Website:https://www.bgpulseusa.com/index.php/ICAIA Volume 7,Issue 01,November-2026

THE ROLE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN TEACHING ENGLISH TO JOURNALISM STUDENTS

Igamberdieva Saida Abdusamatovna
Teacher, Department of Foreign Languages,
University of Journalism and Mass
Communications of Uzbekistan
https://orcid.org/0009-0002-3845-625X
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24274282

Abstract. This article examines the role of generative artificial intelligence (AI) in teaching English for Specific Purposes (ESP) to journalism students. It proposes a task-based approach that integrates AI into three activities: preparing interview questions, writing news headlines and leads, and revising drafts for a target readership. Students first produce their own texts using source materials and then review AI-generated alternatives to identify differences in information order, clarity, tone, and source attribution. During revision, they check whether the AI output preserves facts, accurately attributes claims, and retains the degree of certainty expressed in the original sources. A brief editorial rationale requires students to explain which AI suggestions they accepted or revised and why.

Keywords. Generative artificial intelligence, English for Specific Purposes, journalism education, news writing, editorial judgement, source attribution, AI literacy.

Introduction

Journalism students learning to report in English need to conduct interviews, identify newsworthy information, and write for specific audiences. Each of these tasks requires decisions about language and evidence. An interview question can invite a detailed account or steer a source toward a particular answer. A headline can accurately summarize a development or make a preliminary finding sound conclusive. A news lead can help readers distinguish an established fact from a claim that still requires verification. English for Specific Purposes (ESP) instruction can address these decisions through tasks that reflect the work of journalists.

Generative artificial intelligence (AI) can provide alternative interview questions, headlines, and leads for students to examine. Comparing alternatives helps students see how changes in wording, information order, and tone affect what a reader understands. The same output gives students practice in verification. A fluent sentence may contain a figure absent from the source, omit an attribution, or strengthen a claim beyond what the evidence supports. Identifying these changes requires students to read the source closely and apply journalistic standards to their English-language writing.

This article proposes a task-based approach in which students draft independently, compare their work with AI-generated alternatives, and explain their revisions. It focuses on three activities that can form a single classroom assignment: preparing interview questions, writing a headline and lead, and editing the resulting news text for a specified readership.

Main Part

The teacher provides a short reporting brief that identifies an event, a prospective interviewee, and the information already available. For example, students preparing to interview a university transport coordinator about a proposed evening shuttle service can identify what readers would need to know about its route, operating hours, and approval status. They then draft an opening question and several follow-up questions designed to elicit specific information.

Students ask a generative AI tool to prepare questions for the same interview using the brief. They compare its suggestions with their own questions for clarity, relevance, and neutrality. An AI-generated question such as “How will the new shuttle solve students’ transport problems?” assumes that the service will be introduced and that it will solve the problem. Students could revise it to “What transport problems is the proposed shuttle intended to address?” and follow up with “What evidence informed the

© 2026 International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Applications . All Rights Reserved.

proposed route?" This comparison shows how verb choice and question structure affect both the accuracy of a question and the kind of answer it is likely to elicit.

Students use a short source packet, such as a public notice and an interview transcript, to write an English-language headline and lead. They identify the main development, check its status, and decide which details their intended readers need first. They then compare their drafts with AI-generated versions based on the same materials and audience.

If the source packet states that the university is considering a shuttle service, an AI-generated headline such as "University to Launch Evening Shuttle" implies that the decision has already been made. "University Considers Evening Shuttle for Students" preserves the proposal's status. The lead can then identify who announced the proposal, explain whom it would serve, and indicate whether an implementation date has been set. In discussing these alternatives, students examine how verbs such as *considers*, *proposes*, *approves*, and *launches* mark different stages of an event. The exercise connects vocabulary development with precision in reporting.

Students revise the news text for a defined readership, such as readers of a campus newspaper or an international student newsletter. Campus readers may need practical details about the proposed route and timetable. International students may also need a brief explanation of unfamiliar campus locations. Students can use AI to generate alternatives for each readership and check every added detail against the source material.

Source attribution is central to this stage. If a transport coordinator says the shuttle *could* reduce waiting times, the revision should retain both the attribution and the uncertainty. Students mark any changes in names, figures, dates, quotations, or the status of a claim. They then write a brief editorial rationale explaining one AI suggestion they accepted and one they revised or rejected. Each explanation should refer to the source material or to a specific audience need.

The teacher assesses the student's initial draft, revised text, and editorial rationale together. The interview questions can be evaluated for clarity, neutrality, and their potential to elicit usable information. The headline and lead can be assessed for concision, information order, factual fidelity, and clear attribution. The rationale shows whether the student can explain the editorial effect of a language choice. For example, replacing *will launch* with *is considering* demonstrates an understanding of how verb choice changes what readers can infer about the status of a proposal.

Conclusion

Generative AI can support journalism-focused ESP instruction by giving students alternative phrasings to test against source evidence and audience needs. The proposed sequence gives students practice in formulating neutral interview questions, selecting information for headlines and leads, and preserving attribution and uncertainty during revision. Reviewing the initial draft alongside the final text and editorial rationale allows instructors to assess English-language performance and the reasoning behind editorial decisions.

The methodology is an instructional proposal illustrated through a classroom reporting task. Its effectiveness could be examined by comparing students' independently written interview questions, headlines, and leads before and after a series of AI-assisted lessons, using the same criteria at both stages.

References

1. Abdusamatovna, I. S. (2023). Process and criteria of teaching listening. *International journal of advanced research in education, technology and management*, *2*(3).
2. Dudley-Evans, T., & St John, M. J. (1998). *Developments in English for specific purposes: A multi-disciplinary approach*. Cambridge University Press.
3. Miao, F., & Holmes, W. (2023). *Guidance for generative AI in education and research*. UNESCO. https://doi.org/10.54675/EWZM9535 doi.org

© 2026 International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Applications . All Rights Reserved.

4. Satibaldiyev, E. K. (2026). Agency and evidentiality under English dominance in Russian and Uzbek news translation. *The Lingua Spectrum, 4*(1), 357–361. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20810713
5. Subbotina, M. V., Yakovleva, G. G., Gilazova, G. S., & Gubanov, A. R. (2023). Kontaktoustanavlivayushchie sredstva v zagolovkakh mediatekstov (na materiale russkogo, angliyskogo i chuvashskogo yazykov) [Phatic means in media text headlines (based on the material of the Russian, English and Chuvash languages)]. *Philology. Theory & Practice, 16*(10), 3486–3490. https://doi.org/10.30853/phil20230536 Philology. Theory & Practice
6. Igamberdieva Saida Abdusamatovna. (2025). THE ROLE OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS IN DEVELOPING STUDENTS' INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE. *IQRO INDEXING*, *18*(01), 233-236. https://worldlyjournals.com/index.php/IFX/article/view/15573
7. Igamberdieva Saida Abdusamatovna. THE ROLE OF PROVERBS IN DEVELOPING INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNING. (2025). *Journal of Multidisciplinary Sciences and Innovations*, *4*(9), 376-379. https://doi.org/10.55640/

© 2026 International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Applications . All Rights Reserved.