HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

PEDAGOGICAL AND TECHNICAL CHALLENGES OF LANGUAGE LEARNING THROUGH DIGITAL TOOLS (AI AND APPLICATIONS)

O'razaliyeva Mavluda Shukhrat kizi
Student of Uzbekistan State University of World Languages.
Scientific advisor: **Ismailova Z.A.**
lecturer at the Uzbek State University of World Languages

Annotation: This article explores the pedagogical and technical challenges of language learning through digital tools, including Artificial Intelligence and applications. The rapid proliferation of digital technologies and artificial intelligence has fundamentally transformed the landscape of english as a second language and english as a foreign language education. While mobile applications, intelligent tutoring systems, and generative AI models offer unprecedented opportunities for personalized, ubiquitous learning, their integration is hindered by significant challenges.

Keywords: *Artificial Intelligence, digital language learning, pedagogical challenges, technical issues, second language acquisition, digital divide.*

Introduction. Pedagogically, it analyzes issues related to reduced authentic interaction, cognitive overload, and the erosion of learner autonomy. Technically, it explores software algorithmic biases, data privacy vulnerabilities, and the digital divide. By synthesizing current empirical literature, the study provides a balanced framework for educators and developers to optimize digital tool implementation while mitigating inherent systemic risks.

The digital revolution in education has shifted language learning from traditional, teacher-centered classrooms to dynamic, technology-mediated environments. Digital tools ranging from gamified mobile applications to advanced Artificial Intelligence platforms like automated writing evaluation and conversational chatbots promise democratization and hyper-personalization of language education. These technologies allow learners to engage with target languages independent of geographical and temporal constraints.

However, the rapid deployment of these tools often outpaces the development of robust pedagogical frameworks and technical infrastructure. The uncritical adoption of AI and educational applications frequently results in a mismatch between technological capability and actual second language acquisition efficacy. To fully harness the potential of computer-assisted language learning and mobile-assisted language learning, it is imperative to dissect the pedagogical and technical friction points that hinder optimal learning outcomes.

One of the primary pedagogical concerns in AI-driven language learning is the deficit in authentic, contextualized communication. According to Long's Interaction Hypothesis, language acquisition occurs most effectively when learners engage in negotiation of meaning during interpersonal communication. This structural flow requires a dynamic exchange where meaning is co-constructed by human speakers.

Most current language apps and AI chatbots operate on predictable algorithmic scripts. They lack the capacity to replicate human socio-pragmatic nuances, cultural contexts, and paralinguistic cues such as gestures and facial expressions. Consequently, learners may develop structural accuracy in grammar and vocabulary but fail to achieve true communicative competence, struggling to navigate real-world, unpredictable human conversations.

While gamification features such as points, streaks, and leaderboards are designed to enhance learner motivation, they often induce a shift from intrinsic to extrinsic motivation. Learners frequently become consumed by winning the game or maintaining their rank rather than deeply processing

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

linguistic structures. This superficial engagement leads to rote memorization rather than deep cognitive assimilation.

Furthermore, poorly designed user interfaces, excessive push notifications, and fragmented hypermedia elements can cause severe cognitive overload. Drawing from Sweller's cognitive load theory, when the working memory is overwhelmed by extraneous technological stimuli like animations, ads, and complex game mechanics, the cognitive capacity available for germane load is drastically reduced. This prevents the actual processing and schema construction of the target language.

AI applications often market themselves as complete replacements for human instructors. This assumption undermines the critical role of pedagogical scaffolding within Vygotsky's zone of proximal development. While AI can detect surface-level errors, it frequently fails to diagnose the underlying conceptual misconceptions driving those errors. Without a human educator to provide strategic feedback and emotional encouragement, independent learners using digital apps often experience high attrition rates, losing direction when they encounter complex plateaus in advanced syntax or academic writing.

From a technical perspective, the efficacy of AI language tools heavily relies on the datasets used to train them. Automated speech recognition systems, which power pronunciation and speaking apps, are notorious for demographic and regional biases. Most standard ASR models are trained on native-speaker data or standardized accents, specifically General American or Received Pronunciation. As a result, these systems frequently misinterpret or unfairly penalize the natural accents and phonological variations of non-native, elementary-level speakers. This technical rigidity can frustrate learners, leading to foreign language anxiety and diminished self-efficacy. Conversely, some generative AI models are too lenient, accepting grammatically flawed or pragmatically inappropriate inputs, thereby reinforcing interlanguage fossilization.

The operational mechanism of adaptive AI tools requires the continuous collection and analysis of massive amounts of user data, including voice recordings, text inputs, and behavioral patterns. This raises critical concerns regarding data privacy and security. Many educational technology platforms do not fully comply with stringent global data protection standards such as the general data protection regulation. The potential for data breaches, unauthorized commercial monetization of student data, and lack of transparency regarding algorithmic decision-making create profound ethical dilemmas for educational institutions adopting these tools.

The implementation of advanced AI language learning tools presupposes access to high-speed internet, modern hardware, and consistent electrical power. In many developing regions and rural communities, this technical infrastructure remains a luxury. The reliance on cloud-based, resource-heavy AI applications exacerbates the educational equity gap, known as the digital divide. Learners in resource-constrained environments are restricted to offline, low-tier, or outdated applications that lack the adaptive capabilities of cutting-edge intelligent tutoring systems, further disadvantaging them in global language proficiency.

To bridge these pedagogical and technical gaps, educational institutions must reject technological determinism and adopt a pedagogical-first approach. This requires a balanced integration model where digital infrastructure and cognitive principles work in tandem. Digital applications should not replace teachers but serve as cognitive tools within a blended classroom environment. AI can handle repetitive drills, vocabulary acquisition, and initial draft editing, freeing up the human teacher to facilitate intensive, authentic communicative activities and socio-cultural debates. This hybrid approach directly addresses the lack of authentic pragmatics and mitigates high learner attrition rates. On a technical level, software developers must train ASR and Natural Language

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

Processing models on diverse, non-native linguistic corpora. Acknowledging World Englishes and legitimate dialectal variations prevents algorithmic alienation and accent discrimination against language learners. Furthermore, companies must develop open-source, low-bandwidth tools that can run efficiently in resource-constrained environments to address the digital divide.

Conclusion. Digital tools and Artificial Intelligence represent a paradigm shift in language pedagogy, offering powerful mechanisms for autonomous vocabulary building and personalized pacing. However, as demonstrated, their deployment is compromised by profound pedagogical limitations regarding authentic communication and cognitive load, alongside technical hurdles involving algorithmic bias and systemic inequality. The future of language education does not lie in the total automation of instruction, but in a symbiotic, hybrid model where advanced technical tools are strictly governed by robust pedagogical theories, ensuring that technology serves human communication rather than mechanizing it.

References:

1. Stockwell, G. (2022). Mobile-Assisted Language Learning: Concepts, Contexts and Challenges. Cambridge University Press. pp. 85-112.
2. Kukulska-Hulme, A., & Viberg, O. (2018). Mobile collaborative language learning: A systematic review. Computer Assisted Language Learning, 207-249.
3. Chockalingam, S., & Solidum, J. (2024). Artificial Intelligence in Second Language Acquisition: Exploring Pedagogical Limits and Technical Constraints. Journal of Educational Technology & Society, 142-156.
4. Jalolov, J. J. (2012). Foreign Language Teaching Methodology. Pedagogy. 148-175.
5. Raximov, B. X. (2025). Digitalization of English language teaching in higher education institutions: an analysis of technical constraints and student motivation. Foreign Languages in Uzbekistan. 112-126.
6. Yusupova, S. B., & Axmedova, D. R. (2023). Organization of students' independent language learning activities in a digital educational environment: problems and solutions. Innovations in Pedagogy and Psychology, 44-51.