NAMANGAN DAVLAT UNIVERSITETI
ILMIY AXBOROTNOMASI, [2026-8]
ISSN:2181-1458
ISSN:2181-0427

13.00.00-PEDAGOGIKA
journal.namdu.uz
PEDAGOGICAL

MAKTABDA INGLIZ TILINI (EFL) O‘ QITISH AMALIYOTIDA SUN’IY INTELLEKT: MUAMMOLAR VA KASBIY RIVOJLANISHGA BO‘ LGAN EHTIYOJLAR

Gulbahor Gasanova
O‘ qituvchi, 168-maktab

Annotatsiya: *Sun’iy intellekt o‘ qituvchilarning kundalik faoliyatidan tobora kengroq o‘ rin egallamoqda, biroq uning ta’limiy qiymati o‘ qituvchilarning texnologik imkoniyatlarni til o‘ rganish maqsadlari bilan qay darajada bog‘ lay olishiga bevosita bog‘ liq. Ushbu konseptual maqolada maktablarda ingliz tilini xorijiy til sifatida o‘ qitishda sun’iy intellektdan foydalanish masalalari o‘ qituvchilarning pedagogik amaliyoti, mavjud muammolari va kasbiy rivojlanish ehtiyojlari nuqtayi nazaridan tahlil qilinadi. So‘ nggi tadqiqotlar o‘ qituvchilar generativ sun’iy intellektdan ko‘ pincha darslarni rejalashtirish, mashg‘ ulot va topshiriqlarni ishlab chiqish, o‘ quv materiallarini tayyorlash, baholash hamda fikr-mulohaza taqdim etishda foydalanayotganini ko‘ rsatadi. O‘ zbekistonda olib borilgan tadqiqotlar ham o‘ qituvchilarning sun’iy intellektga nisbatan ijobiy munosabatini aniqlash bilan birga, ularning pedagogik va axloqiy kompetensiyalarini yanada rivojlantirish zarurligini ko‘ rsatmoqda. Biroq ko‘ plab o‘ qituvchilar ushbu yo‘ nalishda yetarli darajada rasmiy tayyorgarlikdan o‘ tmagan bo‘ lib, sun’iy intellekt yaratgan ma’lumotlarning aniqligi, shaxsiy ma’lumotlar daxlsizligi, algoritmik tarafkashlik, akademik halollik, o‘ quvchilarning texnologiyaga qaram bo‘ lib qolishi va o‘ qituvchining kasbiy mulohaza yuritish qobiliyati susayishi mumkinligidan xavotirda. Maqolada sun’iy intellektni samarali integratsiya qilish faqat texnik bilim yoki ommabop vositalardan foydalanish imkoniyati bilan cheklanmasligi ta’kidlanadi. Maktab ingliz tili o‘ qituvchilariga til haqidagi bilim, topshiriqlarni loyihalash, tanqidiy baholash, axloqiy qaror qabul qilish va refleksiv amaliyotni birlashtiruvchi fanga xos sun’iy intellekt savodxonligi zarur. Amaliy, hamkorlikka asoslangan va maktab tomonidan qo‘ llab-quvvatlanadigan kasbiy ta’lim o‘ qituvchilarga ta’lim berish hamda baholash uchun mas’uliyatni o‘ zida saqlagan holda sun’iy intellektdan imkoniyatlari cheklangan yordamchi pedagogik vosita sifatida foydalanishga yordam beradi.*

Kalit so‘ zlar: *sun’iy intellekt; maktabda ingliz tilini xorijiy til sifatida o‘ qitish; o‘ qituvchilarning kasbiy rivojlanishi; sun’iy intellekt savodxonligi; pedagogik amaliyot; o‘ qituvchining kasbiy mulohazasi.*

ИСКУССТВЕННЫЙ ИНТЕЛЛЕКТ В ШКОЛЬНОЙ ПЕДАГОГИЧЕСКОЙ ПРАКТИЧЕСКОЙ ПРАКТИКЕ EFL. ПРОБЛЕМЫ И ПОТРЕБНОСТИ В ПРОФЕССИОНАЛЬНОМ РАЗВИТИИ

Аннотация: *Искусственный интеллект всё активнее входит в повседневную профессиональную деятельность учителей, однако его образовательная ценность зависит от того, насколько эффективно педагоги соотносят технологические возможности с целями обучения языку. В данной концептуальной статье рассматривается использование искусственного интеллекта при преподавании английского языка как иностранного в школе с особым вниманием к педагогической практике учителей, существующим трудностям и потребностям в профессиональном развитии. Результаты современных исследований показывают, что учителя часто применяют генеративный искусственный интеллект при планировании уроков, разработке учебных заданий и видов деятельности, подготовке материалов, оценивании и предоставлении обратной связи. Исследования, проведённые в Узбекистане, также свидетельствуют о положительном отношении учителей к искусственному интеллекту и одновременно указывают на необходимость дальнейшего развития их педагогических и этических компетенций. Однако многие педагоги не имеют достаточной формальной подготовки в данной области и выражают обеспокоенность по поводу точности генерируемой информации, конфиденциальности данных, алгоритмической предвзятости, академической добросовестности, зависимости учащихся от технологий и возможного ослабления профессионального суждения учителя. В статье утверждается, что эффективная интеграция искусственного интеллекта требует большего, чем технические знания или доступ к популярным цифровым инструментам. Учителям английского языка необходима предметно-ориентированная грамотность в области искусственного интеллекта, объединяющая языковую компетентность, проектирование заданий, критическое оценивание, принятие этически обоснованных решений и рефлексивную практику. Практическое, совместное и поддерживаемое школой профессиональное обучение может помочь педагогам использовать искусственный интеллект в качестве вспомогательного педагогического ресурса с ограниченными функциями, сохраняя при этом ответственность за преподавание и оценивание.*

Ключевые слова: *искусственный интеллект; преподавание английского языка как иностранного в школе; профессиональное развитие учителей; грамотность в области искусственного интеллекта; педагогическая практика; профессиональное суждение учителя.*

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN SCHOOL EFL TEACHING PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICES CHALLENGES AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT NEEDS

Abstract: *Artificial intelligence is becoming part of teachers' everyday work, yet its educational value depends on how teachers connect technological functions with language learning goals. This conceptual article examines the use of artificial intelligence in school English as a foreign language teaching, with attention to teachers' pedagogical practices, common challenges, and professional development needs. Recent research shows that teachers often use generative artificial intelligence for lesson planning, activity design, materials, assessment, and feedback. Evidence from Uzbekistan also shows positive teacher attitudes alongside a need for stronger pedagogical and ethical competence. However, many teachers receive little formal preparation and remain concerned about accuracy, privacy, bias, academic integrity, learner dependence, and the possible weakening of professional judgement. The article argues that effective integration requires more than technical knowledge or access to a popular tool. School EFL teachers need subject-specific artificial intelligence literacy that combines language awareness, task design, critical evaluation, ethical decision-making, and reflective practice. Practical, collaborative, and school-supported professional learning can help teachers use artificial intelligence as a limited pedagogical resource while retaining responsibility for instruction and assessment.*

Keywords: *artificial intelligence; school EFL teaching; teacher professional development; AI literacy; pedagogical practices; teacher judgement.*

1 INTRODUCTION

Artificial intelligence (AI) has moved quickly from specialist research into widely available digital tools. Generative AI systems can produce texts, dialogues, explanations, exercises, images, quizzes, lesson outlines, and feedback in response to ordinary language prompts. These functions are relevant to English as a foreign language (EFL) teaching because teachers regularly create examples, adapt texts, design communicative tasks, and respond to learners with different proficiency levels. The speed of content generation can reduce preparation time and widen the range of materials available to teachers. It can also create a false impression that producing content is the same as producing good instruction.

Effective EFL teaching requires decisions about language level, accuracy, purpose, interaction, assessment, and learner development. An AI-generated worksheet may be grammatically correct but still be unsuitable for a class because it does not match the curriculum, invites only mechanical answers, or includes unfamiliar cultural assumptions. The teacher must therefore examine generated material, revise it, and decide how learners will use it. This responsibility is consistent with the Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge framework, which explains that technology becomes useful when technological knowledge is integrated with subject knowledge and pedagogy (Mishra & Koehler, 2006). Celik's (2023) Intelligent-TPACK model extends this principle to AI and gives greater attention to ethical knowledge and informed teacher judgement.

This article reviews current evidence on AI use by language teachers and considers its implications for school EFL teaching. It focuses on three connected questions: what teachers use AI for, which problems limit responsible use, and what professional learning can help teachers make stronger pedagogical decisions. The discussion does not report a new empirical study. Instead, it offers a conceptual synthesis that can guide teacher educators, schools, and future research in emerging EFL contexts.

2 Pedagogical Uses of Artificial Intelligence in School EFL Teaching

Current AI applications support several areas of language teaching. Teachers can generate reading passages at an approximate proficiency level, create vocabulary exercises, prepare role-play prompts, design comprehension questions, and produce alternative explanations of grammar. Speech-recognition tools can provide pronunciation practice, while writing applications can offer initial feedback on grammar, organization, and word choice. Generative systems can also suggest lesson stages, assessment criteria, or differentiated versions of the same activity. Kohnke, Moorhouse, and Zou (2023) describe these possibilities but stress that language teachers and learners need the digital competence to use chatbots critically and ethically.

Recent empirical studies show that teacher use remains concentrated in preparation and content production. Barghi et al. (2026) surveyed 221 EFL teachers and practicum students in Turkiye. Among AI users, the most frequently reported practices were designing activities, lesson planning, preparing presentations, and developing assessments. The study also found that 64.6 percent of users had received no formal AI training. These findings suggest that adoption may occur before teachers have developed a clear framework for checking output or linking it to learning processes.

Evidence from higher education points to a similar pattern. Nazim and Alzubi's (2025) study of 278 EFL teachers found moderate engagement in AI-mediated professional activities alongside highly positive attitudes. Participants used AI for planning, feedback, assessment, reflection, and professional learning, but reported limited AI literacy and concerns about reliability, ethics, and professional autonomy. Although university and school settings differ, the findings show why positive attitudes should not be treated as evidence of pedagogical competence.

In school classrooms, the quality of AI use should be judged by the learning activity that follows. A dialogue generated in seconds has limited value if students only read it silently. Its value increases when learners compare expressions, identify pragmatic differences, rehearse roles, change the context, and create their own dialogue. The same principle applies to feedback. Automated comments can provide a starting point, but students should interpret the comments, decide which suggestions are useful, revise their work, and explain their choices. AI becomes pedagogically meaningful when it supports language processing and learner agency rather than replacing them.

3 Evidence from Uzbekistan

Research in Uzbekistan scholars provides direct evidence about the local educational context. Saydazimova and Saydazimova (2025) surveyed 141 EAP and ESP teachers from 34 local and international higher education institutions in five regions and interviewed 10 teachers. Participants were generally positive and familiar with AI for several pedagogical purposes. The authors classified most teachers as GenAI Adopters or GenAI Collaborators, while noting that further knowledge and experience were required for them to become GenAI Innovators. This distinction shows that frequent use and pedagogical innovation should be evaluated separately.

Mirzayev, Kamal, and Axundjanova (2025) examined seven university EFL teachers in Uzbekistan. The participants valued real-time feedback, support for autonomous learning, and grammar and spelling assistance. They also raised concerns about learner over-reliance, limited ethical knowledge, and possible harm to critical thinking. Although the sample was small and drawn from higher education, the findings identify issues that school-based professional development should address before learner-facing AI use.

Elov et al. (2025) studied 50 upper-intermediate EFL learners in Tashkent and reported stronger gains for the chatbot group in informal speaking and social-pragmatic performance than for the teacher-led comparison group. Their narrow sample limits generalization, but the study provides local evidence that AI-supported interaction can extend speaking practice. Collectively, research conducted in Uzbekistan encourages teacher-supervised experimentation with AI while emphasizing the importance of professional training in task development, content evaluation, ethical use, and the promotion of learner autonomy.

4 Teacher Judgement and Artificial Intelligence Literacy

AI literacy includes understanding what an AI system can do, recognizing its limitations, evaluating its output, and using it responsibly. Ng et al. (2021) describe AI literacy as a combination of knowing and understanding AI, using and applying it, evaluating and creating with it, and considering ethical issues. For EFL teachers, these abilities must be connected with language-specific knowledge. Teachers need to judge grammatical accuracy, register, pragmatic meaning, cultural representation, vocabulary difficulty, and the quality of feedback.

UNESCO's AI Competency Framework for Teachers organizes competence around a human-centred mindset, ethics, AI foundations and applications, AI pedagogy, and AI for professional learning (Miao & Cukurova, 2024). The framework is useful because it does not reduce competence to prompt writing. A teacher who can obtain a fluent response from a chatbot may still be unable to identify bias, protect student information, or design a learner-active task. Professional competence requires informed selection, verification, adaptation, and reflection.

Appropriate trust is also important. In a study of 508 K-12 teachers across six countries, Viberg et al. (2025) found that stronger AI understanding and self-efficacy were associated with greater perceived benefits, fewer concerns, and higher trust. The goal, however, is not unlimited trust. Teachers need calibrated trust: enough confidence to test useful applications and enough critical awareness to question generated material. Final responsibility for curriculum alignment, classroom interaction, and consequential assessment must remain with the teacher.

5 Pedagogical Ethical and Contextual Challenges

Reliability is one of the main barriers to responsible use. Generative AI can produce fluent statements that contain factual errors, invented references, inappropriate examples, or inconsistent feedback. In language teaching, output may also contain problems of register, collocation, pragmatic meaning, or cultural representation. Teachers should compare important information with reliable sources and review all learner-facing material. Fluency cannot serve as evidence of accuracy.

Privacy and data protection require particular care in schools because learners are minors. Teachers should not enter names, personal histories, identifiable student work, or sensitive assessment records into unapproved systems. They also need to understand how a platform stores or reuses data. UNESCO's guidance on generative AI recommends human agency, data protection, inclusion, and age-appropriate use (Miao & Holmes, 2023). These principles should be translated

into simple school rules that identify approved tools, prohibited information, disclosure expectations, and teacher responsibilities.

Academic integrity presents a related challenge. If students submit AI-generated text as their own, the teacher cannot determine what the learner can independently understand or produce. A complete ban may be difficult to enforce, while unrestricted use can reduce productive language practice. Assessment should therefore include visible processes such as planning notes, drafts, oral explanation, peer discussion, and revision records. Teachers can also ask students to identify errors in AI output, compare alternative responses, or justify which suggestions they accepted. These tasks make critical language use observable.

Equity and infrastructure also shape classroom practice. Stable internet, suitable devices, paid features, and high-quality support for local languages are not equally available. An activity that depends on individual access may disadvantage some learners. Teachers need alternative routes that allow participation without personal accounts or expensive subscriptions. Schools should evaluate the cost and accessibility of a tool before expecting teachers to use it.

Finally, AI can affect teacher agency. Ready-made content may save time, but repeated dependence on it can weaken teachers' own material-development skills or make pedagogical decisions less transparent. Nazim and Alzubi (2025) found concerns about professional autonomy, while Barghi et al. (2026) reported that non-users often lacked preparation rather than rejecting AI in principle. These findings indicate that schools should neither pressure teachers to adopt every new tool nor leave them to experiment without guidance.

6 Professional Development Needs

Professional development should begin with teaching problems rather than software demonstrations. A school may first identify where EFL teachers spend time, where learners need more support, and where existing materials are insufficient. Teachers can then examine whether AI offers an appropriate response. This sequence keeps pedagogy in control of technology and prevents training from becoming a list of rapidly changing tools.

A useful programme should develop four connected areas. First, teachers need foundational knowledge of how generative systems produce responses and why errors or bias occur. Second, they need practical prompting and evaluation strategies linked to EFL objectives. Third, they need ethical procedures for privacy, authorship, assessment, and disclosure. Fourth, they need opportunities to reflect on classroom evidence and improve their decisions. These areas align with Intelligent-TPACK and UNESCO's competency framework rather than with narrow technical training (Celik, 2023; Miao & Cukurova, 2024).

Subject-specific practice is essential. During training, teachers might adapt an AI-generated text to a target proficiency level, check a set of grammar examples, evaluate feedback on learner writing, or design a speaking task that preserves student-to-student interaction. They can compare the original output with their revised version and explain each change. This process makes professional judgement visible and provides a basis for peer feedback. It also shows that effective prompting cannot replace knowledge of language and pedagogy.

Training should be differentiated. Teachers who have never used AI need low-risk guided practice and clear explanations. Regular users may need deeper work on verification, assessment, learner dependence, and data protection. Teachers working with younger learners may require stricter safeguards and more teacher-mediated activities. School location, internet access, class size, and prior training should also influence programme design. A needs-sensitive approach is more useful than giving every teacher the same workshop.

Professional learning should continue after initial training. Teachers can work in small groups to plan one AI-supported activity, observe its use, collect learner work, and discuss what changed. A shared evaluation checklist can address accuracy, curriculum alignment, learner activity, privacy, accessibility, and evidence of learning. Rohmah and La Roiba (2026) reported improvements in Indonesian EFL teachers' knowledge, attitudes, and practices after structured AI training. Georgiou's (2026) study of pronunciation teaching also associated more extensive training with more frequent AI use and fewer concerns. These studies support sustained, applied professional learning.

Institutional support remains necessary. Schools should publish concise guidance, provide access to approved tools, protect time for collaborative learning, and clarify how AI may be used in assessment. Leaders should also create a reporting process for inaccurate, biased, or unsafe output. Such support allows teachers to experiment within clear boundaries and reduces inconsistent expectations across subjects or classes.

7 Principles for Responsible School Practice

Responsible AI-supported EFL teaching can be guided by a simple decision cycle. The teacher begins with a specific learning outcome and decides whether AI is necessary. The teacher then generates or selects content, verifies its language and factual quality, adapts it to the learners and curriculum, and designs an activity that requires students to think and communicate. During the lesson, the teacher monitors participation and makes AI use transparent. After the lesson, learner work and teacher reflection provide evidence for deciding whether the activity should be repeated, revised, or removed.

This cycle protects the central role of pedagogy. AI may assist with drafting, variation, or initial feedback, but the teacher determines the purpose and standard of the work. Students should know what assistance is permitted and how to acknowledge it. They should also learn that AI output is a claim to be evaluated, not an answer to be copied. In this form, AI literacy becomes part of language education and critical digital citizenship.

8 Conclusion

AI offers school EFL teachers useful support for planning, materials, differentiation, assessment, and feedback. Current research also shows a persistent gap between access and professional preparation. Teachers may use AI regularly while remaining uncertain about reliability, privacy, academic integrity, equity, and the limits of automated feedback. Positive attitudes alone cannot resolve these problems.

Effective integration depends on teachers' ability to connect AI functions with language-learning objectives, evaluate output, protect learners, and retain responsibility for pedagogical decisions. Professional development should therefore be practical, subject-specific, differentiated, collaborative, and supported by clear school policy. AI should remain a limited resource within teacher-designed instruction. Future research in emerging EFL contexts should examine classroom practices directly and evaluate how sustained professional learning changes teacher judgement and student language development.

REFERENCES

1.Barghi, A. H., Zengin, R., Dahal, N., Hasan, M. K., & Shrestha, S. (2026). Examining EFL teachers' awareness, use and challenges of AI integration in ELT context. Frontiers in Education, 11, 1779680. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2026.1779680

2.Celik, I. (2023). Towards Intelligent-TPACK: An empirical study on teachers' professional knowledge to ethically integrate artificial intelligence-based tools into education. Computers in Human Behavior, 138, 107468. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2022.107468

3.Elov, B., Kholikov, A., Abdullayeva, I., Mamadiyarov, Z., & Ruzikulova, A. (2025). Effectiveness of AI chatbots in promoting informal speaking proficiency and social pragmatic skills in Uzbekistan: A multi-analysis study. Computer-Assisted Language Learning Electronic Journal, 26(7), 137-161. https://doi.org/10.54855/callej.261234567

4.Georgiou, G. P. (2026). Artificial intelligence in pronunciation teaching: Use and beliefs of foreign language teachers. Journal of Education for Teaching. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2026.2676279

5.Kohnke, L., Moorhouse, B. L., & Zou, D. (2023). ChatGPT for language teaching and learning. RELC Journal, 54(2), 537-550. https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882231162868

6.Miao, F., & Cukurova, M. (2024). AI competency framework for teachers. UNESCO. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000391104

7.Miao, F., & Holmes, W. (2023). Guidance for generative AI in education and research. UNESCO. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000386693

8.Mishra, P., & Koehler, M. J. (2006). Technological pedagogical content knowledge: A framework for teacher knowledge. Teachers College Record, 108(6), 1017-1054. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9620.2006.00684.x

9.Mirzayev, A. B. U., Kamal, S. S. L. A., & Axundjanova, M. A. (2025). Understanding Uzbekistan university EFL teachers' perceptions of ChatGPT: From benefits to ethical challenges. International Journal of Information and Education Technology, 15(2), 246-254. https://doi.org/10.18178/ijiet.2025.15.2.2238

10.Nazim, M., & Alzubi, A. A. F. (2025). Empowering EFL teachers' perceptions of generative AI-mediated self-professionalism. PLOS ONE, 20(6), e0326735. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0326735

11.Ng, D. T. K., Leung, J. K. L., Chu, S. K. W., & Qiao, M. S. (2021). Conceptualizing AI literacy: An exploratory review. Computers and Education Artificial Intelligence, 2, 100041. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2021.100041

12.Rohmah, Z., & La Roiba, A. N. (2026). AI training for EFL teachers in Indonesia: Improvements on teachers' knowledge, attitudes, and practices. Learning Research and Practice, 12, 283-297. https://doi.org/10.1080/23735082.2026.2660718

13.Saydazimova, I., & Saydazimova, O. (2025). Teachers' perceptions and agency in implementation of artificial intelligence: The case of Uzbekistan. Technology in Language Teaching and Learning, 7(4), 102980. https://doi.org/10.29140/tltl.v7n4.102980

14.Viberg, O., Cukurova, M., Feldman-Maggor, Y., Alexandron, G., Shirai, S., Kanemune, S., Wasson, B., Tomte, C., Spikol, D., Milrad, M., Coelho, R., & Kizilcec, R. F. (2025). What explains teachers' trust of AI in education across six countries? International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education, 35(3), 1288-1316. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-024-00433-x