



My Approach to Using Artificial Intelligence in English Language Teaching - A Human-Centered Framework for Language Learning and Teaching

Gohar Hambardzumyan

Bridgeway Institute for English & Academic Success, California, United States.

Abstract

Artificial intelligence is now a more and more common feature of second-language education, offering learners new chances to practice, to get instant feedback, and to work at a pace that can be designed for their own requirements. It can be used to help with conversational practice, writing, vocabulary building, pronunciation, and independent learning. Yet, the fast advancement of generative artificial intelligence has led to a number of significant questions concerning the role of teachers, the level of independence expected from learners, the quality of the feedback provided, academic integrity, privacy, bias, and the difference between interacting with an artificial intelligence system and communicating with a real person. This article outlines a methodology that is focused on the needs of the learner and on the learning goals, checks whether or not artificial intelligence provides a real instructional benefit, and then assigns the appropriate responsibilities to the technology, the learner, and the teacher. The approach includes a ten-stage instructional cycle, a structured five-step procedure for dealing with feedback generated by artificial intelligence, integrated development of the various language skills, teacher-led practice, independent learner production, and clear safeguards for responsible use. This methodology was created and recorded in the author's 2026 book and has been further clarified in this article by linking it to existing research in the areas of second-language acquisition, adult learning, corrective feedback, learner production, and technology-supported language education. The framework presented is meant to provide educators equipped with a practical means of using artificial intelligence in order to increase opportunities for individualized practice without permitting the technology to take the place of human teaching or authentic communication.

Keywords: Adult Language Education, Artificial Intelligence, English Language Teaching, Language Learning, Teacher Development.

INTRODUCTION

Artificial intelligence is being used more and more in the teaching of language for aspects such as writing, speaking, vocabulary, grammar, personalized exercises, and self-study. Recent reviews have pointed out possibilities for more practice and increased personalization, but they have also raised concerns regarding accuracy, privacy, academic integrity, the quality of feedback, and the need for more evidence (Balci, 2024; Lo et al., 2024). I have created an approach to teaching English which is centered on people and makes use of AI, starting with the learner and the learning goal rather than with the technology available. My main idea is that AI should support teaching—rather than replace it or decide what teaching should be.

The methodology described in this paper is based on the instructional framework that I developed and set out in my book, *Integrating AI in ESL and TESOL: Pedagogical Strategies*

for the Modern Classroom (Hambardzumyan, 2026a). In this article, that framework is made more formal by linking its various procedures to research in second-language acquisition, adult learning, corrective feedback, learner production, and technology-supported language education. I am not asserting that I have invented AI-assisted language learning; rather, my contribution consists in organising existing pedagogical principles and AI-supported practices into a repeatable TESOL process according to which the teacher determines when it is appropriate to use AI and when human instruction should be given priority.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Methodological Design and Source Materials

The article is not an account of a new experimental intervention but rather sets out a research framework with a focus on methodology. The materials it is based on include my earlier book (Hambardzumyan, 2026a), the comparative

Citation: Gohar Hambardzumyan, "My Approach to Using Artificial Intelligence in English Language Teaching - A Human-Centered Framework for Language Learning and Teaching", Universal Library of Languages and Literatures, 2026; 3(1): 34-42. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.70315/uloap.ullli.2026.0301005>.

study I published on human-guided and AI-assisted vocabulary learning (Hambardzumyan, 2026b), and existing scholarly work in the areas of second-language acquisition, adult learning, corrective feedback, and technology-supported language education.

I created the methodology by first spotting a practical instructional problem, then looking at the relevant pedagogical principles, deciding in which cases AI could really offer an instructional benefit, setting out the responsibilities of both teachers and learners, and finally arranging these decisions into clear, repeatable procedures. The framework includes measures relating to accuracy, academic integrity, privacy, bias, equity, and learner autonomy. It is based on a ten-stage instructional cycle and a five-step process for handling AI-generated feedback and is meant to be suitable for use across different proficiency levels, various language skills, adult learning, academic contexts, and courses aimed at the workforce.

I worked out the methodology by first spotting a practical instructional problem, then looking at the relevant pedagogical principles, deciding in which cases artificial intelligence could really offer an instructional benefit, setting out the responsibilities of both the teacher and the learner, and finally arranging these decisions into clear instructional procedures. I also included safeguards relating to accuracy, academic integrity, privacy, bias, equity, and learner autonomy.

The resulting framework is based on a ten-stage instructional cycle and a five-step procedure for handling feedback generated by artificial intelligence. It has been designed so that it can be adapted to different proficiency levels, different language skills, adult learning situations, academic environments, and courses in English aimed at the workforce.

For this manuscript concerning the methodology, no new participants were recruited and no new data was gathered. As a result, the article includes no new statistical analysis. The empirical vocabulary study mentioned here is a separately published study and is used merely as evidence for one aspect of the overall framework.

Scholarly and Conceptual Foundations

The method I have adopted is based on well-established principles of second-language acquisition relating to interaction, learner production, attention to linguistic form, corrective feedback, meaningful communication, and learner engagement. These principles are not being offered as new findings; what constitutes a methodological contribution is the way in which they are organised with the aid of AI-supported practice.

The distinction that I have drawn between AI rehearsal and genuine interpersonal interaction is given to me by Long (1996). While conversational AI can offer further

opportunities for rehearsing language, communication with people includes intentions, social cues, unexpected responses, and the negotiation of meaning—all of which simulated interaction cannot fully replicate. That is why I use AI conversations mainly as a means of rehearsal and preparation and then move on to teacher-led analysis and actual human communication.

Swain (1985) states that AI-assisted practice results in the ability to produce language independently. It is possible for an answer or correction produced by an AI to improve the output without proving that the learner can produce the language on their own. The five-step feedback procedure that I have developed is based on the work of Schmidt (1990) and on research into corrective feedback (Li, 2010; Lyster & Saito, 2010), the steps being: the learners look at the feedback, recognise patterns, revise having understood the feedback, reflect on it, and then show off their ability to produce the target language independently.

The framework is also based on the principles of adult learning. Knowles et al. (2005) stress the importance of relevance, experience, self-direction, readiness and problem-centred learning; I thus start with the purposes for which adult learners need to learn English—such as employment, higher education, professional communication, healthcare or participation in the community—and use AI only when it serves that purpose.

Another key element in my approach is adult learning. When people enter language courses, they usually have definite aims and a good deal of previous experience. Knowles and his colleagues stress the importance of relevance, experience, self-direction, readiness, and problem-focused learning in adult education (Knowles et al., 2005). These principles are especially applicable to adult ESL. Learners might need English to get a job, pursue higher education, engage in professional communication, access healthcare, meet their family responsibilities, or participate in their communities. That is why I do not introduce AI just because it is available; instead, I first consider what the learner needs to achieve. For instance, if an adult learner has to prepare for a job interview, AI could offer repeated simulation of such interviews and initial feedback. If the learner wishes to improve their professional writing, AI could give them more opportunities to practice and review their language. If the learner needs to expand their vocabulary, AI can create personalized exercises tailored to their needs. Technology is useful since it has a purpose. This is in line with the general emphasis in adult learning on relevance and problem-centered learning, and problem-centered learning.

The Problem Addressed

I created this methodology as a solution to a real-world problem in the field of language teaching—how to provide more individualized practice without diminishing the role of human teaching. The students in any given class can

vary greatly in their proficiency, linguistic background, vocabulary, pronunciation, confidence, learning speed, and academic or professional objectives. Although AI can extend opportunities for repetition, practice, and initial feedback beyond the limited time available in the classroom, greater practice alone does not lead to effective results. For this reason, my approach regards AI as an additional instructional resource rather than a replacement for the teacher.

My Central Principle: Human-Led, AI-Supported Education

My method is based on a well-defined allocation of duties between AI and the teacher. The AI can provide support with repetitive practice, initial feedback, adaptive exercises, personalized examples, reinforcement of vocabulary, pronunciation practice, conversational simulations, feedback on writing, checks of comprehension, and extra practice. However, the teacher must be in charge of the learning objectives, the needs of the learners, the ordering of the instruction, the appropriateness of the AI, reviewing the content produced by the AI, adapting it to the context, promoting critical thinking, encouraging authentic communication, carrying out assessments, showing cultural sensitivity, ensuring academic integrity, and making the final educational decision (Hambardzumyan, 2026a; Lo et al., 2024). I refer to the teacher as a learning architect because the educator is responsible for designing and monitoring the interactions among learners' needs, teaching methods, AI-assisted activities, assessment, and human communication.

Learning Objectives Come Before Technology

At the start of each instructional sequence, I state the learning objective. To this end, I consider what the learner should be able to do, which language or communicative skill is concerned, what difficulty hindering progress, whether AI can meaningfully deal with that difficulty, what aspects require human instruction, and how the target ability will be assessed. It is only after carrying out this process that I decide if AI should be included. For instance, although AI can carry out job interviews repeatedly, the aim of the instruction

is effective communication with a person, not successful performance with an AI system (Hambardzumyan, 2026a). I base my AI-supported teaching on a ten-stage cycle: Identify → Design → Prepare → Teach → Practice → Reflect → Produce → Evaluate → Analyze → Adapt (Hambardzumyan, 2026a). This involves identifying the learners' needs, setting an objective and choosing a teaching strategy, preparing either an AI-supported or a non-AI activity, teaching the relevant language or skill, giving learners guided practice, getting them to look at the feedback, asking them to carry out independent production, assessing their linguistic and communicative performance, analyzing the evidence of what they have learned, and then adjusting the next stage of instruction. The cycle is iterative in that AI functions as part of the instructional process rather than replacing the entire instructional system's than becoming the instructional system.

7.5 Learners turn to AI when it offers a real instructional benefit, for example through individualized repetition, extra language production, or instant preliminary feedback.

7.6 Reflecting, learners look at the feedback provided by AI and think about whether it is accurate and relevant.

7.7 Producing: learners show off the target ability by using the language in a meaningful way.

7.8 I assess both linguistic performance and communicative effectiveness, as well as task completion, appropriateness, and independent performance.

7.9 Analyze by examining the learner's performance and, where appropriate, the AI-assisted learning information in order to spot patterns that call for further teaching.

7.10 Adapt by making changes to future instruction in light of what the learners actually need. The cycle is thus not just: Teach → AI → Finish; instead, it continuously goes through the following stages: Identify → Design → Teach → Practice → Reflect → Produce → Evaluate → Adapt. AI functions within the instructional cycle and does not become the instructional system itself.

Table 1. Ten-Stage Instructional Cycle

1	Identify	Identify learner proficiency, goals, difficulties, educational background, and academic or professional needs.
2	Design	Establish the learning objective and select an appropriate teaching strategy.
3	Prepare	Select or create an artificial intelligence-supported activity and review its content, limitations, and suitability.
4	Teach	Introducing the language, concept, skill, or communicative objective.
5	Practice	Use artificial intelligence when it provides a genuine instructional advantage, such as repetition, additional production, or preliminary feedback.
6	Reflect	Have learners examine artificial intelligence-generated feedback and consider its accuracy and relevance.
7	Produce	Require learners to demonstrate the target ability through meaningful language use.
8	Evaluate	Assess linguistic performance, communicative effectiveness, task achievement, appropriateness, and independent performance.
9	Analyze	Examine learner performance and relevant learning information to identify patterns requiring further instruction.
10	Adapt	Modify subsequent instruction according to evidence of learner needs.

It should be noted that the cycle is meant to be iterative, not linear, and artificial intelligence functions within the instructional cycle rather than becoming the instructional system itself.

AI Suitability Decision Mechanism

A key aspect of my methodology is that it does not assume that AI is suitable for all instructional tasks. Once the learner's needs, objectives, and instructional barriers have been identified, I assess whether AI offers a genuine pedagogical benefit. In the case where it does, I include an AI-assisted activity; if it does not, I opt for teacher-led instruction, peer interaction, authentic communication, or some other suitable resource. Both options are covered by the same methodology.

The decision is based on four questions: What does the learner need to learn? What is stopping the learner from reaching the desired outcome? Which instructional method is most suitable for overcoming that obstacle? Does AI offer a meaningful advantage in this case?

1. **What does the learner need to learn or improve?**
2. **What is stopping the learner from reaching the desired result?**
3. **Which instructional method would be most suitable for dealing with that barrier?**
4. **Does artificial intelligence provide a meaningful solution? The fourth question is the one at which the decision about AI's suitability is made.**

This decision can therefore be represented as:

Identify learner need

↓

Define learning objective

↓

Identify instructional barriers

↓

Evaluate AI suitability

↙ ↘

AI provides a meaningful advantage/AI does not provide a meaningful advantage.

↓ ↓

AI-supported activity Human/peer/other instruction

↓ ↓

Teacher monitoring and mediation

↘ ↙

Learner production

↓

Independent demonstration

↓

Assessment

↓

Analyze learner performance

↓

Adapt subsequent instruction

The two approaches therefore still form part of the same methodology; the issue is not whether the teacher adopts the methodology or not, but **which instructional resource is chosen within it**.

Criteria for Determining AI Suitability

In order to put the decision into practice, I use five criteria: how well it is consistent with the learning objective; whether it adds pedagogical value; whether there is a need for genuine human interaction; whether the output from the AI is reliable and appropriate; and whether the learners are ready to use AI responsibly. Based on these criteria it is possible to decide whether or not to incorporate AI, whether to use it only for rehearsal or preparatory work, or instead opt for some other method of teaching. Ultimately, however, the decision is up to the teacher and not something that can be determined by a simple checklist.

Consistency with the learning

AI should only be considered if its use directly contributes to the intended learning outcome; in cases where the aim is better served by human interaction, a teacher's explanation, working collaboratively, or some other instructional method, AI is not required.

Added pedagogy

The teacher must decide if AI offers an advantage in cases where it would otherwise be hard to provide that advantage. Possible examples are extra individualized practice, repeated exercises, quick preliminary feedback, or chances to carry out practice outside of the scheduled lessons. In such a situation, the use of AI is not justified if it simply repeats an activity which could be carried out more effectively without the aid of AI.

The need for human interaction

Human communication may still need to be at the heart of the matter even when AI is used for preparation or rehearsal if the aim largely involves genuine interpersonal communication, cultural interpretation, the negotiation of meaning, emotional cognition, or interaction that is sensitive to context.

Reliability and appropriateness of AI output

The teacher has to decide if the information, corrections, examples, or feedback produced by AI are adequate for the purpose of instruction. It does not automatically follow that the output from AI is accurate or authoritative.

Considerations regarding learner readiness and responsible use

The teacher considers the learner's level of proficiency, their digital literacy, their ability to assess information produced by AI, the privacy issues involved, the academic-integrity requirements, and the possibility of becoming too dependent on AI.

Learning-objective alignment	Does AI directly support the intended learning outcome?	Consider AI-supported activity
Added pedagogical value	Does AI provide a meaningful advantage over available alternatives?	Incorporate AI where appropriate
Human-interaction requirement	Does the objective require authentic interpersonal communication?	Use AI as preparation/rehearsal rather than a substitute
Output reliability	Can AI-generated content or feedback be appropriately monitored and evaluated?	Use with teacher review
Learner readiness and responsible use	Can the learner use and evaluate AI appropriately?	Establish appropriate guidance and safeguards

My Five-Step AI Feedback Method

A five-step procedure is part of the methodology: Read → Observe Patterns → Revise with Understanding → Reflect → Demonstrate. In this approach, learners carefully read the feedback, notice any patterns that recur, decide if the suggested changes are suitable and give the reasons for their decision, reflect on the basic principle involved, and then produce language on their own. The aim is not simply to get a corrected output but to help the learner develop the capacity to understand and improve language independently. This procedure is set out in my book and is based on research into noticing, corrective feedback, and learner production (Hambardzumyan, 2026a; Schmidt, 1990; Lyster & Saito, 2010; Swain, 1985).

Responsible and Ethical AI Use

The methodology itself includes responsible AI use. It is important that learners have clear expectations regarding academic integrity and understand when they are required to carry out independent work. Teachers ought to avoid unnecessary sharing of learner information and should consider issues relating to privacy, the appropriateness of the tools, and how the data is handled. AI-generated materials must be checked for inaccuracies, cultural assumptions, omissions, and bias. Learners should be made aware of when AI is being used and must not regard its output as automatically correct. Lastly, AI-supported learning needs to consider the fact that access to devices, the internet, paid tools, and digital skills is not equal among learners. The aim is to promote learner autonomy: AI should enhance capabilities without leading to dependence (Lo et al., 2024).

Table 2

Five-Step Process. Note that the last step is meant to show off one's own ability to use language rather than relying on corrections generated by artificial intelligence. dependence on artificial intelligence-generated corrections.

RESULT

Since this article sets out and formalizes a methodological framework rather than describing a new experimental intervention, the results include the framework's instructional structure, procedures, and pedagogical implications rather

than any newly gathered participant data or statistical findings. Neither new participants nor a new dataset were obtained for this manuscript. The discussion therefore looks at how the resulting framework can be applied in different language skills and learner situations, examines the relationship between its procedures and existing scholarly work, and considers what contribution its structure makes to AI-supported English language teaching. Structure contributes to AI-supported English language teaching.

Speaking and Pronunciation

There is certainly scope for making use of AI assistance when it comes to speaking and pronunciation. Learners can carry out repeated practice of ordinary conversations, interactions in the workplace, interviews, presentations, role-plays, fluency exercises and pronunciation and get initial feedback. Research into AI-powered chatbots suggests that there are potential advantages for speaking practice, confidence, engagement, motivation and pronunciation, although it also points out that more evidence is needed (Du & Daniel, 2024). In my method, however, successful interaction with AI is not the last criterion for judging speaking ability. For instance, after interview simulations there is still teacher evaluation and some less predictable contact with a human. The order therefore is AI-assisted practice, followed by teacher analysis and then human communication (Hambardzumyan, 2026a).

Writing and Grammar

When it comes to writing, I follow this sequence: Draft → Feedback → Reflection → Revision → Independent Demonstration. The learners begin by writing something themselves, after which the AI can give initial feedback on aspects such as grammar, vocabulary, sentence structure, organization, clarity, or style. The learners then assess the suggestions, explain why a particular change is suitable, make the necessary revisions, and apply that principle in their future writing. This method links AI-assisted feedback to the research on noticing and corrective feedback (Schmidt, 1990; Lyster & Saito, 2010) and ensures that independent production remains the final stage (Hambardzumyan, 2026a). Grammar is taught through meaningful language and practical, context-based practice; the AI can offer extra controlled exercises and examples, while the teacher helps the learners to achieve meaningful use.

Reading Development

AI can offer help with vocabulary, provide background information, ask questions to check comprehension, give paraphrases, produce summaries, and supply adapted materials when it comes to reading. I make use of these aids to improve access to the text without giving up its intellectual value. After learners can engage with the material, the teaching then progresses to include inference, examination of the author's purpose, critical analysis, comparison, evaluation of arguments, discussion and interpretation. The key point I hold is that AI can assist a learner in accessing a text, while it is the teacher who helps the learner to think about it (Hambardzumyan, 2026a).

Listening Development

For listening, AI can increase the amount and flexibility of practice by adapting materials to proficiency, speech rate, vocabulary, topic, and communicative situation. Learners can replay difficult material and review comprehension, while classroom time can focus on discussion, interpretation, note-taking, spontaneous responses, and real-world communication. Exposure to Vocabulary is a crucial element since, in my published comparative study of 60 ESL learners (Hambardzumyan, 2026b), I also looked at both AI-assisted and human-led vocabulary teaching. The study showed that there are advantages to both methods and concluded that it is better to combine individualized AI-assisted practice with human guidance than to regard them as opposing options. As part of the overall methodology, AI can be used to detect vocabulary gaps, tailor word lists, give examples in context, assist with retrieval, and allow for repeated review. The learners then apply the new vocabulary in practical speaking and writing. The study provides empirical support for one component of the broader framework; the book explains how vocabulary development fits within it.

Integrated Language-Skill Development

I never regard speaking, writing, grammar, vocabulary, reading, and listening as separate systems. A lesson can be organized so that reading, vocabulary, grammar, writing, feedback, speaking, and listening all revolve around a single communicative aim. Although AI might be suitable for certain stages, teacher or peer interaction is more appropriate in other cases. This kind of integrated approach supports the main idea that AI should be chosen based on the learning objective rather than simply because it is available (Hambardzumyan, 2026a).

Assessment and Feedback

The assessment decides if learners are developing their language skills rather than just becoming more skilled at using AI. While AI can provide formative feedback and help to identify patterns in grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, writing, or comprehension, I still keep the final say regarding communicative effectiveness, appropriateness, cultural

sensitivity, critical thinking, originality, reasoning, task completion, and independent performance. It is therefore necessary for significant academic decisions to involve teacher review (Lo et al., 2024; Hambardzumyan, 2026a).

Adult, Immigrant, and Multilingual Learners

Adult and multilingual learners play a central role in the methodology since English is usually linked to specific academic, professional, social, or personal objectives. There are situations in which people need to learn English to get a job, attend university, advance in their careers, access healthcare services, or take part in their community. That is why I start by looking at the learner's purpose and then examine whether AI can help with it, for instance by providing practice for interviews, helping with vocabulary for the workplace, offering opportunities to practise academic writing, or assisting with pronunciation work outside of formal lessons. This method is in line with the principles of adult learning such as relevance, drawing on experience, self-direction, and problem-centered learning (James et al., 2026; Knowles et al., 2005).

Academic and Workforce-Oriented English

People studying English in an academic or professional context need to have the language necessary to carry out real-life tasks, for example by taking part in university discussions, completing assignments, giving presentations, having interviews, communicating with colleagues, and writing professional messages. Although AI can offer practice and initial feedback, the final performance should be carried out on its own and, when appropriate, with other people as well. Activities that make use of AI thus help learners to prepare for actual communication rather than substitute for it.

Teacher Development

It is important to focus on teacher development since having access to AI on its own is not enough to ensure effective teaching. Teachers must receive training in a number of areas, including instructional design, AI-assisted practice, assessment, academic integrity, privacy, bias, digital literacy, TESOL pedagogy, learner autonomy, and culturally responsive teaching. They also need to know when it is appropriate not to use AI. I refer to this role as that of a learning architect: the teacher decides why and when AI is to be used, what the learners are to do with it, how the mediation takes place, and how learning is to be assessed (Lo et al., 2024; Hambardzumyan, 2026a).

Transferability

I developed the methodology with the aim of enabling other educators to understand it, teach it, and modify it according to their needs. The method includes clearly defined procedures such as learning objectives, the instructional cycle, criteria for the use of AI, feedback procedures, assessment practices,

principles relating to teacher development, and example activities. The framework is meant to be adaptable and not simply copied verbatim. Although the Bridgeway Institute for English & Academic Success is a setting in which it is intended to be put into practice, the methodology can also be applied in other ESL, TESOL, adult, academic, and professional settings. Professional settings.

Evaluation and Success in implementation is not determined merely using AI. Instead, I plan to look at various outcomes including language development, engagement, independent learning, persistence, completion, and progress towards academic or professional goals. The refinement process consists of Implement → Measure → Analyze → Refine → Reimplement. Any activities which do not offer substantial instructional value should be revised or stopped. This ensures that the methodology remains open to testing, criticism, and improvement as more evidence accumulates.

Positioning Methodology in Relation to Existing AI-Support

The quick advancement of generative AI has led to an increasing amount of research being carried out on speaking, writing, feedback, personalization, teacher development, and responsible use. Reviews also indicate that the research is still focused on contexts and language areas, which shows that there is a continued need for wider and more practical instructional approaches (Balci, 2024; Deng & Jamaludin, 2026; Du & Daniel, 2024; Lo et al., 2024). Recent frameworks also stress the need for responsible integration, critical thinking, learner autonomy, teacher development, and AI literacy (Pack & Maloney, 2024; Pham & Renandya, 2026). Pham & Renandya 2026).

I am not suggesting that human-centered teaching, personalization, teacher involvement, or responsible AI usage are innovations specific to this approach; rather, the contribution of this methodology lies in the way these well-established principles are put into practice—by starting with the learners' needs and objectives, assessing the appropriateness of AI, assigning responsibilities to both the teacher and the technology, guiding learners from practice with support to independent performance, and using assessment to inform future instruction.

Table 3. Placing the Proposed Methodology within the Existing Body of AI-Education Research

Pack & Maloney (2024)	Ethical and pedagogical considerations for AI in TESOL	Provides important ethical/pedagogical grounding; the present methodology operationalizes responsible use within a repeatable instructional cycle.
Kong & Yang (2024)	Human-centered GenAI framework; self-regulated learning; teacher facilitation	Shares human-centered principles; differs in TESOL focus and the explicit movement from AI-supported practice to independent language performance and human communication.
Lo et al. (2024)	Empirical applications of ChatGPT in ESL/EFL	Establishes the developing evidence base and opportunities/limitations; the present methodology provides an instructional architecture for applying AI across language-learning processes.

The significance of these developments lies in the way they relate to the methodology described in this article. I do not regard human-centered teaching, teacher involvement, personalization, or responsible AI use as innovations that are specific to my approach; rather, these principles are becoming more common in the wider body of literature on AI-supported education. Moreover, the theoretical basis of my methodology—comprising interaction, learner production, noticing, corrective feedback, meaningful communication, and relevance for adult learners—is based on existing scholarly work and is not introduced here as something entirely new (Knowles et al., 2005; Li, 2010; Long, 1996; Lyster & Saito, 2010; Schmidt, 1990; Swain, 1985).

What is distinctive about my methodology?

The fact that my method is distinctive has nothing to do with asserting that its various components are entirely new; rather, the value of the method lies in the way these components are structured together. Four aspects are central: first, the use of AI is based on a pedagogical need; second, performance supported by AI must be distinguished from learning that has been shown on its own; third, AI feedback is turned into a learning process by means of the Read → Observe → Revise → Reflect → Demonstrate sequence; and fourth, after the AI-assisted speaking rehearsal there is deliberately a teacher-led analysis and some human interaction. Taken together, these features make up an integrated pedagogical framework as part of the ten-stage cycle. The contribution is thus integrative and procedural, not technological.

What I have established is a **structured relationship between these elements which determines the way in which learners go from a need for language learning through to supported practice and finally to the independent demonstration of ability.**

The following features are especially important in this structure.

Identify → Design → Prepare → Teach → Practice → Reflect → Produce → Evaluate → Analyze → Adapt

The cycle creates a pattern that can be repeatedly followed involving the learners' needs, the teacher's decision-making, the AI-assisted activity, reflection, independent production, assessment, and the subsequent adjustment of instruction.

Lee et al. (2025)	GenAI in English-language teaching; teacher agency and collaboration	Reinforces the importance of teacher orchestration; the present framework specifies operational cycles and feedback/communication procedures.
Teacher-student-GenAI research (2025)	Balanced teacher-learner-AI interaction	Shares the principle that AI should enhance rather than replace human interaction; the present methodology adds explicit AI-suitability and independent-performance requirements.
Ho &Renandya (2026), FRAILE	Responsible AI integration, critical thinking, integrity, autonomy, teacher development	Strong conceptual overlaps in responsible integration; the present methodology is differentiated through its TESOL instructional cycle, five-step feedback procedure, independent-performance requirement, and rehearsal-to-human-communication sequence.

Limitations and Areas for Further Research

I am not offering this methodology as proof that AI is generally superior to traditional language teaching. Present-day research has found several promising uses as well as concerns regarding accuracy, the quality of feedback, privacy, academic integrity, learner dependence, and unequal access. More research is required to find out which AI-assisted activities lead to lasting improvements, which learners benefit the most, how teacher involvement influences the results, how accurately AI can detect language errors, and when AI promotes autonomy instead of dependence. The methodology should thus continue to be open to testing, criticism, revision, and refinement based on evidence.

CONCLUSIONS

I have not developed a methodology in which artificial intelligence replaces the language teacher. I have developed an approach in which AI and teachers perform complementary roles within a structured TESOL framework. AI is used when it provides meaningful advantages such as individualized practice, repetition, preliminary feedback, adaptive activities, and rehearsal; human teaching remains central to professional judgment, cultural understanding, critical thinking, ethical decision-making, and authentic communication. The approach links the key language skills with assessment, adult ESL, academic communication, and English aimed at the workforce. Students are not just taught to use AI, but are encouraged to question the results it produces, assess the feedback it gives, reflect on what they have received, and show their language skills on their own. Teachers are given the training needed to know when it is appropriate to use AI and when human teaching should be preferred. The methodology was first set out in my book (Hambardzumyan, 2026a) and is here further developed through existing scholarly work and by means of the procedures explained in this article. Its main idea is simple: AI should support teaching—rather than replace it or decide what teaching should be. The worth of AI in English language education will ultimately be determined by the way in which educators make use of it to broaden learning opportunities while keeping the learners, the teachers, and meaningful communication at the heart of the processes, and meaningful connections. The author recognizes the scholars and

educators whose research and professional opinions have contributed to the development of this methodology. The author has nothing to declare about financial or non-financial competing interests in connection with this manuscript. The author states that there has been no external funding received for the development of the methodology or for the preparation of this manuscript. Gohar Hambardzumyan developed and refined the instructional framework, compiled the pertinent scholarly literature, wrote the manuscript, and completed the revision and final editing. and completed the revision and final editing.

REFERENCES

1. Balci, Ö. (2024). The role of ChatGPT in English as a foreign language (EFL) learning and teaching: A systematic review. *International Journal of Current Educational Studies*, 3(1), 66–82. <https://doi.org/10.46328/ijces.107>

2. Du, J., & Daniel, B. K. (2024). Transforming language education: A systematic review of AI-powered chatbots for English as a foreign language speaking practice. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 6, 100230. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100230>

3. Hambardzumyan, G. (2026a). *Integrating AI into ESL and TESOL: Pedagogical strategies for the modern classroom*.

4. Hambardzumyan, G. (2026b). AI-driven vocabulary acquisition for ESL learners: A comparative study of human-guided vs. AI-assisted learning. *European Journal of English Language and Literature Studies*, 14(1), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.37745/ejells.2013/vol14n1122>

5. James, B. M., Kenner, K. A., Bunch, G. C., Raufman, J., & Trejo, X. (2026). *Adult education ESL in the United States: A systematic literature review* (CCRC Working Paper No. 139). Community College Research Center, Teachers College, Columbia University.

6. Knowles, M. S., Holton, E. F., & Swanson, R. A. (2005). *The adult learner: The definitive classic in adult education and human resource development* (6th ed.). Elsevier.

7. Li, S. (2010). The effectiveness of corrective feedback in SLA: A meta-analysis. *Language Learning*, 60(2), 309–365. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2010.00561.x>

8. Lo, C. K., Yu, P. L. H., Xu, S., Ng, D. T. K., & Jong, M. S. Y. (2024). Exploring the application of ChatGPT in ESL/EFL education and related research issues: A systematic review of empirical studies. *Smart Learning Environments*, 11, 50. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-024-00342-5>
9. Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413–468). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-012589042-7/50015-3>
10. Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2010). Oral feedback in classroom SLA: A meta-analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32(2), 265–302. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990520>
11. Schmidt, R. W. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11(2), 129–158. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/11.2.129>
12. Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235–253). Newbury House.
13. Pack, A., & Maloney, J. (2024). Using artificial intelligence in TESOL: Some ethical and pedagogical considerations. *TESOL Quarterly*, 58(2), 1007–1018. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3320>
14. Kong, S.-C., & Yang, Y. (2024). A human-centered learning and teaching framework using generative artificial intelligence for self-regulated learning development through domain knowledge learning in K–12 settings. *IEEE Transactions on Learning Technologies*, 17, 1588–1599. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TLT.2024.3392830>
15. Lee, S., Jeon, J., McKinley, J., & Rose, H. (2025). Generative AI and English language teaching: A global Englishes perspective. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 45, 85–108. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190525100184>
16. Deng, L., & Jamaludin, K. A. (2026). Roles of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) in English as a foreign language (EFL) instruction: A systematic literature review. *SAGE Open*, 16(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440261418315>
17. Pham, V. P. H., & Renandya, W. A. (2026). Navigating the AI turn: Framework for responsible AI integration in language education. *International Journal of TESOL & Education*, 6(2), 70–85. <https://doi.org/10.54855/ijte.26626>