Arab World English Journal
INTERNATIONAL PEER REVIEWED JOURNAL ISSN: 2229-9327

Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Special Issue on Artificial Intelligence, No> 3. 2026. Pp.195-211
DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/AI3.13

Investigating EFL Learners' Perceptions of the Use of AI Language Tools: A Mixed-Method Study

Maryam W. Khalid
Translation Department, College of Languages, Nawroz University-Duhok
Kurdistan Region, Iraq
Emails: Maryam.khalid@nawroz.edu.krd

Received:10/19/2025 Accepted:12/28/2025 Published:01/24/2026

Abstract:
Artificial Intelligence-powered educational tools are increasingly shaping language learning worldwide; however, there is still limited research on how EFL learners in multilingual contexts perceive and experience these technologies. This study investigates the perceptions of English as a foreign language (EFL) learners at Nawroz University in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq regarding AI language-learning tools. Understanding these perceptions is crucial for effective pedagogical integration in culturally diverse educational settings. The study employs a mixed-methods design, utilizing a 28-item Likert-scale questionnaire (7-point scale) organized into six primary constructs derived from the Technology Acceptance Model and Constructivist Learning Theory. The researcher administered the questionnaire via the SurveyMonkey platform to 112 participants through academic communication channels, receiving 100 responses. The findings revealed positive insights into AI language-learning tools: 71% of participants reported increased confidence in their English, and 56% indicated that they received adequate learning support. The key factors identified included personalized learning pathways, immediate feedback, pronunciation exercises, and interactive dialogue capabilities. The study found noticeable improvement across several language skills, particularly in speaking confidence and grammatical accuracy. At the same time, educators need to take into account cultural contexts, levels of technological literacy, and the role of human instruction when implementing AI tools. Understanding learners' perceptions of AI language tools can therefore offer teachers useful guidance for integrating AI-supported learning in multilingual EFL settings.

Keywords: Artificial intelligence, constructivist learning theory, educational technology, English as a foreign language, learners' perceptions, mixed-methods research, technology acceptance model

How to cite: Khalid, M.W. (2026). Investigating EFL Learners' Perceptions of the Use of AI Language Tools: A Mixed-Method Study. *Arab World English Journal, Special Issue on Artificial Intelligence*, (3):195-211. https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/AI3.13

Introduction

English language proficiency is increasingly vital for academic and professional growth in the Kurdistan Region. However, English as a foreign language (EFL) learner face a number of unique challenges. In multilingual contexts, learners must navigate the simultaneous use of Kurdish, Arabic, and English. Traditional teaching approaches often fail to address individual learner needs, provide sufficient speaking practice, or offer timely feedback. In addition, large class sizes and limited collaboration among teachers further reduce the level of support available, making it difficult for learners to develop confidence in using English (Barzinji, 2024).

The advancement of AI has led to new solutions to educational challenges. AI-powered language learning tools, such as intelligent tutoring systems, adaptive platforms, and chatbots, offer benefits that traditional teachings rarely provide. These include personalized learning pathways, prompt error correction, unlimited practice, and continuous access (Godwin-Jones, 2019). These AI-powered capabilities are particularly promising for contexts like Kurdistan, where large class sizes and limited resources restrict the effectiveness of standard pedagogical approaches. In multilingual contexts, such as the Kurdistan Region of Iraq, learning technologies have not been effective in addressing individual differences and diverse learning needs. Here, learners interact with complex dynamics of Kurdish, Arabic, and English (Azeez & Al Bajalani, 2018).

Two principal theoretical frameworks underpin the use of AI in language teaching. Technology acceptance is widely used to explain how learners respond to new educational technologies. The Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), developed by Davis (1989), explains how users accept and adopt new technologies. According to Davis (1989), perceived usefulness refers to *"the degree to which a person believes that using a particular system would enhance his or her job performance"* (p. 320).

In addition to TAM, Constructivist Learning Theory (CLT) highlights student-centered methods and views learning as a process of knowledge construction. This theoretical approach was developed by Vygotsky (1978). Focusing on these two frameworks enables us to explore how AI tools can support individualized learning paths while maintaining high pedagogical standards. This research fills a significant gap by investigating how EFL learners use AI-powered teaching tools in their university classes.

Current studies have explored AI applications in language acquisition in general (Qiao & Zhao, 2023; Wei, 2023). Few studies have explicitly focused on multilingual learners in Middle Eastern countries (Aldawood & Almeshari, 2019). In these contexts, language diversity and cultural factors may significantly impact learners' acceptance and benefit from technology (Hosseini & Kamal, 2012; Zhao et al., 2024).

This paper employs a mixed-methods approach, grounded in the Technology Acceptance Model and Constructivist Learning Theory, to investigate EFL learners' attitudes toward AI-enhanced language learning tools at Nawroz University. It examines learners' acceptance and students' perceptions of how tools support English language development. The data address three primary research questions:

1. What are EFL learners' perceptions of the usefulness and ease of use of AI-based language learning tools?
2. Which AI features do learners value most for their language development?
3. How do the AI tools learners use relate to their self-reported gains in English language proficiency?

ISSN: 2229-9327

This study examines EFL learners' perceptions and use of AI-based language learning tools in a trilingual Middle Eastern context, focusing on both general technology acceptance factors and local influences shaping AI implementation.

Literature Review

Artificial Intelligence in Language Education

AI is a technology that helps to make work and daily tasks easier. A study by Cheng (2022) supports this by demonstrating that robust computing systems have sparked increased interest in creative computing and intelligent AI tools, leading to the development of new, beneficial applications.

AI impacts language teaching in various ways, including through intelligent tutoring programs and tools that support language learning. Recent research demonstrates the value of AI in language learning. Feng (2025) and Creely et al. (2025), for instance, have shown that AI can tailor learning experiences to individual learner needs and dynamically adapt to their progress.

Technology in Educational Contexts: Theoretical Foundations

Technology acceptance in education has become an important focus for researchers in the field of information systems. Understanding the extent to which learners accept and use new technologies is essential for both researchers and decision-makers who are responsible for shaping educational investments and policy frameworks (Teo, 2011).

The Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) provides a theoretical framework for explaining how learners adopt educational technologies. Davis (1989) identified perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use as the main determinants of technology adoption. Building upon these insights, Venkatesh and Davis (2000) developed TAM2 to incorporate social influence and cognitive instrumental processes for technology acceptance in academic environments.

AI-Enhanced Language Learning: From Theory to Practice

Constructivist learning theory (CLT), first proposed by Vygotsky in 1978 and subsequently developed by scholars such as Jonassen and Rohrer-Murphy (1999), highlights that learners construct understanding through purposeful activities and collaborative engagement. This view is frequently associated with AI's role in providing creative support, as it can address diverse educational challenges faced by individual learners.

The Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) is the core concept in Vygotsky's theory that describes the difference between what learners can do alone and what they can do with some support. AI-based language learning technologies can operate within this zone by providing personalized feedback to each student, making the learning experience easier or harder based on their progress (Hsu, 2019).

AI Applications in Second Language Acquisition

The use of AI in language acquisition has changed over time. Among the most exciting advancements in AI language education are intelligent tutoring systems (ITS). These systems combine subject matter expertise, student progress tracking, and teaching expertise to deliver truly personalized learning experiences. Meta-analytic research by Ma et al. (2014) demonstrated that ITS can produce learning gains equivalent to one-on-one human tutoring when properly designed and implemented.

Cultural and Linguistic Contexts: The Case of Kurdistan Region

The Kurdish language situation is unique, posing both opportunities and challenges for English teaching. Kurdish learners often navigate a trilingual environment: Kurdish, Arabic, and English. Learners may benefit from positive transfer between languages, or experience interference, depending on how closely related the languages are and their level of proficiency in each one. (Barzinji, 2024).

Method

Research Design

To explore EFL learners' perceptions of AI teaching tools and their relationship to self-reported language learning, the researcher employed two main theories: Vygotsky's (1978) Constructivist Learning Theory (CLT) and Davis' (1989) Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), adopting a mixed-methods approach.

Research Setting and Context

The research was conducted in the Department of Translation at Nawroz University in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq during the Spring 2025 semester. The research selected Nawroz University because its diverse student body reflects the multilingual nature of Kurdistan's higher education landscape.

Participants and Sampling Strategy

This current study aims to gather information from a particular sample. The study focused on undergraduate students in the Department of Translation at Nawroz University. These students enhance their English proficiency through translation classes and are a vital group of EFL learners in higher education. The researchers used specialized statistical software to determine the required sample size for reliable and meaningful results. The analysis indicated that at least 98 students were required, so the study recruited 100 participants to compensate for potential dropouts.

Participant Demographics

Table 1. *Participant demographics and background characteristics (N=100)*

Demographic Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Age Groups	18-20 years	42	42%
Age Groups	21-23 years	33	33%
Age Groups	24-26 years	18	18%
Age Groups	27-35 years	7	7%
Gender	Female	58	58%
Gender	Male	42	42%
Primary Language	Kurdish	70	70%
Primary Language	Arabic	30	30%
Department of Study	Translation	100	100%
Year in Translation Program	First Year	31	31%
Year in Translation Program	Second Year	34	34%
Year in Translation Program	Third Year	35	35%

English Proficiency Level	Intermediate	45	45%
English Proficiency Level	Upper-Intermediate	38	38%
English Proficiency Level	Advanced	17	17%
Geographic Origin	Urban	73	73%
Geographic Origin	Rural	27	27%
Previous AI Experience	Yes	78	78%
Previous AI Experience	No	22	22%

The study's participant group was diverse, with a slight female majority, which is typical of language programs. Most participants (78%) had prior experience with AI tools, enabling them to provide valuable feedback on AI effectiveness.

Instrument Development and Validation

Questionnaire Design

The researcher developed the research instrument through a systematic, theory-driven approach integrating TAM and CLT constructs .The questionnaire comprised 28 items organized into six primary constructs: Perceived Usefulness (six items), Perceived Ease of Use (five items), Personalized Learning Features (four items), Immediate Feedback Quality (four items), Learning Outcomes (six items), and Cultural Appropriateness (three items).

Validation Process

To ensure clarity and cultural suitability, the questionnaire was first reviewed through cognitive interviews with eight students from the target population. During these sessions, participants were asked to verbalize their thoughts while responding to the items, which helped identify areas of misunderstanding and potential cultural mismatch.

Following this stage, a pilot study was conducted with 25 participants to assess the instrument's reliability. The results indicated a satisfactory level of internal consistency, with a Cronbach's alpha value of 0.84.

Final Instrument Reliability

Table 2. *Internal consistency reliability coefficients*

Construct	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Perceived Usefulness	6	0.85
Perceived Ease of Use	5	0.82
Personalized Learning	4	0.79
Feedback Quality	4	0.81
Learning Outcomes	6	0.87
Cultural Appropriateness	3	0.74
Overall Scale	28	0.89

All reliability coefficients exceeded the 0.70 threshold recommended for exploratory research, with most surpassing 0.80, indicating good to excellent internal consistency.

Data Collection Procedures

The researcher collected data through SurveyMonkey over two weeks (April 15-30, 2025. The researcher selected SurveyMonkey as a cost-effective platform that provides essential features for academic research, including anonymous response collection, basic analytics, and mobile compatibility (SurveyMonkey, 2024). The researcher recruited participants from the Department of Translation through departmental announcements and academic communication channels. The process included: Ethical Approval (Institutional Review Board approval obtained, Protocol #2025-04-15), Informed Consent (Digital consent process with comprehensive participation information), Survey Administration (Anonymous, self-paced completion using SurveyMonkey's standard survey features), Response Monitoring (Manual monitoring of response patterns and completion times), and Quality Control (Screening for incomplete responses and obvious response patterns).89% of students finished the survey (100 out of 112), showing strong interest. The platform worked well for students, since most used their smartphones to take the survey.

Data Analysis Strategy

Quantitative Analysis

Quantitative data analysis was conducted using R (version 4.3.1) and included: Descriptive Statistics (Means, standard deviations, and frequency distributions), Reliability Analysis (Internal consistency assessment using Cronbach's alpha), Inferential Statistics (Multiple regression analysis to examine predictor relationships), and Group Comparisons (Independent t-tests and ANOVA for demographic differences).

Qualitative Analysis

The open-ended answers were analyzed by identifying common ideas and patterns, following the method outlined by Braun and Clarke (2006). The process involved identifying key points in the answers, grouping them into themes, and having another person review the work to ensure the results were reliable.

Mixed-Method Integration

The researcher integrated quantitative and qualitative data to provide a comprehensive understanding of participants' experiences with AI language learning tools.

Results

Descriptive Statistics and Overall Patterns

Data analysis revealed that EFL learners generally have positive perceptions of AI-enhanced language learning tools. Participants demonstrated strong acceptance of AI technologies while maintaining realistic expectations about their educational role.

Table 3. *Descriptive statistics for main study variables*

Variable	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Skewness	Kurtosis
Perceived Usefulness	5.67	1.12	2.33	7.00	-0.82	0.45
Perceived Ease of Use	5.12	1.24	1.80	7.00	-0.45	-0.23
Personalized Learning	5.43	1.18	2.25	7.00	-0.67	0.12
Feedback Quality	5.28	1.15	2.50	7.00	-0.58	0.08
Learning Outcomes	5.40	1.08	2.67	7.00	-0.71	0.34

Cultural Appropriateness	4.80	1.31	1.67	7.00	-0.31	-0.45
AI Tool Acceptance	5.45	1.06	2.80	7.00	-0.64	0.28

Data analysis shows acceptable normality with skewness and kurtosis values within acceptable ranges (±2.0), supporting the use of parametric statistical tests.

Technology Acceptance and Learning Outcomes

Table 4. *Learning outcome improvements by skill area*

Language Skill	% Reporting Improvement	Mean Improvement Score	Effect Size (Cohen's d)
Speaking Confidence	71%	5.40	1.19 (Large)
Grammatical Accuracy	73%	5.20	1.15 (Large)
Vocabulary Knowledge	68%	4.90	0.95 (Large)
Writing Quality	65%	4.70	0.87 (Large)
Pronunciation Skills	62%	4.50	0.78 (Medium)
Listening Comprehension	59%	4.30	0.71 (Medium)

The results demonstrate substantial improvements across all language skills, with speaking confidence and grammatical accuracy showing the most significant gains. These findings align with students' preferences for AI features that provide immediate feedback and error correction.

AI Feature Preferences and Priorities

Table 5. *Student preferences for AI learning features*

Feature Category	1st Priority	2nd Priority	3rd Priority	Weighted Score
Personalized Learning Pathways	40%	26%	18%	40%
Immediate Feedback Systems	30%	32%	22%	30%
Pronunciation Practice Tools	20%	19%	28%	20%
Interactive Dialogue Capabilities	10%	15%	20%	10%

Students demonstrated clear preferences for adaptive, personalized features over entertainment-focused elements, reflecting a pragmatic approach to technology adoption focused on learning effectiveness.

Cultural and Linguistic Background Analysis

Table 6. *Comparison by first language background*

Variable	Kurdish L1 (n=70)		Arabic L1 (n=30)		Statistical Test
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Pronunciation Tool Acceptance	5.80	1.05	4.90	1.23	t(98)=3.12, p=.002
Text-Based Tool Preference	5.20	1.18	6.10	0.95	t(98)=-2.85, p=.005
Overall AI Acceptance	5.60	1.08	5.30	1.02	t(98)=1.25, p=.215
Cultural Appropriateness	4.20	1.35	3.80	1.21	t(98)=1.32, p=.189

Note: $p < .05$, $p < .01$

The analysis revealed that students' first language influenced their preferences for specific technology features. Kurdish speakers showed a stronger preference for pronunciation-focused tools, whereas Arabic speakers favored text-based learning resources.

Predictive Model of AI Tool Acceptance

The researcher conducted a statistical analysis to identify factors motivating students to use AI language learning tools.

Table 7. *Multiple regression analysis results*

Predictor Variable	B	SE B	B	T	P	95% CI
Constant	0.43	0.28	-	1.54	.127	-0.12, 0.98
Perceived Usefulness	0.51	0.08	0.54	6.75	<.001	0.36, 0.66
Perceived Ease of Use	0.26	0.07	0.31	4.43	<.001	0.13, 0.39
Cultural Appropriateness	0.18	0.09	0.22	2.44	.017	0.03, 0.33

Model Summary: $R^2 = .67$, $F(3,96) = 64.73$, $p < .001$

The model explained 67% of the variance in AI tool acceptance intentions. Perceived usefulness emerged as the strongest predictor, followed by ease of use and cultural appropriateness, supporting the extended TAM framework.

Implementation Challenges and Barriers

Table 8. Student-identified implementation challenges

Challenge	Frequency	Percentage	Priority Level
Limited Kurdish Language Interface	67	67%	Critical
Internet Connectivity Issues	42	42%	High
Insufficient Teacher Guidance	34	34%	Medium
Device Storage Limitations	31	31%	Medium
Cost Considerations	28	28%	Medium
Technical Complexity	23	23%	Low

Qualitative Findings and Thematic Analysis

The qualitative analysis revealed four major themes that provide deeper insight into students' experiences with AI-enhanced language learning.

Theme 1: Safe Learning Environment

Students consistently emphasized the psychological safety that AI tools provide for language practice. Representative quotes include: "With AI, I can make mistakes without feeling embarrassed. This freedom helps me practice speaking more confidently." (Female, 20, Kurdish L1)

Theme 2: Personalized Learning Value

Participants appreciated the adaptive nature of AI systems that respond to individual learning needs: "The AI remembers what I struggle with and keeps helping me until I improve. It is like having a personal tutor available 24/7." (Male, 22, Arabic L1)

Theme 3: Cultural Connection Needs

Students expressed desire for more culturally relevant content and examples: "I wish the AI used examples from Kurdish culture instead of always Western contexts. It would make learning more meaningful for us." (Female, 21, Kurdish L1)

Theme 4: Complementary Educational Role

Learners demonstrated sophisticated understanding of AI's appropriate role in education: "AI is excellent for practice and immediate feedback, but we still need teachers for cultural explanations and complex grammar concepts." (Male, 23, Kurdish L1)

Statistical Assumptions and Data Quality

The researchers verified all statistical assumptions: Normality (Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests indicated acceptable normality, $p > .05$), Linearity (Scatterplots confirmed linear relationships between continuous variables), Homoscedasticity (Levene's tests supported the equality of variances assumption), Independence (Random sampling and anonymous responses ensured independence), and Multicollinearity (VIF values < 3.0 indicated acceptable collinearity levels).

Discussion

Technology Acceptance in Multilingual Contexts

This study provides objective evidence that using AI tools in multilingual EFL classrooms, particularly with Kurdish translation students, can be effective. The findings indicate that three factors predict students' acceptance of AI language learning tools: perceived usefulness, ease of use, and cultural relevance. This finding supports the cross-cultural applicability of the Technology Acceptance Model beyond Western contexts (Davis, 1989; Tarhini et al., 2017).

The research shows that students reported significant improvement in various language areas, with 71% feeling more confident in speaking and 73% noting an improvement in their grammar. These results provide a new perspective on how culture influences education and align with other research indicating that AI tools are beneficial in language learning (Huang et al., 2022; Ma et al., 2014).

This paper contributes to earlier studies by demonstrating that the degree to which technology aligns with local culture is crucial for determining whether people will use it in group learning. This finding prompts us to question whether ideas about technology acceptance from Western countries are applicable everywhere, highlighting the need for theories that account for cultural differences (Hofstede, 2001; Straub et al., 1997).

The study found that EFL learners prefer different kinds of learning tools, some students like text-based features, while others prefer pronunciation features. These differences appear to be linked to learners' first language influences on their learning, particularly in the context of technology. The results suggest that educators should adjust AI learning tools for students with different language backgrounds rather than applying a one-size-fits-all approach (Cenoz & Gorter, 2020; Kroll & Bialystok, 2013).

The study demonstrates that ideas from constructivist learning can be effectively integrated with AI teaching, as evidenced by students' acceptance of step-by-step feedback and learning that meets their individual needs (chosen by 40% of students). This research helps us see how flexible technology can support students at different learning levels (Hsu, 2019; Vygotsky, 1978).

Schools and universities should prioritize cultural alignment and comprehensive user training when adopting AI tools, rather than simply chasing the latest technology. The average ease-of-use score (M = 5.12) indicates that success depends more on robust instructional support and training than on advanced features (Sato & Loewen, 2019).

Since 34% of students asked teachers for help in choosing AI tools, it is clear that teachers need good training programs. Teachers should learn not only how to use these tools but also how to integrate them as supplements to, rather than replacements for, their instruction (Qiao & Zhao, 2023).

The order of student preferences (personalized learning, instant feedback, pronunciation, and then conversation) provides clear guidance for incorporating AI into EFL classes. Instead of using all technology at once, focusing on the most wanted features may give the best results while saving resources (Godwin-Jones, 2019).

The significant role of cultural fit in students' acceptance of AI tools highlights the need for educational AI to be adapted to local culture, rather than merely translated. Developers should include local examples and make the tools feel familiar to users (Tarhini et al., 2017).

The clear order of what students like most helps decide which AI features to develop first. Instant feedback and personalized help are the most important, while entertainment features are less valued. These priorities suggest that academic effectiveness takes precedence over enjoyment in this educational context (Ma et al., 2014).

Since 42% of students experienced internet problems and 31% had storage issues, developers should design AI tools to function across diverse technological environments. Features such as working offline, using less data, and running smoothly with slow internet should be a priority in areas with less reliable technology (Pedro, 2019).

This study fills a critical gap by examining how students who speak more than one language utilize AI language tools in complex language settings. These findings illuminate how multilingualism influences students' technology acceptance and use, providing direction for future research (Barzinji, 2024).

This study provides objective evidence for culture's influence on technology acceptance, contradicting one-size-fits-all adoption models. These findings are relevant not just to language learning but also to any educational technology used in settings with diverse cultures (Zhao et al., 2024).

The study demonstrates how to combine quantitative analysis with open-ended responses to gain a comprehensive understanding of how students utilize educational technology. Researchers can use this approach to guide future investigations (Plano, 2017).

Limitations of the Research

This study has several significant findings. Since all 100 participants came from a single urban university, the results may not be generalizable to rural students or individuals from other regions of Kurdistan or with different language backgrounds (Tarhini et al., 2017). The students from the Translation Department may not represent all types of learners. Since the researcher collected data at one point in time, this study cannot establish cause-and-effect relationships.

Some responses might not be entirely accurate, as participants may have provided overly optimistic answers or misjudged themselves. The participants may demonstrate response acquiescence, with high mean scores ($M > 4.8$) potentially reflecting cultural tendencies toward harmony. They lack clear guidance on how to utilize AI tools effectively. They are unsure whether to use AI academically, and if so, how and where to use it (Kroll & Bialystok, 2013).

Finally, because technology is evolving rapidly, and nearly half of the students reported experiencing internet connectivity issues, these factors could impact the future use of AI tools. Moreover, since all participants spoke Kurdish or Arabic as their first language, the findings may not be generalizable to other linguistic groups.

Conclusion

The main conclusions of this study are that students' use and acceptance of AI language learning tools can be predicted by how useful, easy to use, and culturally appropriate they find them, even outside Western countries. These predictive relationships are especially powerful for Kurdish translation students. The study found that students reported improvements across multiple language skills: 71% felt more confident in speaking, and 73% noted improved grammar. As AI technology evolves rapidly, ongoing research and updates will be necessary to ensure these tools benefit all language learners fairly and effectively.

Final Recommendations

Based on these findings, this study offers several practical recommendations for Kurdish EFL educators and other multilingual educational contexts.

Educational institutions should focus on four key areas: selecting culturally appropriate AI tools, developing comprehensive teacher training programs for AI integration, improving technological infrastructure, and implementing AI features incrementally rather than all at once.

AI Tool Developers should find out what local users need before making and adapting their tools. They should focus on features like instant feedback and personalized help, not just entertainment. Tools should be compatible with various technology environments, and developers should collaborate with teachers to ensure the tools align with teaching needs.

Future Research Directions

Future research should pursue two complementary directions. First, long-term studies should investigate AI tools' direct impact on language learning outcomes. Second, research should examine implementation perspectives from both students and teachers. Student-focused studies should analyze engagement patterns and their effects on learning, while teacher-focused research should explore training needs, attitudes toward AI technology, and barriers to classroom adoption.

Finding: This research is not funded.
Acknowledgments: The authors would like to express their gratitude to the Department of Translation at Nawroz University.
Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.
Authenticity: This manuscript is an original work
Artificial Intelligence Statement: During the preparation of this work, the authors used Grammarly to improve readability and language. The authors reviewed and edited the content as needed and they take full responsibility for the content of the publication.

About the Author:

Maryam Waleed Khalid is an Assistant Lecturer in the Department of Translation at Nawroz University, Kurdistan Region, Iraq. Her academic interests include the integration of educational technology in language learning, the use of artificial intelligence in EFL contexts, and translation studies. Her research particularly focuses on learners' acceptance of digital tools, the pedagogical implications of AI-enhanced language learning, and the role of digital literacy in translation education. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0008-8979-7402

References

Abdulaziz Aldawood, A., & Almeshari, F. (2019). Effects of learning culture on English-language learning for Saudi EFL students. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Volume, 10*. https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol10no3.23

Azeez, P. Z., & Al Bajalani, F. R. (2018). Effects of mobile assisted language learning on developing Kurdish EFL students: Listening sub skills at Koya University. *Koya University Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 1*(1), 85-95. https://doi.org/10.14500/kujhss.v1n1y2018.pp85-95

Barzinji, P. A. (2024). Implications and insights: A comprehensive review of English language teaching research in Iraqi Kurdistan. *Studies in Literature and Language*, *28*(1), 22-30. http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/13321

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77-101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2020). Teaching English through pedagogical translanguaging. *World Englishes*, *39*(2), 300-311. https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12462

Cheng, T. (2022). The application of a web-based scientific computing system in innovation and entrepreneurship. *Discrete Dynamics in Nature and Society*, *2022*(1), 1453889. https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/1453889

Clark, V. P., & Ivankova, N. V. (2017). Mixed methods research. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, *12*(3), 305-306.https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2016.1262619

Creely, E., Barnes, M., Tour, E., Henderson, M., Waterhouse, P., Pena, M. A., & Patel, S. V. (2025). Exploring attitudes to generative AI in education for English as an additional language (EAL) adult learners. *ReCALL*, *37*(Special Issue 2), 174-190. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0958344024000314

Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly*, *13*(3), 319-340. https://doi.org/10.2307/249008

Feng, L. (2025). Investigating the effects of artificial intelligence-assisted language learning strategies on cognitive load and learning outcomes: A comparative study. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, *62*(8), 1961–1994. https://doi.org/10.1177/07356331241268349

Godwin-Jones, R. (2019). In a world of SMART technology, why learn another language? *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, *+22*(2), 4-13. https://doi.org/10.30191/ETS.201904_22(2).0002

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.

Hosseini, Z., & Kamal, A. (2012). Developing an instrument to measure perceived technology integration knowledge of teachers. *International Magazine on Advances in Computer Science and Telecommunications, 3*(1), 79-89.

Hsu, L. (2019). Using scaffolding and game-based learning to teach EFL writing: A case study of a Taiwanese junior high school. *System*, *86*, 102128. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.102128

Huang, W., Hew, K. F., & Fryer, L. K. (2022). Chatbots for language learning—Are they really useful? A systematic review of chatbot-supported language learning. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, *38*(1), 237-257. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12610

Jonassen, D. H., & Rohrer-Murphy, L. (1999). Activity theory as a framework for designing constructivist learning environments. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, *47*(1), 61-79. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02299477

Kroll, J. F., & Bialystok, E. (2013). Understanding the consequences of bilingualism for language processing and cognition. *Journal of Cognitive Psychology*, *25*(5), 497-514. https://doi.org/10.1080/20445911.2013.799170

Ma, W., Adesope, O. O., Nesbit, J. C., & Liu, Q. (2014). Intelligent tutoring systems and learning outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *106*(4), 901-918. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037123

Pedro, F. (2019). *Artificial intelligence in education: Challenges and opportunities for sustainable development*. Paris, France: UNESCO Publishing.

Qiao, H., & Zhao, A. (2023). Artificial intelligence-based language learning: Illuminating the impact on speaking skills and self-regulation in the Chinese EFL context. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *14*, 1255594. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1255594

Sato, M., & Loewen, S. (2019). *Evidence-based second language pedagogy*.Routledge.

Straub, D., Keil, M., & Brenner, W. (1997). Testing the technology acceptance model across cultures: A three-country study. *Information & Management*, *33*(1), 1-11. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-7206(97)00026-8

SurveyMonkey. (2024). SurveyMonkey platform [Survey software]. https://www.surveymonkey.com

Tarhini, A., Hone, K., Liu, X., & Tarhini, T. (2017). Examining the moderating effect of individual-level cultural values on users' acceptance of E-learning in developing countries: A structural equation modeling of an extended technology acceptance model. *Interactive Learning Environments*, *25*(3), 306-328. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2015.1122635

Teo, T. (2011). Factors influencing teachers' intention to use technology: Model development and test. *Computers & Education*, *57*(4), 2432-2440. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2011.06.008

Venkatesh, V., & Davis, F. D. (2000). A theoretical extension of the technology acceptance model: Four longitudinal field studies. *Management Science*, *46*(2), 186-204. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.46.2.186.11926

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wei, L. (2023). Artificial intelligence in language instruction: Impact on English learning achievement, L2 motivation, and self-regulated learning. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *14*, 1261955. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1261955

Zhao, P., Hassan, A., & Burhanuddin, N. A. N. (2024). A systematic review of factors influencing English language competency for ethnic minority students: an ecological systems theory perspective. *Cogent Education*, *11*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2024.2415730

Appendices

Appendix A: Survey Questionnaire

Section A: Demographic Information

#	Question	Response Options
1	Age	_____ years
2	Gender	☐ Male ☐ Female
3	Primary Language	☐ Kurdish ☐ Arabic ☐ Other: _____
4	Academic Year	☐ First ☐ Second ☐ Third ☐ Fourth
5	Year in Translation Program	☐ First Year ☐ Second Year ☐ Third Year ☐ Fourth Year
6	English Proficiency Level	☐ Beginner ☐ Intermediate ☐ Upper-Intermediate ☐ Advanced
7	Geographic Origin	☐ Urban ☐ Rural
8	Previous AI Tool Experience	☐ Yes ☐ No If yes, which tools: ☐ Google Translate ☐ Grammarly ☐ Duolingo ☐ ChatGPT ☐ Other: _____

Sections B-G: Likert Scale Questions

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree | 2 = Disagree | 3 = Somewhat Disagree | 4 = Neutral | 5 = Somewhat Agree | 6 = Agree | 7 = Strongly Agree

No.	Variables	Section	Statement	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Section B: Perceived Usefulness									
8		PU	AI language learning tools would enhance English learning effectiveness	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9		PU	Using AI tools would improve overall English performance	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10		PU	AI tools would help students achieve their learning objectives more easily	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11		PU	students perceived AI language learning tools as genuinely useful for their studies	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
12		PU	AI tools would accelerate the English learning process	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
13		PU	Using AI tools would improve students' overall English performance	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	Section C: Perceived Ease of Use									

14		PEOU	Learning to operate AI language tools would be easy for students	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
15		PEOU	Students would find AI language tools easy to use	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
16		PEOU	It would be easy for students to become skillful at using AI language tools	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
17		PEOU	AI language tools would have clear and understandable instructions	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
18		PEOU	Interacting with AI language tools would be straightforward	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	Section D: Personalized Learning Features									
19		PLF	AI tools would adapt content to match students' learning pace.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
20		PLF	AI systems would provide material appropriate for students' level	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
21		PLF	AI tools would offer individualized learning pathways for students' needs.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
22		PLF	AI technology would adjust to students' specific learning requirements.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	Section E: Immediate Feedback Quality									
23		IFQ	AI tools would provide helpful instant corrections of students' errors	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
24		IFQ	Real-time feedback from AI would help students learn from mistakes quickly.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
25		IFQ	AI tools would give students valuable suggestions for improvement	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
26		IFQ	Immediate AI feedback would make students' learning more effective	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	Section F: Learning Outcomes									
27		LO	AI tools would increase students' confidence in speaking English	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

ISSN: 2229-9327

28		LO	Grammatical accuracy would improve through the use of an AI	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
29		LO	AI tools would help expand students' English vocabulary	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
30		LO	Students' English writing quality would improve with AI assistance	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
31		LO	Students would feel more confident using English after using AI tools	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
32		LO	Overall, AI tools would enhance students' English language learning	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	Section G: Cultural Appropriateness									
33		CA	AI language tools would respect students' cultural backgrounds and values	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
34		CA	Content in AI tools would be appropriate for Kurdish learners	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
35		CA	Students would feel culturally comfortable using AI language learning tools	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Section H: Feature Ranking

#	Question	Response
36	Please rank the following AI features in order of importance (1 = Most Important, 4 = Least Important)	___ Personalized learning pathways that adapt to my level ___ Immediate feedback and error correction ___ Pronunciation practice and speech recognition ___ Interactive dialogue practice with AI

Section I: Open-Ended Questions

#	Question	Response
37	Describe a positive experience with AI language learning tools, whether experienced or expected	
38	What improvements would most benefit Kurdish EFL learners in AI language tools?	
39	How should AI tools work together with traditional teaching methods?	

ISSN: 2229-9327

40	What cultural factors should AI tool developers consider when designing for Kurdish/Arabic students?	

Thanks for participating. These responses will help investigate EFL learners' perceptions of the Use of AI Language Tools.