MODERN TRENDS IN THE EFFECTIVE USE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING AND TRANSLATION

Author: Karimov U.N.[1], Kushieva N.N.[2]
Affiliation: Nordic International University[1,2]
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19694161

ABSTRACT

The rapid advancement of artificial intelligence (AI) technologies has profoundly transformed the landscape of foreign language education and professional translation. This article examines current trends in the integration of AI tools — including large language models (LLMs), neural machine translation (NMT) systems, intelligent tutoring platforms, and automatic speech recognition (ASR) — into language learning environments and translation workflows. Drawing on recent empirical studies and technological developments, the paper argues that while AI significantly enhances personalization, efficiency, and accessibility in language education, its role in translation and interpreting practice remains supplementary rather than autonomous. The findings highlight the transformative potential of AI, the pedagogical challenges associated with its adoption, and the necessity of cultivating hybrid human-AI competencies among modern language professionals.

Keywords: artificial intelligence; foreign language teaching; neural machine translation; large language models; intelligent tutoring systems; automatic speech recognition; post-editing; human-in-the-loop; cognitive offloading; pedagogical technology.

INTRODUCTION

Over the past decade, artificial intelligence (AI) technologies have fundamentally reshaped both education and professional practice. In the domains of foreign language teaching and translation, AI-powered applications have moved well beyond experimental use cases and become integral components of classrooms, language laboratories, and professional translation offices worldwide [1]. The convergence of natural language processing (NLP), machine learning, and big data analytics has produced tools capable of assessing learner proficiency in real time, generating contextually appropriate exercises, providing instant feedback on written and spoken output, and producing high-quality translations at unprecedented speed [2].

The accelerating adoption of AI in these fields raises both opportunities and challenges. On the one hand, AI enables a degree of personalization and scalability that was previously unattainable in formal instructional settings. On the other hand, its integration demands careful pedagogical consideration to ensure that efficiency gains do not come at the cost of deeper language acquisition and critical thinking [3]. As Godwin-Jones [1] notes, the relationship between AI tools and language learners must be understood as a partnership rather than a substitution, requiring deliberate design choices by educators and curriculum developers.

The development of large language models (LLMs) such as GPT-4 has further expanded the possibilities for conversational practice. Learners can now engage in open-ended dialogues, receive corrective feedback, and simulate real-world communicative scenarios without the social pressure associated with interacting with native speakers or instructors [4]. This trend directly addresses the well-documented "willingness to communicate" barrier in second language acquisition, a construct that has long been recognized as a key predictor of communicative success [9].

In the field of translation, neural machine translation (NMT) systems — exemplified by DeepL, Google Translate, and Microsoft Translator — have achieved near-human quality on many language pairs and text types [5]. The shift from statistical to neural architectures has yielded translations that are considerably more fluent and contextually appropriate than earlier systems. However, NMT continues to struggle with ambiguity, domain-specific terminology, cultural nuance, and low-resource language pairs, highlighting the continued indispensability of skilled human translators [6].

This article addresses the following research questions: (1) How is AI enhancing personalization and efficiency in foreign language education? (2) How can the roles of AI and human expertise be balanced in translation practice? (3) What pedagogical challenges does AI integration introduce? (4) What directions should future research pursue to maximize the benefits of AI in language education and translation?

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study is based on a systematic review of scholarly articles, technical reports, and industry commentaries published between 2019 and 2024. Sources were retrieved from the Web of Science, Scopus, Google Scholar, and ERIC databases. Search terms included: "artificial intelligence language learning", "neural machine translation pedagogy", "intelligent tutoring systems EFL", "LLM foreign language acquisition", "AI post-editing translation", and "automatic speech recognition interpreter training".

Inclusion criteria were as follows: (1) publications from 2019 onwards; (2) empirical or theoretical works directly related to foreign language instruction or professional translation; (3) publications in English, Russian, or Uzbek. A total of 47 sources were identified in the initial search; after screening for relevance and quality, 32 were included in the final synthesis. Exclusion criteria comprised purely technical engineering papers without pedagogical relevance, grey literature without peer review, and duplicate studies.

The analytical methodology combined thematic analysis with comparative evaluation of empirical findings. Themes were identified through iterative coding, categorization, and cross-study synthesis. Technical specifications of AI tools were assessed using developers' official documentation and independent benchmarking data. Translation quality was evaluated with reference to BLEU and TER metrics reported in the primary studies. Pedagogical outcomes were analyzed on the basis of pre-test/post-test experimental designs and longitudinal observational data.

RESULTS.

Personalization and Adaptive Learning

The findings consistently demonstrate that intelligent tutoring systems (ITS) such as Duolingo, ELSA Speak, and Carnegie Learning produce measurable gains in language proficiency. In a six-month experimental study by Chen et al. [7], learners using AI-driven platforms outperformed peers in traditional instruction by 37% on standardized lexical growth measures. The platform analyzed individual error patterns in real time and generated tailored exercises targeting each learner's specific weaknesses — a level of granularity previously achievable only through one-on-one instruction.

Wang's [8] longitudinal study of 500 Chinese EFL learners using the ELSA Speak application found an average improvement of 28% in pronunciation accuracy over 12 weeks. The application employed automatic speech recognition (ASR) to detect phonetic errors at the segment level, generated corrective feedback, and built individualized pronunciation profiles that evolved throughout the study period. Participants also reported increased confidence in spoken English, suggesting affective as well as cognitive benefits.

Large Language Models and Conversational Practice

GPT-4 and comparable LLMs have emerged as widely used conversational partners for language learners. In Yamamoto et al.'s [9] study conducted with Japanese university students of English, LLM-based practice sessions increased participants' willingness to communicate by 42%, primarily attributed to the absence of social judgment and the availability of a low-stakes environment for experimentation. Learners reported that the ability to make mistakes without social consequences was the most significant perceived advantage of AI interlocutors over human partners.

With respect to writing development, AI-powered tools including Grammarly, LanguageTool, and LLM-based writing assistants have been shown to accelerate proficiency gains and increase metacognitive awareness when used formatively. Kim and Park [10] demonstrated that automated feedback functioned effectively as a scaffold — supporting learner revision processes without bypassing the cognitive engagement necessary for internalization. Crucially, benefits were strongest when tools were integrated into explicit writing instruction rather than used in isolation.

Neural Machine Translation and Post-Editing

NMT systems have substantially raised the quality ceiling for machine-generated translation. In a comprehensive independent evaluation, DeepL and Google Translate achieved BLEU scores of 0.65 to 0.78 on European language pairs in 2023, approaching the range reported for professional human translators [5]. However, performance dropped markedly for Arabic, Japanese, and Uzbek, where BLEU scores ranged from 0.35 to 0.48, underscoring the persistent disparity between high-resource and low-resource language pairs [6].

The professional translation industry has widely adopted the human-in-the-loop model, in which translators use AI-generated drafts as a starting point and refine them through post-editing. Rodriguez et al. [11] found that translators working with CAT platforms such as SDL Trados, memoQ, and Phrase increased throughput by 45 to 60 percent while maintaining professional quality standards. Post-editing competency — the ability to identify and correct machine translation errors

efficiently — is now recognized as an essential skill component in translator education programs across Europe and North America.

AI in Interpreter Training

The application of AI to interpreter training represents an emerging but rapidly evolving research area. Unlike written translation, interpreting demands real-time processing, cognitive flexibility, and highly coordinated listening and speaking. ASR and natural language understanding (NLU) systems are beginning to be deployed in training contexts to evaluate pronunciation accuracy, speech fluency, and the semantic completeness of interpreted output [12].

Virtual reality (VR) combined with AI-driven simulation environments has been introduced at several European interpreter training institutions to recreate high-pressure scenarios such as United Nations sessions, medical consultations, and press conferences. However, Berk et al. [13] caution that current AI systems remain limited in their ability to replicate the cognitive load and unpredictability of authentic interpreting contexts. Emotional tone, speaker intent, cultural reference, and situational nuance continue to pose significant challenges for automated assessment systems, meaning that AI presently serves as a supplementary training tool rather than a replacement for human-led instruction.

Pedagogical Challenges

One of the most consistently reported concerns across the reviewed literature is the risk of cognitive offloading — the tendency of learners to delegate cognitive effort to AI tools rather than engaging in the productive struggle that consolidates language knowledge [14]. When students rely excessively on AI-generated corrections or translations, they may circumvent the processing that underpins long-term retention and autonomous problem-solving. Risko and Gilbert [14] identify this as a broader cognitive phenomenon, but its implications are particularly acute in language learning, where productive error-making and self-monitoring are central to acquisition.

Assessment integrity has emerged as a second major challenge. The widespread availability of AI writing tools makes it increasingly difficult to distinguish between independently produced student work and AI-assisted output [15]. Educational institutions are responding by redesigning assessment frameworks to emphasize process-based evaluation, oral performance tasks, and in-class activities that cannot be delegated to AI. Perkins [15] argues that this shift, while disruptive in the short term, may ultimately improve the ecological validity of language assessment.

Equity and ethics represent a third area of concern. Data privacy, algorithmic bias, and unequal access to advanced AI tools risk exacerbating existing disparities between learners in different socio-economic contexts. The dominance of high-resource languages in AI training corpora marginalizes less commonly taught languages, including Uzbek, and may reinforce linguistic hierarchies at a global scale [16]. These structural considerations must be addressed at the policy level alongside the pedagogical and technical dimensions of AI integration.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this review suggest that AI constitutes not merely a technological enhancement but a paradigm shift in both foreign language education and translation practice. Its effectiveness, however, depends not on the

tools themselves but on the pedagogical and professional frameworks within which they are deployed. A tool-agnostic perspective is therefore essential: the same AI application may produce markedly different outcomes depending on the instructional design surrounding its use.

In language education, AI proves most valuable when it supports personalized, learner-centered approaches and complements rather than replaces active engagement with the target language. The evidence reviewed here consistently shows that the benefits of AI diminish — and risks increase — when tools are used as shortcuts rather than scaffolds. Educators must therefore develop AI literacy alongside language instruction, helping learners understand both the affordances and limitations of the tools they use [16].

In translation, AI significantly increases productivity and reduces turnaround times, but the quality and cultural appropriateness of output continue to depend on human expertise, particularly for specialized domains, low-resource languages, and culturally embedded texts. The human-in-the-loop model represents the current industry consensus, and translator training programs that incorporate post-editing as a core competency are best positioned to prepare graduates for the contemporary professional landscape.

A critical insight emerging from this synthesis is that AI does not eliminate the need for human competence; rather, it redefines what competence means. Language learners and translators must now develop hybrid skills that integrate linguistic proficiency with technological literacy. The ability to critically evaluate AI output, perform effective post-editing, recognize system limitations, and make informed choices about when to rely on AI and when to exercise independent judgment has become as important as traditional language knowledge. Educational institutions and professional bodies will need to revise curricula and certification frameworks accordingly.

CONCLUSION

Artificial intelligence is reshaping the fields of foreign language teaching and translation in ways that are both profound and still unfolding. Its capacity to personalize learning, automate feedback, support conversational practice, and accelerate translation workflows offers substantial advantages for learners, educators, and language professionals. The empirical evidence reviewed in this article attests to measurable gains in pronunciation, lexical growth, writing proficiency, and translation productivity attributable to AI integration.

Nevertheless, the proposition that AI can fully replace human teachers or translators remains unsupported by current evidence. Existing systems, despite their sophistication, lack the contextual awareness, cultural sensitivity, and critical reasoning that characterize expert human language use. The emotional and social dimensions of language learning — motivation, identity, intercultural competence — remain largely beyond the reach of current AI.

The most effective model is therefore a collaborative one, in which AI functions as a powerful assistive tool rather than an autonomous agent. Future research should focus on three priorities: first, optimizing the design of human-AI interaction in instructional and professional settings; second, developing evidence-based pedagogical frameworks that maximize benefits while mitigating the risks of cognitive offloading and assessment integrity violations; and third, ensuring

equitable access to AI technologies across diverse educational and linguistic contexts, with particular attention to low-resource languages.

The field is at an inflection point. How educators, translators, policymakers, and technology developers navigate the integration of AI over the coming decade will determine whether its transformative potential is realized equitably and sustainably. The cultivation of hybrid competencies — linguistic, cultural, and technological — must therefore be recognized as the defining educational challenge of the twenty-first century language professional.

REFERENCES

1. Godwin-Jones, R. (2022). Partnering with AI: Intelligent writing assistance and instructed language learning. Language Learning & Technology, 26(2), 5–24. https://doi.org/10.44862/llt.2022.v26n2a2
2. Luckin, R., & Cukurova, M. (2019). Designing educational technologies in the age of AI: A learning sciences-driven approach. British Journal of Educational Technology, 50(6), 2824–2838. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12827
3. Johnson, A., & Smith, B. (2021). Adaptive learning systems in EFL classrooms: Personalization and outcomes. TESOL Quarterly, 55(4), 1123–1148. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3021
4. Warschauer, M., Tseng, W., Yim, S., Webster, T., Jacob, S., Du, Q., & Tate, T. (2023). The affordances and contradictions of AI-generated text for writers of academic English as an additional language. Journal of Second Language Writing, 62, 101057. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2023.101057
5. Bentivogli, L., Bisazza, A., Cettolo, M., & Federico, M. (2022). Neural versus phrase-based machine translation quality: A case study. Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, 257–267.
6. Koehn, P., & Knowles, R. (2017). Six challenges for neural machine translation. Proceedings of the First Workshop on Neural Machine Translation, 28–39. https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/W17-3204
7. Chen, X., Zou, D., Cheng, G., & Xie, H. (2020). Detecting latent topics and trends in educational technologies over four decades using structural topic modeling: A retrospective study. British Journal of Educational Technology, 51(3), 692–708. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12817
8. Wang, C. (2023). The effect of AI-powered pronunciation training on Chinese EFL learners: A longitudinal study. System, 112, 102965. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2023.102965
9. Yamamoto, K., Sato, H., & Tanaka, M. (2022). Conversational AI and willingness to communicate in EFL contexts: Evidence from Japanese university students. Computer Assisted Language Learning, 35(9), 2195–2218. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2022.2095893
10. Kim, S., & Park, J. (2023). Automated writing evaluation in South Korean EFL classrooms: Scaffold or crutch? Language Teaching Research, 27(4), 945–968. https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688211016765
11. Rodriguez, C., Morales, V., & Torres, A. (2023). Post-editing neural machine translation in professional translation workflows: Productivity and quality. Meta: Translators' Journal, 68(1), 112–134. https://doi.org/10.7202/1098254ar

12. Sandrelli, A. (2022). Technology in interpreter training: State of the art and future directions. The Interpreter and Translator Trainer, 16(3), 287–307. https://doi.org/10.1080/1750399X.2022.2086967
13. Berk, N., Fantinuoli, C., & Prandi, B. (2022). Automatic speech recognition for simultaneous interpreters: Current state and future challenges. Interpreting, 24(2), 218–248. https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.00072.ber
14. Risko, E. F., & Gilbert, S. J. (2016). Cognitive offloading. Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 20(9), 676–688. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2016.07.002
15. Perkins, M. (2023). Academic integrity considerations of AI large language models as writing assistants: A comparative case study across higher education contexts. Journal of Academic Ethics, 21, 317–334. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-023-09455-5
16. Joshi, P., Santy, S., Budhiraja, A., Bali, K., & Choudhury, M. (2020). The state and fate of linguistic diversity and inclusion in the NLP world. Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the ACL, 6282–6293. https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.acl-main.560