IQRO JURNALI , IQRO JOURNAL, ИКРО ЖУРНАЛИ
ISSN:2181-4341| wordlyknowledge.uz/index.php/iqro
Volume 23. Issue 02. Sentabr, 2026

DEVELOPING SCHOOL STUDENTS' INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE THROUGH ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE TOOLS IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDUCATION

Muxtorova Gulxumor Nazirali qizi
Master's Degree in Linguistics: English Language
Uzbekistan State University of World Languages,
Graduate
English Language Teacher, Specialized School, Zangiota
District, Uzbekistan
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22988790

Abstract

The rapid development of artificial intelligence (AI), particularly generative artificial intelligence (GenAI), is transforming the pedagogical landscape of foreign language education. However, the educational value of AI should not be reduced to grammar correction, vocabulary support, or automated text generation. In increasingly multicultural and digitally mediated communication environments, English language learners also need the ability to interpret cultural meanings, negotiate differences, adapt communicative behaviour to diverse contexts, and critically evaluate cultural information. Against this background, the present study examines the pedagogical potential of AI tools for developing school students' intercultural communicative competence (ICC) in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) education. The study employs a qualitative conceptual research design based on critical analysis and synthesis of established ICC frameworks, the CEFR Companion Volume, recent systematic reviews of AI-supported language learning, and recent empirical research on GenAI-mediated intercultural interaction. The analysis identifies five pedagogically significant functions of AI: simulation of intercultural encounters, dialogic interaction, adaptive feedback, cultural comparison and reflection, and mediation across linguistic and cultural boundaries. On this basis, the study proposes an AI-Mediated Intercultural Learning Cycle (AI-MILC) consisting of five interconnected stages: cultural activation, AI-mediated interaction, cultural comparison, critical verification, and reflective transfer. The article argues that AI should function as a pedagogically controlled mediator rather than as an authoritative source of cultural knowledge. Particular attention is therefore given to cultural stereotyping, hallucinated information, algorithmic bias, learner overreliance, privacy, age appropriateness, and teacher mediation. The proposed framework provides a theoretically grounded basis for integrating AI into school-level EFL instruction while preserving the central role of human agency, critical thinking, and intercultural reflection.

Keywords: artificial intelligence, generative AI, intercultural communicative competence, EFL, school students, English language education, AI-mediated interaction, cultural awareness, intercultural learning, critical AI literacy, digital pedagogy.

1. INTRODUCTION

The internationalization of education, digital communication, migration, tourism, and transnational professional interaction has fundamentally changed the objectives of foreign

language education. Knowing a foreign language can no longer be understood exclusively as the ability to produce grammatically accurate sentences or memorize a large vocabulary. Learners increasingly need to communicate with people whose cultural assumptions, communicative conventions, social expectations, and interpretations of politeness may differ from their own. Consequently, the development of intercultural communicative competence (ICC) has become an important dimension of contemporary language education.

Byram's influential model conceptualizes ICC as a multidimensional construct involving attitudes, knowledge, skills of interpreting and relating, skills of discovery and interaction, and critical cultural awareness [1]. This approach is particularly important because it moves foreign language education away from the transmission of factual information about national cultures toward the development of learners' capacity to interpret cultural meanings and interact appropriately across cultural boundaries. Byram's model was explicitly developed to address the teaching and assessment of learners' ability to relate to and communicate with people who speak different languages and live within different cultural contexts.

Deardorff's process model similarly conceptualizes intercultural competence as a developmental process rather than a fixed body of knowledge. Attitudes such as respect, openness, and curiosity constitute an important starting point, while knowledge, skills of interpretation and interaction, internal outcomes, and observable external outcomes are interconnected within the competence-development process [2]. This perspective is particularly relevant to school education because adolescents do not merely need information about other cultures; they need structured opportunities to question assumptions, compare perspectives, negotiate meanings, and reflect on their own cultural positioning.

The Council of Europe's Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Companion Volume further strengthens this orientation by explicitly incorporating plurilingual and pluricultural competence, online interaction, mediation, sociolinguistic competence, and pragmatic competence into contemporary language education [3]. The Companion Volume identifies online interaction as an important dimension of language use and describes mediation as a process through which learners facilitate communication and meaning-making across linguistic and cultural barriers.

At the same time, artificial intelligence has emerged as one of the most consequential technological developments in language education. Large language models and conversational AI systems can generate context-sensitive dialogues, simulate communicative roles, provide immediate feedback, reformulate language, generate culturally situated scenarios, and support individualized practice. A systematic review of AI-powered chatbots in EFL speaking education examined 24 empirical studies and reported potential benefits related to speaking confidence, engagement, pronunciation, willingness to communicate, and reduced speaking anxiety, while also identifying limitations such as disengagement, speech-recognition problems, level mismatch, and limited interactional variety [4].

Nevertheless, the emergence of AI does not automatically solve the pedagogical problem of intercultural learning. A 2024 systematic review of the first year of research on ChatGPT and language education identified 36 studies and found that much of the empirical literature was concentrated in higher education, while important gaps remained concerning longitudinal research, diversified educational contexts, and the quality of AI-generated feedback [5].

This issue is especially significant at school level. A quasi-experimental study conducted with eighth-grade EFL learners in Thailand demonstrated that an eight-week interculturally embedded English curriculum could improve students' intercultural development, motivation, and English learning outcomes [6]. The study involved 59 students across experimental and control groups and provides important evidence that ICC-oriented instruction can be effectively integrated into adolescent EFL education.

The question, therefore, is not simply whether artificial intelligence can be introduced into English language lessons. The more important pedagogical question is how AI can be designed and mediated so that interaction with technology contributes to the development of learners' intercultural communicative competence rather than merely increasing the amount of language practice.

Recent scholarship has begun to address this issue. Lee's 2025 review argues that the relationship between ChatGPT and intercultural competence in foreign language education remains comparatively underexplored and emphasizes the importance of critical AI literacy when learners engage with AI-generated cultural content [7]. More recently, Qu and Chen conducted a quasi-experimental study involving 59 undergraduate EFL learners in China and reported that students working with voice-based GenAI interlocutors demonstrated stronger intercultural speaking performance and perceived ICC than a peer-partnered comparison group after a 10-week course [8]. Importantly, however, that evidence comes from university students rather than school students and therefore should not be directly generalized to adolescents.

A further 2026 systematic literature review analyzed 35 peer-reviewed studies published between 2020 and 2025 and characterized AI as a potential cultural mediator through adaptive feedback and AI-mediated language production [9].

These developments reveal an important research gap. Existing scholarship increasingly examines either ICC in adolescent EFL education or AI-supported language learning, while research specifically integrating AI-mediated interaction, adolescent EFL learners, and ICC development remains comparatively limited. The present study addresses this intersection.

The purpose of this article is therefore to develop a theoretically grounded pedagogical framework for using AI tools to support school students' intercultural communicative competence in EFL education. The study does not claim to present experimental results from the author's school. Instead, it synthesizes established theoretical models and recent empirical evidence and develops a pedagogical framework that can subsequently be tested through controlled school-based research.

The study addresses the following research questions:

RQ1. What dimensions of intercultural communicative competence are particularly relevant to AI-supported school-level EFL education?

RQ2. What pedagogical affordances of AI can contribute to the development of school students' intercultural communicative competence?

RQ3. What risks and limitations must be addressed when AI is used for intercultural learning?

RQ4. How can AI-mediated intercultural activities be organized into a coherent pedagogical model for school EFL classrooms?

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The present study adopts a qualitative conceptual research design combining critical literature review, comparative theoretical analysis, pedagogical synthesis, and conceptual modelling. The purpose of the methodology is not to measure the effectiveness of a particular AI application experimentally, but to establish a theoretically defensible framework that can be subjected to empirical validation in future research.The source base was organized into four interconnected categories.

The first category consisted of foundational theoretical literature on intercultural communicative competence, particularly Byram's model [1] and Deardorff's process-oriented conceptualization [2]. These sources were used to establish the conceptual dimensions of ICC.

The second category consisted of internationally recognized language-education frameworks. In particular, the CEFR Companion Volume was examined with attention to plurilingual and pluricultural competence, online interaction, mediation, sociolinguistic competence, and pragmatic competence [3]. The Council of Europe explicitly connects mediation with communication across linguistic and cultural barriers, making this dimension particularly relevant to AI-mediated learning.

The third category comprised systematic reviews concerning artificial intelligence and foreign language education. Du and Daniel's systematic review of AI-powered chatbots examined 24 empirical studies on EFL speaking practice [4], while the 2024 systematic review of ChatGPT and language education synthesized 36 studies published during the first year of ChatGPT-related research [5].

The fourth category consisted of recent empirical and review-based studies directly related to AI and intercultural competence. These included Lee's review of ChatGPT and intercultural competence [7], Qu and Chen's 2026 quasi-experimental study of GenAI interlocutors and ICC [8], and the 2026 systematic review of AI-mediated language production and adaptive feedback in relation to ICC [9].

The analysis followed four stages: (1) identification of core ICC dimensions; (2) identification of AI affordances relevant to those dimensions; (3) identification of risks and pedagogical constraints; and (4) synthesis of the findings into an integrated instructional cycle.

A key methodological principle was evidence separation. Findings obtained from university-level research were not treated as direct evidence of effects among school students. Similarly, evidence concerning general language learning was not automatically interpreted as evidence of ICC development. This distinction is essential for maintaining methodological validity.

3. RESULTS

3.1. Reframing intercultural communicative competence for AI-mediated EFL education

The synthesis indicates that ICC in AI-mediated school EFL education should be conceptualized as a multidimensional competence involving at least five mutually dependent capacities.

The first is intercultural knowledge: the learner's ability to recognize that communicative behaviour is shaped by cultural, social, situational, and individual factors.

The second is intercultural attitude: openness, curiosity, respect, willingness to suspend premature judgement, and readiness to encounter perspectives different from one's own.

The third is interpretive and interactional competence: the ability to interpret culturally situated messages and adapt one's own communicative behaviour to a particular context.

The fourth is critical cultural awareness: the ability to question stereotypes, identify overgeneralizations, compare perspectives, and evaluate representations of culture rather than simply accepting them.

The fifth is mediation and reflective transfer: the ability to explain cultural meanings to others, negotiate understanding, and transfer insights obtained from one intercultural situation to another.

This expanded interpretation is compatible with the CEFR Companion Volume, which places pluricultural competence, online interaction, mediation, sociolinguistic competence, and pragmatic competence within the broader framework of language use [3].

Consequently, AI-supported ICC education should not be assessed by asking only whether students have acquired factual information about English-speaking countries. A more meaningful question is whether students can use English appropriately when cultural expectations differ.

3.2. AI as an intercultural simulation environment

One of the most significant affordances of generative AI is its capacity to simulate communicative situations that may otherwise be difficult to reproduce in an ordinary classroom.A teacher can construct scenarios involving an international school exchange, a first meeting with a foreign student, a disagreement during a group project, a job interview, a request for assistance, an invitation, a misunderstanding caused by different politeness expectations, or a discussion involving culturally sensitive topics.The pedagogical value of such simulations does not lie in pretending that AI is a real representative of a national culture. Rather, the simulation provides a controlled environment for practising interpretation and communicative decision-making.This distinction is essential. A learner should not be taught that an AI persona representing a British, American, Japanese, or Uzbek interlocutor is an authentic representation of all members of that culture. Instead, the AI persona should be treated as one constructed communicative perspective.

Recent empirical evidence supports the potential of this approach. Qu and Chen's 2026 study used GenAI interlocutors to simulate a culturally distinct "other" and found significant advantages for the GenAI group in intercultural speaking performance and perceived ICC among undergraduate EFL learners [8].

However, because that research involved university students, its results should be treated as evidence of pedagogical potential, not as direct evidence of effectiveness for school students.

3.3. AI-supported pragmatic competence

A major contribution of AI-mediated interaction lies in its potential to make pragmatic choices visible.Consider a situation in which a student wants to request help from a teacher, disagree with a classmate, decline an invitation, or ask a potentially sensitive question. Grammatically correct language may still be pragmatically inappropriate.AI can generate alternative versions of the same communicative intention and invite students to compare them

according to politeness, directness, formality, relationship, social distance, and context.For example, rather than simply asking an AI system to “correct my sentence,” the learner can be prompted to analyse:

- the communicative intention;
- the relationship between the speakers;
- the level of formality;
- possible cultural interpretations;
- alternative formulations;
- possible consequences of each formulation.

This transforms AI from a correction mechanism into a metapragmatic learning tool.The approach corresponds closely to the CEFR’s distinction between linguistic, sociolinguistic, and pragmatic competence [3].

3.4. AI-supported cultural comparison

Another important pedagogical function is structured comparison.

Instead of presenting culture as a list of facts, teachers can ask students to compare how the same communicative event may be interpreted in different contexts.

For example:

Situation: A student arrives several minutes late to a meeting.

Students may ask:

1. How might lateness be interpreted in different contexts?
2. What factors might influence the interpretation?
3. Is there a single “correct” cultural response?
4. How could the same behaviour be interpreted differently by different individuals?
5. What additional information would be needed before making a judgement?

AI can generate several hypothetical interpretations, after which students verify them against authentic sources and discuss the limitations of generalization.

The educational objective is therefore not cultural classification but cultural interpretation.This is consistent with Byram’s emphasis on interpreting and relating and with the broader intercultural orientation of contemporary language education [1][3].

3.5. Critical verification of AI-generated cultural information

The most important methodological condition identified in the analysis is that AI-generated cultural information should not be treated as automatically reliable.

Generative AI can produce plausible but inaccurate information. In an intercultural context, the consequences can be particularly problematic because an inaccurate response may reinforce stereotypes or present a culturally heterogeneous population as homogeneous.For this reason, the proposed framework introduces critical verification as a compulsory stage.

Students should be encouraged to ask:

- What evidence supports this claim?
- Is the statement describing a tendency or making an absolute generalization?
- Could regional, generational, social, or individual differences change the interpretation?
- Can the claim be confirmed by an authoritative source?
- Does another source provide a different perspective?
- Is the AI confusing cultural convention with personal behaviour?

This process creates a productive connection between intercultural competence and critical AI literacy.Lee's 2025 review specifically identifies critical AI literacy as an important consideration in the relationship between ChatGPT and intercultural competence [7].

4. THE AI-MEDIATED INTERCULTURAL LEARNING CYCLE

The principal conceptual contribution of this study is the AI-Mediated Intercultural Learning Cycle (AI-MILC).The model consists of five sequential but recursive stages:

Stage 1 — Cultural Activation

The teacher introduces an authentic or realistically constructed intercultural situation. Students first predict possible interpretations before interacting with AI.

Stage 2 — AI-Mediated Interaction

Students interact with an AI system playing a defined communicative role. The interaction focuses on a meaningful task rather than unrestricted conversation.

Stage 3 — Cultural Comparison

Students compare the AI-mediated interaction with their own cultural expectations and identify similarities, differences, and areas of uncertainty.

Stage 4 — Critical Verification

Students verify significant cultural claims against reliable external sources. AI-generated information is explicitly treated as a hypothesis requiring evaluation.

Stage 5 — Reflective Transfer

Students reflect on what they have learned and apply the insight to a new communicative situation. The cycle can subsequently begin again with a more complex situation. The model therefore differs from a simple "AI conversation" approach. Its structure is: Experience → Interaction → Comparison → Verification → Reflection → Transfer.The pedagogical logic is that intercultural competence develops through the combination of experience, interpretation, interaction, critical awareness, and reflection rather than through exposure to cultural information alone.

5. PEDAGOGICAL IMPLEMENTATION IN SCHOOL EFL CLASSROOMS

The AI-MILC framework can be implemented through age-appropriate tasks.

At the lower-intermediate level, learners can work with everyday situations such as greetings, invitations, school routines, food preferences, classroom behaviour, and requests. At the intermediate level, tasks can involve misunderstandings, disagreement, social media communication, travel, international friendship, and collaborative projects. At the upper-intermediate level, learners can analyse more complex issues such as stereotypes, cultural identity, social norms, intercultural conflict, digital communication, and representation. The teacher should adapt the complexity of the AI prompt, vocabulary, interactional demands, and reflection task to the students' linguistic level.

A typical 45–60-minute lesson could follow the sequence below:

Lesson phase	**Student activity**	**AI function**	**ICC dimension**
Activation	Predict possible cultural interpretations	Generate contrasting scenarios	Cultural awareness
Interaction	Conduct a simulated dialogue	Intercultural interlocutor	Interactional competence
Comparison	Compare expectations	Produce alternative perspectives	Interpretation
Verification	Check cultural claims	Provide hypotheses/questions	Critical awareness
Reflection	Explain what changed in their thinking	Generate reflection prompts	Attitude and self-awareness
Transfer	Apply learning to a new situation	Simulate a new context	Adaptive competence

The teacher remains responsible for task design, source validation, classroom management, age appropriateness, and evaluation.

6. TEACHER MEDIATION AND HUMAN AGENCY

The integration of AI does not eliminate the teacher's role. On the contrary, ICC-oriented AI pedagogy requires substantial teacher mediation.

The teacher performs at least five functions.

First, the teacher selects culturally and pedagogically appropriate situations.

Second, the teacher determines the communicative objectives of the AI interaction.

Third, the teacher monitors AI-generated content for factual inaccuracies, stereotypes, and inappropriate generalizations.

Fourth, the teacher creates opportunities for peer discussion and human interaction rather than allowing AI to replace interpersonal communication.

Fifth, the teacher evaluates students' reflective and intercultural development.

This position corresponds with UNESCO's human-centred approach to generative AI in education. UNESCO emphasizes human agency, ethical and safe use, data privacy, pedagogical validation, and age-appropriate approaches to AI-supported education [10].Thus, the pedagogical principle should not be "AI instead of the teacher", but rather "teacher-mediated AI for deeper human learning."

7. RISKS AND PEDAGOGICAL LIMITATIONS

7.1. Cultural stereotyping

AI may reproduce stereotypical descriptions of national or cultural groups. Teachers should therefore discourage absolute formulations such as "all people from X culture…" and encourage contextualized language such as "in some contexts," "may," or "can sometimes."

7.2. Hallucinated cultural information

AI systems can produce plausible but incorrect statements. Students must therefore be trained to distinguish generated information from verified evidence.

7.3. Algorithmic bias

The cultural representations generated by AI depend partly on the data and patterns underlying the model. Certain cultural perspectives may therefore be overrepresented while others may receive limited or distorted representation.

7.4. Learner overreliance

If students allow AI to formulate every response, they may become less willing to independently interpret, formulate, and negotiate meaning. AI use should therefore increase learner agency rather than reduce it.

7.5. Loss of authentic human interaction

A simulated cultural interaction is not equivalent to communication with a real person. AI cannot fully reproduce facial expressions, embodied behaviour, emotional complexity, social history, or spontaneous interpersonal negotiation. Recent research on GenAI interlocutors has itself identified limitations related to missing paralinguistic cues [8].

7.6. Privacy and age appropriateness

Because school students are minors, privacy and age-appropriate use require particular attention. UNESCO recommends human-centred regulation, data-privacy protection, and age-sensitive approaches to independent interaction with GenAI systems [10].These limitations demonstrate that AI should be incorporated as one component of a broader pedagogical ecosystem rather than treated as an autonomous instructional solution.

8. DISCUSSION

The synthesis of the literature reveals an important distinction between AI-supported language competence and AI-supported intercultural communicative competence.

The former primarily concerns linguistic performance: vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, fluency, writing, or speaking. Systematic reviews demonstrate that AI chatbots can support several of these areas [4][5].

The latter is broader. ICC requires learners to understand how language functions within social and cultural contexts. Therefore, an AI system can improve grammatical accuracy without necessarily improving intercultural competence.

This distinction has major implications for classroom practice.

If the teacher asks an AI system to “correct this sentence,” the activity is primarily linguistic.If the teacher asks students to determine whether the sentence is appropriate for a particular relationship, social situation, cultural context, and communicative purpose, the activity becomes intercultural and pragmatic.The difference is pedagogically substantial.The evidence from adolescent EFL education also suggests that intercultural learning can be successfully integrated into secondary-school language curricula. Lee, Ho, and Chen’s study with eighth-grade learners demonstrated that an interculturally embedded curriculum could produce stronger outcomes than a comparison curriculum [6].At the same time, the recent AI literature demonstrates that the strongest empirical evidence for AI-mediated ICC currently comes largely from adult or university learners. Qu and Chen’s 2026 study, for example, involved undergraduate EFL learners rather than school students [8].

This creates a clear research opportunity: the AI-mediated development of ICC among adolescent EFL learners requires more controlled empirical investigation. The proposed AI-

MILC framework responds to this gap by combining established ICC theory with contemporary AI-mediated interaction. Its central innovation is not the introduction of AI itself, but the integration of five pedagogical operations—interaction, comparison, verification, reflection, and transfer—into a single instructional cycle.

9. SCIENTIFIC NOVELTY

The scientific novelty of the study can be formulated in four interconnected propositions.

First, AI is conceptualized not merely as a language-learning assistant but as a pedagogically mediated intercultural simulation and interaction environment.

Second, the study proposes the AI-Mediated Intercultural Learning Cycle (AI-MILC) as a conceptual framework for school-level EFL education.

Third, the framework integrates intercultural competence and critical AI literacy, requiring students to evaluate AI-generated cultural information rather than merely consume it.

Fourth, the framework explicitly distinguishes AI-generated cultural representation from authentic cultural experience, thereby positioning teacher mediation and human interaction as indispensable components of the learning process.

This conceptualization extends existing AI-in-language-learning approaches by placing intercultural interpretation and critical reflection at the centre of the instructional design.

10. CONCLUSION

Artificial intelligence is creating new possibilities for foreign language education, but its pedagogical value depends on how the technology is integrated into the learning process. The present study demonstrates, through a synthesis of foundational ICC theory, CEFR principles, systematic reviews, and recent empirical studies, that AI has considerable potential to support the development of school students' intercultural communicative competence when it is used within a carefully designed pedagogical framework.

The analysis indicates that AI can support intercultural learning through simulated encounters, dialogic interaction, pragmatic feedback, cultural comparison, mediation, and reflective practice. However, these possibilities do not justify treating AI as an authoritative cultural source. Generative AI may reproduce stereotypes, provide inaccurate information, omit contextual complexity, or encourage learner dependency. Consequently, critical verification and teacher mediation are essential.

The proposed AI-Mediated Intercultural Learning Cycle (AI-MILC) addresses this challenge by organizing learning into five interconnected stages: cultural activation, AI-mediated interaction, cultural comparison, critical verification, and reflective transfer. The model shifts the pedagogical focus from simply "using AI in English lessons" to using AI as a structured tool for developing the learner's capacity to interpret, communicate, question, and reflect across cultural boundaries.

The framework is particularly relevant to school EFL education because adolescents require structured support when engaging with culturally complex and algorithmically generated information. AI-mediated activities should therefore remain age-appropriate, teacher-guided, privacy-conscious, and integrated with authentic human interaction.

The current evidence also indicates a significant empirical research opportunity. While recent research provides promising evidence for AI-supported ICC among university-level EFL learners, and separate research demonstrates the feasibility of ICC-oriented instruction among secondary-school learners, the intersection of these two areas remains insufficiently investigated. Future research should therefore test the AI-MILC framework through controlled school-based studies using pre-test/post-test designs, validated ICC measures, interactional data, learner reflections, and delayed assessments of transfer.

Ultimately, the educational purpose of AI should not be to replace intercultural human interaction. Its greater potential lies in creating additional opportunities for learners to practise, question, compare, and reflect before they enter complex real-world communicative situations. In this sense, the most valuable AI-supported language classroom is not one in which technology speaks for the learner, but one in which technology helps the learner become a more aware, critical, flexible, and culturally responsive communicator.

REFERENCES

1. Byram, M. (1997). Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
2. Deardorff, D. K. (2006). Identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization. Journal of Studies in International Education, 10(3), 241–266. https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315306287002.
3. Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment—Companion Volume. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. The framework includes descriptors for plurilingual and pluricultural competence, online interaction, mediation, sociolinguistic competence, and pragmatic competence.
4. Du, J., & Daniel, B. K. (2024). Transforming language education: A systematic review of AI-powered chatbots for English as a foreign language speaking practice. Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 6, 100230. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100230.
5. A systematic review of the first year of publications on ChatGPT and language education: Examining research on ChatGPT's use in language learning and teaching. (2024). Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 7, 100266. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100266.
6. Lee, T.-Y., Ho, Y.-C., & Chen, C.-H. (2023). Integrating intercultural communicative competence into an online EFL classroom: An empirical study of a secondary school in Thailand. Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education, 8, Article 4. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-022-00174-1.
7. Lee, Y. M. (2025). Navigating intercultural competence with ChatGPT: Implications and recommendations for foreign language education. Journal of Language Teaching, 5(2), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.54475/jlt.2025.005.
8. Qu, Z., & Chen, L. (2026). Simulating the "cultural other": The impact of GenAI interlocutors on EFL learners' intercultural communicative competence, speaking anxiety, and learning engagement. Frontiers in Psychology, 17, 1799695. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2026.1799695.