CURRENT RESEARCH JOURNAL OF PEDAGOGICS (ISSN: 2767-3278)

VOLUME: Vol.07 Issue03 2026
DOI: - 10.37547/pedagogics-crjp-07-03-05
Page: - 26-31
RESEARCH ARTICLE OPEN ACCESS

The Use of Modern Technologies in Developing the Written Speech of English Philology Students

Maxsetova Zuxra Torebayevna

Teacher at Almalyk State Technical Institute, Uzbekistan

Received: 27 January 2026 **Accepted:** 22 February 2026 **Published:** 15 March 2026

ABSTRACT

This article examines the use of modern technologies in developing the written speech of English philology students. The relevance of the topic is determined by the transformation of higher education, the growth of digital academic environments, and the increasing role of technology-enhanced writing instruction in second-language education. Recent research shows that technology-supported writing development now extends beyond simple word processing and includes automated writing evaluation, corpus tools, collaborative digital platforms, multimodal composing, self-regulation environments, and generative AI-based support. The purpose of the study is to substantiate the pedagogical value of modern technologies in developing the written speech of English philology students and to identify the main methodological conditions under which such technologies become educationally effective. The findings show that modern technologies improve written speech development when they are used not as substitutes for teaching, but as tools for planning, drafting, feedback, revision, corpus-based noticing, collaboration, and reflection. It is argued that technology becomes most productive when it strengthens students' linguistic awareness, genre sensitivity, autonomy, and revision habits. The article concludes that the integration of modern technologies into writing instruction can significantly enhance the written competence of English philology students, provided that pedagogical guidance, critical use, and alignment with academic goals are maintained.

Keywords: Written speech, English philology students, educational technology, second-language writing, automated writing evaluation, corpus tools, digital writing platforms, generative AI, feedback, academic writing.

INTRODUCTION

Written speech occupies a central place in the education of English philology students because it serves not only as a linguistic skill, but also as a medium for literary interpretation, linguistic analysis, academic argumentation, and professional self-expression. In philological training, students are expected to write summaries, analytical responses, essays, reviews, research abstracts, and course papers. For this reason, the development of written speech cannot be limited to grammar drills or isolated composition tasks. It must be understood as the gradual formation of the ability to produce coherent, purposeful, stylistically appropriate, and academically grounded texts.

In recent years, the teaching of second-language writing has increasingly moved into digital environments. Research in technology-enhanced language learning shows that this transformation is not peripheral; it has become one of the leading trends in contemporary language education. A 2024 bibliometric analysis of technology-enhanced language learning identifies sustained growth in digitally mediated language instruction and highlights writing-related digital tools among the field's major directions. At the same time, work in second-language writing indicates that the use of technology has diversified. Instead of relying only on word processors or online dictionaries, teachers and students now work with automated writing evaluation systems, corpora, collaborative writing

platforms, multimodal composing tools, and AI-supported environments.

For English philology students, this shift is especially important. Their writing tasks are usually more demanding than general language exercises because they involve conceptual precision, disciplinary vocabulary, evidence-based interpretation, and awareness of genre conventions. Modern technologies can support these demands in multiple ways. They can facilitate drafting, provide immediate feedback, help students notice patterns in authentic language use, support collaborative revision, and increase access to disciplinary models of academic discourse. However, the educational value of technology is not automatic. Research on automated feedback, corpus pedagogy, and AI-assisted writing repeatedly shows that student outcomes depend on how tools are integrated, how feedback is interpreted, and how teachers scaffold use.

The purpose of this article is to analyze the role of modern technologies in developing the written speech of English philology students and to determine the pedagogical conditions under which such technologies contribute to sustainable writing development.

The study is based on qualitative theoretical methodology and employs analysis, synthesis, comparison, and interpretation. The theoretical foundation includes contemporary research on second-language writing, automated writing evaluation, corpus-based pedagogy, digital multimodal composing, collaborative digital learning, and AI-supported writing environments. Special attention is given to recent review studies and empirical research that clarify how technologies affect writing quality, student engagement, self-regulation, and teacher practice.

The analytical procedure focused on several interrelated dimensions of writing development: planning, drafting, linguistic awareness, revision, feedback uptake, autonomy, and academic genre control. These dimensions were then examined through the lens of specific digital tools and environments. Automated writing evaluation was considered as a feedback technology; corpora and data-driven learning were examined as tools of language noticing and genre awareness; collaborative platforms were considered as environments for co-construction and peer response; generative AI and custom GPT-based scaffolds were examined as emerging supports for idea generation, lexical assistance, and revision; and digital self-regulation and multimodal composing were analyzed as broader writing-development ecosystems.

The article does not report a new classroom experiment. Its aim is theoretical and methodological: to synthesize current research and present a coherent account of how modern technologies can be used to develop written speech among English philology students in higher education.

RESULTS

The analysis shows that modern technologies support the development of written speech most effectively when they intervene in the writing process rather than only in its final product. One of the clearest findings in recent literature is that digital tools are particularly useful for enhancing feedback, revision, and learner self-regulation. A 2024 synthesis of automated writing evaluation in second-language contexts shows that AWE systems influence student engagement with feedback, but their effectiveness depends on whether learners actively interpret and use the feedback rather than simply accepting corrections mechanically. This is highly relevant to English philology students, whose written tasks often require nuanced choices of vocabulary, cohesion, and stance. In such contexts, immediate feedback can reduce the time gap between production and reflection, allowing students to revise while their writing intentions remain cognitively active.

A second major result is that corpus technologies make a strong contribution to written speech development by deepening language awareness. Research on corpus-based pedagogy shows that when teachers and learners use corpora or data-driven learning tasks, they gain access to authentic patterns of lexical choice, collocation, phraseology, and genre-specific structure. A systematic review of corpus use and data-driven learning in language education concludes that corpus-informed work enables learners to move beyond intuition and notice language regularities through authentic evidence. Research in ReCALL likewise shows that even teacher training in corpus-based pedagogy changes how writing-related activities are designed, especially in relation to noticing and genre-sensitive instruction. For English philology students, this is particularly valuable because their writing often requires stylistic precision and discipline-specific formulations. Corpus tools help them see not only whether a structure is possible, but how it is typically realized in actual academic discourse.

The findings also indicate that collaborative digital environments strengthen written speech by making writing more social, visible, and revisable. Technology-enhanced cooperative language learning research published in 2024 reports that digital collaborative environments support interaction, negotiation, peer assistance, and shared construction of texts in language learning contexts. In writing pedagogy, this means that students can co-plan texts, comment on drafts, and engage in peer review more efficiently than in purely paper-based settings. For English philology students, whose writing often involves interpretive and argumentative work, this collaborative dimension is important because it exposes writing to multiple perspectives before formal submission. It also helps students experience writing not merely as solitary production but as dialogic academic practice.

Another significant result is the growing role of self-regulation technologies in writing development. A 2025 study on technology-enhanced self-regulation training reports that second-language students improved writing-related confidence, motivation, individualized writing strategies, and technology autonomy through structured digital support. This finding suggests that technology does more than assist local language correction. It can shape the learner's management of the writing process itself. English philology students often struggle not only with formulation, but also with organizing time, sustaining revision, and monitoring argument development. Digital writing environments that support planning, staged drafting, and reflective tracking can therefore help develop metacognitive aspects of written speech.

The analysis further shows that automated writing evaluation has become one of the most visible technological directions in writing pedagogy, but its educational value is mixed and depends heavily on mediation. A 2024 systematic review focused specifically on Grammarly, Pigai, and Criterion argues that AWE tools can help improve English writing skills, especially in relation to surface-level accuracy and feedback availability, yet they also require careful pedagogical framing because feedback quality, student trust, and revision depth vary across contexts. This is especially important for English philology students. If they rely on automated feedback only for grammar cleanup, their writing may become more correct but not necessarily more analytical, coherent, or stylistically mature. The most productive use occurs when automated feedback becomes the first stage of revision, followed by teacher guidance and self-reflective refinement.

A further result concerns digital multimodal composing and broader digital writing ecologies. Research on L2 writing autonomy through digital multimodal composing indicates that extended technology-rich writing projects can promote autonomy and sustained engagement with writing. Related work on immersive technology-enhanced writing education shows that the field is expanding toward more complex digital environments in which writing is combined with multimodal production and contextualized communication. For philology students, these environments may be especially useful in tasks involving literary blogging, annotated criticism, digital storytelling, or reflective portfolios. Such activities do not replace academic writing, but they broaden students' sense of authorship and rhetorical choice.

One of the most current findings in the literature is the rising importance of generative AI. A 2025 study comparing ChatGPT and automated writing evaluation found measurable effects on writing performance and motivational dimensions of L2 writing, suggesting that generative AI is now a major factor in writing pedagogy discussions. Another 2025 study integrating a custom GPT into corpus-based pedagogy for vocabulary support showed that AI can function effectively when embedded within structured scaffolding rather than used as an unrestricted shortcut. These findings are highly relevant for English philology students. Generative AI can support brainstorming, lexical expansion, paraphrasing, rhetorical modeling, and revision prompts, but it can also encourage passivity or textual dependence if used uncritically. The results therefore indicate that AI is pedagogically valuable only when students remain responsible for authorship, source control, and analytical substance.

The study also reveals that modern technologies help shift writing pedagogy from correction-centered routines toward a more layered developmental model. Instead of treating writing as a final text to be judged, digital tools make it possible to see writing as a visible process of drafting, reviewing, responding, and reworking. This aligns with current thinking in second-language writing, where writing is understood as recursive and socially mediated rather than linear and purely individual. Digital environments make this recursive nature easier to teach because drafts, comments, revisions, and alternative versions can be stored, compared, and reflected upon over time.

At the same time, the findings consistently show that no technology works independently of pedagogy. Research on teacher development for corpus pedagogy emphasizes that teachers need support in integrating tools into authentic classroom teaching, since technological availability alone does not guarantee meaningful instruction. The same logic applies to AWE and AI: the presence of a tool does not itself create improvement. Improvement emerges when tasks, feedback, teacher mediation, and student reflection are aligned.

The results of the analysis confirm that modern technologies can significantly enrich the development of written speech among English philology students, but only within a principled instructional framework. One of the most important implications is that technology should be viewed as a mediator of writing processes rather than as a replacement for writing competence. This distinction is central because digitally produced text can appear fluent even when the learner's own control over structure, argument, and style remains weak. Research on student engagement with automated feedback shows that successful outcomes depend on how students cognitively, behaviorally, and affectively engage with the technology. In other words, educational value lies not in exposure to tools, but in informed use.

For English philology students, this is especially important because their writing demands exceed everyday communicative writing. They are expected to develop interpretive depth, textual precision, discipline-sensitive vocabulary, and an academic voice. This means that modern technologies should be integrated not merely to speed up writing but to deepen writing awareness. Corpus tools are especially productive here because they support philological habits of close observation and evidence-based judgment. When students use corpora to examine collocations, stance markers, reporting verbs, or genre patterns, they are not only learning language; they are learning to reason with linguistic evidence.

The discussion also shows that feedback technologies must be used critically. AWE systems are effective for detecting certain recurring language problems, especially at the surface level, but they cannot fully evaluate interpretive adequacy, conceptual coherence, or originality. Review research on AWE repeatedly suggests that such tools are best treated as formative supports rather than authoritative judges. For philology students, this means that teacher feedback remains indispensable, particularly in literary, cultural, and linguistic writing where the quality of argument matters as much as formal accuracy.

Generative AI creates an even more complex pedagogical situation. On the one hand, recent studies indicate that AI can scaffold vocabulary access, writing confidence, and draft improvement when embedded in structured tasks. On the other hand, unrestricted use may reduce productive struggle and weaken the formation of independent authorship. The pedagogical conclusion is not that AI should be prohibited in all cases, nor that it should be embraced uncritically. Rather, it should be framed as a tool for guided support, critical comparison, and revision prompting. Students should learn to question AI output, verify linguistic and factual choices, and rewrite with disciplinary intent.

Another important implication concerns autonomy. Modern technologies are often praised for making learners more independent, but the research suggests that autonomy is not produced automatically by access. It emerges when students are taught how to use digital environments strategically. The study on technology-enhanced self-regulation training is instructive in this regard because it shows that technology can enhance writing only when it also strengthens confidence, strategy use, and reflective control. For English philology students, who frequently manage long and cognitively demanding writing tasks, such strategic autonomy is a central educational goal.

The findings further imply that modern technologies can help overcome an older division between language accuracy and higher-order composition. Corpus-based noticing supports lexical and phraseological precision. Collaborative platforms support idea development and peer review. AWE tools support rapid attention to recurring errors. AI and digital planning tools support drafting and reformulation. When these are combined intelligently, students can work simultaneously on local and global aspects of writing. This integrated approach is particularly suitable for philology programs, where writing quality depends on both formal command and interpretive sophistication.

At the same time, the study recognizes limitations. The literature reviewed covers varied contexts, tools, and learner populations, and not all findings transfer directly to every philology classroom. Some digital tools are more suitable for accuracy-focused writing, others for academic discourse, and others for motivation or autonomy. Future

empirical work should therefore investigate how English philology students in specific higher education settings use particular technologies across genres such as literary essays, stylistic analyses, research abstracts, and translation commentaries.

The study demonstrates that modern technologies have substantial potential for developing the written speech of English philology students. Their educational value lies in supporting key components of writing: planning, drafting, linguistic noticing, feedback uptake, revision, collaboration, and self-regulation. Automated writing evaluation, corpus tools, collaborative platforms, multimodal environments, and generative AI all offer real advantages when used within clearly defined pedagogical aims.

At the same time, the analysis shows that technology does not improve writing by itself. Its effectiveness depends on teacher mediation, critical student use, and alignment with genre, discipline, and learning outcomes. For English philology students, this means that digital tools should help them become more precise, reflective, and independent writers, not merely faster producers of text.

Thus, the use of modern technologies in developing written speech should be understood as part of a broader methodological transformation in language education. When technologies are integrated thoughtfully, they enrich writing instruction, strengthen academic literacy, and create more favorable conditions for the formation of mature written competence in English philology students.

REFERENCES

1. Арнольд, И. В. Стилистика. Современный английский язык : учебник. — 8-е изд. — Москва : Флинта ; Наука, 2006. — 384 с.
2. Гальперин, И. Р. Текст как объект лингвистического исследования. — Москва : Наука, 1981. — 139 с.
3. Зимняя, И. А. Психология обучения иностранным языкам в школе. — Москва : Просвещение, 1991. — 222 с.
4. Hasumi, T. Technology-enhanced language learning in English education: A bibliometric analysis // Cogent Education. — 2024. — Vol. 11, No. 1.
5. Karatay, Y., et al. Automated writing evaluation use in second language writing classrooms: A critical interpretive synthesis // System. — 2024.
6. Schmidt, N., et al. Unpacking second language writing teacher knowledge through corpus-based pedagogy training // ReCALL. — 2023. — Vol. 35, No. 3. — P. 292–309.
7. Lusta, A., et al. Language corpus and data-driven learning in language education: A systematic review // Heliyon. — 2023. — Vol. 9.
8. Ranalli, J. L2 student engagement with automated feedback on writing // Language Teaching Research. — 2021.
9. Dizon, G. Automated writing evaluation systems: A systematic review of Grammarly, Pigai, and Criterion with a perspective on future directions // Cogent Education. — 2024.
10. Xiaosa, L., et al. How L2 student writers engage with automated feedback // Journal of English for Academic Purposes. — 2025.
11. Liu, Y., et al. Technology-enhanced cooperative language learning: A systematic review // Journal of Teaching English with Technology. — 2024.
12. Tran, T. T. T., et al. Technology-enhanced self-regulation training: A dynamic pathway for second language academic writing development // System. — 2025.
13. Xie, L., et al. Promoting second language writing autonomy through digital multimodal composing // Contemporary Educational Psychology. — 2025.
14. Chen, Y., Li, M., Huang, C., Cukurova, M., Ma, Q. A systematic review of research on immersive technology-enhanced writing education: The current state and a research agenda // IEEE Transactions on Learning Technologies. — 2023.
15. Shi, H., et al. Comparing the effects of ChatGPT and automated writing evaluation on L2 writing performance // Computer Assisted Language Learning. — 2025.
16. Liu, J., et al. Supporting low-proficiency L2 learners'

vocabulary development with a custom GPT in a corpus-based pedagogy framework // Computer Assisted Language Learning. — 2025.

17. Flowerdew, L. A critical review of corpus-based pedagogic perspectives on thesis writing // English for Specific Purposes. — 2024.

18. Ma, Q., et al. Teacher paths for developing corpus-based language pedagogy in authentic classroom teaching // Computer Assisted Language Learning. — 2024.

19. Ren, B., et al. AI-driven scaffolding for advancing L2 writing skills // Cogent Education. — 2025.

20. Hyland, K. Second Language Writing. — Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2019.