

AI Supported English Learning: A New Model for Effective, Inclusive, and Authentic Instruction

Mohammad Fateh Issa 

Independent Researcher, Syria

Corresponding Author: e-mail: mohamdfateh34191817@gmail.comAvailable online at: <https://doi.org/10.66422/RJMU.ID.69>

Received: 15 May 2026

Revised: 28 June 2026

Accepted: 31 July 2026

Abstract— Artificial Intelligence (AI) is reshaping English Language Teaching (ELT) by offering new ways to personalize instruction, support learner autonomy, and enhance teaching effectiveness. This chapter examines key categories of AI tools—writing assistants, speech analysis systems, and conversational agents—and explains how they contribute to individualized learning and reduced learner anxiety. It also discusses how AI changes the educator's role, highlights concerns related to access, assessment integrity, and overdependence, and argues for responsible integration that strengthens learning without diminishing the central role of teachers.

Keywords— AI supported learning, English language teaching, personalization, learner autonomy, speech technologies, conversational agents, differentiated instruction, academic integrity.

I. INTRODUCTION

English language classrooms today serve learners with diverse backgrounds, goals, and proficiency levels (Krashen). In universities and professional settings, students often need English for research, presentations, and workplace communication (Reinders and Benson). Traditional teaching approaches, which typically follow a uniform pace, struggle to meet these varied needs (Benson).

AI technologies now offer new possibilities for addressing this challenge (Godwin-Jones). Modern language models can analyze learner output, understand context, and generate tailored feedback (Zhai). These capabilities make AI a powerful complement to traditional instruction, especially in settings where learners benefit from flexible, individualized support (Stockwell).

II. Categories of AI Tools in Language Education

AI Writing Assistants

Contemporary AI writing tools help learners refine grammar, vocabulary, organization, and coherence (Zhai). They provide detailed feedback on sentence flow, terminology, and logical structure—support that is especially valuable for university students preparing

academic essays, research papers, or professional documents (Reinders and Benson).

Speech and Pronunciation Technologies

AI-driven speech analysis systems evaluate pronunciation, stress, rhythm, and fluency (Derwing and Munro). Neural network models interpret both linguistic accuracy and communicative intent, allowing learners to practice speaking in private, low-pressure environments (Derwing and Munro). This is particularly helpful for adult learners who may feel anxious speaking in front of peers (Krashen).

Conversational AI Systems

AI chatbots simulate authentic dialogue, giving learners opportunities to practice language in realistic scenarios (Stockwell). These systems reduce speaking anxiety by removing social judgment and encourage experimentation with new vocabulary and structures (Krashen).

III. Individualization and Differentiated Instruction

One of the most compelling advantages of artificial intelligence in language education lies in its capacity to personalize instruction at a level that would be

extraordinarily difficult to sustain through conventional classroom practice alone (Godwin-Jones). Language learners rarely progress in neat, synchronized patterns. Even when they share the same syllabus, textbook, teacher, and number of instructional hours, their needs quickly diverge. One learner may struggle with listening comprehension but perform strongly in grammar, another may understand complex texts yet hesitate when speaking, while a third may require extensive vocabulary development before more advanced tasks become genuinely useful. Traditional instruction can respond to some of these differences, but in large classes the extent of individualized attention inevitably becomes limited.

AI changes that equation by making continuous, fine-grained adjustment possible. Rather than treating the class as a single instructional unit, AI-supported systems can observe patterns in individual learner performance and modify subsequent activities accordingly. These systems may monitor accuracy, response time, recurring error patterns, task completion, hesitation, and indicators of engagement, using such information to build an evolving picture of how a learner is progressing (Stockwell). The result is not simply a record of performance but a potentially dynamic instructional profile.

This distinction matters. A conventional exercise tells the learner whether an answer is right or wrong. An adaptive system can go further by asking what the error reveals. Was the mistake accidental, or does it recur consistently? Does the learner respond correctly but unusually slowly, suggesting uncertainty rather than mastery? Is performance deteriorating as sentence complexity increases? Has engagement dropped because the task has become too easy, too difficult, or simply repetitive? Such patterns can guide the system toward different instructional decisions.

In this sense, personalization is not merely about giving learners different exercises. It is about changing the sequence, difficulty, focus, and sometimes even the mode of instruction according to evidence generated through interaction.

Matching Content to Academic and Professional Needs

The value of personalization becomes especially visible in English for Specific Purposes and discipline-based language learning. Learners do not all need the same vocabulary, genres, communicative conventions, or reading practices. Engineering students, for instance, may need technical terminology, procedural language, report-writing conventions, and discipline-specific reading materials, whereas law students may require sustained exposure to legal discourse,

argumentation, case analysis, and highly specialized lexical patterns (Reinders and Benson).

A general language course can provide important foundations, but it cannot always accommodate such variation in depth. AI systems, by contrast, can generate or adapt content around the learner's academic field while simultaneously adjusting it to the learner's proficiency level (Godwin-Jones). This creates an interesting possibility: two students studying English at approximately the same level could receive entirely different materials because their disciplinary contexts demand different linguistic repertoires.

An engineering student might practice interpreting a technical description of a mechanical process, identifying cause-and-effect relationships in a research abstract, or learning how modal verbs function in safety instructions. A law student at the same proficiency level could instead work with simplified case summaries, contractual language, or argumentative passages structured around claims and evidence. The underlying language-learning objectives may overlap, but the content becomes more relevant to the learner's actual academic or professional world.

That relevance is pedagogically important. Learners are often more willing to engage with language when they can see why it matters. Vocabulary feels less arbitrary when it appears in familiar disciplinary contexts, and reading becomes more purposeful when the text resembles material that students may eventually encounter in lectures, textbooks, laboratories, court documents, professional reports, or workplace communication.

AI therefore has the potential to narrow a long-standing gap between general language instruction and the specialized communicative demands learners eventually face.

Adaptive Difficulty and the Pace of Learning

Personalization also involves timing. Learners do not simply need different content; they often need different levels of challenge at different moments. An activity that is appropriate today may become trivial after several successful attempts, while another may remain frustrating because the learner has not yet developed the prerequisite knowledge needed to complete it effectively.

AI-supported systems can respond to these shifts by modifying task complexity as learners progress or encounter difficulty (Zhai). A learner who consistently performs well may receive longer texts, more complex grammatical structures, less explicit scaffolding, or tasks requiring greater inferential reasoning. Another

learner who struggles repeatedly with the same feature may be given additional examples, simplified input, targeted practice, or alternative explanations before moving forward.

This kind of responsiveness reflects an important principle of learning: difficulty is useful only when it remains productive. Tasks that are excessively easy may produce boredom and little development. Tasks that are overwhelmingly difficult can generate frustration without meaningful learning. The most valuable activities often sit somewhere between these extremes, demanding effort while remaining achievable. AI can help keep learners closer to this productive zone by continually recalibrating task demands. The process may appear almost invisible from the learner's perspective. One exercise leads to another, but behind that sequence the system is adjusting difficulty according to patterns in previous performance.

Of course, adaptation should not be confused with constant simplification. A well-designed system should not protect learners from every difficulty. Struggle is part of learning. The more meaningful goal is to distinguish between productive challenge and unproductive overload.

Personalization at Scale

The practical significance of AI becomes even clearer when class size is considered. Teachers have always personalized instruction to some degree. Experienced instructors notice who needs additional explanation, who is ready for more advanced work, who repeatedly makes the same error, and who has quietly disengaged. The difficulty lies not in recognizing the value of personalization but in sustaining it across dozens, sometimes hundreds, of learners.

In large classes, individualization can quickly become overwhelming. A teacher may want to design separate materials for students with different proficiency levels, academic backgrounds, or learning difficulties, but time imposes a hard limit. Preparing individualized readings, vocabulary exercises, feedback, and assessment tasks for every student would create an enormous workload. AI can reduce some of this pressure by automating parts of the adaptive process, making individualized pathways more feasible without requiring teachers to manually redesign every activity for every learner (Hockly). This is perhaps where the technology becomes most practically consequential. Personalization is no longer restricted to small tutorial settings or exceptionally resource-rich institutions; at least in principle, it can be extended across much larger groups.

A teacher might define the learning objectives, select the broader pedagogical direction, and establish appropriate boundaries, while the AI system adapts examples, task difficulty, vocabulary sets, or supplementary practice to individual learners. The division of labor becomes more flexible. Human expertise determines what should be learned and why; computational systems assist with adjusting how practice is delivered.

The Changing Role of the Teacher

It would be misleading, however, to interpret AI-driven personalization as a replacement for teacher judgment. A system can detect performance patterns, but it does not necessarily understand the full reason behind them. A student may respond slowly because the material is difficult, but perhaps the student is tired, distracted, anxious, unfamiliar with the interface, or simply taking more care with the task. Numerical indicators can reveal patterns without fully explaining them.

This is where teacher interpretation remains indispensable.

The strongest model of personalization is likely to be one in which AI and teacher expertise complement rather than compete with each other. AI can process large amounts of learner data and identify tendencies that might otherwise remain unnoticed. Teachers can place those tendencies within a broader human context: motivation, confidence, classroom dynamics, cultural background, previous educational experience, and personal goals.

In that sense, AI may function less as an autonomous instructor and more as a highly responsive analytical and instructional assistant. It can make recommendations, adapt materials, and provide repeated practice, while the teacher retains responsibility for pedagogical judgment, relational support, and the broader direction of learning. This partnership also changes what teachers can spend their time doing. If routine differentiation and some forms of feedback are partially automated, instructors may be able to devote more attention to discussion, mentoring, complex feedback, communicative practice, and the interpersonal dimensions of language learning that are difficult to reduce to data.

Personalization Without Losing the Human Dimension

The promise of AI-driven personalization is substantial, but it also invites a more difficult question: how personalized is personalized enough?

A system may know that a learner struggles with phrasal verbs, reads slowly, and performs well on vocabulary recall. Yet these data points do not capture the entirety of the learner. Language learning is entangled with confidence, identity, aspiration, frustration, curiosity, and sometimes embarrassment. A student who avoids speaking may not lack vocabulary at all; the real obstacle may be fear of making mistakes in front of peers. No adaptive algorithm can be assumed to understand such complexity merely because it has access to performance data.

Personalization should therefore be viewed as a pedagogical resource rather than a complete model of the learner. Used carefully, AI can make instruction more responsive, more relevant, and more efficiently differentiated. It can help learners encounter vocabulary from their own academic fields, receive tasks that correspond more closely to their current proficiency, and move through material at a pace that reflects their actual progress rather than an inflexible class schedule (Godwin-Jones; Zhai). It can also make individualized support more realistic in contexts where teachers face large groups and limited preparation time (Hockly).

The real strength of the technology may lie here—not in replacing the teacher's knowledge of the learner, but in expanding what can realistically be done with that knowledge. When AI-supported personalization is combined with human judgment, it becomes possible to imagine language instruction that is both scalable and responsive, structured yet flexible, data-informed without becoming data-dominated. That balance is difficult, certainly, but it is precisely what makes the prospect so significant.

IV. Promoting Learner Autonomy and Reducing Psychological Barriers

Many adult learners experience anxiety when using English in academic or professional settings (Krashen). AI platforms provide low-stakes environments where learners can practice without fear of negative evaluation (Derwing and Munro). Research in second language acquisition shows that interacting with machine-based interlocutors reduces psychological barriers and encourages risk-taking in language use (Krashen).

AI tools also offer progress-tracking features that help learners monitor their development, set goals, and take ownership of their learning (Benson). This metacognitive awareness supports motivation and confidence—key factors in successful adult language learning (Reinders and Benson).

V. Reconceptualizing the Educator's Role

The growing presence of artificial intelligence in education does not make teachers obsolete; rather, it alters the nature of what their expertise is expected to accomplish (Selwyn). This distinction is important because discussions about AI in education are often framed too narrowly, as if the central question were whether machines will replace human instructors. In practice, the more plausible transformation is subtler. Some responsibilities may become partially automated, others may diminish in importance, and entirely new responsibilities may emerge. The teacher remains central, but the role becomes less focused on repetitive instructional labor and increasingly centered on judgment, design, interpretation, mentorship, and the orchestration of complex learning experiences.

Many routine activities that once consumed substantial amounts of teacher time can now be supported by AI. Automated systems can identify common grammatical errors, generate preliminary feedback, suggest revisions, produce practice exercises, summarize patterns in learner performance, or provide immediate responses to relatively straightforward questions. When these tasks are handled partly by AI, educators gain more space to concentrate on forms of instruction that require deeper human interpretation and pedagogical sensitivity (Hockly).

This redistribution of effort should not be confused with simply “doing less.” In some respects, the opposite may be true. The teacher's work becomes less procedural and more intellectually demanding. Correcting fifty nearly identical grammar exercises is time-consuming, but deciding why learners repeatedly misunderstand a concept, how an activity should be redesigned, or when an AI-generated explanation is misleading requires a different—and arguably more sophisticated—kind of professional expertise. The technology can process. The teacher still has to decide what deserves attention.

Shifting Attention Toward Higher-Level Learning

As routine correction and basic feedback become increasingly automated, educators can redirect their time toward forms of learning that are difficult to reduce to simple rules or algorithmic responses (Hockly). These include:

- leading meaningful discussions in which learners interpret, question, challenge, and connect ideas rather than merely reproduce information;
- supporting critical thinking by encouraging students to evaluate evidence, compare competing claims, identify assumptions, and defend their reasoning;

- guiding advanced academic writing, particularly where argumentation, disciplinary conventions, intellectual coherence, originality, and voice matter;
- teaching responsible AI use, including questions of accuracy, bias, attribution, privacy, academic integrity, and appropriate dependence on automated systems;
- building collaboration and communication skills through negotiation, peer interaction, group problem-solving, and other forms of socially situated learning.

These responsibilities are significant because they represent areas in which educational value does not arise simply from producing a correct answer. A student may receive a grammatically accurate paragraph from an AI system in seconds, but that does not necessarily mean the student understands why the argument works, whether the evidence is convincing, or how the same idea might be reformulated for a different audience. Likewise, an AI tool can generate a response to a controversial question, yet the educational task lies in examining the assumptions behind that response, comparing it with other perspectives, and deciding whether the reasoning is defensible.

This changes the instructional emphasis. Instead of spending disproportionate amounts of time correcting surface-level errors, teachers can help students wrestle with interpretation, evidence, judgment, uncertainty, and intellectual responsibility. Those activities are more difficult to automate because they depend heavily on context and on the ability to understand not merely what learners produce, but what they are trying to accomplish.

The Teacher as a Designer of Learning Experiences

The teacher's role is consequently moving closer to that of a learning designer. Educators increasingly need to decide how human interaction and technological support should be combined, when automation is useful, when it becomes intrusive, and which elements of a learning experience should remain deliberately human (Selwyn).

Designing such environments involves much more than selecting an AI platform and asking students to use it. Teachers must consider the sequence of activities, the cognitive demands placed on learners, the purpose of AI interaction, the type of feedback generated, and the point at which teacher intervention becomes necessary. An AI tool that is effective for vocabulary practice may be poorly suited to assessing a student's ability to participate in a nuanced academic discussion. Similarly, generative AI may be helpful for brainstorming but problematic if learners use it to

bypass the struggle involved in developing their own argument.

The design question, then, is not simply Can AI perform this task? A more useful question is Should it perform this task here, for these learners, at this stage of learning?

That difference is crucial. Technology can easily become pedagogically seductive. A tool may be impressive, fast, and technically sophisticated while still contributing little to meaningful learning. Teachers therefore need to evaluate AI not according to novelty but according to instructional purpose. What is the learner expected to understand after using the tool? What cognitive work remains the learner's responsibility? Does the technology provide support, or does it quietly remove the very challenge from which learning would normally emerge?

The strongest AI-supported learning environments are likely to be those in which these questions are considered deliberately rather than after the technology has already been adopted.

Human Judgment in an Automated Environment

AI can recognize patterns in performance, but educational interpretation extends far beyond pattern recognition. A system may detect that a student repeatedly gives short responses, makes frequent lexical errors, or performs poorly on a particular type of task. What it may not fully understand is why.

The learner may be confused. Or anxious. Or bored. Perhaps the instructions were unclear. Perhaps the student knows the answer but lacks confidence in expressing it. A sudden decline in performance could reflect cognitive difficulty, but it could just as easily arise from fatigue, stress, distraction, or circumstances outside the classroom. These distinctions matter because they lead to very different pedagogical responses.

Human educators bring contextual judgment to such situations. They observe tone, hesitation, frustration, enthusiasm, resistance, and subtle changes in participation that may not be meaningfully represented in performance data. They also understand learners as people with histories, aspirations, identities, and relationships—not simply as collections of measurable outputs.

This is one reason the teacher's role may become more important rather than less important as AI becomes more powerful. The more decisions are informed by automated systems, the more necessary it becomes to

have professionals capable of interpreting those systems critically. A recommendation generated by AI is not the same as a pedagogical decision.

Teaching Students to Use AI Responsibly

Perhaps one of the most significant new responsibilities for educators is teaching students how to use AI without surrendering intellectual agency. As generative systems become embedded in writing, research, translation, coding, communication, and information retrieval, students will increasingly encounter situations in which AI assistance is available almost instantly. Banning such tools entirely may be unrealistic in many educational contexts. Uncritical acceptance would be equally problematic.

Teachers therefore need to help learners understand when AI use supports learning and when it begins to replace it. This includes teaching students to question generated information, verify factual claims, recognize fabricated references, identify possible bias, and remain attentive to the limitations of automated outputs. It also involves discussing attribution and academic integrity: when does AI assistance become authorship? When should its use be disclosed? What kinds of support are legitimate in one assignment but inappropriate in another?

These are not merely technical questions. They are questions about intellectual responsibility. Students may also need to learn how to interact productively with AI. Poorly framed prompts often generate shallow or misleading responses, while carefully structured interaction can encourage comparison, revision, and deeper exploration. Yet prompt proficiency by itself is not enough. A learner must still possess sufficient knowledge to judge whether the output is plausible, relevant, or wrong. Otherwise, fluency with the tool risks becoming dependence on the tool.

Teachers are therefore being asked to cultivate a new form of critical digital literacy—one that combines technical understanding with skepticism, ethical awareness, and disciplinary judgment.

AI Literacy as a Professional Requirement

For educators to guide students responsibly, they themselves need a meaningful degree of AI literacy. This does not necessarily mean becoming programmers or experts in machine learning. It does mean understanding, at least conceptually, how AI tools function, what kinds of data they use, why they may produce inaccurate or biased outputs, and where their limitations become pedagogically significant (Hockly).

AI literacy also includes recognizing the difference between apparent fluency and genuine understanding. Generative systems can produce polished language with extraordinary confidence, even when the underlying content is weak or factually incorrect. This presents an unusual educational challenge because traditional markers of quality—clarity, coherence, grammatical accuracy—may no longer reliably indicate sound reasoning.

Teachers need enough familiarity with AI systems to recognize these tensions. They should be able to evaluate generated content, identify situations in which AI may distort learning objectives, and understand the privacy or ethical concerns associated with uploading student work to external platforms. They also need to know when a tool should not be used.

Training in AI literacy should therefore move beyond button-clicking tutorials. Knowing where a feature is located in an interface is useful, but it does not constitute professional readiness. Educators need opportunities to experiment with AI, examine its failures, compare outputs, discuss ethical dilemmas, and connect technological possibilities with established pedagogical principles (Hockly).

Without this foundation, there is a risk that AI integration will be driven by convenience or institutional enthusiasm rather than educational value.

Preserving the Human Core of Teaching

The emergence of AI also forces education to reconsider what is uniquely valuable about human teaching. Some aspects are obvious. Teachers motivate, reassure, challenge, interpret, negotiate, and build relationships. Yet these functions are sometimes underestimated because they are difficult to quantify.

A student may remember a teacher not because that teacher explained a grammatical rule more efficiently than software, but because the teacher recognized potential before the student did. Another may persist through a difficult course because an instructor noticed frustration and intervened at exactly the right moment. These moments do not fit neatly into automated analytics, yet they can determine whether learning continues at all.

Human teaching also involves moral and social dimensions. Educators decide what forms of discussion are respectful, how disagreement should be managed, when a student needs encouragement rather than correction, and how group dynamics affect participation. They help learners develop not only knowledge but habits of inquiry, responsibility, collaboration, and self-reflection. AI can contribute to

these environments, but it does not eliminate the need for them.

In fact, as automated systems become better at generating explanations and handling routine instructional tasks, the relational dimension of teaching may become more visible. What once seemed secondary—the conversation after class, the carefully phrased question, the recognition of hesitation, the ability to adjust a lesson because the room suddenly feels lost—may increasingly distinguish genuinely human instruction from technologically mediated support.

Toward a Human-AI Partnership in Education

The future of teaching is unlikely to involve a simple division in which AI handles routine tasks and humans handle everything else. The relationship will probably be more intertwined. Teachers may use AI to analyze learner data, develop materials, generate alternative examples, support differentiated instruction, or provide preliminary feedback. At the same time, they will need to monitor the quality of those outputs, determine when human intervention is necessary, and ensure that technological efficiency does not erode meaningful learning.

Teachers are thus becoming mediators between learners and increasingly powerful technological systems. They must know when to invite AI into the learning process, when to constrain it, and when to remove it entirely. This expanded role requires professional confidence as much as technical competence. Educators should not be positioned as passive recipients of technological change, expected simply to adopt whatever systems institutions provide. Their pedagogical expertise should shape how AI is implemented because they are the professionals closest to the realities of learning.

Seen from this perspective, AI does not diminish the role of the teacher; it exposes which parts of teaching were never fundamentally about information delivery in the first place (Selwyn). When routine correction, elementary feedback, and repetitive practice can be partially automated, what remains is not an empty space. What remains is judgment, mentorship, creativity, ethical guidance, intellectual challenge, relationship-building, and the careful design of environments in which learners can actually grow. Those responsibilities are harder to automate. They are also, arguably, the parts of teaching that matter most.

VI. Challenges and Ethical Considerations Unequal Access to Technology

Not all learners have reliable internet access or appropriate devices (Warschauer). Students in

under-resourced institutions or economically disadvantaged communities may struggle to benefit from AI-enhanced learning (Selwyn). Without addressing these disparities, AI risks widening existing achievement gaps (Warschauer).

Assessment Authenticity and Academic Integrity

AI writing tools make it difficult to determine whether students completed assignments independently (Rezaei et al.). Traditional take-home essays may no longer reflect actual proficiency. Institutions must adopt alternative assessment methods—such as in-class writing, oral presentations, portfolios, and process-based evaluation—to maintain authenticity (Rezaei et al.).

Overdependence on AI

Excessive reliance on AI for correction or idea generation can hinder the development of essential language skills (Krashen). AI should support learning, not replace cognitive effort (Selwyn). Educators must design activities that ensure learners remain actively engaged in meaningful language production (Stockwell).

VII. CONCLUSION

Artificial intelligence offers powerful opportunities to enhance English language instruction through personalization, reduced anxiety, and more efficient feedback (Godwin-Jones). However, these benefits depend on responsible implementation, equitable access, and strong teacher preparation (Hockly). AI works best as an instructional enhancement—supporting, not replacing, the human expertise that drives language learning (Selwyn). The future of ELT will be shaped by educators' ability to integrate AI thoughtfully while maintaining the pedagogical principles that underpin effective language teaching (Reinders and Benson).

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest.

Funding

The authors received no financial support for this book review.

Human Participants

This paper does not involve human participants.

Originality Note

The authors confirm that the manuscript is their original work, and if others' works are used, they are properly cited/quoted.

REFERENCES

1. Benson, P. (2011). *Teaching and Researching Autonomy in Language Learning* (2nd ed.).

- Longman.
2. Derwing, T. M., & Munro, M. J. (2015). *Pronunciation Research and Teaching: A Psycholinguistic Approach*. John Benjamins Publishing.
 3. Godwin-Jones, R. (2017). Scaling up and zooming in: Big data and personalization in language learning. *Language Learning & Technology*, 21(1), 4–15.
 4. Hockly, N. (2023). *Blended Learning and Teacher Education: Current Trends and Future Directions*. Cambridge University Press.
 5. Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Pergamon Press.
 6. Reinders, H., & Benson, P. (2017). Research agendas: Language learning beyond the classroom. *Language Teaching*, 50(4), 561–578.
 7. Rezaei, A., Ahmadi, S., & Thorne, S. L. (2024). Generative AI and academic integrity in language classrooms: Developing resilient process-oriented assessments. *TESOL Quarterly*, 58(2), 412–435.
 8. Selwyn, N. (2019). *Should Robots Replace Teachers? AI and the Future of Education*. Polity Press.
 9. Stockwell, G. (2022). *Mobile-Assisted Language Learning: Concepts, Contexts and Challenges*. Cambridge University Press.
 10. Warschauer, M. (2003). *Technology and Social Inclusion: Rethinking the Digital Divide*. MIT Press.
 11. Zhai, C. (2024). Large language models in second language writing: Feedback loops, cognitive load, and rhetorical development. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 63, 101085

About the author

Mohammad Fateh Issa is a researcher at the Faculty of Arts, Al-Ma'arefa Private University, Idlib, and an English language educator based in Syria. He holds a degree in English Language from the Faculty of Arts and Humanities, University of Aleppo. His teaching experience spans several institutions, including Al-Marah School, Tariq Al-Ibda' School, Al-Amal Al-Wa'id School, Ard Al-Ma'refa School, and Aleppo Private Secondary School, in addition to online teaching, where he has worked with learners at different levels to strengthen their real-life language use. He also gives courses and tutoring sessions in university-level subjects, helping students prepare for their academic coursework and exams. Beyond teaching, he worked with the Syrian Arab Red Crescent, and has taken an active interest in exploring how artificial intelligence tools can be integrated into language learning and teaching practice. Known for his practical, student-centered approach, he continues to combine research, teaching, and technology in his work.



This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) (CC BY-NC 4.0) which allows reusers to distribute, remix, adapt, and build upon the material in any medium or format for noncommercial purposes only, and only so long as attribution is given to the creator.