



COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF TEACHERS' ATTITUDES TOWARD THE USE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING: A SURVEY- BASED STUDY AT M. AUEZOV SOUTH KAZAKHSTAN UNIVERSITY

N.A. Yesimkhanova¹ , S.K. Mamekova^{*2} , S.N. Kurbanbaeva³ ,
Zh. Dzhunusbekova⁴ , S.N. Kozhanov⁵ 

^{1,2,3,4,5} M. Auezov South Kazakhstan University, Shymkent, Kazakhstan

E-mail: ¹yesimkhanovan@list.ru, ^{*2}smamekova@mail.ru, ³saule_kurban@mail.ru,
⁴dzhunusbekova1976@mail.ru, ⁵aazaazel@mail.ru

Abstract. Teachers' attitudes toward the use of artificial intelligence (AI) in English language teaching at M. Auezov South Kazakhstan University, the largest university in South Kazakhstan is considered in this study. Conducted with 30 teachers from the "Foreign languages for technical specialties" chair, the research employs a mixed-methods approach, integrating surveys for quantitative data and thematic analysis for qualitative insights. The findings reveal that teachers generally hold a positive view of AI, appreciating its potential to automate routine tasks, enhance personalized learning, and improve student engagement. However, attitudes vary significantly based on age, teaching experience, and digital literacy, with younger teachers showing greater enthusiasm. Major barriers include insufficient technical training, limited access to AI tools, and concerns about AI potentially replacing teachers. The study highlights the need for targeted professional development to address these challenges and foster effective AI integration. Practical recommendations are proposed, such as providing training on AI tools, ensuring access to reliable technology, and promoting a balanced approach that combines AI with traditional teaching methods. These insights contribute to understanding teachers' perspectives on AI in language education and offer strategies to enhance its adoption in Kazakhstan's universities.

Key words: artificial intelligence, teachers' attitudes, higher education institutions, digitalization of education.

Introduction

In today's globalized and digitally driven world, artificial intelligence (AI) is becoming a powerful force in reshaping education, particularly in the area of foreign language instruction like English. In the context of Kazakhstan, where English is increasingly seen as essential for professional interaction—especially within technical and scientific sectors—there is a pressing demand for more dynamic and effective teaching strategies. Despite the growing body of international research on artificial intelligence in education, limited attention has been paid to teachers' perceptions of AI integration in the context of higher education institutions in Central Asia. In particular, there is a lack of empirical evidence regarding how university teachers in Kazakhstan perceive the opportunities and challenges associated with AI-supported English language instruction. This gap hinders the development of evidence-based strategies for effective AI implementation in language education. The incorporation of AI into language learning creates valuable opportunities for tailoring instruction to individual needs, offering real-time feedback, and fostering skill development through engaging digital tools. Nevertheless, the widespread use of AI in classrooms is still met with several hurdles, ranging from infrastructural and technological constraints to uncertainties in teaching methodology and cautious attitudes from educators rooted in traditional practices. Existing studies, such as those by Li and Ma, highlight the opportunities and challenges of AI in language education, emphasizing its ability to tailor learning experiences, yet they often overlook the specific teachers' attitudes in diverse cultural contexts like Kazakhstan (Li and Ma, 2020). Similarly, Wang and Zhang explored global perspectives on teachers' attitudes toward AI, but their findings lack depth regarding the unique socio-educational environment of Kazakhstan, particularly in technical education (Wang and Zhang, 2021). At M. Auezov South Kazakhstan University, the largest university in South Kazakhstan with 15,000 students, including 4% international students, the “Foreign languages for technical specialties” chair provides an ideal setting to investigate these dynamics (Times Higher Education, 2024). The study's aim is to comparatively analyze teachers' attitudes toward the use of AI in teaching English and identify factors influencing their perceptions. Despite the growing international literature on AI-assisted language learning, empirical evidence from Kazakhstan remains limited. Therefore, investigating teachers' attitudes toward AI in this context is important for understanding the opportunities and challenges of technology integration in higher education.

Scientific Novelty

The scientific novelty of this study lies in its empirical examination of university teachers' attitudes toward the use of artificial intelligence in English language teaching within the context of Kazakhstan's higher education system. Unlike previous studies that primarily focused on technological aspects of AI adoption or were conducted in other educational environments, this research identifies the relationship between teachers' age, teaching experience, digital competence, and their readiness to integrate AI into pedagogical practice. Furthermore, the study contributes to the limited body of research on AI implementation in language education in Central Asia and provides context-specific recommendations for higher education institutions.

Literature Review

Recent international studies have further expanded research on AI in English language teaching. Crompton and Odu (2024) discuss both the affordances and challenges of AI for English language teaching and learning. Hınız (2024) examines teachers' and students' perceptions of ChatGPT integration in a foreign-language school, while Cogo, Patsko and Szoke (2024) discuss the opportunities and ethical and pedagogical issues associated with generative AI in ELT. Lee et al. (2025) further consider the implications of generative AI for English language teaching from a Global Englishes perspective.

Teachers' attitudes toward AI are shaped by both the potential benefits of the technology and concerns about its implementation. Celik et al. (2022), in a systematic review of research on AI and teachers, found that AI can support teachers by assisting with instructional and administrative tasks, while its implementation also raises challenges related to teachers' competencies, professional roles, and the need for appropriate preparation. The authors emphasize that teachers need sufficient knowledge and skills to use AI effectively and critically. Fütterer et al. (2023) also reported that reactions to ChatGPT in education were mixed, with educators recognizing its potential while expressing concerns about the implications of generative AI for teaching and learning. These findings suggest that teachers' readiness to use AI depends not only on the perceived usefulness of the technology but also on their competence and confidence in integrating it into educational practice.

In Kazakhstan, the implementation of AI is supported by national digitalization initiatives. Recent research in the Kazakhstani higher education context indicates that technical barriers and limited digital training may hinder the implementation of AI in universities (Meiramova and Zagatova, 2025).

Methodology

The study was conducted using a mixed methodology, including quantitative and qualitative methods, to provide a comprehensive analysis of teachers' attitudes towards AI usage. The study involved 30 teachers from the "Foreign language for technical specialties" chair at M. Auezov South Kazakhstan university. The sample was formed using the purposive selection method to include teachers of different ages (from 25 to 60 years), work experience (from 2 to 30 years) and level of digital competence (from beginner to advanced). Although the sample size was limited, purposive sampling was employed to ensure diversity in terms of age, teaching experience, and digital competence.

Data collection methods

At the preparatory stage, we focused on studying the theoretical foundations of using AI in teaching English.

Based on the literature review, we developed a questionnaire for data collection. The questionnaire included 10 closed questions (Likert scale 1-5, where 1 is "completely disagree", 5 is "completely agree") and 3 open questions. Examples of closed questions: *"AI helps me save time on checking assignments"*, *"I am afraid that AI will replace the teacher"*. Open questions: *"What advantages do you see in using AI?"*, *"What difficulties arise when implementing AI?"* The questionnaire was tested on 5 colleagues to ensure the clarity of the wording, after which we agreed on its implementation with the head of the chair.

At the first stage, we selected a sample of 30 teachers from the "Foreign language for technical specialties" chair at SKU using the purposive sampling method. The sample included teachers of different ages (25–60 years), years of experience (2–30 years), and levels of digital competence (from beginner to advanced) for a variety of factors. We distributed a questionnaire to all teachers. All 30 teachers completed the questionnaire, which ensured a 100% return rate. Data collection took 2 weeks.

In addition, we analyzed the department's curricula to understand whether technology was already being used in teaching. We found that teachers were using online platforms such as "Kahoot", but the direct use of AI (e.g., chatbots or automatic pronunciation checkers) was limited. This confirmed the study's relevance, since the AI implementation is at an early stage.

In the data analysis stage, we used a mixed methodology, combining quantitative and qualitative approaches, as recommended in the educational research literature (Creswell, 2014).

Quantitative analysis:

We processed the responses to the closed-ended questions using SPSS. For each statement, we calculated the mean score (M) and standard deviation (SD). For example, for the statement "*AI helps personalize learning*," the mean score was 3.8 (SD = 0.9), indicating a moderately positive attitude. We also conducted a t-test to compare under 40 teachers' attitudes ($n = 15$, $M = 4.0$) and over 40 ($n = 15$, $M = 3.5$), which showed a significant difference ($t(28) = 2.15$, $p = 0.04$). In addition, we used Pearson correlation analysis to assess the relationship between the digital competence level and readiness to use AI. The result showed a positive correlation ($r = 0.67$, $p < 0.01$), which confirms the hypothesis about the influence of digital skills.

Qualitative analysis:

We analyzed the responses to the open-ended questions using thematic analysis, following the methodology of Braun & Clarke. First, we reviewed the responses, then coded them, identifying key ideas. For example, the phrase "*AI helps check pronunciation*" was coded as "automation". Then we grouped the codes into themes:

Advantages of AI: automation (18 mentions), personalization of learning (15 mentions).

Barriers: technical difficulties (12 mentions), concerns about replacing the teacher (8 mentions).

We used NVivo software to organize the codes, which simplified the analysis.

Based on our analysis, we came to the following conclusions. SKUs teachers generally have a positive attitude towards AI (the average score for most statements is above 3.5), especially valuing its ability to automate routine tasks and personalize learning. However, differences were observed between the age groups, while teachers with lower levels of digital competence more often reported concerns about technical difficulties and the possible replacement of teachers. Qualitative data showed that a lack of training in working with AI was one of the main barriers. This finding is consistent with previous research emphasizing the importance of structured professional development and institutional support for teachers in adopting educational technologies (El Shaban & Egbert, 2018).

Based on the obtained research results, we offer recommendations such as introducing AI in stages, starting with simple tools (for example, Grammarly for checking texts), and organizing training on the use of AI for teachers. These recommendations may be useful for SKU and other universities in Kazakhstan, where digitalization of education is supported actively.

Results and discussion

Quantitative Results

The questionnaire, consisting of 10 closed questions, was filled in by all 30 teachers of the "Foreign language for technical specialties" chair of SKU (return rate: 100%). The answers were assessed on a Likert scale from 1 to 5 (1 - "completely disagree", 5 - "completely agree"). For each question, the mean score (M), standard deviation (SD), and percentage of agreement (the proportion of respondents who chose 4 or 5 points) were calculated. The data were processed using the SPSS program, and statistical analysis was also carried out to compare groups and identify correlations.

Using the statement example "*AI helps personalize learning for students*" from the survey, we will take a closer look at how we arrived at these figures.

Quantitative data were analyzed using SPSS. Descriptive statistics (mean scores and standard deviations) were calculated for all questionnaire items. Independent-samples t-tests were conducted to compare age groups, while Pearson correlation analysis was used to examine relationships between digital competence and readiness to use AI

So, the final results for the first question look like this: average score (M) = 3.8, standard deviation = 0.9, percentage of agreement = 70%

For all the other 9 questions, we did the same calculations that we wrote in Table 1.

Table 1. Results of closed questions

	Statement	Mean score (M)	Standard deviation (SD)	Percentage of agreement (4–5 points)
1	AI helps personalize learning for students	3.8	0.9	70%
2	AI saves time on checking written assignments	4.0	0.7	80%
3	AI improves students' pronunciation skills	3.6	1.0	60%
4	I feel confident in using AI in teaching	3.2	1.1	40%
5	I am afraid that AI will replace the teacher in the future	3.2	1.1	40%
6	AI requires significant technical resources that we do not have	3.5	0.9	53%
7	AI can be useful for creating interactive tasks	3.9	0.8	73%
8	Using AI reduces the quality of interaction between the student and the teacher	2.9	1.2	30%
9	I am willing to undergo training to effectively use AI	4.1	0.6	83%
10	AI should be integrated into English language teaching at our university	3.7	0.9	67%

Using this method, we also compared attitudes towards the use of AI in teaching English between two groups of SKU teachers: under 40 years old and over 40 years old. This statistical method helped us determine whether there was a significant difference in their perception of AI, which was one of the study's objectives. The result of the t-test was: $t(28) = 2.15$, $p = 0.04$, which indicates a significant difference from a statistical point of view.

For the calculation, we divided the participants into two groups: over 40 years old and under. In the questionnaire mentioned earlier, when filling it out, teachers had to indicate their age, which allowed us to distribute them into two groups of 15 people. The average score in both groups was 15. The standard deviation for each of the groups was: for group 1 (under 40 years old) - 0.17 and 0.18 for group 2, respectively. As a result, we obtained:

Group 1: $M_1 = 4.0$, $SD_1 = 0.17$

Group 2: $M_2 = 3.5$, $SD_2 = 0.18$

From the obtained results, we can say that junior teachers, on average, have a more positive attitude towards AI (4.0 vs. 3.5), and there is no big difference in the answers, which indicates similarity of judgments.

Qualitative results

The qualitative results of the study were obtained based on the responses of 30 teachers of the "Foreign language for technical specialties" chair of SKU to three open-ended questions of the questionnaire aimed at identifying their perceptions of the artificial intelligence (AI) usage in teaching English. To analyze this data, we used thematic analysis following the methodology of Braun and Clarke, which is a standard approach for processing qualitative data in educational research (Braun and Clarke, 2006). The questionnaire was distributed to 30 teachers who provided responses, which ensured a 100% return rate. The open-ended questions were as follows:

Question 11: "What advantages do you see in using AI in English language teaching?"

Question 12: "What difficulties arise in implementing AI in English language teaching?"

Question 13: "What measures will help to effectively implement AI in English language teaching?"

We designed the questions to elicit teachers' subjective views on AI, including both positive and negative aspects. The answers varied in length, from a single sentence (e.g., "*AI saves time*") to several lines (e.g., "*We don't have the equipment, and I'm afraid that AI will make teachers redundant*"). After collecting the data, each answer was numbered (e.g., Teacher 1, Teacher 2, etc.) to preserve anonymity but still track the data source. We removed blank answers (e.g., "*I don't know*" or gaps), but these were few in number as all questions were mandatory. The result was 90 text responses (30 teachers × 3 questions), which formed the data basis for further analysis.

Next, we took notes on recurring ideas and keywords. For example, in the answers to question 11 (advantages of AI), the words "automation", "time", "pronunciation", "personalization" were frequently encountered. In the answers to question 12 (challenges), the words "equipment", "internet", "training", "replacement" stood out.

Answer to question 11: "AI helps check pronunciation, which saves time."

Codes: "automation", "time saving", "pronunciation".

Answer to question 12: "We don't have the equipment to work with AI."

Codes: "technical difficulties", "lack of equipment".

Answer to question 12: "I'm afraid that AI will make the teacher unnecessary."

Codes: "fears of replacement", "role of the teacher".

Answer to question 13: "We need training for teachers so that we can use AI."

Codes: "training", "preparation".

In the end, we identified about 20 unique codes, such as "automation", "personalization", "technical difficulties", "fears of replacement", "training", "infrastructure". Some responses contained multiple codes, as teachers mentioned different aspects (e.g., "*AI saves time, but we don't have the Internet*" - codes for "automation" and "technical difficulties")

After coding, we began thematic extraction, grouping codes into broader themes that reflected the main ideas expressed by teachers. We focused on questions 11 and 12, as they directly related to the benefits and barriers mentioned in the results. Question 13 (implementation measures) was analyzed separately for recommendations. The frequency of mention was:

Theme "Advantages of AI"

The code "automation" (e.g., "*AI checks assignments automatically*") was mentioned 18 times (60% of teachers).

The code "personalization" (e.g., "*AI adjusts assignments to the student's level*") was mentioned 15 times (50%).

The code "pronunciation" (e.g., "*AI helps check pronunciation*") was included in the theme "automation" as it is related to the automation of assessment, and was mentioned 10 times (33%), but was not highlighted as a separate theme due to its lower frequency.

Example: "*AI helps check pronunciation, which saves time*" (Teacher 5).

Theme “Obstacles”:

The code “technical difficulties” (e.g., “*No equipment*”, “*Bad internet*”) was mentioned 12 times (40%).

The code “fears of replacement” (e.g., “*AI can replace a teacher*”) was mentioned 8 times (27%).

The code “lack of training” (e.g., “*I don’t know how to use AI*”) was mentioned 10 times (33%), but was included in the topic “technical difficulties” because it is related to infrastructure and training.

Example: “*We don’t have the equipment to work with AI*” (Teacher 12). Themes were formed based on the mentions’ frequency and their relevance to the study. The sum of mentions exceeds 30, since one teacher could mention several codes in one answer (e.g., “*AI saves time, but there is no equipment*” - two codes). To obtain accurate results, we checked that themes were clearly defined and did not overlap. For example, the code “time saving” was combined with “automation”, since it is a consequence of it. We also made sure that themes cover the majority of the data: “automation” and “personalization” cover 80% of the answers to question 11, and “technical difficulties” and “fears of replacement” cover 70% of the answers to question 12. The remaining answers (e.g., “*AI is too complex*”) were less frequent and did not form a separate theme.

The qualitative results were presented as main themes with frequency of mentions and examples; the results are presented in Table 2:

Table 2. Results of open-ended questions

№	Question	Main topics and frequency of mentions
11	What advantages do you see in using AI in teaching English?	Automation of routine tasks: 18 mentions Personalization of learning: 15 mentions (50%) Improving pronunciation: 10 mentions (33%)
12	What are the challenges in implementing AI in teaching English?	Technical difficulties (lack of equipment, internet): 12 mentions (40%) Lack of preparation: 10 mentions (33%) Fears of replacing a teacher: 8 mentions (27%)
13	What measures will help to effectively implement AI in teaching English?	Conducting training for teachers: 20 mentions (67%) Providing technical support: 15 mentions (50%) Phased implementation of AI: 12 mentions (40%)

The findings generally support previous international studies indicating that teachers with higher levels of digital competence demonstrate more positive attitudes toward AI integration. However, compared with studies conducted in technologically advanced educational environments, Kazakhstani teachers reported greater concerns regarding technical infrastructure and professional training. These differences may be explained by institutional and contextual factors specific to developing educational systems.

Research Limitations

Several limitations should be acknowledged. First, the study involved a relatively small sample of 30 teachers from a single university, which limits the generalizability of the findings. Second, the data were collected through self-reported questionnaires, which may be influenced by social desirability bias. Third, the study focused exclusively on teachers of English for tech-

nical specialties and therefore may not fully represent attitudes among instructors from other academic disciplines. Future studies should include larger samples from multiple universities and employ longitudinal research designs to provide a more comprehensive understanding of AI adoption in higher education.

Conclusion

This study examined teachers' attitudes toward the use of artificial intelligence (AI) in English language teaching at M. Auezov South Kazakhstan University. The findings indicate that university teachers generally hold positive perceptions of AI and recognize its potential to automate routine tasks, support personalized learning, improve pronunciation practice, and increase student engagement. At the same time, the results demonstrate that attitudes toward AI are influenced by several factors, including age, teaching experience, and level of digital competence. Younger teachers and those with stronger digital skills expressed greater readiness to integrate AI tools into their teaching practices.

The study also identified several barriers that hinder the effective implementation of AI in English language education. These include insufficient technical infrastructure, limited access to AI-based educational tools, inadequate professional training, and concerns regarding the possible replacement of teachers' roles by technology. Despite these challenges, the high level of willingness among participants to receive additional training suggests considerable potential for the further adoption of AI in higher education.

The scientific contribution of this research lies in providing empirical evidence on teachers' attitudes toward AI in the context of higher education in Kazakhstan, a setting that remains underrepresented in international research on educational technologies. The findings contribute to a better understanding of the factors influencing teachers' readiness to adopt AI and highlight the importance of digital competence and institutional support in successful technology integration.

Based on the findings, several practical recommendations can be proposed. Universities should provide systematic professional development programs focused on AI literacy and pedagogical applications of AI tools. Educational institutions should also ensure adequate technical infrastructure and access to reliable digital resources. Furthermore, AI should be introduced gradually and used as a complementary tool that supports rather than replaces teachers' professional expertise. Continuous collaboration between educators, administrators, and information technology specialists is essential for the sustainable implementation of AI in language education.

Several limitations should be acknowledged. The study was conducted at a single university and involved a relatively small sample of participants, which may limit the generalizability of the findings. In addition, the study relied on self-reported questionnaire data. Future research should include larger and more diverse samples from different universities across Kazakhstan and employ additional methods such as interviews, classroom observations, and longitudinal studies to obtain a more comprehensive understanding of AI integration in English language teaching.

Overall, the findings suggest that the successful adoption of AI in English language education depends not only on technological availability but also on teachers' preparedness, institutional support, and the development of effective strategies for integrating AI into pedagogical practice.

Contribution of the authors:

Yesimkhanova N.A. – conceptualized the study, developed the research design, and supervised the theoretical framework and conclusions.

Mamekova S.K. – was responsible for the methodology, data collection, and initial data interpretation.

Kurbanbaeva S.N. – conducted the literature review and contributed to the introduction and discussion sections.

Dzhunusbekova Zh. – provided pedagogical expertise, edited the manuscript, and coordinated the practical examples.

Kozhanov S.N. – contributed to the technological aspects of AI, data analysis, and the discussion section.

All authors made a substantial contribution and approved the final version of the manuscript.

References

Crompton, H., & Odu, O. (2024). AI and English language teaching: Affordances and challenges. *British Journal of Educational Technology*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13460>

Hiniz, G. (2024). A year of generative AI in English language teaching and learning – A case study. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 58(2), 291–311. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2024.2404132>

Cogo, A., Patsko, L., & Szoke, J. (2024). Generative artificial intelligence and ELT. *ELT Journal*, 78(4), 373–377. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccae051>

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>

Celik, I., Dindar, M., Muukkonen, H., & Järvelä, S. (2022). The promises and challenges of artificial intelligence for teachers: A systematic review of research. *TechTrends*, 66, 616–630. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-022-00715-y>

Fütterer, T., Fischer, C., Alekseeva, A., Chen, X., Tate, T., Warschauer, M., & Gerjets, P. (2023). ChatGPT in education: Global reactions to AI innovations. *Scientific Reports*, 13, 15310. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-42227-6>

Meiramova, S. A., & Zagatova, S. B. (2025). AI-powered smart technologies for enhancing innovative English teaching in higher education in Kazakhstan. *International Conference on Social Sciences and Humanities*. <https://doi.org/10.61796/icossh.v2i3.141>

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. 4th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

El Shaban, A., & Egbert, J. (2018). Diffusing education technology: A model for language teacher professional development in CALL. *System*, 78, 234–244. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2018.09.002>

Н. Есимханова¹, С. Мамекова^{*2}, С. Курбанбаева³, Ж. Джунусбекова⁴, С. Кожанов⁵

^{1,2,3,4,5} *М. Әуезов атындағы Оңтүстік Қазақстан университеті,
Шымкент, Қазақстан*

Қазақстандағы жоғары оқу орындарында ағылшын тілін оқытуда ЖИ пайдалануға мұғалімдердің қатынасын салыстырмалы талдау

Аңдатпа. Бұл зерттеу Оңтүстік Қазақстандағы ең ірі университет – М. Әуезов атындағы Оңтүстік Қазақстан университетінде ағылшын тілі сабақтарында жасанды интеллектті (ЖИ) қолдануға қатысты оқытушылардың көзқарасын талдауға арналған. Зерттеуге «Техникалық мамандықтарға арналған шет тілдері» кафедрасының 30 оқытушысы қатысты, ал талдау үшін аралас әдіс қолданылды: сандық деректерді жинау үшін сауалнама және сапалық қорытындылар үшін тақырыптық талдау. Нәтижелер оқытушылардың ЖИ-ге жалпы оң көзқараста екенін көрсетеді, олар оның күнделікті тапсырмаларды автоматтандыру,

оқытуды жекелендіру және студенттердің қызығушылығын арттыру мүмкіндігін жоғары бағалайды. Алайда, олардың пікірлері жас ерекшелігіне, оқыту тәжірибесіне және цифрлық сауаттылық деңгейіне байланысты айтарлықтай өзгереді, жас оқытушылар үлкен ынта білдіреді. Негізгі кедергілерге техникалық дайындықтың жетіспеушілігі, ЖИ құралдарына шектеулі қолжетімділік және ЖИ оқытушыларды алмастыруы мүмкін деген қауіп жатады. Зерттеу осы кедергілерді жеңу және ЖИ-ді тиімді енгізу үшін мақсатты кәсіби дамудың қажеттілігін атап өтеді. Практикалық ұсынымдар берілді: ЖИ құралдарын пайдалану бойынша тренингтер өткізу, сенімді технологияларға қолжетімділікті қамтамасыз ету және ЖИ-ді дәстүрлі оқыту әдістерімен біріктіретін теңгерімді тәсілді енгізу. Бұл қорытындылар тілдік білім беруде ЖИ-ге қатысты оқытушылардың көзқарасын түсінуге үлес қосады және Қазақстан университеттерінде оны енгізу стратегияларын ұсынады.

Түйін сөздер: жасанды интеллект, ағылшын тілін оқыту, оқытушылардың көзқарасы, Қазақстан жоғары оқу орындары, білім беруді цифрландыру.

Н. Есимханова¹, С. Мамекова^{*2}, С. Курбанбаева³, Ж. Джунусбекова⁴, С. Кожанов⁵

^{1,2,3,4,5} Южно-Казахстанский университет имени М. Ауэзова,

Шымкент, Республика Казахстан

Сравнительный анализ отношения преподавателей к использованию искусственного интеллекта в обучении английскому языку в Южно-Казахстанском университете имени М. Ауэзова

Аннотация. Исследование посвящено анализу отношения преподавателей к использованию искусственного интеллекта (ИИ) в обучении английскому языку в Южно-Казахстанском университете им. М. Ауэзова, крупнейшем университете Южного Казахстана. В исследовании приняли участие 30 преподавателей кафедры «Иностранные языки для технических специальностей», а для анализа применялся смешанный метод, включающий анкетирование для получения количественных данных и тематический анализ для качественных выводов. Результаты показывают, что преподаватели в целом положительно относятся к ИИ, высоко ценя его способность автоматизировать рутинные задачи, персонализировать обучение и повышать вовлечённость студентов. Однако их взгляды существенно различаются в зависимости от возраста, опыта преподавания и уровня цифровой грамотности, причём молодые преподаватели проявляют больший энтузиазм. Основные препятствия включают недостаток технической подготовки, ограниченный доступ к инструментам ИИ и опасения, что ИИ может заменить преподавателей. Исследование подчёркивает необходимость целенаправленного профессионального развития для преодоления этих барьеров и эффективного внедрения ИИ. Предложены практические рекомендации, включая проведение тренингов по использованию ИИ, обеспечение доступа к надёжным технологиям и внедрение сбалансированного подхода, сочетающего ИИ с традиционными методами обучения. Эти выводы способствуют пониманию отношения преподавателей к ИИ в языковом образовании и предлагают стратегии для его внедрения в университетах Казахстана.

Ключевые слова: искусственный интеллект, обучение английскому языку, отношение преподавателей, вузы Казахстана, цифровизация образования

Information about the authors:

Yesimkhanova Nagima Auelbekovna – Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor, Department of Practical Russian Language for Technical Specialties, M. Auezov South Kazakhstan University, Tauke Khan Ave., 5, 160012, Shymkent, Kazakhstan.

Mamekova Sandugash Kurmanaliyevna – corresponding author, Master of Pedagogical Sciences, Senior Lecturer, Department of Foreign Languages for Technical Specialties, M. Auezov South Kazakhstan University, Tauke Khan Ave., 5, 160012, Shymkent, Kazakhstan.

Kurbanbaeva Saule Nauayevna – Senior Lecturer, Department of Foreign Languages for Technical Specialties, M. Auezov South Kazakhstan University, Tauke Khan Ave., 5, 160012, Shymkent, Kazakhstan.

Dzhunusbekova Zhanat Sabitovna – Master of Pedagogical Sciences, Senior Lecturer, Department of Foreign Languages for Technical Specialties, M. Auezov South Kazakhstan University, Tauke Khan Ave., 5, 160012, Shymkent, Kazakhstan.

Kozhanov Serik Nuriddinovich – Master of Philology, Lecturer, Department of Foreign Languages for Technical Specialties, M. Auezov South Kazakhstan University, Tauke Khan Ave., 5, 160012, Shymkent, Kazakhstan.

Авторлар туралы мәлімет:

Есімханова Нағима Ауелбековна – педагогика ғылымдарының кандидаты, «Техникалық мамандықтарға арналған практикалық орыс тілі» кафедрасының доценті, М. Әуезов атындағы Оңтүстік Қазақстан университеті, Тәуке хан даңғылы, 5, 160012, Шымкент, Қазақстан.

Мамекова Сандұғаш Курманалыевна – хат-хабар авторы, педагогика ғылымдарының магистрі, «Техникалық мамандықтарға арналған шет тілдері» кафедрасының аға оқытушысы, М. Әуезов атындағы Оңтүстік Қазақстан университеті, Тәуке хан даңғылы, 5, 160012, Шымкент, Қазақстан.

Құрбанбаева Сәуле Науаевна – «Техникалық мамандықтарға арналған шет тілдері» кафедрасының аға оқытушысы, М. Әуезов атындағы Оңтүстік Қазақстан университеті, Тәуке хан даңғылы, 5, 160012, Шымкент, Қазақстан.

Жүнісбекова Жаннат Сабитовна – педагогика ғылымдарының магистрі, «Техникалық мамандықтарға арналған шет тілдері» кафедрасының аға оқытушысы, М. Әуезов атындағы Оңтүстік Қазақстан университеті, Тәуке хан даңғылы, 5, 160012, Шымкент, Қазақстан.

Қожанов Серік Нуриддинович – филология ғылымдарының магистрі, «Техникалық мамандықтарға арналған шет тілдері» кафедрасының оқытушысы, М. Әуезов атындағы Оңтүстік Қазақстан университеті, Тәуке хан даңғылы, 5, 160012, Шымкент, Қазақстан.

Сведения об авторах:

Есімханова Нагима Ауелбековна – кандидат педагогических наук, доцент кафедры «Практический русский язык для технических специальностей», Южно-Казахстанский университет имени М. Ауэзова, просп. Тауке хана, 5, 160012, Шымкент, Республика Казахстан.

Мамекова Сандұғаш Курманалыевна – автор для корреспонденции, магистр педагогических наук, старший преподаватель кафедры «Иностранные языки для технических специальностей», Южно-Казахстанский университет имени М. Ауэзова, просп. Тауке хана, 5, 160012, Шымкент, Республика Казахстан.

Курбанбаева Сауле Науаевна – старший преподаватель кафедры «Иностранные языки для технических специальностей», Южно-Казахстанский университет имени М. Ауэзова, просп. Тауке хана, 5, 160012, Шымкент, Республика Казахстан.

Джунусбекова Жаннат Сабитовна – магистр педагогических наук, старший преподаватель кафедры «Иностранные языки для технических специальностей», Южно-Казахстанский университет имени М. Ауэзова, просп. Тауке хана, 5, 160012, Шымкент, Республика Казахстан.

Кожанов Серик Нуриддинович – магистр филологии, преподаватель кафедры «Иностранные языки для технических специальностей», Южно-Казахстанский университет имени М. Ауэзова, просп. Тауке хана, 5, 160012, Шымкент, Республика Казахстан.