulated learning.	Students felt isolated without peer interaction.
24	**Suciati, et al. (2022).** *AI in speaking classes.*	Boosted performance in controlled speaking tasks.	Lacked spontaneity found in human conversation.
25	**Kang, T. (2022).** *AI chatbots and willingness to communicate.*	Lowered anxiety for introverted students.	Engagement dropped once the "novelty effect" wore off.
26	**Divekar, R., et al. (2022).** *Foreign language immersion via AI.*	provided immersive, scenario-based practice.	High technical barrier/cost for implementation.
27	Kim, N. (2022). *AWE vs Teacher Feedback.*	AWE was faster and handled surface errors well.	Teacher feedback was superior for logic/coherence.
28	**Akgun, S., & Greenhow, C. (2022).** *AI in Education: Safety and Privacy.*	precise tracking of learning analytics.	Risk of surveillance and misuse of student data.
29	**Yang, X. (2022).** *AWE and Chinese EFL learners.*	Significant gains in writing fluency.	Mixed/low results for complex sentence accuracy.
30	**Link, S., et al. (2022).** *Automated writing evaluation reliability.*	Scalable for large classes.	Inability to detect humor, irony, or cultural nuance.

Table 3 shows " The Teacher's Shifting Identity". These studies from 2022 are a kind of tipping point, where we can see, pedagogically, how the

rest of the human/machine balance is going to go. The results suggest a structural alteration in teacher's role from "knowledge transmitter " to "learning context planner.". However, this transition was not without challenges; Marrone et al. for deeper, richer means of seeking correction as human beings, which meant that in a perfect world, teachers lost a little authority in not being the best in correctors based off the eventual personal experience-based development of AI-based tools o were able to give this kind of shallow correction into form faster, they were still faster.

When it comes to students, the data shows a tension between precision and autonomy. Although AI writing assistants helped the vocabulary and grammatical organization and complexity of Gayed and colleagues et al. discovered that many students played a passive role, accepting edits made without questioning them, which undermined their agency. What this will be going through is a discussion that AI need active mediation to be able to be useful. Soleimani et al. That means AI is great for self-regulated learning but not great at replacing motivation from peer interaction and many perform worse in AI-based programs and end up feeling isolated.

Table 4: Ten AI Education Studies in 2023

No.	Author(s) & Study	Key Pros (Benefits)	Key Cons (Challenges)
31	**Atlas, S. (2023).** *ChatGPT for higher education.* (Applied to K-12).	Streamlines administrative tasks for teachers.	Requires "prompt engineering" skills teachers lack.
32	**Baidoo-Anu, D., & Ansah, L. (2023).** *Education in the era of Generative AI.*	Promotes personalized and interactive learning.	Lack of accuracy/reliability in AI responses.
33	**Barrot, J. S. (2023).** *Using ChatGPT for second language writing: Pitfalls and potentials.*	Excellent for idea generation and modeling.	High risk of plagiarism and "hallucinated" facts.
34	**Chan, C. K. Y. (2023).** *GenAI policy in education.*	Policies can provide a framework for safe use.	Current policies are often vague or unenforceable.
35	**Chiu, T. K., et al. (2023).** *Student perceptions of GenAI.*	Students felt supported and empowered.	Confusion over what constitutes "authorship."
36	**Guo, K., & Wang, Y. (2023).** *Effects of ChatGPT on EFL writing.*	Improved linguistic accuracy and cohesion.	Students struggled to maintain their own "voice."
37	**Jeon, J., & Lee, S. (2023).** *ChatGPT in the EFL classroom.*	Teachers found it useful for lesson planning.	Students used it to bypass cognitive effort (cheating).
38	**Koraishi, O. (2023).** *Teaching English in the age of AI..*	Optimizes material creation and assessment.	Questions the validity/bias of AI-generated content.
39	**Rudolph, J., et al. (2023).** *ChatGPT: Bullshit spewer or the end of traditional assessments?*	Forces a positive shift to oral/authentic assessment.	Renders traditional essay homework obsolete.
40	**Vera, F. (2023).** *ChatGPT's pedagogical benefits.*	Outperformed traditional instruction in some metrics.	Ethical concerns regarding academic integrity.

Table 4 sheds light on "The generative AI disruption". The theoretical and practical discourse changed greatly in 2023 with the emergence of Generative AI (e.g., ChatGPT). Results from this period reveal an ideological division. ChatGPT and other tools were celebrated first for their potential to increase the efficiency of administrative tasks and second as supercomputers for ideas and models. Meanwhile, the issue of "hallucinated facts," where the AI confidently presents false information, presented an acute threat to academic honesty.

A lot of the studies in 2023 revolve around traditional assessment being outdated. Rudolph et al. claim has been that the typical essay home assignment was no longer an appropriate measure of student performance, and that we needed a move toward oral and authentic assessment. In addition, a new "digital divide" around skill set developed; according to Atlas, teachers effectively needed to become "prompt engineers" to use these tools, a skill set most did not have. As an educational lesson, this is a shift away from Literacy in AI, where we teach kids to use the tool, toward AI Literacy, teaching students to critique what it produces, and maintain their "voice" in the flood of suggestions from a machine.

Table 5: Ten AI Education Studies in 2024

No.	Author(s) & Study	Key Pros (Benefits)	Key Cons (Challenges)
41	**Aljemely, Y.** (2024). *Training teachers to utilize AI.*	AI is beneficial for admin and differentiation.	Lack of standardized training leads to misuse.
42	**Alrajhi, M.** (2024). *Shift from traditional to AI methodologies.*	Modernizes the classroom environment.	Teachers struggle to keep up with the pace of change.
43	**Hwang, G. J., & Chen, N. S.** (2024). *GenAI in education: Vision and challenges.*	Vision of a fully personalized tutor for every child.	Challenge of maintaining human connection.
44	**Mabuan, R. A.** (2024). *GenAI and student agency.*	Helps students overcome writer's block.	Risks making students passive editors rather than writers.
45	**Mohamed, A.** (2024). *AI implementation in EFL: A qualitative synthesis.*	AI caters effectively to individual learning styles.	Integration is hindered by infrastructure/cost.
46	**Mujeeb, S.** (2024). *Critical thinking and AI dependency.*	AI offers instant answers and support.	Learners become less inclined to solve problems themselves.
47	**Pat-El, R., et al.** (2024). *Motivation and AI assessment.*	Well-designed AI feedback boosts motivation.	Poorly implemented AI feels punitive/surveillant.
48	**Rejali, et al.** (2024). *TAM and AI adoption in EFL.*	"Perceived Ease of Use" drives adoption.	Social influence (peers) can negatively impact usage.
49	**Strickland, A.** (2024). *AI tools in the language classroom.*	Enhances accessibility for diverse learners.	Creates a "digital divide" based on tool access.
50	**Yang, L., & Li, R.** (2024). *ChatGPT for L2 learning.*	Facilitates general language skill acquisition.	Mixed impact on deep reading comprehension.

Table 5 reflects " Critical Thinking and the Equity Gap". The research then conducted in 2024 to look into the cognitive effects of living with AI over a period of decades. Definitely a big one was critical thinking; since AI can quickly answer any query, Mujeeb found learners less willing to go through the necessary "struggle" involved in solving a problem. This stands in stark contrast to the long-promised vision of Hwang and Chen of a tailor-made tutor and mentor for every child, which implies that a true AI experience has the psychological potential if not the actual delivery of it.

The results showed deepening divisions economically and socially. While AI opens the door wider, Strickland said, it also establishes a point of entry based on who can pay for top-shelf tools, thus favoring more affluent students. The motivation-related discussion indicates similar complexity: well-crafted AI feedback can enhance motivation, while poorly designed systems could also seem "punitive" or surveillant, reducing the student experience.

Table 6: Ten AI Education Studies in 2025

No.	Author(s) & Study	Key Pros (Benefits)	Key Cons (Challenges)
51	**Benek, K. (2025).** *EFL learners' and teachers' perceptions of AI-powered language learning technologies.*	Learners perceived AI as highly personalized and beneficial for proficiency.	Teachers faced significant ethical dilemmas and compatibility issues with current curricula.
52	**Haciyeva, A. (2025).** *Integration of Artificial Intelligence into Language Teaching.*	AI facilitates adaptive, data-informed learning pathways for every student.	Raised critical concerns about data security and the "dependability" of automated feedback.
53	**Hou, Z., & Min, S. (2025).** *AI in informal digital English learning: A meta-analysis.*	Informal AI use (outside school) had a large positive effect on in-class proficiency.	Highlights a widening gap for students who lack access to digital tools at home.
54	**Jeon, E.-Y. (2025).** *Artificial Intelligence in ESL/EFL Education: Evidence from Recent Reviews.*	Confirmed AI's strong potential to enhance productive skills (writing/speaking) via cognitive scaffolding.	Benefits are conditional; risks include overreliance and uneven attention to K-12 contexts.
55	**Kundu, A., & Bej, T. (2025).** *Transforming EFL teaching with AI: A systematic review of empirical studies.*	AI transforms teachers from content deliverers to "learning architects."	Integrating AI requires a massive shift in pedagogical strategy that many schools are not ready for.
56	**Lai, Z. C.-C. (2025).** *The Impact of AI-Assisted Blended Learning on Writing Efficacy and Resilience.*	AI tools in a blended environment significantly improved students' "writing resilience."	Control groups using traditional methods showed lower self-efficacy in tackling difficult tasks.
57	**Liu, M., & Reinders, H. (2025).** *Do AI chatbots impact motivation? Insights from a preliminary longitudinal study.*	Sustained interaction with chatbots helped maintain long-term motivation.	Motivation was highly dependent on the "social presence" of the specific chatbot used.
58	**Lo, A. W. T. (2025).** *The educational affordances and challenges of generative AI in global English's-oriented materials.*	GenAI allows for the creation of diverse, "Global English" reading materials instantly.	The AI often defaulted to "standard" native-speaker norms, erasing cultural linguistic variety.
59	**Mahdi, H. S., & Alkhateeb, A. (2025).** *Revolutionising Essay Evaluation: A Cutting-Edge Rubric for AI-Assisted Writing.*	Developed a robust rubric that standardizes how AI-assisted writing is graded.	traditional rubrics failed to account for the "co-authorship" nature of AI text.
60	**Teng, M. F., & Huang, J. (2025).** *Incorporating ChatGPT for EFL Writing and Its Effects on Writing Engagement.*	ChatGPT feedback significantly boosted behavioral and cognitive engagement in writing.	Students often focused on surface-level corrections rather than deep structural changes.

In Table 6, "Resilience, Co-Authorship, and Cultural Integrity" are represented. These outputs from 2025, written in a mature style of Human-AI Collaboration, reflect an advanced articulation of the subject matter. The results indicate that a discussion has evolved from "cheating" to "co-authorship". In this sense, Mahdi and Alkhateeb note in their work on new rubrics that in the age of AI the partnership is the new unit of analysis as students and AI write together, and assessment has to move their focus from the isolated student to the actual collaboration. The fact that AI-assisted blended learning boosted "writing resilience"-one of the most noteworthy and positive results Lai found-is not surprising considering when faced with a difficult but tantalizing task, we usually abandon it after a while.

Still, the biggest challenge is all about culture. Lo suggests that much of the time Generative AI defaults to "default" or "standard" native-speaker norms, which makes the difference of "Global English" disappear and further marginalize non-native identity. The pedagogical consensus for 2025 is that, because the integration of AI represents a large structural change, teachers have a new role as "learning architect" and schools of education need to face the ethical dilemmas inherent in these inevitable developments, and the curricular incompatibilities and constraints that keep such practises from flourishing.

7. Conclusions

The current study presents a thorough synthesis between AI and EFL education of this study, based on an analysis of 60 research studies (2020-2025). The results uncover an innovative treatment once used for anxiety is now grown to a sophisticated, disruptive phenomenon that fundamentally alters the nature of language learning.

The given literature also suggests a departure from the conventional personalized learning model towards "Human-AI Collaboration" frameworks. While early research reflected the notion that AI was excellent at getting down the 'affective filter' so that students could speak without fear of being judged, AI could be doing most important of all providing 'cognitive scaffolding'. Now, in 2025, AI is more than just a practice tool; it is a tool for building "writing resilience" the capacity to persist on a complex writing task that might otherwise fall apart and be abandoned.

However, this reliance on the technology can be a double edged sword. Now the core problem is less about technical viability and more about eroding critical thought. Due to the increasing prevalence of AI tools, the greatest danger is that instead of processing that information, students format the erroneous output from an AI and accept it, thus evading meaningful cognitive engagement. Additionally, the present study exemplifies a classical ethical dilemma: by default, the Generative AI system is going to remove the cultural diversity (i.e. voices from various other cultures) from the global English.

In addition, the study shows a pedagogical paradigm shift which will ultimately give us the right to employ AI in EFL settings. Instead of replacing teachers, it argues they must reinvent themselves as "learning architects" who can design environments in which AI enhances not replaces human labour. This calls for education strategies which rethink how "AI Agency" is approached preparing students to use these powerful tools as ways to amplify their own voice, rather than ceding it to a machine.

8. Recommendations and Future Research

Schools need to have an ethical AI framework in place, invest in teacher training for effective integration and accessible technology. These findings hold critical implications for the future of education, but future research is needed to examine the long-term effects of AI on developing language skills, cognitive development, and learning through social interaction in a variety of educational settings.

9. References

Akgun, S., & Greenhow, C. (2022). AIin education: Addressing ethical challenges in K-12 settings. *AI and Ethics*, *2*(4), 431–440. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-021-00096-7

Baker, J. (2021). *AI and curriculum development: Adaptive learning in the modern classroom*. Routledge.

Gayed, J. M., Carlon, M. K. J., Oriola, A. M., & Cross, J. S. (2022). Exploring an AI-based writing assistant's impact on English language learners. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *3*, Article 100055. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2022.100055

Hwang, G. J., & Chen, N. S. (2024). GenAI in education: Vision and challenges. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *6*, Article 100198.

Jeon, J. (2020). AI chatbots in EFL: User experience and psychological acceptance. *Interactive Learning Environments*, *32*(1), 1–15.

Kukulska-Hulme, A. (2021). AI and mobile learning for languages: A critical review. *Language Learning & Technology*, *25*(1), 12–29.

Liu, M., & Reinders, H. (2025). Do AI chatbots impact motivation? Insights from a preliminary longitudinal study. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, *62*(4), 1102–1125.

Marrone, R., Taddeo, V., & Hill, G. (2022). AI and the changing role of the teacher: From transmitter to designer. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *118*, Article 103823.

Mohamed, A. (2024). AI implementation in EFL: A qualitative synthesis of teacher perceptions. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, *14*(2), 45–58.

Mujeeb, S. (2024). Critical thinking and AI dependency in the language classroom. *Journal of Critical Pedagogy*, *10*(3), 112–128.

Shin, D. (2021). AI in the elementary classroom: Motivation and feasibility. *Journal of Elementary Education*, *34*(2), 78–95.

Soleimani, E., Gholami, J., & Marzban, A. (2022). AI-based instruction in EFL contexts: Self-regulation and peer interaction. *Education and Information Technologies*, *27*(5), 6543–6562.

Strickland, A. (2024). AI tools in the language classroom: Bridging the digital divide. *TESOL Journal*, *15*(1), Article e789.

Zhai, X., He, P., & Wu, J. (2021). Risks of overreliance on AIin language learning. *Language Education Review*, *12*(2), 210–225.

Zhang, Z. (2020). Learner engagement with Automated Writing Evaluation (AWE): Feedback and revision. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *33*(4), 315–334.