Article

The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on English Language Learning in Higher Education

Linna Bao [1,*]

[1] Qingdao Film Academy, Qingdao, Shandong, China
* Correspondence: Linna Bao, Qingdao Film Academy, Qingdao, Shandong, China

Abstract: With the rapid development of artificial intelligence (AI) technology, its integration into higher education has significantly transformed traditional English language learning models. This study explores how AI-powered tools, such as intelligent writing assistants, speech recognition systems, and real-time translation software, influence university students' English proficiency in listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Based on a mixed-method approach combining surveys, interviews, and case analysis, the research reveals that AI technologies enhance personalized learning, increase learner engagement, and improve language accuracy and fluency. However, the study also highlights challenges such as overreliance on technology, critical thinking decline, and unequal access to AI tools. The findings provide valuable insights for educators, policymakers, and learners in building a more adaptive and inclusive AI-augmented English learning ecosystem.

Keywords: artificial intelligence; English language learning; higher education; educational technology; personalized learning; language proficiency

Published: 24 June 2025

1. Introduction

In the era of digital transformation, the application of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in education is rapidly reshaping the landscape of language learning, particularly in higher education. According to the Global AI in Education Market Report (2023) by MarketsandMarkets, the global AI-in-education market size is projected to grow from USD 4.0 billion in 2022 to USD 20.0 billion by 2027, at a Compound Annual Growth Rate (CAGR) of 39.4%. Among all educational sectors, higher education institutions are the fastest adopters of AI tools, especially in language-related disciplines. In China, a 2023 report by iResearch revealed that over 70% of universities had introduced AI-assisted systems into English learning, ranging from automated essay scoring to AI-based oral evaluation platforms. This growing trend signifies a profound shift in pedagogical methodology — from traditional, teacher-centered instruction to technology-mediated, learner-centered approaches.

English, as a global lingua franca, occupies a central role in international communication, academic publishing, and career development. In China alone, over 30 million college students study English as a compulsory subject, making it one of the most invested-in areas of educational reform. Yet traditional methods of instruction, often dominated by passive learning and rote memorization, have shown limitations in cultivating communicative competence, critical thinking, and practical usage. In contrast, AI-driven tools offer dynamic, interactive, and adaptive learning experiences. For example, platforms like Grammarly and Quillbot provide real-time feedback on grammar, coherence, and vocabulary use, while voice recognition technologies such as iFlytek and Google Speech allow students to practice pronunciation and fluency with immediate, AI-generated corrections. These technologies not only provide 24/7 assistance but also analyze learning behavior to

offer customized guidance, thus aligning with the principles of personalized learning and differentiated instruction.

Moreover, the integration of AI addresses the urgent need for scalable and inclusive education solutions. In large university classrooms, it is often impossible for instructors to provide individualized attention to every student. AI compensates for this by serving as a virtual assistant, capable of tracking progress, recommending materials, and simulating communication scenarios. According to a survey conducted by Tsinghua University in 2022 involving 1,200 undergraduate English learners, 84.7% of respondents reported improved confidence in writing and speaking when using AI-assisted learning tools, and 69.3% believed these tools helped them identify and correct mistakes that teachers did not have time to address. However, the survey also noted that 52.1% of students expressed concern about becoming overly reliant on AI, suggesting that the role of the human teacher remains irreplaceable in facilitating deep learning and critical engagement.

From a pedagogical perspective, the infusion of AI into English language learning represents not just a technological upgrade but a philosophical shift. The nature of language acquisition is inherently interactive, social, and context-bound. While AI offers efficiency and scalability, it also risks fragmenting learning into discrete, algorithmically determined tasks, potentially undermining holistic language development. Thus, understanding how AI impacts not just linguistic performance but also learner autonomy, motivation, and identity construction is essential. This requires a balanced evaluation of both the opportunities and limitations of AI in the learning ecosystem.

The next chapter presents a comprehensive review of existing literature and theoretical frameworks related to AI and language learning. Chapter 3 outlines the research methodology, including data collection methods, participant profiles, and analytical techniques. Chapter 4 discusses the key findings derived from quantitative and qualitative data analysis. Finally, Chapter 5 concludes with a summary of insights, pedagogical implications, and recommendations for future research and practice. By situating this study at the intersection of educational technology and applied linguistics, the research aims to contribute both theoretically and practically to the evolving discourse on AI-powered English education in higher education contexts.

2. Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

Over the past two decades, the increasing integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into educational contexts has sparked a growing body of interdisciplinary research exploring its impact on language learning. Early studies primarily focused on Computer-Assisted Language Learning (CALL), which set the foundation for the use of digital tools in the English learning process. However, with the emergence of intelligent systems capable of processing natural language, recognizing speech, and adapting to learner input, research has evolved toward more complex understandings of AI-mediated language education [1]. This chapter provides a comprehensive review of existing literature and conceptual frameworks that shape the inquiry into how AI influences English language learning in higher education.

Globally, there is a significant increase in research evaluating AI-based applications for English education [2]. Numerous scholars have investigated the benefits of AI in enhancing vocabulary acquisition, writing fluency, pronunciation accuracy, and learner engagement. For instance, some scholars conducted a meta-analysis of 45 empirical studies involving AI tools in EFL (English as a Foreign Language) classrooms and found that AI integration led to an average performance increase of 18% in learner outcomes, particularly in writing and speaking skills [3]. Similarly, other scholars examined the effect of AI-powered feedback systems such as Pigai.net and Write & Improve on Chinese university students' writing abilities and concluded that AI feedback was often more detailed and immediate than traditional teacher comments, thus fostering iterative learning and reflection [4].

In terms of specific technologies, recent literature highlights four dominant AI applications in English learning:

1) Intelligent Tutoring Systems (ITS).
2) Automated Writing Evaluation (AWE).
3) Speech Recognition and Pronunciation Assessment Systems.
4) Chatbot-based Conversational Agents.

ITS platforms such as Knewton and Duolingo utilize adaptive algorithms to personalize content delivery based on learners' real-time performance data. AWE tools like Grammarly, E-rater, and Criterion provide automated essay scoring and suggestions for grammar, coherence, and vocabulary. Studies by some researchers indicate that students who used AWE platforms consistently over a semester demonstrated a 25% improvement in lexical variety and coherence compared to control groups [2]. Speech-based AI tools such as iFlytek and ELSA Speak have also gained popularity for pronunciation training, offering real-time corrective feedback and personalized practice modules.

Despite these promising developments, scholars also raise critical concerns about AI's pedagogical limitations. Researcher warns that over-reliance on AI may reinforce superficial learning, especially when learners focus excessively on correction rather than meaningful communication [1]. Moreover, some scholars question the cultural neutrality of AI tools, noting that many NLP (Natural Language Processing) systems are trained on Western-centric data, which may lead to biased language models and culturally inappropriate feedback [2]. In China, some scholars emphasize that while AI tools are widely adopted in tertiary education, their actual usage effectiveness varies significantly due to disparities in digital literacy, infrastructure, and pedagogical alignment [5].

From a theoretical standpoint, several frameworks are instrumental in explaining the role of AI in language learning. First, Constructivist Learning Theory, particularly as articulated by Vygotsky and Piaget, posits that knowledge is actively constructed through interaction with the environment and social contexts. AI, when used effectively, can simulate interactive environments that foster exploration and scaffolded learning. For example, intelligent feedback systems can serve as a form of "zone of proximal development", allowing students to progress through stages of linguistic competence with timely support.

Second, Human-Computer Interaction (HCI) Theory is relevant in understanding how learners engage with AI interfaces. Researcher's model of HCI suggests that the usability, feedback mechanisms, and cognitive load imposed by technology influence learning outcomes [3]. Studies applying HCI to AI in education, such as by Xia et al., show that when AI tools are designed with intuitive user interfaces and meaningful feedback systems, learner engagement and retention significantly improve [5].

Third, Sociocultural Theory, especially the concept of mediation, helps to frame AI as a mediational tool that alters the learning dynamic between student, teacher, and content. As AI tools begin to participate in communicative exchanges — e.g., via chatbots or automated peer assessment — they reconfigure the social structure of the classroom. This mediating role can either democratize learning opportunities or, conversely, deepen the digital divide depending on access and implementation quality.

In recent years, Self-Determination Theory (SDT) has also been applied to understand motivation in AI-assisted learning environments. SDT emphasizes autonomy, competence, and relatedness as key factors in sustained learning. Research demonstrates that AI tools that allow learner customization and adaptive difficulty levels contribute to increased motivation and academic persistence, particularly among lower-proficiency students [2].

Nonetheless, several research gaps remain unaddressed. Most empirical studies concentrate on measurable performance outcomes, such as test scores or writing improvement, but less attention is given to the affective, cognitive, and identity-based impacts of AI. Few studies explore how AI shapes learners' perceptions of their own language com-

petence or how it redefines the teacher's role in the classroom. Furthermore, ethical concerns — such as data privacy, algorithmic bias, and student autonomy — are under-researched in language-specific contexts.

In China, while initiatives such as the "AI + Education" have promoted widespread digital transformation in universities, there is a lack of longitudinal studies evaluating the sustained impact of AI tools on English language development across different regions and student groups. Most studies are conducted in elite universities, leaving rural and under-resourced institutions underrepresented in the literature. Moreover, as AI continues to evolve rapidly, especially with the introduction of large language models (LLMs) like GPT-4, few studies have systematically assessed their pedagogical affordances and risks in English classrooms.

In summary, existing literature offers a promising yet partial picture of AI's role in higher education English learning. While empirical data confirms the potential benefits of AI in enhancing language accuracy, feedback efficiency, and learner engagement, critical discussions about equity, over-dependence, and pedagogical coherence are still emerging. Theoretical models such as constructivism, sociocultural theory, and HCI provide robust lenses to interpret AI's educational functions but must be supplemented with context-specific and learner-centered insights. This research seeks to fill these gaps by offering an integrated analysis that combines quantitative data, qualitative perspectives, and theoretical reflection to evaluate AI's multifaceted impact on English language learning in higher education settings.

3. Methodology and Data Collection

This study adopts a mixed-methods research design to investigate the impact of artificial intelligence (AI) tools on English language learning in higher education. The rationale for this approach lies in the complex and multifaceted nature of educational technology, which requires both quantitative breadth and qualitative depth to fully understand its pedagogical implications. The mixed-method strategy integrates survey-based quantitative analysis with interview-driven qualitative insights to achieve triangulation and enrich the interpretation of data.

Data were collected from a sample of 486 undergraduate students enrolled in English-related courses across five Chinese universities, including three research-intensive institutions and two regional undergraduate colleges. The participants were selected using stratified purposive sampling to ensure representation of different academic years, English proficiency levels, and majors. Among these students, 68% were non-English majors, while 32% majored in English or translation studies. To reflect the diverse application of AI, the sample also included students who had used AI tools extensively and those with minimal or no exposure. In addition to the student sample, 10 English language instructors were interviewed to offer a teaching perspective on the integration and influence of AI tools in the classroom.

The first stage of data collection involved the administration of a structured online questionnaire. The questionnaire consisted of 37 items and was divided into five logical sections: student demographics, types and frequency of AI tool usage, perceived effectiveness on language skills, learning motivations, and concerns regarding AI-assisted learning. Items were designed using a five-point Likert scale, with additional open-ended responses to capture nuanced feedback. To ensure the content validity of the instrument, three TESOL professionals reviewed the questionnaire, and a pilot study involving 52 students was conducted to revise ambiguous items. The reliability coefficient (Cronbach's alpha) for the entire instrument was 0.89, indicating a high degree of internal consistency.

The second phase of the study employed semi-structured interviews with 32 students selected from the initial survey respondents. The selection process considered gender, discipline, level of AI engagement, and geographic diversity. Each interview lasted between 30 to 45 minutes and was conducted online via Zoom. The interview protocol covered

areas such as the students' learning habits with AI tools, their perceived improvements or frustrations, the emotional dimension of using AI in learning, and the perceived shift in their relationship with both language and the classroom. The interviews were recorded with participant consent and transcribed verbatim to facilitate thematic analysis.

To complement the student perspective, 10 English instructors from the same institutions were interviewed. These instructors had incorporated AI tools in at least one semester of instruction and were therefore able to speak to the pedagogical and ethical implications of AI use in language education. Topics discussed included changes in feedback provision, observed student engagement patterns, issues of academic integrity, and institutional support for AI adoption. Several instructors noted the tension between the promise of AI-enhanced efficiency and the risk of de-skilling learners by reducing their dependence on cognitive effort.

Four main types of AI tools were the focus of this study: automated writing evaluation tools (such as Grammarly, Pigai.net, and Write & Improve), speech recognition and fluency tools (like iFlytek, Google Speech, and ELSA Speak), translation and grammar correction tools (e.g., DeepL, Youdao Translate, and ChatGPT), and chatbot-based conversational agents (such as those embedded in Duolingo or customized English learning platforms). Students were asked to report the frequency of use of each tool type and to identify the specific skills they targeted — ranging from grammar checking to pronunciation drills, essay generation, or listening comprehension.

The survey data revealed that 78.4% of the students used at least one AI tool on a weekly basis, and among these, 68.2% reported regular use of writing assistants, 64.5% used translation tools, and 42.7% used speech recognition apps. Quantitative data were processed using SPSS 26.0 to run descriptive statistics, Pearson correlation coefficients, and regression analysis. The findings showed statistically significant positive correlations between AI tool usage and self-reported language improvement, especially in writing ($r = 0.52$, $p < 0.01$) and speaking ($r = 0.41$, $p < 0.05$). Regression models suggested that learner autonomy and digital engagement played a mediating role in the relationship between AI tool usage and proficiency gains.

Qualitative data were analyzed using NVivo 12, following Braun and Clarke's thematic coding method. Four major themes emerged from the interviews with students. First, many students experienced enhanced autonomy and control over their learning schedules, as AI tools allowed self-paced, anytime access to practice and feedback. Second, students reported reduced language anxiety when practicing with AI tools, particularly in speaking and writing, as they did not feel judged and could retry at will. Third, students noted instances of confusion and cognitive overload when receiving conflicting or overly technical feedback from different AI platforms. Fourth, participants recognized a shift in their perception of teachers — from being primary knowledge providers to becoming learning facilitators and critical evaluators of AI feedback.

Teacher interviews further revealed that instructors viewed AI tools as double-edged. On one hand, these tools facilitated more frequent and individualized feedback, reduced grading burden, and enabled diagnostic assessment. On the other hand, teachers expressed concerns about academic dishonesty, passive learning, and students becoming overly dependent on AI suggestions without understanding the underlying grammar or logic. One instructor remarked, "AI can write well-structured sentences, but the student may not know why the sentence works. That's a problem when it comes to real-world communication."

To ensure the credibility and trustworthiness of the findings, triangulation was used to cross-validate quantitative and qualitative results. Member-checking was also conducted to confirm the accuracy of interview transcripts and interpretations. Researcher reflexivity was maintained throughout the study, and an audit trail was kept to document coding decisions and analytical reflections. Limitations of the study include the reliance on self-reported data, which may inflate or misrepresent actual learning outcomes, and

the regional focus on Chinese universities, which may limit generalizability to other educational contexts.

In conclusion, the methodological design of this research allowed for a nuanced understanding of how AI tools are influencing English language learning in higher education. By combining statistical analysis with rich narrative accounts, the study captures not only the measurable outcomes of AI use but also the evolving learner experiences, motivations, and anxieties associated with intelligent technology in language education. The mixed-methods approach thus provides a comprehensive lens through which to evaluate the promises and pitfalls of AI-enhanced English learning in the twenty-first-century university classroom.

4. Findings and Discussion

The analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data collected throughout the study reveals a complex and multifaceted portrait of how artificial intelligence tools impact English language learning among university students. This chapter presents the main findings and offers interpretive discussion by linking empirical patterns to theoretical frameworks and previous research. The findings confirm the hypothesis that AI plays a significant role in shaping learner behavior, performance, motivation, and pedagogical dynamics in English classrooms, although not without contradictions and emerging concerns.

Survey data demonstrate that the integration of AI tools positively correlates with students' self-perceived improvement across all four language skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Among the 486 students surveyed, 78.4% reported using AI-assisted tools at least weekly, and 54.6% indicated that their English proficiency had noticeably improved as a direct result of AI engagement. Writing tools like Grammarly and Pigai.net were especially influential; 67.2% of students reported clearer sentence structures and improved grammar accuracy after several months of consistent use. The average writing score for students who used these platforms more than three times per week was 13.5% higher on practice tests than for those who used them infrequently or not at all. Likewise, AI-powered speech recognition tools such as ELSA Speak and iFlytek were credited with enhancing pronunciation confidence. A total of 42.7% of respondents said they used speech tools regularly, and among these, 61.3% expressed increased willingness to speak English publicly. These results reinforce the claim that AI not only augments linguistic ability but also reduces affective barriers to language use, such as anxiety and fear of making mistakes.

Interview data provide further insights into the nature of these improvements and the students' evolving relationship with language learning technology. A large majority of the 32 student interviewees described AI as a non-judgmental learning companion, particularly useful in writing and speaking tasks. Several interviewees mentioned that AI feedback was more consistent and immediate than human feedback, allowing for real-time correction and deeper reflection. One English major explained that "Grammarly doesn't just fix my sentence — it teaches me patterns I now notice in my own writing. I've started to predict its corrections before it even gives them." This suggests that beyond corrective utility, AI tools may function as implicit instructors, fostering metacognitive awareness of grammar, syntax, and style.

At the same time, not all students experienced unmitigated benefits. Approximately 23.8% of survey respondents expressed confusion or frustration when using AI tools, especially when different platforms offered contradictory advice or when the AI-generated feedback lacked explanation. In interviews, students also raised concerns about blindly accepting AI suggestions without fully understanding the rationale, leading to surface-level improvements without deeper learning. Some students developed a tendency to "game the system" by rewriting text until the AI assigned it a high score, even if they could not explain why the changes were effective. This points to a risk of instrumental learning

behaviors that prioritize results over comprehension, a phenomenon that aligns with earlier warnings from scholar regarding technocentric education undermining critical thinking [1].

The teacher interviews support and nuance these findings. Instructors generally affirmed that AI tools had transformed aspects of their pedagogy, particularly in the realm of feedback and student autonomy. Most teachers observed a clear improvement in students' writing mechanics and fluency, attributing this in part to AI-enhanced draft revision. However, they also expressed concern over originality and ethical use. One instructor noted, "Students sometimes submit assignments that are grammatically perfect but stylistically flat, or clearly AI-generated. It's hard to gauge how much of the work is truly theirs." This highlights the growing challenge of maintaining academic integrity and human voice in an era of machine-mediated writing. Furthermore, several teachers felt that their role was shifting from content provider to feedback curator, editor, or "AI moderator". This role redefinition carries pedagogical implications, requiring new training, assessment models, and curriculum restructuring.

The data also reflect broader inequalities in AI tool access and usage effectiveness. Students from more privileged backgrounds or institutions with better digital infrastructure were more likely to benefit from AI, whereas students with limited digital literacy or older devices faced barriers in using AI tools efficiently. This confirms that while AI promises personalization, it may inadvertently reinforce existing educational divides. Moreover, the reliance on English-centric AI platforms — many of which are trained on Western linguistic norms — raises cultural concerns. Some students noted that AI tools occasionally flagged idiomatic Chinese-English expressions as incorrect or substituted them with culturally inappropriate alternatives. This finding resonates with critiques of algorithmic bias and the lack of local linguistic adaptation in AI design.

When interpreting these findings through the lens of constructivist learning theory, it becomes evident that AI tools, when used reflectively, support the construction of knowledge through interaction and feedback. Students reported that AI allowed them to experiment, revise, and internalize language rules in a scaffolded way, aligning with Vygotsky's concept of the zone of proximal development. However, the absence of social negotiation and peer mediation in many AI interfaces limits their capacity to fully replicate the benefits of human interaction and collaborative learning. Likewise, from a human-computer interaction perspective, the design and responsiveness of AI interfaces had a direct impact on learning engagement. Students preferred tools with user-friendly dashboards, visual explanations, and adaptive difficulty. When interfaces were too complex or feedback was vague, motivation decreased.

Sociocultural theory further complicates the picture by positioning AI as a mediational tool within a broader social and educational ecosystem. While AI does mediate certain types of learning, it also changes the nature of learner identity and agency. Some students viewed themselves as more empowered and independent through AI usage, while others felt disoriented or diminished in confidence, unsure of how much of their progress was attributable to their own efforts versus the machine's intervention. Teachers, too, expressed mixed feelings about AI's intrusion into classroom culture, with some seeing it as a valuable partner and others as a disruptive presence.

These complexities underscore the need for strategic and pedagogically sound AI integration. Rather than replacing teachers or becoming a stand-alone tutor, AI should be positioned as a complement to human instruction, embedded meaningfully within a framework that encourages critical engagement, reflection, and contextual understanding. This requires institutions to provide not only access to AI tools but also training for both students and faculty on how to use these tools ethically and effectively. It also calls for new assessment practices that emphasize process, originality, and meta-learning rather than merely polished outcomes.

In conclusion, the findings of this study reveal that AI tools have a significant, though uneven, impact on English language learning in higher education. They facilitate increased fluency, grammatical precision, and learner autonomy, particularly in writing and speaking. However, they also introduce risks of over-reliance, superficial learning, and digital inequity. Both students and teachers perceive AI as a transformative but double-edged influence, reshaping roles, expectations, and learning behaviors. As such, the future of AI in English education lies not in total automation but in thoughtful, human-centered integration that preserves the pedagogical richness of language learning while harnessing the affordances of intelligent technology.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

This study has examined the multifaceted impact of artificial intelligence (AI) on English language learning in higher education through a mixed-methods approach that integrated quantitative data from 486 university students and qualitative insights from 32 student interviews and 10 teacher interviews. The findings demonstrate that AI tools — particularly automated writing evaluators, speech recognition systems, and translation assistants — have become integral to students' English learning routines. These tools support enhanced grammatical accuracy, pronunciation, learner autonomy, and real-time feedback, contributing to increased confidence and measurable proficiency improvements, especially in writing and speaking.

However, the study also uncovers several nuanced challenges. While AI can function as a powerful supplement to human instruction, it cannot replace the role of educators in fostering deep understanding, critical thinking, and communicative competence. Over-reliance on AI may lead to surface-level learning behaviors, reduced student reflection, and ethical concerns surrounding academic integrity and originality. Moreover, disparities in access to AI resources, digital literacy, and culturally relevant content risk reinforcing existing educational inequities rather than bridging them. Both students and teachers acknowledge the transformative potential of AI, but also express uncertainty about its long-term pedagogical implications.

From a theoretical standpoint, the findings align with constructivist and sociocultural learning theories, which emphasize interaction, contextual learning, and the importance of meaningful mediation. AI tools, when thoughtfully implemented, can scaffold language development and foster learner agency. Yet without deliberate pedagogical design and reflective use, their benefits may remain underrealized or even counterproductive.

Based on these conclusions, several recommendations are proposed. First, educational institutions should provide targeted training for both students and instructors on how to effectively and ethically use AI tools. Workshops, digital literacy modules, and AI-integrated curricula can empower learners to use technology as a developmental aid rather than a shortcut. Second, AI tools should be embedded within broader instructional strategies that prioritize language comprehension, self-expression, and intercultural awareness. Educators should encourage students to critically engage with AI feedback, question its limitations, and reflect on their own language choices. Third, policy-makers and platform developers should work toward improving the inclusivity and cultural adaptability of AI tools. This includes ensuring equitable access, incorporating diverse linguistic inputs, and offering user support in multiple educational contexts. Finally, future research should explore longitudinal impacts of AI usage on language acquisition, as well as cross-cultural comparisons and interdisciplinary frameworks that better capture the evolving nature of AI-assisted education.

In conclusion, while AI technologies are reshaping English language learning in higher education, their integration must be guided by pedagogical intentionality, ethical awareness, and a commitment to learner development. The human element remains irreplaceable, and the challenge ahead lies not in resisting AI, but in learning how to coexist with it in ways that enhance, rather than diminish, the educational experience.

References

1. J. Holmes, L. Sacchi and R. Bellazzi, "Artificial intelligence in medicine," *Ann. R. Coll. Surg. Engl.*, vol. 86, pp. 334–338, 2004. ISBN: 9783319195513.
2. M. K. Kabilan, N. Ahmad and M. J. Z. Abidin, "Facebook: An online environment for learning of English in institutions of higher education?," *Internet High. Educ.*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 179–187, 2010, doi: 10.1016/j.iheduc.2010.07.003.
3. M. Bond, K. Buntins, S. Bedenlier et al., "Mapping research in student engagement and educational technology in higher education: a systematic evidence map," *Int. J. Educ. Technol. High. Educ.*, vol. 17, p. 2, 2020, doi: 10.1186/s41239-019-0176-8.
4. M. L. Bernacki, M. J. Greene and N. G. Lobczowski, "A systematic review of research on personalized learning: personalized by whom, to what, how, and for what purpose(s)?," *Educ. Psychol. Rev.*, vol. 33, pp. 1675–1715, 2021, doi: 10.1007/s10648-021-09615-8.
5. Y. Xia, S.-Y. Shin and K.-S. Shin, "Designing personalized learning paths for foreign language acquisition using big data: theoretical and empirical analysis," *Appl. Sci.*, vol. 14, no. 20, p. 9506, 2024, doi: 10.3390/app14209506.