American Journal of Alternative Education
ISSN: 2997-3953 (Online)
Vol. 2, No. 6, June 2025,
Available online at: https://scientificbulletin.com/index.php/AJAE

Using AR Technologies in Foreign Language Teaching: New Opportunities and Prospects

Kasimova Kamila Makhammadjonovna
Namangan state university, Faculty of Philology teacher, kam_ila_90@mail.ru

Abdulxayeva Buoysha Xusniddinova
Namangan state university, Faculty of Philology trainee teacher

Article information:
Manuscript received: 18 Apr 2025; **Accepted:** 17 May 2025; **Published:** 18 Jun 2025

Abstract: This paper explores the implementation of Augmented Reality (AR) technologies in foreign language education, emphasizing their capacity to foster immersive, interactive, and contextual learning experiences. Drawing from empirical research conducted in secondary schools, the study evaluates the pedagogical benefits of AR, including increased learner motivation, improved vocabulary retention, and enhanced engagement. Challenges such as digital infrastructure, teacher preparedness, and accessibility are also examined. The findings indicate that AR holds considerable promise for transforming traditional language instruction into dynamic, student-centered experiences.

Keys words: Augmented Reality, Foreign Language Learning, Educational Technology, Immersive Learning, Pedagogy, Student Engagement

1. Introduction

In recent years, educational paradigms have shifted toward learner-centered models supported by digital innovation. One such technology is Augmented Reality (AR), which overlays digital information onto the physical world, offering novel ways to teach abstract or linguistic content. In foreign language education, AR introduces contextualized, multisensory learning environments that promote active participation and reduce language anxiety (Lin & Chen, 2020).

This paper investigates the role of AR in second language acquisition (SLA), considering both its theoretical foundations and practical classroom applications. It seeks to answer the following research questions:

1. How does AR influence language acquisition outcomes in secondary school learners?
2. What are the main pedagogical and logistical challenges in implementing AR?
3. What are the long-term implications and prospects of AR integration in language curricula?

2. Literature Review

2.1 Augmented Reality in Education

AR has been increasingly adopted across disciplines including science, medicine, and technical training (Ibáñez & Delgado-Kloos, 2018). Its application in language education, though still emerging, has shown encouraging results, particularly in vocabulary acquisition and student motivation.

2.2 Theoretical Foundations

Vygotsky's sociocultural theory and constructivist learning principles provide a strong theoretical basis for AR's use in education. AR enables situated learning (Lave & Wenger, 1991), where learners acquire language skills in simulated real-life contexts.

2.3 AR and Language Learning Outcomes

Studies have highlighted AR's potential to enhance vocabulary retention, listening comprehension, and speaking fluency (Billinghurst & Dünser, 2012). Learners benefit from the interactivity and immediate feedback offered by AR tools.

2.4 Gaps in the Literature

Despite growing interest, limited large-scale research exists on AR's long-term impact and its integration into formal language curricula. Additionally, few studies focus on its application at the secondary school level.

3. Methods

3.1 Research Design

A **quasi-experimental mixed-methods** design was adopted. The study combined quantitative assessments (pre/post vocabulary and speaking tests) with qualitative interviews and classroom observations.

3.2 Participants

The study involved 80 students (aged 14–17) and 10 English teachers from three urban secondary schools. Participants were divided into an experimental group (AR-enhanced instruction) and a control group (traditional instruction).

3.3 Instruments

- **Language proficiency tests** aligned with CEFR A2-B1 levels
- **Motivation and engagement survey** using a 5-point Likert scale
- **Observation checklist** for AR engagement behaviors
- **Semi-structured interview guide** for teachers and students

3.4 AR Tools Used

- *Mondly AR* for speaking and vocabulary practice
- Custom-designed AR flashcards using *BlippAR*
- AR role-play scenarios via *ZapWorks Studio*

3.5 Procedure

Over six weeks, the experimental group received three 45-minute AR sessions per week. Lessons focused on vocabulary, conversation, and situational role-play. Pre- and post-intervention assessments were conducted in week 1 and week 6, respectively.

4. Results

4.1 Quantitative Findings

- **Vocabulary retention** improved by **23%** in the AR group vs **11%** in the control group ($p < 0.05$).
- **Speaking fluency scores** rose by an average of 1.2 points (on a 10-point scale) in the AR group.
- **Engagement survey** showed that 86% of students found AR lessons "highly motivating," compared to 47% in the control group.

4.2 Qualitative Insights

Teacher perspectives:

- "**Students became less self-conscious during speaking activities."**
- **"AR provided** an instant context for words, which aided memorization."

Student feedback:

- "I feel like I'm using English in real life."
- "It's like playing a game, but I learn without realizing."

4.3 Observational Data

Students using AR displayed increased verbal output, more peer-to-peer interaction, and higher participation in class discussions.

5. Discussion

5.1 AR as a Catalyst for Language Engagement

AR's immersive environment helps learners overcome traditional barriers in SLA such as fear of making mistakes, lack of context, and low engagement. By simulating real-life scenarios (e.g., ordering food, asking for directions), AR allows students to practice target structures meaningfully.

5.2 Pedagogical Implications

To fully exploit AR's benefits, educators must be trained not only in technical use but also in instructional design. Integrating AR should not be an afterthought but aligned with curriculum goals, assessment, and scaffolding strategies.

5.3 Limitations

- Technological limitations: Inconsistent access to AR-capable devices
- Teacher readiness: Varying degrees of digital literacy
- Content **quality:** Limited availability of high-quality, curriculum-aligned AR materials

5.4 Future Prospects

As AR platforms become more accessible and educational content expands, we foresee a broader adoption of AR in hybrid and blended language classrooms. Moreover, coupling AR with AI-driven feedback mechanisms may further personalize language instruction.

6. Conclusion

This study demonstrates that AR can significantly enrich foreign language instruction by promoting engagement, retention, and fluency. However, systemic challenges related to training, resources, and content development must be addressed for sustainable integration. Future research should explore longitudinal impacts, equity of access, and integration into assessment frameworks.

References

1. Azuma, R. T. (1997). A survey of augmented reality. *Presence: Teleoperators & Virtual Environments*, 6(4), 355–385.
2. Billinghurst, M., & Dünser, A. (2012). Augmented reality in the classroom. *Computer*, 45(7), 56–63.
3. Ibáñez, M.-B., & Delgado-Kloos, C. (2018). Augmented reality for STEM learning: A systematic review. *Computers & Education*, 123, 109–123.
4. Lin, T.-J., & Chen, H.-R. (2020). Integrating AR into language learning: A meta-analysis. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 33(3), 1–24.

5. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
6. Makhammadjonovna K. K. METHODOLOGICAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE STUDY OF LARGE-SCALE WORKS OF ART //Western European Journal of Modern Experiments and Scientific Methods. – 2024. – Т. 2. – №. 4. – С. 116-120.
7. Касимова К. М. The Role of Reading in Russian Language Lessons //International Journal of Scientific Trends. – 2024. – Т. 3. – №. 3. – С. 17-26.
8. Makhammadzhonovna K. K. PSYCHOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENTS'PERCEPTION OF WORKS OF ART //Western European Journal of Modern Experiments and Scientific Methods. – 2024. – Т. 2. – №. 4. – С. 107-110.