

Review

Enhancing Communicative Language Learning through Digital Tools and Generative AI

Lavdosh Malaj¹, Thomas Christiansen²

¹ University "Ismaïl Qemali", Vlorë, Albania

² University of Salento, Lecce, Italy

Corresponding author: lavdosh.malaj@univlora.edu.al

Article Type: Review Article

Received: March 2026 | Accepted: May 2026 | Published: June 2026

Abstract

This article explores the transformative impact of generative AI and digital tools on communicative language learning, with a focus on encouraging learner autonomy, critical engagement, and developing higher-order thinking skills. Drawing on classroom experience and interdisciplinary research, it examines both the promise and the pitfalls of integrating AI into educational practice, especially among Gen Z learners. The discussion highlights risks, such as the ELIZA effect and AI-driven misinformation, while also emphasizing AI's potential as an adaptive digital language assistant capable of offering personalized feedback and interactive dialogue. Through practical examples and linguistic activities, this article illustrates how tasks like image generation, role-play, and prompt engineering can enhance linguistic competence and intellectual agility. Ultimately, it advocates for responsible integration, encouraging educators to harness AI tools to complement human instruction, uphold

academic integrity, and promote reflective, learner-centred methodologies.

Keywords: *Generative AI, Communicative Language Learning, Learner Autonomy, Prompt Engineering*

Introduction

In recent times, the emergence and widespread adoption of Artificial Intelligence (AI) – particularly generative AI – across – nearly every facet of human activity, including education, has sparked a familiar blend of wonder, enthusiasm, and apprehension. Within the realm of language instruction, AI holds enormous promise to reshape learning through tailored, dynamic, and immersive experiences.

Generative AI encompasses a range of techniques that enable machines to create new content – such

Review

as text, images, audio, or video – by recognizing and replicating patterns from the data they have been trained on. However, this powerful capability also fuels concerns around authenticity and accuracy. Without careful oversight, generative AI could produce misleading or even harmful outputs that are difficult to distinguish from human-generated content.

AI chatbots are not designed to retrieve and report facts, as are the search engines that preceded them; their aim is “merely” to replicate natural language. They have a tendency to try to please the human interlocutor and to give him or her authoritative answers even if they, the chatbot, does not have the correct information to hand. Incorrect chatbot responses therefore frequently occur even in everyday situations. As Kasner and Dusek (2024) note, “80% of the outputs of Open LLM contain a semantic error” – that is to say, the content of their responses may be inaccurate, unverifiable, misleading, or problematic in some way. Cases, where an AI system generates information that is factually incorrect, invented, or inexistent are known technically as “hallucination”.¹ Studies like that of Xu et al. (2024) suggest these so-called hallucinations are a built-in limitation of large language models (LLMs) and cannot be fully eliminated. Chatbot reliability tends to improve when responding to routine or widely understood queries but decreases significantly with less typical or nuanced tasks (McCoy et al. 2023): the kinds of activities that constitute language learning especially at higher levels. The main problem with the phenomenon of hallucination is that chatbots are not trained to express uncertainty in any of their replies – users are typically displeased when they do – and instead articulate all their replies to enquiries in the same authoritative and self-assured manner that often is unquestioned by overly deferential or uncritical human interlocutors.

As AI gets more complex and sophisticated human supervision may become impossible, and AI tools may have to be developed specifically to monitor other AI tools leading ultimately to the age-old dilemma of “*QUIS CUSTODIET IPSOS CUSTODES*”.²

Such concerns leave students and educators alike navigating uncharted territory – questioning not only AI’s effectiveness and ethical implications but also its short- and long-term impact on language learning environments. Doubts persist around whether these tools genuinely improve educational outcomes or risk eroding the human-centred foundation of learning. Many educators stress the importance of ensuring AI functions as a supportive resource, rather than as a substitute for human expertise and interpersonal exchange, especially with children and young adults who are being increasingly isolated in bubbles created by digital technology and social media.

Still, despite these dilemmas, it is clear that generative AI offers remarkable opportunities for language teaching. Used carefully and with consideration, AI-enabled tools empower educators to design engaging and personalized learning experiences that meet the diverse needs of individual learners. Whether through adaptive tutoring systems, language learning apps, virtual assistants, or innovations yet to come, AI opens new doors to real-time feedback and sophisticated scaffolding designed for every single learner that were once unimaginable.

This article highlights a selection of language learning scenarios that incorporate digital tools and AI to promote communicative competence. Drawing from years of classroom experience and practical insights, we examine how educators can leverage AI to cultivate meaningful dialogue and enhance linguistic skills. Our exploration includes a range of pedagogical strategies, technological advances, and examples of best practices that reflect

¹ See, for example, <https://www.datacamp.com/blog/ai-hallucination>

² For example, the AI developer Anthropic has introduced Constitutional AI, a framework that aligns the system’s behaviour with a set of human-centric principles, such as minimizing harm, respecting individual preferences, and promoting truthfulness. Rather than relying solely on human feedback, it leverages self-supervision and adversarial training to internalize its “constitution” autonomously. Through

constrained optimization, the model is guided to remain helpful while operating strictly within its constitutional boundaries, steering clear of ambiguous or open-ended objectives. Additionally, its training data and architecture are carefully curated to embed pro-social behaviours and guard against unsafe or deceptive outputs. See: constitutional.ai

Review

both the potential and the challenges of AI-enabled language education.

As one traverses this evolving educational landscape, it is vital to approach AI integration with thoughtful reflection, ethical awareness, and a strong commitment to student agency and a learner-centred approach. By acknowledging both the transformative power and the limitations of AI, educators can unlock new ways to empower learners and equip them with future-ready skills.

Ultimately, our goal is to present inspiring and innovative approaches to engaging students through digital tools and AI – both inside and beyond the classroom – while reinforcing autonomy and motivation. We aim to demonstrate how AI-powered platforms and chatbots can become useful digital assistants to teachers and learners, helping to craft accessible, adaptive, and personalized learning environments tailor-made for today's learners.

Gen Z and AI

The majority of those currently engaged in education and formal language learning come from Gen Z (Generation Z). Like their immediate predecessors in Gen Y, they have often been referred to as “digital natives” (Prensky, 2001). Technology has permeated their lives from the beginning, and for many, imagining a world without it is simply inconceivable. Yet, this deep-rooted familiarity does not preclude a sense of unease. Increasing media coverage surrounding advanced AI – particularly generative models – has sparked anxiety among students about the future relevance of the professions they are training for. Language-related careers such as translation and interpreting, traditionally popular among language graduates, are already feeling the impact of AI disruption, fuelling demotivation and uncertainty.

Such fears can be misplaced because AI should not be seen as a substitute for human intelligence. De Cremer and Kasparov (2021) caution against equating the capacities of human and artificial intelligence. While AI systems are fast, precise, and consistently logical, they lack traits such as emotional intelligence, cultural sensitivity, and intuition – all of which are distinctly human, and priceless.

Recognizing the evolving nature of the workplace and the complementary strengths of humans and AI is essential for equipping young people with the tools to thrive professionally once they leave formal education. Educators now face the responsibility of preparing students not only to navigate AI-enhanced environments, but also to engage with its complexities – ethically and critically. This entails not only exploring AI's potential, but rigorously examining its limitations and risks.

Unsurprisingly, the younger generations have embraced AI tools enthusiastically. Their early adoption has been so pronounced that many educators are concerned about the possible misuse of these technologies to gain unfair academic advantages – often through methods that more technologically challenged teachers struggle to detect. Widespread use of generative AI for assessments has raised profound questions around academic integrity. If such tools are used to produce work that is passed off as original, the principle of merit-based advancement itself may be compromised.

In response to these challenges, many education institutions are seeking ways to balance AI's educational potential with the requirement to safeguard academic standards. Rather than prohibiting tools like ChatGPT or DeepSeek, conventional wisdom recommends educating students on responsible use. It emphasizes the importance of understanding risks related to plagiarism, bias, and misinformation, and anticipates a transformation in assessment methods to mitigate the risk of AI-enabled cheating.

The risks of having young people interacting with generative AI and chatbots

Before exploring practical strategies to empower learners to engage productively with AI, it is necessary to first address some of the real risks involved. While the advantages are many, the potential for harm is significant when AI is misused, particularly by students hoping to avoid effort. Without thoughtful oversight and expert moderation by educators, AI's presence in the classroom could be counterproductive, and this offers reassurance to those educators concerned about being replaced by technology.

Review

One especially troubling phenomenon outlined is the “ELIZA Effect.” Named after a pioneering 1966 chatbot developed by MIT computer scientist Joseph Weizenbaum, ELIZA gained notoriety for its DOCTOR script, which mimicked a Rogerian therapist by turning users’ inputs into probing questions. Despite its limited capabilities, many users attributed human-like understanding to ELIZA and even shared deeply personal thoughts with it. The ELIZA Effect refers to our tendency to anthropomorphize non-human entities – whether pets, toys, or even vehicles such as ships or cars. When it comes to chatbots, the risk increases exponentially: unlike passive objects, they respond, and this interactivity can intensify users’ projections, blurring the line between reality and illusion, especially in the case of children, who are particularly susceptible to this effect, used as they are to make-believe and interacting with dolls or cuddly toys as if they were alive. A deeply troubling recent example of the ELIZA effect occurred in February 2024, involving a 14-year-old boy named Sewell Setzer III from Orlando, Florida. According to lawsuit filed by his mother, he tragically died by suicide after forming a profound emotional attachment to a chatbot developed by Character.AI, despite knowing it was not a real person.¹

Children and young adults like Sewell, are clearly vulnerable. Raised in a digital age where social media often replaces traditional relationships, they may be especially prone to treating chatbots as real companions. As influencer culture expands, this phenomenon will likely intensify. Some online personalities are already launching personalized chatbots that mimic interactions with their followers – an innovation driven, one may fear, not by educational or philanthropic goals but by commercial gain.

Reputable AI developers and providers are aware of this danger. Most chatbots have procedures in place to stop them from doing harm to or encouraging humans to harm themselves or others. There is however a clear and present risk that less reputable actors, unscrupulous and greedy influencers, rogue states, or nefarious forces on the dark web,

may develop AI systems that do not espouse such a philosophy and purposely do not incorporate such safeguards. This is a risk that cannot be mitigated in the classroom, but it makes it even more important that students, as responsible citizens, are familiar with AI and the dangers that it can pose.

Learning to harness AI

AI is not infallible nor all-powerful, which should come as reassurance to those worried about it taking their jobs. The limitations of AI not only underscore the genuine concerns students may have about being side-lined in the job market by faster, cheaper, and seemingly more reliable alternatives, but also illuminate a clear path forward. Preparing for any 21st-century career will likely involve mastering the art of communicating and collaborating with AI tools and chatbots – skills that may become as critical as engaging with human colleagues.

Historically, every major technological breakthrough has disrupted existing job roles but also sparked the rise of entirely new profession. Today, one such role rapidly emerging is the “prompt engineer” – a specialist who crafts precise input to guide AI systems in performing specific tasks.

Language students, equipped with advanced communication abilities and a strong grasp of context, inference, and pragmatics, are uniquely suited for this evolving field. Chatbots are built to simulate human interaction, yet they are merely participants in Turing’s famed “Imitation Game” (1954). These systems lack true cultural understanding or lived human experience. Interacting with a chatbot can feel like conversing with someone fluent in your language but unfamiliar with its societal norms, unspoken cues, and conversational subtleties (see Grice, 1974).

Just as one would adapt communication when speaking with someone from a different cultural background, engaging effectively with AI requires accommodation strategies and an awareness of where misunderstandings can arise. Students

¹ See <https://www.nytimes.com/2024/10/23/technology/characterai-lawsuit-teen-suicide.html>

Review

trained in mediation and intercultural communication already possess the sensitivity and foundational knowledge needed to navigate these challenges. Their ability to bridge gaps between human nuance and machine logic positions them well for this emerging human-digital dialogue.

Practical ways for empowering learners with AI tools

Despite the serious challenges AI presents, it is not something we can simply ignore. Alongside its limitations, it offers numerous benefits. There is a growing imperative to encourage students to engage with AI in positive and constructive ways. Language students, in particular, are well positioned to serve as intermediaries between humans and machines – making them ideal candidates to become prompt engineers. With this in mind, the following section proposes a set of practical activities designed to give learners hands-on experience with AI tools, enhancing both their confidence and motivation.

As previously noted, effective use of chatbots depends on learning how to compose prompts that guide AI toward increasingly complex and satisfactory outcomes. This is more nuanced than it may initially seem. While chatbots often communicate in a naturalistic manner, they are still prone to misinterpretation, especially when it comes to pragmatic understanding. For example, when one person asks another, “Can you tell me the way to the station?” the expected response is directions to the station in question – not confirmation of whether one is aware of the relevant station’s location without actually giving directions. Although advancements in Natural Language Processing (NLP) and its branch, Natural Language Inference (NLI), have significantly mitigated these alignment issues (see Khurana et al., 2023), limitations persist. Although advances are being made all the time, chatbots can still struggle to reliably interpret every indirect speech act (Searle, 1975), and lack a consistent grasp of conversational implicature (Grice, 1974) or relevance (Sperber & Wilson, 1986).

Prompt writing is a skill best acquired through iterative practice – trial and error being intrinsic to the learning process. To practice, learners can be

given specific tasks to complete using chatbots. Picture generation is one of the many concrete tasks where chatbots can provide valuable practice for learners, written or spoken (usually by means of a microphone and speech-to-text software). The utility of such activities stems from the fact that they constitute specific tasks which have a product or output that the learner themselves can use as a gauge for how successful their own input has been: if the picture or graphic generated matches more or less what they are describing then they can see for themselves that they have completed the task successfully. Asking learners to describe specific pictures or images is a good first stage (and a simple picture description is part of the Cambridge B1 Preliminary speaking test), later on, as a more creative activity, learners could generate original images out of their imagination.

Below in Figure 1, we give an example of a description of a picture with an AI-generated picture (using Microsoft Co-pilot) as output for the prompt describing the original picture:

As can be seen, in this example, the output is largely, but not completely satisfactory: the old lady is pictured with two walking sticks, for example, although the prompt specifies “*a walking stick*”. The AI has also put the two people in the middle of the road. This not specified in the prompt, because it is something that a human, with real word knowledge and experience, would neglect to specify assuming that it was implied or self-evident. Such a breakdown in communication between human and AI is useful because it shows the learner that AI does not always process input in the same way as a human would, necessitating that the human prompter is prepared to render some details specific that, with a human interlocutor, they would assume were given. The real value of this exercise comes in trying to mediate further with the AI and making any necessary moderations by editing the prompt slightly and regenerating the picture (Figure 9):

Although this picture is not quite perfect – the old lady is perilously close to the kerb, for instance – there is a tangible improvement and shows the basic principles behind prompting (in essence interacting with the chatbot to perform a specific task).

Review

Such an activity can also be modified to allow learners to describe graphs (an important academic skill, especially in scientific or technical subjects, and part of such tests as IELTS Academic) – as illustrated in Figure 3 using an example from a practice test:

Again, the output is good but not perfect, and the point of the exercise is to encourage learners to learn how to give the AI further prompts in order to fine-tune the output.

Using AI to increase learner autonomy

The principle of learner autonomy is a cornerstone of the communicative approach to language acquisition.¹ It emphasizes the importance of learners taking charge of their own educational journey – developing independence, self-management, and sustained motivation. When learners take responsibility for their progress, they become more involved in setting personal goals, choosing relevant materials, and monitoring their own development. This active participation contributes significantly to their linguistic competence.

However, there is one glaring concern, namely that the rise of AI may encourage passivity among students, potentially diminishing their drive to engage with learning tasks. Some argue that generative AI could even render language learning obsolete – an idea touched on by Ostler (2010: 261), well before today's more advanced and widespread AI technologies emerged.

In brief, if electronics can remove the requirement for a human intermediary to interpret or translate, the frustrations of the language barrier may be overcome without any universal shared medium beyond compatible software. Recorded speeches and printed texts will become virtual media, accessible through whatever language the listener or speaker prefers.

Contrary to the perspective implied by Ostler here, we contend that AI is unlikely to eliminate the need for language learning. On the contrary, it has the potential to significantly empower learners – perhaps even contributing to a wider enthusiasm

for learning languages. Perhaps the three most obvious are the following.

Firstly, as illustrated by our examples with picture/graph prompts in §7, while AI often produces a larger share of the linguistic output during interactions, this does not relegate the learner to a passive role. AI systems are designed to respond to user input and direction. When learners recognize this dynamic, they can fully harness AI's capabilities as an adaptive and responsive learning partner.

Secondly, unlike traditional digital media such as search engines, AI-powered chatbots allow users to interact via natural language. Learners can go beyond simple queries and engage in meaningful dialogue – requesting clarification, elaboration, and context, in ways previously unavailable.

Last but not least, although AI may generate extensive reading and listening material, this content is tailored to the learner's own requests. This personal relevance can enhance engagement, driving learners to process the material and respond in an authentically communicative manner.

Using AI for correction and immediate feedback

The ability of AI and chatbots to correct input is a valuable tool for learners, and their teachers who might otherwise be forced to spend hours and hours correcting student work and assignments, often outside normal working hours. This does not mean that teachers may now delegate all their marking to AI. Rather, they may now assign more written work to their learners because AI may take up the extra load. Indeed, such is the nature of marking that teachers, especially those in the state sector, cannot typically assign as quite as much written work as their students may need, simply because they do have the time to correct and give feedback on it all. A devious teacher might use AI in any case, and pretend to their students that they were still marking by hand, but this would be unethical. Instead, if AI is to be used for at least some marking, with the justification that it provides the

¹ See, for example, Holec (1981), Benson (2011)

Review

learner with more practice and immediate feedback (as opposed to waiting a few days before the teacher can hand it back, at which point the learner may have lost all interest in the task), then it makes perfect sense to empower students by letting them learn to work autonomously with the AI and to treat it as a digital language assistant.

Clearly, when it comes to testing or to work that will be assessed by the teacher then it is important that this be done without the assistance of AI, or if it is, that the degree of assistance is clearly apparent to the teacher or assessor. In order to do this, some code of practice has to be negotiated and drawn up and communicated clearly to students. Identifying student malpractice by means of AI is becoming a pressing issue and, although tools have been developed to identify or to block AI (in both written and spoken tests), the technology is moving so fast that a kind of arms race is well underway. Consequently, at least as such time that attitudes to and means of testing and assessment undergo radical change, the problem seems to be here to stay.

This worrying trend should not blind educators to the fact that chatbots do prove effective at identifying and listing linguistic inaccuracies in the input of users, if prompted to do so, and can thus play a valuable role in learners' language acquisition as shown in Figure 4:

As can be seen, the chatbot will provide a lot of feedback almost instantaneously with only a simple, non-technical prompt: "Correct my English. List any corrections and provide feedback on how I may improve the text". It does not even need to know what the question the student is attempting is.¹ A more sophisticated prompt, one provided by a teacher for example, might include more detailed instructions and consist of something like:

"Correct the English in this text. List the errors and give me some advice on how to improve my answer. The question I was asked to answer was "[Insert question / task here]". Here is

the answer that I want you to correct: "[insert your answer]".

The drawback with such a system lies in the quality of the feedback. General chatbots², at least, are not very consistent in terms of format and will not always produce feedback in the way illustrated above, which may confuse learners. As can also be seen in Figure 4 (last section "How You Can Improve") the chatbot can give feedback which is very general and prone to bland platitudes (e.g. "make sure verb forms match the tense.").

Chatbots can be useful to learners is in responding to queries about language, where otherwise they might ask the teacher or assistant (in most cases, only possible during lessons) or try to find the answer to their question (often easier said than done) in a reference book or via a web search:

As can be seen, the chatbot gives a comprehensive and clear answer, with illustrative examples of use. Even though, as with all information given by chatbots, the learner should be aware of the fact that chatbots can "hallucinate" (see §1). Setting aside the frustrating issue of output reliability, one clear advantage chatbots hold over traditional reference materials is their interactivity. Learners can engage with them directly – requesting clarification or additional details whenever something is unclear, confusing, or even seems implausible. They can thus ask follow up questions, much like they might do with a teacher or language assistant, if they find the information incomplete or unsatisfactory, or something has sparked their curiosity.

Initially in Figure 6, the chatbot gives the standard reply that almost any pedagogical grammar would provide. Interestingly, in the final section, it goes beyond this and touches briefly upon some matters related to non-standard usage and language change. Notwithstanding this, it avoids discussing any wider theoretical issues, seeking refuge instead in the platitude "language loves exceptions". The advantage of the chatbot over a conventional reference work, apart from obvious concerns of

¹ In this case: "An English-speaking friend of yours who is still at school does not know whether to study at a university near their hometown or in another city far way. Write an email in reply. Briefly describe how and why you chose the university where you are studying. Discuss the advantages and disadvantages of studying where you do and whether you wish

that you had gone somewhere else. Write 150-200 words. (30 MARKS). Maximum time = 30 mins.

² Special AI tools, which come at a financial cost, provide more sophisticated feedback, which teachers can modify and adapt to their learners' needs.

Review

cost, time and availability, is precisely that it can be questioned if anything is unclear or seems wrong (i.e. “hallucinations”). If in the exchange reported as Figure 6, the learner is unhappy with the recourse to the concept of exception, then they are free to press the chatbot further, and get an immediate reply as shown in Figure 7:

The chatbot, tireless and as ready to help as ever, starts out by praising the student for their curiosity (“Brilliant observation”), thus reinforcing such behaviour. It then goes on to give another well-reasoned and well-organised reply that this time discusses the issues of non-standardness and ever shifting linguistic norms in a way that a non-expert can follow. The information that it gives is largely accurate, but regarding concerns of hallucination (see §1), learners would be advised to check anything that they learn in this way either with their teacher or a reference book, or if time does not allow, even another chatbot.

Using AI as to stimulate learner curiosity and to develop Higher Order Thinking Skills.

Developing higher-order thinking skills (HOTS) – such as analysis, evaluation, and synthesis – is vital to enriching language learning beyond lower order thinking skills (LOTSs), such as memorization.¹ HOTSs nurture deeper engagement with texts, help learners form nuanced arguments, and empower them to interpret meaning across diverse contexts. When students use target language to evaluate ideas, draw comparisons, or reflect critically, they activate metacognitive strategies that enhance retention and communicative confidence (Anderson / Krathwohl, 2001). Moreover, tasks like summarizing complex information, and responding to open-ended prompts have been shown to boost linguistic and cognitive flexibility (Cummins, 2000). By integrating Bloom’s taxonomy into curriculum design, educators can scaffold language tasks that not only build proficiency but also stimulate intellectual growth. AI systems can be useful tools in this process.

The activities outlined in Table 1 offer a structured and varied foundation for further development and variation. For instance, a role-play interview could be transformed into an integrated skills task, where learners use the dialogue they generate as the source material for writing a newspaper or magazine article. Learners might also conduct parallel interviews using different chatbots – such as Chat GPT and Deep Seek – prompted to impersonate the same celebrity. By comparing the responses, they can identify inconsistencies and be reminded that chatbots are not infallible nor objective, underscoring the importance of fact-checking and not treating them as authorities on any particular matter.

Another approach could involve using chatbot roleplay to explore the biography of a historical figure. For example, a learner studying science might ask a chatbot roleplaying as Maria (Marie) Salomea Skłodowska-Curie something like: “Given your love of your homeland Poland, how did you feel when you left Warsaw to study in Paris?”

Such imaginative lines of enquiry naturally spark curiosity and can be followed up with independent research to assess the plausibility of the chatbot’s responses. This again plays the vital role of instilling the awareness that, while engaging, chatbot outputs may not always be factually accurate and are prone to hallucination.

For more advanced students, this activity can be adapted to cover “What if?” scenarios, encouraging them to explore issues for themselves and indulge in informed speculation, which may then be discussed with educators or peers. For example, a chatbot pretending to be Marie Curie, could be asked how she thinks her life would have turned out if had stayed in Warsaw instead of going to France. Alternatively, students of science, in particular physics, especially those on CLIL courses², might like to ask more technical questions such as “Madame Curie, how did you isolate pure radium chloride from pitchblende, and what challenges did you face during the fractional crystallization process?”

¹ See Blooms Taxonomy (1956), revised by Anderson and Krathwohl (2001).

² Content Language and Integrated Learning – see, for example, Coyle et al. (2010).

Review

The kinds of activities listed in Table 1, promote active investigation rather than passive information consumption. They encourage learners to be inquisitive, seek out additional sources, and critically engage with the material. In doing so, learners experience a dynamic form of learning that traditional reference works struggle to match. Unlike a static written text, which is limited to the author's choices and assumptions about reader interest, a chatbot can adapt in real-time to the learner's curiosity: much like being having a personal tutor, who never tires of answering questions, at one's disposal "24/7" so-to-speak.

Conclusions

The integration of generative AI into communicative language learning offers both myriad interesting opportunities and considerable challenges. As this article demonstrates, these tools, when applied ethically and thoughtfully, can enhance learner autonomy, stimulate higher-order thinking, and tailor instruction to individual needs. Yet, their effectiveness hinges on educators' ability to scaffold meaningful interactions, guide prompt writing, and promote critical engagement with AI-generated output.

AI is not a replacement for human teaching but a valuable tool in the evolving educational landscape. Its limitations (such as lack of real-world experience and unreliability as regards content – see hallucinations §1) underscore the continued importance of human mediation, especially as regards intercultural awareness, contextual sensitivity, and emotional intelligence.

Gen Z learners' affinity for digital technology positions them uniquely to benefit from AI-rich environments. With proper guidance, they can learn to navigate AI's complexities while developing skills relevant to future linguistic, academic, and professional contexts.

Ultimately, rather than diminishing the role of language education, generative AI can invigorate it – empowering learners to explore language dynamically and creatively. Educators should embrace this shift by cultivating responsible use, reinforcing

academic integrity, and leveraging AI to invigorate – not stifle – students' cognitive and communicative growth.

References

- Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (Eds.). (2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives*. Longman
- Benson, P. (2011). *Teaching and researching autonomy in language learning* (2nd ed.). Pearson Education Limited.
- Bloom, B. S. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals. Handbook I: Cognitive domain*. David McKay.
- Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Multilingual Matters.
- Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL: Content and language integrated learning*. Cambridge University Press.
- De Cremer, D., & Kasparov, G. (2021, March 18). *AI should augment human intelligence, not replace it*. Harvard Business Review. <https://hbr.org/2021/03/ai-should-augment-human-intelligence-not-replace-it>
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics: Vol. 3. Speech acts* (pp. 41–58). Academic Press.
- Holec, H. (1981). *Autonomy and foreign language learning*. Pergamon Press.
- Khurana, D., Koli, A., Khatter, K., & Singh, S. (2023). Natural language processing: State of the art, current trends and challenges. *Multimedia Tools and Applications*, 82(3), 3713–3744. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11042-022-13428-4>
- McCoy, T. R., Yao, S., Friedman, D., Hardy, M., & Griffiths, T. L. (2023). *Embers of autoregression: Understanding large language models through the problem they are trained to solve*. arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2309.13638>
- Ostler, N. (2010). *The last lingua franca: English until the return of Babel*. Penguin.

Review

Prensky, M. (2001). Digital natives, digital immigrants. *On the Horizon*, 9(5), 1–6.

Searle, J. R. (1975). Indirect speech acts. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics: Vol. 3. Speech acts* (pp. 59–82). Academic Press.

Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance: Communication and cognition*. Blackwell.

Turing, A. M. (1950). Computing machinery and intelligence. *Mind*, 59(236), 433–460.

Weizenbaum, J. (1966). ELIZA—A computer program for the study of natural language communication between man and machine. *Communications of the ACM*, 9(1), 36–45.
<https://doi.org/10.1145/365153.365168>

Xu, Z., Jain, S., & Kankanhalli, M. (2024). *Hallucination is inevitable: An innate limitation of large language models*. arXiv.
<https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2401.11817>