Materiallar to'plami · Conference Proceedings
"ZAMONAVIY TADQIQOTLAR VA BARQAROR RIVOJLANISH" respublika ilmiy-amaliy konferensiyasi
04 August 2026
UDK 37
PEDAGOGIKA

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE-EMPOWERED ENGLISH LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION FOR SUSTAINABLE GROWTH, ENHANCING COMMUNICATIVE AND SOCIOLINGUISTIC COMPETENCE IN TERTIARY EDUCATION

Ra'no Qahramon qizi Solixova*
PhD Researcher, Uzbekistan State World Languages University
✉ solixovarano23@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This article explores the ways AI technologies could be implemented into English language teaching at the tertiary level to support sustainable instructional development when enhancing learners' communicative and sociolinguistic competence. Emphasizing communicative language education, the research examines adjustable learning stages, colloquial mediators, and systematized feedback classifications, as well as natural-language-processing (NLP) assets as tools that can customize teaching, extending exposure to actual language usage, and strengthening student autonomy. The article discusses that while AI assets are educationally based compared to being utilized as separate innovations, they could assist students in gaining both structural accuracy and pragmatic and cultural as well as register-relevant skills that comprise sociolinguistic competence.

Keywords

artificial intelligence, English language teaching, communicative competence, sociolinguistic competence, tertiary education, sustainable growth, adjustable learning, natural language processing.

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.21743074

INTRODUCTION

The robust variety of artificial intelligence in tertiary education has established fresh potentials for foreign language teaching. English, as the leading lingua franca, based on academic, professional, as well as digital communication, inhabits a core space within higher curricula all-inclusive, and universities are progressively anticipated to support students who can interact in an effective way across both linguistic and cultural limitations [1, p. 45]. Simultaneously, the international program for sustainable growth positions precise focus on all-encompassing and reasonable as well as quality teaching, placing language education as a tool for social flexibility and economic contribution [2, p. 12]. On the contrary, AI-fostered English teaching is gradually observed not purely as a high-tech comfort but as a strategic answer to the requirement for measurable, individualized, and maintainable modules of language instruction.

The aim of this thesis is dual: initially, to explore the ways AI assets could be educationally implemented into higher English teaching to foster communicative and sociolinguistic competence; next, to locate this combination in the wider frame of sustainable instructional growth. The debate makes connections from applied linguistics and computer-assisted language learning (CALL), as well as sociolinguistic concepts.

MAIN PART

The concept of communicative competence, initially founded by Hymes as an educative alternative to merely grammatical frameworks of language knowledge, maintains that competent language usage demands acknowledgement of both what is grammatically probable and what is contextually suitable and viable as well

as really executed in a speech community [3, p. 278]. As Canale and Swain later monitored such a paradigm in grammatical, sociolinguistic, and discourse as well as strategic elements, an outline progressed to underscore communicative language teaching (CLT) methodology [4, p. 30]. Sociolinguistic competence, particularly, stresses the student's capability to make as well as explain statements in an appropriate way, corresponding with register, politeness, and dialect as well as sociocultural settings [4, p. 34].

For higher education students getting ready to get into global academic and professional atmospheres, sociolinguistic competence is questionable as far-reaching as grammatical accuracy: miscalculating register within an email to a supervisor or deteriorating to explain pragmatic keywords within a negotiation could weaken interaction even when syntax is impeccable. Conventional classroom teaching is limited by inadequate contact hours as well as the hands-on impracticality of revealing each student to a satisfactorily broad category of actual registers and interlocutors, generally making it challenging to establish such competence in a systematic way [5, p. 66]. It is specifically this variety that AI-enhanced teaching is placed to deal with.

Modern AI claims within language education could be classified into numerous coinciding varieties. Adjustable learning platforms utilize student enactment data to arrange activities as well as adapt challenges in actual time, permitting teaching to be personalized at a scale that is not flexible for a sole teacher operating a big language module and offering students together with low-stakes chances for expanded conversational training, replicating a category of registers and roles as well as sociocultural settings on requirement [1, p. 52]. Computerized writing assessment as well as NLP-mediated feedback assets investigate both grammar mistakes and, progressively, problems of coherence and tone as well as pragmatic suitability, providing students with iterative comments that would else demand significant teacher time [7, p. 88].

Speech-awareness as well as pronunciation-interpretation assets expand this individualization to the verbal sphere, recommending students instant, non-judgmental comment on precision and prosody—aspects routinely aligned with sociolinguistic tolerance within authentic communication [6, p. 27]. Overall, such assets permit teachers to change classroom time missing from recurring practice to tertiary-order interactive tasks: compromise of connotation and intercultural debate, as well as register-altering activities that explicitly build sociolinguistic competence.

Significantly, the educational value of such assets is based on their implementation into a coherent teaching framework compared to their application as detached innovations. Kukulska-Hulme as well as coworkers, claims that technology-empowered language learning is most efficient when it is task-oriented as well as rooted in actual interactive targets, in comparison with being treated as an alternative for classroom communication [5, p. 71]. AI operates best as a loudspeaker of communicative drilling, lengthening the quantity and gap of input and communication accessible to students outside the classroom when the teacher keeps charge of sociocultural enclosing and error modification priorities as well as evaluation rationality.

The notion of sustainable development in instruction mentions models of teaching that are measurable and source-effective as well as able to maintain quality results as learner populations and institutional limitations grow [2, p. 15]. AI-enhanced teaching subsidizes such a target in numerous precise ways. Initially, adjustable and self-accessible AI assets decrease the marginal value of offering personalized training, letting under-investigated institutions lengthen evocative communicative practice to greater associates with no comparative rises within staffing [2, p. 19]. Next, AI-mediated analytics permit foundations to find out learning distinctions prior as well as distribute teacher focus where it is most necessary, enhancing the efficacy of present human resources. Finally, by assisting student autonomy and self-guided training, AI assets embed lasting learning habits steady with the wider goals of SDG 4, which aims for comprehensive and unbiased quality education that promotes lasting learning chances for all [2, p. 9].

Such advantages, but are provisional on justifiable admission to digital groundwork and on faculty preparedness to implement AI assets in a critical way. AI-enhanced teaching dangers expanding rather than tightening varieties between well-sourced and under-sourced organizations without intentional organizational planning [7, p. 94].

Several difficulties are shared by the combination of AI in English language teaching. Overdependence on automated feedback might inspire surface-level accuracy, taking advantage of profounder communicative

development [7, p. 91]. General AI-mediated language modules might also evade a slender category of registers, occasionally formal or neutral, hypothetically under-reflecting the sociolinguistic gap students need to face [1, p. 55]. Data confidentiality and algorithmic unfairness, as well as unsatisfactory contact to trustworthy internet connectivity, showcase additional issues that organizations need to deal with as aspects of conscientious adjustment.

Considering such difficulties, numerous suggestions appear for higher education drilling. Teachers ought to manage AI assets intentionally, choosing those that show students different registers as well as actual sociocultural settings compared to evading general communicative practice. AI-mediated feedback needs to be placed as formative and additional, corresponding with educators maintaining duty for summative evaluation of communicative appropriateness. Institutions need to invest in faculty growth; thus, teachers could critically assess and adjust AI devices rather than implementing them uncritically. Ultimately, curriculum designers must directly situate AI-assisted tasks onto sociolinguistic competence findings, guaranteeing that technology usage is determined compared to accompanying ones.

CONCLUSION

AI-assisted English language teaching maintains significant assurance for higher education, suggesting measurable assets of expanding communicative practice as well as individualizing feedback that conventional classroom teaching could not effortlessly copy. When carefully implemented in a conversational, sociolinguistically educated teaching, such tools can assist students move beyond structural correctness toward the pragmatic as well as contextual competence needed for efficient authentic interaction. Acknowledging this perspective within a style coherent with justifiable growth, however, demands intentional organizational planning and faculty readiness besides progressive vital assessment of the tools themselves. Future study needs to explore longitudinal learning results aligned with particular AI assets and examine the ways sociolinguistic competence could be more clearly evaluated within AI-supported learning contexts.

REFERENCES

1. Godwin-Jones, R. Big Data, Language Learning, and Generative AI // Language Learning & Technology. — 2021. — Vol. 25(3). — P. 42-58.

2. United Nations. Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. — New York: UN, 2015. — 35 p.

3. Hymes, D. On Communicative Competence // Sociolinguistics: Selected Readings / ed. by J. B. Pride, J. Holmes. — Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972. — P. 269-293.

4. Canale, M., Swain, M. Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing // Applied Linguistics. — 1980. — Vol. 1(1). — P. 1-47.

5. Kukulska-Hulme, A., Lee, H., Norris, L. Mobile Learning Revolution: Implications for Language Pedagogy // The Handbook of Technology and Second Language Teaching and Learning / ed. by C. Chapelle, S. Sauro. — Hoboken: Wiley, 2020. — P. 217-233.

6. Chapelle, C. A. Computer Applications in Second Language Acquisition: Foundations for Teaching, Testing, and Research. — Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. — 220 p.

7. Warschauer, M., Healey, D. Computers and Language Learning: An Overview // Language Teaching. — 1998. — Vol. 31(2). — P. 57-71.