

The Effects of AI-Enhanced Task-Based Language Teaching on Tenth Graders' English-Speaking Skills: A Study at a High School

Le Hoang Phuc^{1*}, Le Van Tuyen²

^{1,2} HUTECH University, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam

ABSTRACT: The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into English language teaching has created more opportunities for students to help them enhance their English-speaking skills. The study aimed to investigate the effects of AI-enhanced Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) on the English-speaking skills of tenth graders and to explore their perceptions of AI-supported task-based speaking activities at a high school in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. A quasi-experimental design was employed involving 79 tenth graders from two classes. The experimental group (n = 40) received AI-enhanced TBLT, while the control group (n = 39) received the standard TBLT throughout a 12-week intervention. A quantitative method was used to collect the data from pre- and post-speaking tests, while qualitative data were collected through a questionnaire and semi-structured interviews. Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Qualitative data were examined via content analysis. The findings revealed that the experimental group demonstrated greater development in their speaking performance than the control group. Students also expressed their positive and negative perceptions of AI-enhanced task-based speaking activities when they utilized their AI tools in speaking activities. The findings suggested that the integration of AI tools into the TBLT method could enhance students' English-speaking skills and promote positive learning experiences, despite some challenges in Vietnamese high schools.

KEYWORDS: Artificial Intelligence (AI), Task -Based Language Teaching (TBLT), English Speaking Skills, AI-Enhanced TBLT language learning, Vietnamese High School Students.

INTRODUCTION

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has developed rapidly to become a powerful assistant in English learning and teaching. As Owoc, Sawicka, and Weichbroth (2021) observed, AI opens up many opportunities to teach and learn by supporting learners and teachers anytime and anywhere. The development of AI tools such as AI-powered chatbots or AI-speech recognition systems allows students to develop their English skills, especially their communicative competence, by giving them immediate feedback and individualized support. AI becomes a valuable tool because it can promote students' autonomy, help students build their confidence, or provide authentic conversations. Therefore, the combination of AI in language education can provide so many opportunities for students who are willing to improve their speaking competence.

Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) is commonly adopted in many countries (Ali & Abbas, 2014) to enhance students' speaking competence. TBLT has been widely used for its ability to promote meaningful communication, authentic language usage, and learner engagement. TBLT is different from the Grammar Translation Method (GTM) because of using authentic communicative tasks rather than memorizing grammatical structures. TBLT helps students solve their speaking tasks through role-play, discussions, interviews, or problem-solving tasks. As a result, many high schools in Vietnam implement TBLT in their EFL classrooms so that students can improve their communicative competence.

However, in the study context, Trung Vuong High School, implementing traditional TBLT faces some challenges. EFL classrooms consist of many students gathering in one class, so teachers have to provide individualized feedback. Traditional TBLT still faces some challenges such as limited real-time feedback, proper scaffolding, individual support, or large class sizes (Tham & Huyen, 2021). In addition, students tend to feel anxious when they perform their speaking skills in front of their teachers or friends. Zhiping and Paramasivam (2013) showed that classroom anxiety is the main factor that affects the performance of students.

Because of these challenges, AI-enhanced TBLT has the potential to solve the limitations of traditional TBLT by increasing authentic interaction and creating more engaging and supportive speaking environments. AI-powered Chatbots, including ChatGPT, Grok, and Gemini, can provide immediate feedback, personalized practice, pronunciation correction, and ongoing support before, during, and after task performance. Furthermore, AI-powered speech recognition, especially Elsa Speak, can help students improve



their pronunciation and correct their mistakes quickly. Therefore, AI-enhanced TBLT has the potential to solve these challenges and create more opportunities for students.

In addition, some international studies have introduced the positive effects of AI tools when combined with TBLT. Students can improve their pronunciation, grammatical accuracy, fluency, vocabulary development, engagement, motivation, and speaking confidence. Furthermore, previous studies pointed out the challenges when TBLT is combined with AI tools, including pronunciation recognition, technical limitations, or unequal access to digital technologies. However, these previous studies focus only on universities rather than public high schools. Nissa, Mardiah, and Srikanda investigated the combination of AI and TBLT to develop students’ language skills at Universitas Muhammadiyah Sumatera Utara in 2025.

Therefore, this study needs to determine whether integrating AI tools into TBLT can enhance English speaking skills among Vietnamese high school students and explore their perceptions of the benefits and challenges of this approach. To address this gap, the current study investigated the effects of AI-enhanced TBLT on tenth graders’ English-speaking skills at Trung Vuong High School. It also explored students’ perceptions regarding the benefits and challenges of this approach. The study attempts to address the following two research questions:

- a) To what extent does the use of AI-enhanced TBLT enhance English speaking performance for tenth graders?
- b) What are students’ perceptions of the benefits and challenges of AI-enhanced task-based speaking activities?

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The quasi-experimental mixed-methods research design was used in this current study. The pre- and post-speaking tests were designed to measure the effects of AI-enhanced TBLT. Furthermore, the students of the experimental group completed a survey after their intervention. The survey questionnaire was used to examine students’ perceptions of benefits and challenges of using AI tools in TBLT. The study also employed semi-structured interviews to collect qualitative data. The mixed-method approach provided validity and allowed the researcher to gain a deeper understanding of the effects and students’ perceptions towards this approach.

Research Site and Participants

This study only focused on two EFL classes. 79 tenth-grade students in both classes participated in this study. One class served as the experimental group (N = 40) while the other class served as the control group (N = 39). The study was conducted at Trung Vuong High School, a public high school in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam.

Research Instruments

The study employed three research instruments that were used to collect both quantitative and qualitative data in this study, including pre and post-speaking tests, a questionnaire, and semi-structured interviews that were believed to be suitable for the quasi-experimental mixed-method research design.

The pre- and post-speaking tests were designed to measure students’ speaking abilities, including “Fluency, Grammatical Accuracy, Pronunciation, Lexical Resources, and Interaction”. The questionnaire consists of 45 items using 5-point Likert scales: “strongly disagree (SD), disagree (D), neutral (N), agree (A), and strongly agree (SA). Section 1 asks about the students’ personal information. Sections 2 and 3 ask about the benefits consisting of six categories (27 items) and challenges consisting of four categories (18 items) of AI-enhanced TBLT. The categories of each construct and their Cronbach’s alpha coefficients are presented in the following table.

Table 1: Cronbach’s alpha coefficients of the items

Constructs	Categories	No of Items	Cronbach’s Alpha
The perceived benefits of AI - enhanced TBLT	1) Immediate Feedback	4	0.711
	2) Motivation and Confidence	5	0.716
	3) Engagement of Students	5	0.777
	4) Improving Pronunciation	4	0.747
	5) Anxiety Reduction	4	0.708

	6) Developing Language Skills	5	0.794
The perceived challenges of AI – enhanced TBLT	1) Pronunciation Misunderstanding	3	0.720
	2) Lack of Clear Instructions	5	0.717
	3) Reduced Teaching Quality	5	0.711
	4) Unequal Access Issues	5	0.736

In addition, the interview consisted of 10 questions focusing on students' perceptions of benefits and challenges of AI-enhanced task-based speaking activities.

Procedures of Data Collection and Analysis

Data collection

The data collection was conducted at Trung Vuong High School during a 12-week intervention. The study consisted of 79 tenth-grade students who were from 2 EFL classes. 40 students served as the experimental group, while 39 students belonged to the control group. 40 students from the experimental group completed a questionnaire to explore their perceptions of AI-enhanced TBLT after completing the intervention. Furthermore, 8 students from the experimental group were selected randomly to participate in the interviews. Each student had approximately 15 minutes to answer 10 interview questions related to the benefits and challenges of AI-enhanced TBLT.

Data analysis

The quantitative data collected from the pretest, posttest, and questionnaire were analyzed by utilizing the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 27. Regarding data collected from the pretest and posttest, inferential statistics were used to compare speaking scores in both groups. The independent samples t-test was conducted to analyze the p-values of pre- and post-speaking tests of each group, which were before and after the intervention. Furthermore, the paired samples t-test was also used to determine the enhancement of the experimental and control groups by analyzing p-values. This paired samples t-test compared the speaking points of students in both groups. In terms of the questionnaire data, descriptive statistics were used. Mean score (M) and standard deviation (SD) were calculated. The interval width to interpret the mean value was based on a 5-point scale. The interval width was 0.8. The mean scores were interpreted using the following scales in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Mean score interpretation

Mean Values	Levels of Agreement
1.00 – 1.80	Strongly Disagree
1.80 – 2.60	Disagree
2.60 – 3.40	Neutral
3.40 – 4.20	Agree
4.20 – 5.00	Strongly Agree

In addition, all the data from the semi-structured interviews were analyzed using content analysis. The interview included 8 students in the experimental group. They were coded as S1, S2, and S8 to ensure anonymity and consistency of the analysis.

RESULTS

The findings of the study are presented by research questions in this section.

The Effects of AI-enhanced TBLT on English Speaking Performance

Table 3. The descriptive statistics of the post-speaking test

Group Statistics					
Post - Test	Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
	The Experimental Group	40	7.9000	.87119	.13775
	The Control Group	39	6.9231	.57968	.09282

Table 3 presents the descriptive statistics of the post-speaking test between the experimental and control groups. The experimental group achieved a better mean score ($M = 7.90$, $SD = 0.87$) than the control group ($M = 6.92$, $SD = 0.58$). Despite the improvement of the experimental group, the standard deviations of the two groups were still low, showing a consistent level of speaking performance among the two groups. Overall, the results suggested that students who received the AI-enhanced TBLT performed better in their speaking performance than students who received the standard TBLT.

Table 4. The independent samples t-test of the post-speaking test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	M	Std. Error Difference
Post - Test	Equal variances assumed	7.922	.006	5.852	77	.000	.97692	.16693
	Equal variances not assumed			5.881	68.05	.000	.97692	.16610

The independent samples t - test was conducted to investigate whether the difference in post-speaking test between the experimental and control groups. According to Table 3, the results revealed a significant difference between the two groups ($t = 5.88$, $p < .001$). Because the significance value of the test was lower than 0.005, the result emphasized that the experimental group achieved significantly higher speaking scores than the control group after completing the intervention phase.

Benefits and Challenges of Using AI-Enhanced TBLT

Perceived Benefits of AI-Enhanced TBLT

This section presents both quantitative and qualitative data reflecting the six categories of students' perceived benefits. The results of the questionnaire indicated that students emphasized their positive perception of "**Immediate Feedback**" provided by AI tools. Accordingly, "Speaking Performance Enhancement" achieved the highest mean score (Item 4: $M = 4.38$, $SD = 0.49$), followed by "Immediate Feedback on Speaking Performance" (Item 1: $M = 4.30$, $SD = 0.52$), and "Identifying Pronunciation Mistakes" (Item 3: $M = 4.30$, $SD = 0.61$). "Immediate Mistakes Correction" obtained the lowest mean score (Item 2: $M = 4.28$, $SD = 0.64$). The mean scores and standard deviations emphasized that students agreed that the category was essential for developing their speaking competence. From interviews, students expressed that "*AI tools help me with so many things during my speaking performance, especially by providing instant feedback, so I can correct my speaking mistakes quickly.* (S1)" Similarly, S3 mentioned, "*AI tools such as ChatGPT detect and provide immediate feedback based on my speaking mistakes quickly, so I can correct them.* (S3)" Therefore, AI tools helped students improve their speaking performance because of providing immediate feedback.

Furthermore, students indicated positive perceptions of the second category "**Motivation and confidence**". The highest M was item "Confidence in Speaking English" (Item 7: $M = 4.52$, $SD = 0.51$), followed by "Interest in Speaking Activities" (Item 6: $M = 4.55$, $SD = 0.50$), and "Enjoyment of Speaking Lesson" (Item 8: $M = 4.40$, $SD = 0.50$). Students also agreed in two categories: "Increase in Speaking Motivation" (Item 5: $M = 4.35$, $SD = 0.48$) and "Comfort Level in Speaking" (Item 9: $M = 4.28$, $SD = 0.60$). Students strongly agreed that AI-enhanced TBLT could increase and build their motivation and confidence in their speaking lessons. Regarding data collected from interviews, students also expressed that AI tools provided many handy suggestions. S4 mentioned, "*Although AI is just a tool to support me, it makes me not afraid of making mistakes during my speaking tasks.* (S4)" Furthermore, S6 expressed that "*AI tools provide so many useful suggestions for me. They help me expand my ideas and maintain my English communication smoothly, so I feel confident when I express my speech in English.* (S6)"



In addition, students held positive perceptions of **“Engagement of Students”** during AI-enhanced TBLT. The highest mean score of these items was “Interactivity of Speaking Tasks” (Item 12: $M = 4.10$, $SD = 0.71$) and “Boredom Reduction in Speaking Tasks” (Item 14: $M = 4.10$, $SD = 0.67$). Students also agreed that AI tools helped them stay focused: “Focus Maintenance during Speaking Activities” (Item 13: $M = 4.00$, $SD = 0.91$). “Enjoyment of AI Speaking Activities” and “Lesson Engagement via AI Activities” achieved the mean score (Item 11: $M = 3.85$, $SD = 0.77$) and (Item 10: $M = 3.80$, $SD = 0.65$), emphasizing that these items were the lowest. The results demonstrated that students agreed that AI-enhanced TBLT could develop students’ engagement in their English-speaking lessons. Qualitative data also revealed that AI-enhanced TBLT was more dynamic, interactive, and enjoyable than traditional speaking activities. According to S8, *“AI tools can create different scenarios and provide questions for me, so I like my speaking lessons a lot. (S8)”* Similarly, S7 expressed that *“AI tools can create so many conversation topics and authentic dialogues, so my speaking lessons are very dynamic. (S7)”*

Moreover, students had positive perceptions of the role of AI tools in **“Improving Pronunciation”**. The highest mean score was “Effective Pronunciation Practice” (Item 18: $M = 3.83$, $SD = 0.75$), followed by “Pronunciation Development” (Item 15: $M = 3.78$, $SD = 0.58$), and “Clarity in Word Pronunciation” (Item 16: $M = 3.77$, $SD = 0.66$). The item “Recognition of Pronunciation Mistakes” was the lowest mean score (Item 17: $M = 3.75$, $SD = 0.588$). The result showed that AI tools could detect pronunciation errors quickly, so students agreed with this category. Several students reported that AI tools could help them develop their pronunciation by providing pronunciation suggestions and instant corrections during their speaking performance. Based on S2, *“AI tools help me improve my pronunciation better because they instruct me how to pronounce each sound. (S2)”* Similarly, S3 reported that *“I am not confident when I speak English because of my pronunciation, but AI tools can help me improve it effectively by showing me how to pronounce. (S3)”*

Additionally, students indicated positive perceptions towards **“Anxiety Reduction.”** These items achieved the highest mean scores, such as “Reduction in Fear of Making Mistakes” (Item 22: $M = 4.50$, $SD = 0.51$) and “Reduction in Speaking Nervousness” (Item 20: $M = 4.38$, $SD = 0.59$). Both remaining items were “Speaking Relaxation Level” (Item 21: $M = 4.25$, $SD = 0.71$) and “Speaking Anxiety Reduction” (Item 19: $M = 4.13$, $SD = 0.52$). The mean scores and standard deviations were high and low, emphasizing that students agreed that AI-enhanced TBLT contributed to reducing their anxiety and helped them feel less nervous, more enjoyable, and more confident. During the interview, most students reported that practicing with AI tools could help them feel more enjoyable and less nervous when they communicated in English. S6 provided that *“AI tools suggested many ideas, so I am not anxious when I communicate in English. (S6)”* S7 expressed that *“When I practice with AI tools, they do not judge or smile at me due to my mistakes, so I believe more when speaking English. (S7)”*

Finally, students emphasized that the combination of AI tools and TBLT could assist students in **“Developing Language Skills”**. Among these categories, the highest item was “Communication Skills Improvement” (Item 27: $M = 4.23$, $SD = 0.62$), followed by “Clarity in Expression of Ideas” (Item 26: $M = 4.10$, $SD = 0.63$), and “Grammatical Accuracy Improvement” (Item 25: $M = 4.08$, $SD = 0.63$). Both “Speaking Ability Improvement” and “Effective Vocabulary Usage” achieved the same mean score (Item 23: $M = 4.00$, $SD = 0.32$; Item 24: $M = 4.00$, $SD = 0.75$), while the standard deviations were different. Although these items had the lowest mean score, students still agreed that AI tools could help them enhance their speaking ability and vocabulary usage. During the interview, most students reported that practicing with AI tools could help them expand their vocabulary bank, improve their grammatical accuracy, and express their ideas more clearly during their speaking activities. S3 pointed out that *“For me, AI tools help me so many things. I can recognize my mistakes and improve my vocabulary through AI tools like ChatGPT. (S3)”* S4 showed that *“AI tools help me a lot. For example, I will know how to use this vocabulary instead of that vocabulary based on the contexts. Moreover, I can speak with AI tools to improve my speaking competence. (S4)”*

Perceived Challenges of AI-Enhanced TBLT

According to the challenges of AI-enhanced TBLT, students showed their difficulties related to **“Pronunciation Misunderstanding”** by AI tools. The highest item was “Inaccurate Speech Recognition” by AI, which achieved the mean score (Item 29: $M = 3.55$, $SD = 0.78$), followed by “Unreliability of AI Pronunciation Feedback” (Item 30: $M = 3.43$, $SD = 0.98$), and “Incorrect Pronunciation Feedback from AI” (Item 28: $M = 3.13$, $SD = 0.76$). Students were aware of the limitations of AI tools in identifying their pronunciation, but the mean scores of three items indicated that these challenges do not seem to be the main obstacles to speaking activities. During the interview, students reported that AI tools sometimes misunderstood their pronunciation, particularly when they spoke quickly, used unfamiliar words, or spoke unclearly. Nevertheless, they confirmed that these problems



did not occur too much and did not influence their speaking practice. S5 expressed that *“AI tools cannot identify my pronunciation when I speak too fast or pronounce unclear words, but it did not impact my speaking practice much. (S5)”* Besides, S6 showed that *“AI tools are smart, but sometimes, they cannot understand why I am saying. (S6)”*

Another challenge was **“Lack of Clear Instructions”** when students use AI tools during their speaking activities. Students indicated their low levels of difficulty in this category. *“The Need for Training Programs”* on AI tools Usage was the highest item (Item 34: M = 2.85, SD = 0.62). The next item was *“Inadequate Instructions on AI Usage in Speaking Tasks,”* which achieved the mean score (Item 35: M = 2.65, SD = 0.62), followed by *“Need for Guidance on AI Integration”* in Speaking Tasks (Item 33: M = 2.60, SD = 0.74), and *“Unclear of AI Tools Instructions”* (Item 32: M = 2.48, SD = 0.75). The lowest item was *“Insufficiency of Instructions on AI Tools Usage”* (Item 31: M = 1.92, SD = 0.42). The lack of clear instructions was not the main challenge for using AI-enhanced TBLT. Most students agreed that they had enough instructions, but a small number of students needed more training activities before using AI tools. Students showed that they received enough instructions from their teachers. However, the instructions for AI tools were sometimes difficult. Some students were confused about them, but they could still use their AI tools during their speaking activities. S4 expressed that *“Not at all, because I used other AI tools before, so the instructions are very easy to understand. (S4)”* However, S8 showed that *“Yes, it is a bit difficult for me because I do not know technology well, so I think I need to participate in more training programs. (S8)”*

Furthermore, students indicated their perception of whether the application of AI tools could **“Reduce Teaching Quality”** in speaking lessons. The item *“Teacher Explanation Value”* was the highest item (Item 38: M = 3.95, SD = 1.152), and *“Teacher Feedback Preference”* was the second highest item (Item 37: M = 3.63, SD = 1.148). These items emphasized that students believed that the explanations and feedback of teachers were always better than AI tools. The remaining items received the lower mean scores, including *“Lower AI Effectiveness”* (Item 39: M = 3.18, SD = 1.152), *“Reduced Interaction Quality”* (Item 40: M = 3.05, SD = 1.131), and *“Reduced Teacher Role”* (Item 36: M = 2.48, SD = 0.960). These findings showed that AI could not replace the role of teachers in their EFL classes. In addition, students believed that AI tools could not reduce the quality of teaching. All items provided a medium consensus among students, emphasizing that some students had different opinions. The interview indicated that students believed that teachers were significant in contributing to their learning process. Based on S1, *“In my opinion, AI can help me achieve my speaking goals, but I would like to learn with my teachers rather than AI tools because teachers’ feedback is always reliable. (S1)”* Similarly, S2 pointed out that *“I do not think that AI could reduce my learning quality because my teachers always support me when I need. (S2)”*

Finally, students expressed their experiences related to **“Unequal Access to AI Tools”**. The range of the mean score was from 2.88 to 3.88, emphasizing both neutral and agreed levels. The item *“Internet Connection Limits”* was the highest item (Item 44: M = 3.88, SD = 0.757), emphasizing that unstable internet connection was a big issue. The *“Lack of Suitable Devices”* achieved the highest mean score (Item 43: M = 3.82, SD = 0.675), and *“Unequal AI Access”* received the highest score (Item 41: M = 3.80, SD = 0.516). These items indicated that some devices could not access AI tools due to a shortage of storage capacity or slow response time, and students agreed that equal access to AI tools was a big issue among students. The remaining items *“AI Tools Payment Requirements”* and *“Technical Access Issues,”* received the mean scores (Item 45: M = 3.67, SD = 0.694) and (Item 42: M = 2.88, SD = 0.992), emphasizing that some special features of AI tools need payment and technical problems could stop students from accessing their AI tools. In addition, students reported that not all students had the same learning conditions. Some students expressed that the unstable internet connection made them feel annoyed. According to the description provided by S3, *“During my speaking lessons, the internet connection was interrupted many times, so it disrupted my learning process. (S3)”* S8 expressed that *“some AI tools’ features, such as adding files of ChatGPT cannot use continuously, so I need to buy the plus version to keep using them. (S8)”* Besides, S6 commented, *“my mobile phone was very old phone, so I could not install AI applications. (S6)”*

DISCUSSION

The Improvement of English-Speaking Performance

The findings indicate that both the control and experimental groups improved their speaking competence following the intervention. Both groups received the post-speaking test to evaluate the effects of this approach. The mean score of the experimental group was M = 7.90 and SD = 0.87 compared with the control group (M = 6.93, SD = 0.58). The independent samples t-test presented the difference between the two groups ($p = 0.000 < 0.001$) after the intervention. The experimental group indicated that



they developed their speaking performance ($p = 0.000 < 0.001$), while the control group did not enhance their speaking skills ($p = 0.324 > 0.05$). Therefore, the results presented that the group who studied with the integration of AI tools with the TBLT method achieved more effectively than the group who only received the traditional TBLT approach.

The findings of the study are aligned with those of [Huang, Hew, and Fryer](#), who introduced that AI tools could become assistant tools to support TBLT by providing personalized learning, suggesting learning paths, or giving instant feedback throughout speaking activities in 2021. Moreover, [Nisa, Mardiah, and Srikanda \(2025\)](#) stated that the integration of AI tools with the TBLT method could be more effective than the traditional TBLT method by simulating real-life conversations, providing immediate feedback, and assisting students in solving their TBLT's authentic tasks. Some reasons are explained below why the experimental group achieved more effectively and gained the highest scores than the control group after the intervention. Firstly, AI tools assisted students in developing various speaking skills, including pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, and fluency. Secondly, the integration of AI tools with the TBLT method created more opportunities for autonomous learning. Thirdly, students could spend more time practicing their speaking skills not only in the classroom but also after school. Furthermore, AI tools could support every stage, including pre-, while-, and post-stages, of the TBLT lessons. Finally, AI-enhanced TBLT could create a more engaging learning environment. Students participated in their speaking activities actively because AI tools could make speaking practice more relaxed and interactive. Overall, the findings of research question 1 presented that AI-enhanced TBLT was an effective method for developing tenth graders' English-speaking skills.

Tenth Graders' Perceptions of AI-Enhanced TBLT

Students showed their positive perceptions of the benefits of AI-enhanced TBLT. Most questionnaire items in the six benefit categories obtained the highest mean scores. These categories emphasized that students believed that AI tools assisted them in learning speaking skills. Among the six categories, the "Immediate Feedback" items obtained the highest responses, ranging from 4.30 to 4.38. Other categories, including Motivation and Confidence, "Engagement," "Pronunciation Improvement," "Anxiety Reduction," and "Language Skills Improvement, received positive ratings from students. These findings were connected with previous studies. [Huang, Hew, and Fryer](#) showed in 2024 that AI tools provided immediate and personalized feedback based on students' language learning. [Nisa, Mardiah, and Srikanda \(2025\)](#) showed that AI tools can provide immediate feedback to help students improve their speaking performance. Similarly, [Phan](#) pointed out that Chatbots could support English-speaking skills by providing instant corrections and personalized learning experiences in 2025. Overall, the findings presented students' perceptions of the benefits of AI-enhanced TBLT. The results emphasized that AI tools improved students' speaking competence and increased their motivation, confidence, engagement, and opportunities for independent learning.

Despite these benefits, students also expressed their challenges with AI-enhanced TBLT. These challenge categories, including "Misunderstanding Pronunciation," "Lack of Clear Instructions," "Reduced Teaching Quality," and "Unequal Access", obtained mean scores that ranged from approximately 1.92 to 3.95, emphasizing that students recognized some limitations when they used AI tools during their speaking activities. These findings were similar to those of previous studies. They are consistent with the findings of [Li, Mohamad, and You \(2025\)](#), who emphasized that AI speech recognition could misunderstand students' pronunciation due to background noise, unclear speech, or distance. According to [Zang \(2025\)](#), the overuse and much reliance on AI tools could reduce the quality of teaching and learning. Students emphasized that both aspects, such as interactions and explanations, focusing on teachers and students, were necessary, so relying too much on AI tools could reduce the quality of teaching and learning. These findings were consistent with [Huang, Wu, and Dou \(2024\)](#), who showed that poor internet connectivity was considered the main challenge interrupting speaking activities. Moreover, [Vo \(2026\)](#) indicated that students faced many problems because they could not afford advanced AI features or have suitable devices. Overall, AI tools still had several challenges when integrated into the TBLT method. However, these challenges did not impact students' ability to improve their speaking skills.

CONCLUSION

The study was conducted to investigate the effects of AI-enhanced TBLT on tenth graders' English-speaking skills and to explore students' perceptions of learning English speaking through AI-enhanced TBLT. The findings demonstrated that students who received AI-enhanced TBLT achieved greater development in their speaking performance than students who received the standard TBLT. Furthermore, the students of the experimental group recognized benefits of AI-enhanced TBLT, including immediate feedback, increased motivation and confidence, increased classroom engagement, pronunciation improvement, reduced



speaking anxiety, and improved language skills. However, they also expressed several challenges of AI-enhanced TBLT during their speaking activities, including students' pronunciation misunderstanding, the need for teacher instruction, overdependence on AI tools, and unequal access to AI tools.

The findings of the current study have several implications. Firstly, English teachers are encouraged to combine AI tools into the TBLT method, so students will have opportunities to practice their speaking skills inside and outside the classroom. Secondly, teachers need to teach students to use AI tools effectively. AI tools should be considered a supportive tool rather than a replacement for teachers. Teachers should monitor and encourage their students to think independently instead of completely relying on AI tools. Finally, learning materials should include AI-assisted speaking tasks that can encourage students to practice more authentic communication. Curriculum developers need to ensure that AI tools can help teachers in their speaking lessons, but they do not replace the interactions.

However, this current study still has some limitations. Firstly, the study only focused on one high school. The sample was small, and all participants came from the same educational setting. Secondly, the intervention phase was short due to the school's time constraint. Although the results indicated that AI-enhanced TBLT had positive effects on tenth graders' English-speaking skills, the study may need more time to help students become familiar with AI tools. Thirdly, the study was conducted in the Intensive English Program due to the school administration, not focusing on the Main Program. Finally, the current study investigated the use of a limited number of AI tools during the intervention phase.

This current study makes some recommendations for future research. First, future researchers should conduct research with a large number of participants who are from different schools and regions in Vietnam. Secondly, they should provide more time to examine the long-term effects of AI-enhanced TBLT on students' English-speaking skills. Finally, future studies should include more teachers and students who are from different educational levels, or explore the perceptions of both teachers and students.

REFERENCES

1. Abbas, S., & Ali, W. (2014). Comparison between grammar & translation method & communicative language teaching. *International Journal of Advanced Research*, 2(6), 124 – 128, <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1149618.pdf>
2. Huang, X., Wu, Y., & Dou, A. (2024). AI- enhanced task – based language teaching: fostering personalized college English learning. *Frontiers in Educational Research*, 7(10), <https://doi.org/10.25236/FER.2024.071033>.
3. Huang, W., Hew, K. F., & Fryer, L. K. (2021). Chatbots for language learning—Are they really useful? A systematic review of chatbot-supported language learning. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 38(1), 237 – 257, DOI: 10.1111/jcal.12610
4. Li, W., Maslawati, W. L., & You, H. W. (2025). Integrating automatic speech recognition and automated writing evaluation to reduce speaking anxiety and enhance speaking competence among Chinese EFL learners. *Cogent Education*, 12(1), 1 – 31, [https://doi.org/10.47205/plhr.2024\(8-IV\)36](https://doi.org/10.47205/plhr.2024(8-IV)36)
5. Nissa, K., Mardiah, H., & Srikandi, C. N. (2025). Using artificial intelligence in task-based language teaching to foster students' language skills. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan (JIP) STKIP Kusuma Negara*, 17(1), 90-102, <https://doi.org/10.37640/jip.v17i1.2025>
6. Owoc, M. L., Sawicka, A., & Weichbroth, P. (2021). *Artificial Intelligence Technologies in Education: Benefits, Challenges and Strategies of Implementation*. Springer International Publishing.
7. Phan, T. L. (2024). Application of AI in enhancing speaking performance of students in Hanoi. *Vietnam Social Sciences*, 1, 105 – 128, [https://doi.org/10.56794/VSSR.1\(218\).105-128](https://doi.org/10.56794/VSSR.1(218).105-128).
8. Tham, M. D., & Huyen, T. T. H. (2021). Implementing task-based language teaching in Vietnamese secondary schools: what hinders EFL teachers?. *The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language*, 25(2), 1- 15, <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1314679.pdf>
9. Vo, T. M. N. (2026). Integrating artificial intelligence in EFL speaking instructions: opportunities and challenges at the Industrial University of Ho Chi Minh city. *Industry and Trade Magazine*, 1(1), <https://tapchicongthuong.vn/integrating-artificial-intelligence-in-efl-speaking-instruction--opportunities-and-challenges-at-the-industrial-university-of-ho-chi-minh-city-471662.htm>



10. Zang, D. (2025). Task-based teaching method in English teaching from the perspective of big data. *International Journal of Web-Based Learning and Teaching Technologies*, 20(1), 1- 17, [https:// orcid .org/ 0009 -0001 -7556 -7218](https://orcid.org/0009-0001-7556-7218)
11. Zhiping, D., & Paramasivam, S. (2013). Anxiety of speaking English in class among international students in Malaysian university. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 1(11), 1 – 16, <https://ijern.com/journal/November-2013/17.pdf>

Cite this Article: Phuc, L.H., Tuyen, L.V. (2026). The Effects of AI-Enhanced Task-Based Language Teaching on Tenth Graders' English-Speaking Skills: A Study at a High School. International Journal of Current Science Research and Review, 9(8), pp. 4273-4281. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijcsrr/V9-i8-06>