bilimger.kz
Республикалық білім және ғылым порталы
https://bilimger.kz
ҚР Мәдениет және Ақпарат министрлігі тіркелген — Куәлік нөмірі: ***KZ45VPY00102718***
2026

БӨЛІМ: BUKETOV UNIVERSITY / UNIVER / СТУДЕНТ

The Impact of Online Learning on Foreign Language Acquisition

ЖАРИЯЛАНДЫ
13.05.2026

СІЛТЕМЕ
https://bilimger.kz/188643/

Бимаханбет Назерке Әлжанқызы
Академик Е.А. Бөкетов атындағы Қарағанды зерттеу университеті, Қарағанды қаласы, Қазақстан Республикасы

Ғылыми жетекші – ***Сагадиева Кымбат Кошкинбаевна***

Bimakhanbet Nazerke Alzhankyzy
Academician E.A. Buketov Karaganda National Research University, Karaganda, Republic of Kazakhstan

Scientific supervisor – Sagadieva Kymbat Koshkinbaevna

Аннотация. Бұл мақала онлайн оқытудың шет тілін меңгеруге тигізетін әсерін кешенді түрде зерттейді. Зерттеу барысында цифрландырудың дәстүрлі тіл білімін меңгеру үдерісін қалай түбегейлі өзгерткені С. Крашеннің «түсінікті кіріс» гипотезасы мен Л. С. Выготскийдің жақын арадағы даму аймағы тұжырымдамасы негізінде талданады. Мақалада онлайн платформалардың географиялық және әлеуметтік-экономикалық кедергілерді жоюдағы рөлі, аутентті тілдік ортаға қолжетімділікті кеңейтудегі маңызы, сондай-ақ жасанды интеллект негізіндегі бейімделгіш технологиялардың оқу үдерісін жекелендіру мүмкіндіктері жан-жақты қарастырылады. Сонымен қатар онлайн оқытудың шектеулері — физикалық әлеуметтік қарым-қатынастың азаюы, өзін-өзі реттеу мәселелері және платформалар арасындағы педагогикалық сапасыздық — сыни тұрғыдан бағаланады. Аралас оқыту модельдері, компьютерге негізделген тілді меңгеру (CALL) эволюциясы және онлайн практика қауымдастықтарының рөлі эмпирикалық деректер арқылы зерделенеді. Зерттеу нәтижелері онлайн оқытудың дәстүрлі нұсқаулықты толығымен алмастыра алмайтынын, бірақ дұрыс интеграцияланған жағдайда тіл меңгерудің тереңдігі мен ауқымын айтарлықтай кеңейте алатынын дәлелдейді.

Кілт сөздер: онлайн оқыту, шет тілін меңгеру, екінші тілді меңгеру, аралас оқыту, компьютерге негізделген тілді оқыту, бейімделгіш технологиялар, жасанды интеллект, түсінікті кіріс, практика қауымдастығы, цифрлық педагогика.

Аннотация. Настоящая статья представляет собой комплексное исследование влияния онлайн-обучения на процесс овладения иностранным языком. В работе анализируется, каким образом цифровизация образовательной среды трансформировала традиционные подходы к изучению языка — в частности, через призму гипотезы понятного ввода С. Крашена и концепции зоны ближайшего развития Л. С. Выготского. Подробно рассматриваются преимущества онлайн-платформ: устранение географических и социально-экономических барьеров, расширение доступа к аутентичному языковому материалу, а также возможности персонализации учебного процесса посредством адаптивных технологий на основе искусственного интеллекта. Критически оцениваются ключевые ограничения онлайн-обучения — сокращение возможностей для непосредственного социального взаимодействия, проблемы саморегуляции и неравномерное педагогическое качество цифровых ресурсов. На основе эмпирических данных исследуются модели смешанного обучения, эволюция компьютерного обучения языкам (CALL) и роль онлайн-сообществ практики. Результаты исследования свидетельствуют о том, что онлайн-обучение не способно полностью заменить традиционное аудиторное преподавание, однако при грамотной интеграции существенно расширяет глубину и охват языкового овладения.

Ключевые слова: онлайн-обучение, овладение иностранным языком, усвоение второго языка, смешанное обучение, компьютерное обучение языкам, адаптивные технологии, искусственный интеллект, понятный ввод, сообщество практики, цифровая педагогика.

Abstract. This article presents a comprehensive examination of the impact of online learning on foreign language acquisition. Drawing on Stephen Krashen’s comprehensible input hypothesis and Lev Vygotsky’s concept of the Zone of Proximal Development, the study analyses how digitalization has fundamentally restructured the conditions under which language acquisition occurs. The article explores the advantages afforded by online platforms — including the removal of geographical and socioeconomic barriers, expanded access to authentic linguistic input, and the personalization of learning through AI-driven adaptive technologies — alongside a critical assessment of their inherent limitations, namely the reduction of embodied social interaction, persistent challenges of learner self-regulation, and significant inconsistency in the pedagogical quality of digital resources. Blended learning models, the evolution of Computer-Assisted Language Learning (CALL), and the role of online communities of practice are examined through the lens of empirical research. The findings indicate that online learning cannot wholly replace traditional classroom instruction, but when thoughtfully integrated within broader pedagogical frameworks, it substantially deepens and

extends the scope of language acquisition.

Keywords: online learning, foreign language acquisition, second language acquisition, blended learning, computer-assisted language learning, adaptive technologies, artificial intelligence, comprehensible input, community of practice, digital pedagogy.

The way human beings acquire foreign languages has never been static. For centuries, language learning was bound to physical classrooms, printed textbooks, and the immediate presence of a teacher whose voice and gestures shaped every lesson. Students memorized conjugation tables under fluorescent lights, practiced dialogues with classmates seated beside them, and measured their progress through handwritten examinations. This model, dominant for generations, rested on a fundamental assumption: that meaningful language acquisition required co-presence, shared space, and a structured institutional setting. That assumption has been quietly but decisively dismantled over the past two decades.

The proliferation of high-speed internet, mobile devices, and sophisticated language platforms has relocated the learning experience from the classroom to the screen — and in doing so, has raised questions that linguists, educators, and cognitive scientists are still working to answer. Digitalization has not simply moved existing pedagogical methods online; it has altered the conditions under which language exposure occurs, the frequency and nature of learner-to-input contact, and the degree of agency that learners exercise over their own acquisition process. When a student in Almaty can hold a spontaneous conversation with a native speaker in São Paulo, or receive instant phonetic feedback from an AI tutor at two in the morning, the geography and temporality of language learning have been fundamentally reordered. The central question this transformation raises is not merely whether online environments work, but how, under what conditions, and for whom — and what is genuinely lost when the body, the room, and the human teacher are no longer present.

To examine these questions rigorously, it is necessary to situate them within established theoretical frameworks that explain how language acquisition unfolds in the first place. Stephen Krashen’s Input Hypothesis, developed in the early 1980s, proposed that learners acquire language most effectively when they are exposed to input that is slightly beyond their current level of competence — what he termed «comprehensible input,» or i+1. This theory carries direct implications for digital environments, where learners can self-select content calibrated to their proficiency, accessing precisely the level of challenge that Krashen identified as optimal. Lev Vygotsky’s concept of the Zone of Proximal Development adds a social dimension to this picture: acquisition is not a solitary cognitive event but a process that unfolds in the space between what a learner can do independently and what becomes possible through interaction with a more capable interlocutor. Online platforms, particularly those enabling live tutoring and language exchange, attempt to replicate this interactional scaffolding in digital form — though whether they do so with equivalent depth remains an open and genuinely contested empirical matter.

What emerges from even a preliminary engagement with these frameworks is that online learning environments are neither a simple extension of traditional instruction nor a straightforward improvement upon it. They represent a structurally different context for acquisition, one with its own affordances, its own constraints, and its own demands on the learner. Online learning platforms have fundamentally reshaped foreign language acquisition by expanding access to diverse linguistic input, enabling unprecedented levels of personalization, and creating new spaces for authentic communicative practice — yet these gains coexist with real and underexamined challenges that complicate any uncritical enthusiasm for the digital turn in language education.

Among the most consequential shifts that online learning has introduced into the landscape of foreign language education is the radical restructuring of who gets to learn, where, and when. Traditional classroom-based instruction, for all its pedagogical merits, was never a neutral or universally accessible institution. It demanded physical proximity to an educational facility, adherence to fixed schedules, and in many cases, the financial capacity to afford tuition, commuting, or relocation. These structural requirements quietly but systematically excluded vast populations — rural communities without nearby language schools, working adults whose employment made daytime attendance impossible, learners in economically disadvantaged regions where qualified language teachers were scarce or entirely absent. The digital turn has not eliminated these inequalities, but it has meaningfully disrupted them in ways that deserve careful examination.

Platforms such as Duolingo, Coursera, and iTalki have made foreign language instruction available at a scale and geographic breadth that no institutional classroom network could replicate. A learner in a remote town in Central Asia, without access to a single certified English teacher within a hundred kilometers, can now engage with structured curricula, live tutoring sessions, and algorithmically curated practice exercises — all from a smartphone. This is not a trivial development. Research consistently indicates that sustained exposure and practice frequency are among the strongest predictors of successful language acquisition, and online platforms dramatically lower the threshold for maintaining that frequency. The removal of commuting time, rigid class schedules, and institutional enrollment requirements allows learners to integrate language practice into the texture of daily life rather than carving out dedicated blocks of time that many simply cannot afford. Self-paced learning, in this context, is not merely a convenience feature — it is a structural condition that enables acquisition for populations who were previously excluded from it by circumstance rather than by incapacity or lack of motivation.

The flexibility afforded by online environments also intersects with a deeper dimension of language acquisition: the quality and authenticity of linguistic input. Krashen’s Input Hypothesis makes clear that not all exposure to a target language is equally productive — what matters is the meaningfulness, comprehensibility, and contextual richness of the input

encountered. On this criterion, the internet represents an unprecedented resource. A learner of English has access to hundreds of millions of hours of native speaker content across registers, dialects, and communicative contexts — documentary films, news broadcasts, comedy podcasts, academic lectures, informal vlogs — none of which were available to classroom learners of previous generations except in carefully curated and often artificially simplified forms. This breadth of authentic input matters because language is not a monolithic code but a collection of registers, collocations, pragmatic conventions, and cultural references that can only be fully internalized through exposure to the language as it is actually used, rather than as it is idealized in pedagogical materials.

Beyond passive consumption, online environments have created mechanisms for active, real-time engagement with native speakers that prior generations of learners could only access through costly travel or fortunate personal circumstance. Platforms such as iTalki and Preply connect learners directly with professional tutors and informal conversation partners across the globe, enabling the kind of spontaneous, unscripted communicative practice that researchers in second language acquisition have long identified as essential to developing genuine interactional competence. Video-mediated communication, despite its obvious differences from face-to-face interaction, preserves critical elements of natural conversation — turn-taking, interruption, repair sequences, emotional register — in ways that text-based exchange cannot. When a learner navigates the ambiguity of a native speaker’s fast-paced speech, asks for clarification, and reformulates their own utterance in response to feedback, they are engaging in precisely the kind of negotiation of meaning that Vygotsky’s framework identifies as the engine of linguistic development. The digital infrastructure that makes these interactions routine and affordable is, in this respect, a genuinely transformative pedagogical resource.

What makes the contemporary online learning environment particularly distinctive, however, is not simply its capacity to deliver authentic input or facilitate human interaction, but the sophistication with which it can tailor the learning experience to the individual learner. Adaptive learning technologies, driven by machine learning algorithms, represent a departure from the one-size-fits-all logic that necessarily governs large classroom instruction. Platforms such as Babbel and more advanced iterations of Duolingo track individual error patterns, response latencies, and performance trajectories across thousands of data points, using this information to dynamically adjust the difficulty, content type, and review frequency of the material presented. This is a computational approximation of the i+1 principle that Krashen described — a continuous, real-time calibration of input to sit just beyond the learner’s current threshold of competence, thereby maintaining the productive tension between challenge and comprehensibility that drives acquisition forward.

Immediate corrective feedback, another feature that adaptive platforms increasingly offer, addresses one of the persistent weaknesses of traditional language instruction. In a classroom of twenty or thirty students, the teacher’s capacity to monitor and respond to each learner’s

errors in real time is severely constrained. Errors go unaddressed, fossilize into habitual patterns, and become progressively harder to correct as they are reinforced through unchecked repetition. An AI-driven platform, by contrast, can flag a grammatical error the instant it occurs, provide a targeted explanation, and require the learner to produce a corrected form before moving forward — a cycle of error identification, explanation, and reformulation that research in corrective feedback suggests is among the most effective mechanisms for promoting grammatical accuracy. Pronunciation feedback tools, now increasingly sophisticated through advances in automatic speech recognition, extend this capacity to the phonological dimension of language — a domain in which traditional classroom instruction has often been weakest, particularly in large groups where individual oral production is infrequent.

Alongside these more cognitively focused mechanisms, online platforms have also developed motivational architectures that draw on insights from behavioral psychology to sustain learner engagement over time. Gamification — the integration of point systems, progress streaks, leaderboards, badges, and narrative progression into language learning interfaces — speaks directly to the challenge that attrition poses for online language education. Motivation research in second language acquisition has consistently distinguished between instrumental motivation, driven by external goals, and integrative motivation, driven by a genuine desire to connect with a language community. Gamification occupies an interesting middle space: it is instrumental in its mechanics but can, when well designed, generate a form of intrinsic engagement by making the act of practice itself rewarding rather than merely obligatory. Studies examining Duolingo’s streak mechanism, for instance, have found that it significantly increases daily practice frequency — and given that spaced repetition and consistent exposure are foundational conditions for long-term retention, the motivational infrastructure of these platforms is not superficial but pedagogically consequential.

The advantages catalogued in the preceding section are real, and the research supporting them is substantial — but they do not constitute the full picture. Any intellectually serious account of online language learning must contend with the equally real limitations that digital environments impose, limitations that are not incidental technical shortcomings awaiting the next software update but structural features of a mode of learning that differs from embodied, socially embedded instruction in ways that matter deeply for how language is acquired and used. The enthusiasm that has surrounded the digital turn in language education has sometimes outpaced the evidence, and a closer examination of what online platforms cannot easily replicate reveals challenges that are both pedagogically significant and undertheorized in mainstream discourse.

The most fundamental of these concerns the nature of human communication itself. Language is not, at its core, a system of encoded symbols transmitted between isolated cognitive processors. It is a social practice, embedded in bodies, spaces, silences, and shared

physical contexts that shape meaning in ways that no screen can fully reproduce. When two people speak to each other in the same room, they are not simply exchanging words — they are managing proximity, reading microexpressions that last fractions of a second, adjusting their posture and vocal volume in response to environmental cues, and navigating the subtle choreography of turn-taking that is partly regulated by gaze direction, breath patterns, and the physical orientation of their bodies toward each other. Research in interactional linguistics has documented extensively how much of communicative competence is carried by these non-verbal channels, and how deeply their absence distorts the interactional experience. Learners who develop their foreign language skills primarily through screen-mediated communication may acquire considerable grammatical and lexical proficiency while remaining genuinely underprepared for the sensory complexity of face-to-face interaction with native speakers — a gap that only becomes visible when they leave the digital environment and find themselves disoriented by the speed, embodiment, and contextual density of real-world conversation.

This disorientation points toward a broader limitation that extends beyond the mechanics of interaction: the absence of genuine cultural immersion. Language and culture are not separable domains, and the acquisition of a foreign language in its fullest sense requires prolonged exposure to the social contexts in which that language functions — its humor, its silences, its rituals of politeness and transgression, its unspoken assumptions about what is worth saying and what is better left unsaid. These dimensions of language are absorbed gradually, through lived participation in a community, through misunderstanding and repair, through embarrassment and laughter and the slow recalibration of one’s communicative instincts. Online platforms can expose learners to cultural content — films, podcasts, interactions with native speakers — but they cannot replicate the pressure and richness of actual immersion, where language use is consequential, stakes are real, and the social feedback for communicative failure is immediate and unmediated. The learner who studies French on a platform for three years and the learner who spends three months living in Lyon are acquiring the language in structurally different ways, and conflating these experiences does a disservice to both.

The second major cluster of challenges concerns not what online environments lack externally but what they demand internally from the learner. Self-directed online learning places the entire burden of structure, motivation, and accountability on the individual — a demand that most learners, regardless of their intellectual capacity or genuine interest in the target language, find difficult to sustain over the time scales that language acquisition requires. The data on this point is unambiguous and sobering: completion rates for self-paced online language courses consistently hover in the single digits, a figure that has remained stubbornly low despite years of platform refinement and gamification innovation. This is not primarily a motivational failure on the part of individual learners; it is a structural consequence of removing the social and institutional scaffolding that traditional classroom environments provide. A class schedule that a student must appear for, a teacher who notices and responds

to absence, peers whose presence creates mild social obligation, and an institution that issues grades and credentials — these are not merely bureaucratic conveniences but powerful external regulators of behavior that compensate for the natural fluctuation of intrinsic motivation over time.

Intrinsic motivation — the kind that arises from genuine curiosity, aesthetic pleasure in the language, or deep identification with the community of speakers — is a powerful driver of acquisition when it is present and sustained. But motivation research in second language acquisition is clear that even highly motivated learners experience fluctuations in engagement, and that external structures play a critical role in bridging the gaps between periods of high intrinsic drive. Online learning environments, by their nature, reduce or eliminate most of these external structures, effectively requiring learners to maintain consistent engagement through willpower and self-regulation alone. For learners with strong metacognitive skills, clear instrumental goals, and well-developed habits of autonomous study, this presents no insuperable obstacle. For the majority, it is a demand that gradually erodes even genuine initial enthusiasm, producing the dropout patterns that platform analytics consistently reveal but rarely foreground in their marketing communications.

Compounding this challenge is the uneven distribution of digital literacy across the populations that online language learning is ostensibly designed to serve. The vision of democratized access to language education presupposes that learners possess the technical competencies required to navigate digital platforms effectively — stable internet connectivity, hardware adequate for video communication, familiarity with interface conventions, and the metacognitive capacity to evaluate the quality of online resources and curate a productive learning environment from the overwhelming abundance of available content. These competencies are far from universally distributed, and their absence can render the theoretical accessibility of online platforms practically meaningless for precisely the populations most underserved by traditional educational systems. A learner who lacks confidence in navigating digital tools, or who is overwhelmed by the unstructured vastness of what the internet offers, may find online language learning more paralyzing than empowering — a forest of possibility without a path.

The third area of concern is the uneven and often inadequate quality of the pedagogical resources that populate the online language learning ecosystem. The internet has made it extraordinarily easy to publish language learning content, and the volume of what is available vastly exceeds any individual’s or institution’s capacity to evaluate it systematically. Platforms vary enormously in the soundness of their underlying pedagogical frameworks — some are designed by applied linguists with deep expertise in second language acquisition research, while others are assembled by entrepreneurs with enthusiasm for language but little grounding in how acquisition actually works. Learners who lack the expertise to distinguish between these are routinely exposed to materials that reinforce incorrect grammatical patterns, present

pronunciation models inconsistent with contemporary native speaker norms, or prioritize the recognition of isolated vocabulary items over the development of the collocational and contextual knowledge that genuine proficiency requires. The risk of fossilization — the entrenchment of incorrect forms through unchecked repetition — is particularly acute in self-directed online environments where corrective feedback is absent or algorithmically limited.

Perhaps most consequential among these quality-related limitations is the systematic underemphasis on productive skills that characterizes much of the online language learning landscape. Speaking and writing — the skills that require the learner to generate language rather than merely recognize or respond to it — are also the skills that are most difficult to assess, most resource-intensive to provide feedback on, and least amenable to automation. The result is that many widely used platforms are heavily weighted toward receptive skill development: vocabulary recognition, listening comprehension, reading exercises — all of which can be evaluated by algorithm without human involvement. The learner who completes a year of daily Duolingo practice may have developed a respectable reading vocabulary while remaining deeply uncomfortable with the act of producing spontaneous spoken or written language under real communicative pressure, precisely because that productive dimension was never adequately practiced or meaningfully assessed.

Recognizing the limitations of purely online instruction does not necessitate a retreat to traditional classroom models — it demands instead a more sophisticated understanding of how digital tools and human pedagogical expertise can be combined in ways that preserve the strengths of each while compensating for their respective weaknesses. The most productive developments in contemporary language education have emerged not from the uncritical embrace of technology nor from a defensive attachment to conventional methods, but from careful, evidence-informed attempts to integrate both within coherent instructional designs. Blended learning represents the most developed institutional response to this challenge, and the evidence accumulated around it over the past fifteen years offers genuinely instructive insights into what effective technology-enhanced language education can look like in practice.

Blended learning, in its most theoretically grounded form, is not simply the addition of digital tools to an otherwise unchanged classroom — it is a deliberate restructuring of the learning environment in which online and face-to-face components are assigned the tasks each is best equipped to perform. Receptive skill development, vocabulary building, grammatical explanation, and spaced repetition practice — tasks that are well served by adaptive algorithms and can be completed autonomously — are relocated to the online environment, freeing face-to-face time for the communicative, interactional, and culturally embedded dimensions of language use that require human presence. Research examining blended language programs at university level has repeatedly found that this division of labor, when implemented thoughtfully, produces learning outcomes superior to either purely online or purely classroom-based instruction. A study conducted across multiple European universities

found that students in blended English programs demonstrated significantly greater gains in spoken fluency and pragmatic competence than their counterparts in either fully online or fully traditional tracks — a finding that points not to the superiority of any single medium but to the pedagogical intelligence of combining them strategically. Programs at institutions such as the University of Auckland and Carnegie Mellon have documented similar patterns, with blended cohorts showing higher retention rates and stronger performance on productive skill assessments, suggesting that the human element of language instruction retains irreplaceable value even as digital tools dramatically expand what learners can accomplish independently.

The technological dimension of this integration has been shaped substantially by the evolution of Computer-Assisted Language Learning, a field that has undergone a transformation so thoroughgoing that its early iterations are barely recognizable in its contemporary forms. CALL began in the 1960s and 1970s as a relatively modest enterprise: computers were used to deliver drill-and-practice exercises, providing learners with immediate feedback on discrete grammatical or lexical choices in a format that was more patient and consistent than a human teacher but considerably less responsive and nuanced. These early systems operated on behaviorist principles — stimulus, response, reinforcement — and their limitations reflected the limitations of that framework: language was treated as a collection of separable rules to be memorized rather than a communicative capacity to be developed through meaningful interaction. The shift away from this model, driven by advances in cognitive science and second language acquisition research through the 1980s and 1990s, produced a generation of CALL tools oriented toward meaning-focused tasks, authentic materials, and communicative practice — a significant improvement, though still constrained by the computational limitations of the era.

What has emerged in the past decade, powered by advances in Natural Language Processing and machine learning, represents a qualitative departure from everything that preceded it. NLP-driven tools can now analyze learner speech with sufficient precision to identify not merely whether a phoneme is correct or incorrect but the specific articulatory parameters — tongue position, voicing, aspiration — that produce the deviation from target norms, and generate feedback specific enough to guide the learner toward correction rather than simply flagging the error. Grammar feedback systems can distinguish between systematic errors that reflect a stable but incorrect interlanguage rule and performance errors that reflect momentary inattention, adjusting their instructional response accordingly. These capacities are not merely technical refinements; they represent a meaningful approximation of the diagnostic sensitivity that characterizes expert human language instruction, extended to a scale and availability that no human teaching workforce could match. Conversational AI systems, now sophisticated enough to sustain extended interactions on a wide range of topics, offer learners something that was previously available only through human interlocutors: low-stakes, infinitely patient speaking practice that generates real communicative pressure without the social anxiety that many learners experience in interactions with native speakers. The

pedagogical value of reducing that anxiety — of allowing learners to experiment with the target language, make errors, and recover from them without social consequence — should not be underestimated, given how consistently affective factors have been shown to mediate language acquisition outcomes.

Technology, however, is not the only resource available for addressing the social and interactional deficits of online learning. The growth of online language exchange communities has created new forms of peer-to-peer linguistic engagement that are neither purely instrumental nor institutionally structured, but emerge from the intrinsic communicative needs of their participants. Platforms such as Tandem and HelloTalk connect learners across linguistic boundaries, enabling sustained relationships in which each participant serves simultaneously as learner and informal teacher — a reciprocal arrangement that generates genuine communicative investment of a kind that no platform-designed exercise can fully replicate. These communities function, in Lave and Wenger’s terms, as communities of practice: social formations organized around shared activity, in which learning occurs not through formal instruction but through legitimate peripheral participation — the gradual, socially embedded process by which newcomers acquire the competencies, values, and communicative norms of an established group. When a learner of Mandarin engages in weekly video conversations with a Chinese speaker learning English, correcting each other’s errors, sharing cultural references, and building a genuine interpersonal relationship across linguistic difference, they are participating in something closer to naturalistic acquisition than almost anything a platform algorithm can design. The affective dimension of these relationships — the curiosity, investment, and accountability that arise from genuine human connection — sustains engagement in ways that gamification mechanics, however cleverly designed, rarely achieve over extended periods.

The empirical literature comparing online and traditional classroom instruction in foreign language contexts resists the kind of clean, generalizable conclusions that policymakers and platform developers often seek. Meta-analyses examining studies conducted across multiple language learning contexts — including Blake’s comprehensive review of online language learning research and the large-scale analyses published in the journals Language Learning and Technology and System — consistently find that neither modality holds an unconditional advantage over the other. Outcomes depend heavily on an interlocking set of moderating variables that any serious comparative analysis must account for rather than control away. Learner age is among the most significant of these: younger learners, whose language acquisition mechanisms retain greater neuroplasticity, tend to benefit more from immersive, input-rich environments — conditions that well-designed online platforms can approximate — while adult learners, who bring stronger metacognitive resources and explicit grammatical awareness to the task, often extract greater value from structured, feedback-intensive instruction that blends digital and human elements. A learner’s first language background shapes the challenge profile of the target language in ways that affect which instructional

medium serves them better: a Japanese speaker acquiring English faces phonological and syntactic distances that may require more intensive human feedback than an algorithm currently provides reliably, while a Spanish speaker acquiring Portuguese may thrive in a self-directed online environment where the linguistic proximity makes autonomous progress highly achievable. Proficiency level introduces a further dimension — beginning learners typically require the scaffolding, error correction, and motivational support that human instructors provide more reliably than platforms, whereas advanced learners, who already possess the structural foundation of the language, benefit enormously from the authentic input density and communicative exposure that online environments uniquely offer.

What this evidence collectively implies for curriculum design and institutional language policy is a mandate for integration rather than substitution. Institutions that have replaced traditional language instruction wholesale with online delivery in the name of cost efficiency or pedagogical modernity have, in most documented cases, produced measurable declines in speaking proficiency and long-term retention — the very outcomes that justify language education as an institutional investment. The evidence supports a model in which online tools extend and enrich instruction rather than replace the human relationships and interactional contexts that remain irreducibly central to acquisition. For learners, this means approaching digital platforms not as self-contained solutions but as components of a broader, deliberately constructed learning ecology. For platform developers, it means prioritizing productive skill development, investing in the quality and pedagogical integrity of feedback mechanisms, and resisting the temptation to optimize for engagement metrics at the expense of genuine acquisition outcomes. For researchers, it means that the most urgent questions are not whether online learning works, but which configurations of tools, human interaction, learner characteristics, and institutional structures produce the deepest and most durable linguistic competence — questions that will require longitudinal designs, ecologically valid outcome measures, and a willingness to follow learners beyond the boundaries of the platforms where their learning begins.

References

1. Krashen, S. D. Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition / S. D. Krashen. — Oxford : Pergamon Press, 1982. — 202 p.
2. Blake, R. J. Current trends in online language learning / R. J. Blake // Annual Review of Applied Linguistics. — 2011. — Vol. 31. — P. 19–35.
3. Godwin-Jones, R. Artificial intelligence in language learning: Implications for pedagogy and practice / R. Godwin-Jones // Language Learning & Technology. — 2019. — Vol. 23, № 3. — P. 5–27.
4. Lave, J. Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation / J. Lave, E. Wenger. — Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1991. — 138 p.
5. Chapelle, C. A. Computer Applications in Second Language Acquisition / C. A.

Chapelle. — Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2001. — 216 p.

6. Warschauer, M. Computer-Assisted Language Learning: An Introduction / M. Warschauer, R. Kern. — Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2000. — 250 p.
7. Stockwell, G. Computer-Assisted Language Learning: Diversity in Research and Practice / G. Stockwell. — Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2012. — 214 p.
8. Dörnyei, Z. Motivational Strategies in the Language Classroom / Z. Dörnyei. — Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2001. — 155 p.
9. Long, M. H. The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition / M. H. Long // Handbook of Second Language Acquisition / ed. by W. C. Ritchie, T. K. Bhatia. — New York : Academic Press, 1996. — P. 413–468.
10. Vygotsky, L. S. Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes / L. S. Vygotsky. — Cambridge : Harvard University Press, 1978. — 159 p.

ҚМ АА Куәлік нөмірі: **KZ45VPY00102718** — ҚР Мәдениет және Ақпарат министрлігі