2026-yil
9(1)-son

“FAN VA TA’LIM YANGILIKLARI”

ILMIY - METODIK

JURNALI

saen.uz

FAN VA TA'LIM YANGILIKLARI
JURNALI

2026-yil
9(1)-son

Bosh muharrir:
Shoumarov G‘ayrat Bahromovich, psixologiya fanlari doktori, akademik

Bosh muharrir o‘rinbosari:
Qodirov Umarali Do‘stqobilovich, psixologiya fanlari doktori (DSc), professor

Mas’ul kotib:
Muqimov Alisher

Texnik muharrir:
Qarshiyev Jamshid Murotaliyevich, pedagogika fanlari bo‘yicha falsafa doktori (PhD), dotsent v.b.

TAHRIR HAY’ATI:

01.00.00 – FIZIKA-MATEMATIKA FANLARI
Ayupov Shavkat Abdullayevich, fizika-matematika fanlari doktori, akademik
A’zamov Abdulla, fizika-matematika fanlari doktori, akademik
Zohidov Erkin A’zamovich, fizika-matematika fanlari doktori, professor

02.00.00 – KIMYO FANLARI
Normaxamatov Nodirali Soxobataliyevich, kimyo fanlar doktori, professor
Tojibayev Komiljon Sharobitdinovich, kimyo fanlar doktori, akademik

03.00.00 – BIOLOGIYA FANLARI
Abdurahmonov Ibrohim Yo‘lchiyevich, biologiya fanlari doktori, akademik
Sulaymonov Botirjon Abdushukurovich, biologiya fanlari doktori, akademik

04.00.00 – GEOLOGIYA-MINERALOGIYA FANLARI
Fayziyev Abdulhaq Radjabovich, geologiya-mineralogiya fanlari doktori, professor
Husanov Sultonboy To‘xtayevich, geologiya-mineralogiya fanlari doktori, professor

05.00.00 – TEXNIKA FANLARI
Allayev Qahramon Rahimovich, texnika fanlari doktori, akademik
Majidov Inom Urishevich, texnika fanlari doktori, professor
Turobjonov Sadritdin Maxamatdinovich, texnika fanlari doktori, akademik
Shaumarov Said Sanatovich, texnika fanlari doktori, professor

06.00.00 – QISHLOQ XO‘JALIGI FANLARI
Namozov Shodmon Ergashovich, qishloq xo‘jaligi fanlari doktori, akademik
Shoumarov Hikmat Bahromovich, qishloq xo‘jaligi fanlari nomzodi, professor

07.00.00 – TARIX FANLARI
Ziyo Azamat Hamid o‘g‘li, tarix fanlari doktori, akademik
Sagdullayev Anatoliy Sagdullayevich, tarix fanlari doktori, akademik
Yusupova Diloram Yunusovna, tarix fanlari doktori, akademik

08.00.00 – IQTISODIYOT FANLARI
Abdurahmonov Qalandar Xodjayevich, iqtisod fanlari doktori, akademik
Musayev Behzod Anvarovich, iqtisod fanlari nomzodi
To‘xliyev Nurislom, iqtisod fanlari doktori, akademik
G‘ulomov Saidahror Saidahmedovich, iqtisod fanlari doktori, akademik

FAN VA TA'LIM YANGILIKLARI
JURNALI
2026-yil
9(1)-son

09.00.00 – FALSAFA FANLARI
Nazarov Qiyom Normirzayevich, falsafa fanlari doktori, professor
Saifnazarov Ismoil Saifnazarovich, falsafa fanlari doktori, professor

10.00.00 – FILOLOGIYA FANLARI
Mengliyev Baxtiyor Rajabovich, filologiya fanlari doktori, professor
Sirojiddinov Shuhrat Samariddinovich, filologiya fanlari doktori, akademik
Xidirov Rajab Gulmatovich, filologiya fanlari nomzodi, dotsent (Tojikiston)

11.00.00 – GEOGRAFIYA FANLARI
Nigmatov Asqar Nigmatullayevich, geografiya fanlari doktori, professor
Tojiyeva Zulxumor Nazarovna, geografiya fanlari doktori, professor

12.00.00 – YURIDIK FANLAR
Rustamboyev Mirzayusuf Hakimovich, yuridik fanlar doktori, professor
Saidov Akmal Xolmatovich, yuridik fanlar doktori, akademik
Xolmo'minov Jumanazar Toshtemirovich, yuridik fanlar doktori, professor
Qodirov Bobiromon Bekmurodovich, yuridik fanlar doktori, professor

13.00.00 – PEDAGOGIKA FANLARI
Djurayev Risboy Haydarovich, pedagogika fanlari doktori, akademik
Ibraimov Xolboy, pedagogika fanlari doktori, akademik
Musurmonova Oynisa, pedagogika fanlari doktori, professor
Umarov Bahrom Norboyevich, pedagogika fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori, dotsent

14.00.00 – TIBBIYOT FANLARI
Akilov Xabibulla Ataullayevich, tibbiyot fanlari doktori, professor
Nazirov Feruz Gafurovich, tibbiyot fanlari doktori, akademik

15.00.00 – FARMATSEVTIKA FANLARI
Abdullabekova Viloyat Nurillabekovna, farmatsevtika fanlari doktori, professor
Tulaganov Abduqodir Abdurahmonovich, farmatsevtika fanlari doktori, professor

16.00.00 – VETERINARIYA FANLARI
Daminov Asadullo Suvonovich, veterinariya fanlari doktori, professor
Jabborov Shuhrat Abdumajidovich, veterinariya fanlari doktori, professor
G'afurov Aktam G'afurovich, veterinariya fanlari doktori, professor

17.00.00 – SAN'ATSHUNOSLIK FANLARI
Ahmedova Nigora Rahimovna, sanatshunoslik fanlari doktori, professor
Hakimov Akbar Abdullayevich, san'atshunoslik fanlari doktori, akademik

18.00.00 – ARXITEKTURA FANLARI
Nozilov Dodo Avazovich, arxitektura fanlari doktori, professor
Uralov Axtam Sindarovich, arxitektura fanlari doktori, professor

19.00.00 – PSIXOLOGIYA FANLARI
Abdusamatov Hasanboy Usmonjon o'g'li, psixologiya fanlari doktori, professor
Barotov Sharif Ramazonovich, psixologiya fanlari doktori, professor
Karimova Vasila Mamanosirovna, psixologiya fanlari doktori, professor
Halimova Mashraboy Vohidovna, psixologiya fanlari doktori, professor
Lazar Drajeta, psixologiya fanlari doktori, professor, Belgrad, Serbiya
Karpinskiy Konstantin Viktorovich, psixologiya fanlari doktori, professor, Grodno, Belarussiya
Suletbayeva Ella Serikbayevna, psixologiya fanlari doktori, dotsent

FAN VA TA'LIM YANGILIKLARI
JURNALI
2026-yil
9(1)-son

22.00.00 – SOTSIOLOGIYA FANLARI
Bekmurodov Mansur Bobomurodovich, sotsiologiya fanlari doktori, professor
Toshmuhamedova Dilorom Gafurdjanovna, sotsiologiya fanlari doktori

23.00.00 – SIYOSIY FANLAR
Fayzullayev Alisher Omonullayevich, siyosiy fanlar doktori, professor
Hasanov Otabek Abdurashidovich, siyosiy fanlar doktori
Paxrutdinov Shukritdin Ilyasovich, siyosiy fanlar doktori, professor
Omonov Baxtiyor Axtamovich, siyosiy fanlar doktori, professor
Quronboyev Qahramon Qo'chqorovich, siyosiy fanlar doktori, professor
Avazov Komil Xolliyevich, siyosiy fanlar bo'yicha falsafa doktori

24.00.00 – ISLOMSHUNOSLIK FANLARI
Ibrohimov Ne'matulla, filologiya fanlari doktori, akademik
Islomov Zohidjon Mahmudovich, filologiya fanlari doktori, professor

FAN VA TA'LIM YANGILIKLARI
JURNALI
2026-yil
9(1)-son

UDK 372.881.111.1:004.8

Tursunova Sharifa Abdunosirovna,
Teacher at Secondary School No. 226, Yashnobod District, Tashkent City

EVALUATING AI-GENERATED READING MATERIALS FOR SECONDARY EFL CLASSROOMS IN UZBEKISTAN: AN ADAPTIVE EXPERTISE PERSPECTIVE

Abstract. Generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) enables teachers to produce reading texts and accompanying activities rapidly; however, linguistic fluency alone does not guarantee pedagogical suitability. This article examines the professional judgments required when AI-generated reading materials are evaluated for secondary EFL classrooms in Uzbekistan and interprets these judgments through the concept of adaptive expertise. Using a conceptual-analytical approach, the study synthesizes established research on language-materials evaluation, task-based language teaching (TBLT), adaptive expertise, CEFR-informed proficiency, and teacher AI competence. The analysis identifies six interrelated dimensions for evaluating AI-generated reading materials: linguistic appropriateness, readability, factual accuracy, cultural and contextual relevance, alignment with learning objectives, and task potential. The findings indicate that professional intervention develops from correction to contextual adaptation and, at a more advanced level, to pedagogical transformation. Teachers need to verify factual claims, regulate lexical and syntactic complexity, mediate culturally unfamiliar content, and redesign mechanical comprehension exercises as meaning-focused tasks with identifiable outcomes. The article proposes a six-stage professional cycle—Generate, Evaluate, Verify, Adapt, Taskify, and Reflect—for the responsible use of GenAI in secondary EFL materials development. The proposed framework positions artificial intelligence as a supporting resource while preserving teacher agency, professional judgment, and pedagogical accountability.

Keywords: adaptive expertise, generative artificial intelligence, AI-generated reading materials, EFL, materials evaluation, task-based language teaching, teacher AI competence, Uzbekistan.

ОЦЕНКА УЧЕБНЫХ МАТЕРИАЛОВ ДЛЯ ЧТЕНИЯ, СОЗДАННЫХ С ПОМОЩЬЮ ИСКУССТВЕННОГО ИНТЕЛЛЕКТА, В СРЕДНИХ ШКОЛАХ УЗБЕКИСТАНА: ПОДХОД С ПОЗИЦИИ АДАПТИВНОЙ ЭКСПЕРТНОСТИ

Аннотация. Генеративный искусственный интеллект (GenAI) позволяет учителям быстро создавать тексты для чтения и сопутствующие учебные задания, однако языковая беглость сама по себе не гарантирует их

педагогической пригодности. В статье рассматриваются профессиональные суждения, необходимые при оценивании материалов для чтения, созданных с помощью искусственного интеллекта, для преподавания английского языка как иностранного в средних школах Узбекистана, и данные суждения интерпретируются с позиции концепции адаптивной экспертности. На основе концептуально-аналитического подхода обобщаются исследования по оценке учебных материалов, обучению на основе заданий (TBLT), адаптивной экспертности, уровневой системе CEFR и компетентности учителей в области искусственного интеллекта. В результате выделены шесть взаимосвязанных измерений оценки материалов: языковая соответствительность, читабельность, фактическая точность, культурная и контекстуальная релевантность, соответствие целям обучения и потенциал для организации заданий. Установлено, что профессиональное вмешательство развивается от коррекции отдельных недостатков к контекстуальной адаптации и, на более высоком уровне, к педагогической трансформации материала. Учителю необходимо проверять фактические утверждения, регулировать лексическую и синтаксическую сложность, педагогически опосредовать культурно незнакомый материал и преобразовывать механические задания на понимание в задания, ориентированные на смысл и имеющие конкретный коммуникативный результат. Предлагается шестиступенчатый профессиональный цикл Generate – Evaluate – Verify – Adapt – Taskify – Reflect для ответственного использования GenAI при разработке материалов для чтения. Подход рассматривает искусственный интеллект как вспомогательный ресурс, сохраняя профессиональную самостоятельность, педагогическое суждение и ответственность учителя.

Ключевые слова: адаптивная экспертность, генеративный искусственный интеллект, материалы для чтения, созданные ИИ, английский язык как иностранный, оценка учебных материалов, обучение на основе заданий, компетентность учителя в области ИИ, Узбекистан.

O‘ZBEKISTON O‘RTA TA’LIM MAKTABLARIDA SUN’IY INTELLEKT YORDAMIDA YARATILGAN O‘QISH MATERIALLARINI BAHOLASH: ADAPTIV EKSPERTLIK YONDASHUVI

Annotatsiya. Generativ sun’iy intellekt (GenAI) o‘qish uchun matnlar va ularga mos topshiriqlarni tezkor yaratish imkonini beradi, biroq matnning lingvistik ravonligi uning pedagogik jihatdan maqbulligini kafolatlamaydi. Mazkur maqolada O‘zbekiston o‘rta ta’lim maktablarida ingliz tilini chet tili sifatida o‘qitishda sun’iy intellekt yordamida yaratilgan o‘qish materiallarini baholash uchun zarur bo‘lgan kasbiy qarorlar ko‘rib chiqilib, ular adaptiv ekspertlik konsepsiyasi asosida talqin qilinadi. Konseptual-analitik yondashuv asosida o‘quv

materiallarini baholash, topshiriqqa asoslangan til o‘qitish (TBLT), adaptiv ekspertlik, CEFR darajalari hamda o‘qituvchilarning sun’iy intellekt kompetensiyasiga oid ilmiy tadqiqotlar tahlil qilindi. Natijada AI yordamida yaratilgan o‘qish materiallarini baholashning o‘zaro bog‘liq oltita mezoni aniqlandi: lingvistik muvofiqlik, o‘qish qulayligi, faktik aniqlik, madaniy va kontekstual relevatlik, o‘quv maqsadlariga muvofiqlik hamda topshiriq sifatidagi pedagogik salohiyat. Tahlil natijalari o‘qituvchining professional aralashuvi oddiy tuzatishdan kontekstual moslashtirishga, yuqori darajada esa materialning pedagogik funksiyasini transformatsiya qilishgacha rivojlanishini ko‘rsatadi. O‘qituvchi faktik ma’lumotlarni tekshirishi, leksik va sintaktik murakkablikni o‘quvchi darajasiga moslashtirishi, madaniy jihatdan notanish mazmunni pedagogik vositalar orqali tushuntirishi hamda mexanik tushunish mashqlarini mazmunli va aniq natijaga yo‘naltirilgan topshiriqlarga aylantirishi zarur. Maqolada GenAI’dan mas’uliyatli foydalanish uchun Generate – Evaluate – Verify – Adapt – Taskify – Reflect nomli olti bosqichli professional sikl taklif etiladi. Mazkur yondashuv sun’iy intellektni yordamchi vosita sifatida belgilagan holda, o‘qituvchining kasbiy mustaqilligi, pedagogik qarori va mas’uliyatini saqlab qoladi.

Kalit so‘zlar: adaptiv ekspertlik, generativ sun’iy intellekt, AI yordamida yaratilgan o‘qish materiallari, ingliz tili chet tili sifatida, o‘quv materiallarini baholash, topshiriqqa asoslangan til o‘qitish, o‘qituvchining AI kompetensiyasi, O‘zbekiston.

Introduction. Generative artificial intelligence is increasingly influencing the preparation of language-teaching materials. Systems based on large language models can generate reading passages, comprehension questions, summaries, vocabulary activities, and task prompts within seconds. This capacity is particularly attractive in EFL settings, where teachers routinely need to differentiate instructional input, respond to curriculum requirements, and prepare materials for learners with different levels of language proficiency. At the same time, the educational value of a generated text cannot be inferred from its linguistic fluency alone. Research on language-materials development has long emphasized evaluation, adaptation, and purposeful exploitation rather than the uncritical use of available content [2]. Recent studies of generative AI likewise indicate that plausible and fluent language may coexist with factual, pedagogical, or ethical limitations [9–13].

For secondary-school reading instruction, this distinction is especially important. Reading texts provide linguistic input, but they also mediate vocabulary development, background knowledge, intercultural learning, and classroom interaction. A text intended for A2–B1 learners may be grammatically correct yet unsuitable because of low-frequency vocabulary, dense syntax, unfamiliar assumptions, or excessive conceptual load. The CEFR Companion Volume frames

language proficiency in relation to what learners can process and do in context rather than simply the formal correctness of linguistic forms [8].

The issue becomes more complex when reading material is incorporated into Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT). In TBLT, a task is organized around meaning and an identifiable outcome; therefore, it is not equivalent to every exercise that follows a reading text [1,3]. AI systems can easily generate multiple-choice questions, true/false statements, or vocabulary-matching activities. Such exercises may have instructional value, but they do not automatically create the information exchange, reasoning, decision-making, or problem-solving associated with task-based learning. Teachers therefore need to evaluate not only the linguistic quality of the text but also its instructional function.

This professional judgment can be examined through the concept of adaptive expertise. Hatano and Inagaki distinguished adaptive expertise from routine expertise by emphasizing the ability to respond productively when familiar procedures are insufficient [4]. Subsequent research has conceptualized adaptive expertise as high-level performance in changing or novel situations supported by flexible knowledge, problem solving, and a learning-oriented stance [5]. AI-mediated materials development represents precisely such a situation: generated outputs vary in quality and relevance, and teachers must determine what can be retained, what requires verification, what should be adapted, and when a different pedagogical solution is necessary.

Teacher competence in this area is also closely related to AI literacy. UNESCO's guidance on generative AI emphasizes human-centred and responsible use and cautions against treating generated output as inherently reliable [6]. Its AI Competency Framework for Teachers places human agency, ethics, AI foundations, AI pedagogy, and professional learning within a broader competence architecture [7]. Recent EFL research is particularly relevant in this regard. Xin's study of teachers using generative AI to develop reading materials found that teachers relied on pedagogical knowledge, knowledge of learners, and language awareness when modifying texts and designing tasks [15]. For EFL teachers, therefore, the technical ability to formulate prompts needs to be complemented by materials-evaluation skills and the ability to justify pedagogical decisions.

The Uzbek secondary-school context adds a specific dimension to this evaluation. GenAI systems are trained on broad and predominantly international data and do not automatically determine which references, school routines, cultural practices, or lexical choices are appropriate for a particular Uzbek classroom. Nevertheless, contextualization should not be reduced to replacing unfamiliar content with local examples. Foreign cultural content may be pedagogically valuable when it contributes to intercultural comparison and understanding. The professional task is to determine whether a reference should be retained and explained, compared with a local context, adapted, or replaced because it creates an unnecessary barrier to the learning objective.

Against this background, the article addresses the following question: What constitutes an adaptively expert evaluation of AI-generated reading materials for secondary EFL classrooms in Uzbekistan? The aim is to develop a theoretically grounded framework for evaluating and modifying such materials, with particular attention to their use in TBLT. The analysis focuses on six dimensions: linguistic appropriateness, readability, factual accuracy, cultural and contextual relevance, alignment with learning objectives, and task potential. It also distinguishes three levels of professional intervention—correction, adaptation, and pedagogical transformation—and proposes a practical cycle for classroom-oriented evaluation.

Materials and methods. The study uses a conceptual-analytical design rather than reporting a survey or classroom experiment. Its purpose is to construct a theoretically grounded evaluation framework without presenting uncollected teacher data as empirical findings. Sources were selected purposively for their direct relevance to five conceptual domains: language-materials evaluation [2], TBLT [1,3], adaptive expertise [4,5], CEFR-informed proficiency [8], and teacher AI competence and generative AI in language education [6,7,9–13,15]. The synthesis does not claim to be a systematic review; rather, it uses established and recent scholarship to identify pedagogically defensible criteria for evaluating AI-generated reading materials in the target context.

The analytical procedure consisted of three stages. First, recurrent evaluation concerns were identified across the selected literature. Second, these concerns were mapped onto the decisions a secondary EFL teacher would need to make when reviewing an AI-generated reading text and its accompanying activity. Third, the resulting categories were interpreted through adaptive expertise, with particular attention to whether a professional response merely corrects an observable defect or flexibly reshapes the material for a specific instructional purpose.

Six evaluation dimensions emerged from this synthesis. Linguistic appropriateness concerns vocabulary, grammar, syntax, cohesion, and naturalness. Readability concerns the overall processing burden created by sentence length, lexical density, text organization, and unfamiliar information. Factual accuracy concerns the reliability and internal consistency of content. Cultural and contextual relevance concerns the relationship between generated content and learners' sociocultural environment. Learning-objective alignment concerns whether the text serves the intended curricular or lesson outcome. TBLT suitability concerns whether the material can support meaning-focused language use and an identifiable communicative outcome.

Adaptive expertise was operationalized at the level of professional decision-making. A routine response applies a familiar rule, for example replacing a difficult word with an easier synonym. An adaptive response coordinates several kinds of knowledge and takes account of the specific learner group, curriculum, classroom context, and task. For example, a teacher may retain a culturally unfamiliar passage because it supports intercultural comparison, but redesign the

post-reading activity so that learners compare the foreign practice with a local one and justify a decision. This represents more than correction because it changes the pedagogical function of the material.

Results. The synthesis indicates that the central problem in AI-assisted materials development is not generation itself but professional mediation. AI can provide a draft, whereas the movement from a draft to classroom-ready material depends on teacher judgment. The six evaluation dimensions are interconnected rather than strictly sequential. A lexical choice can affect readability; a cultural reference can influence comprehension and task participation; and a factually accurate passage may nevertheless be poorly aligned with the lesson objective. Evaluation therefore requires teachers to consider the generated material as an integrated instructional whole.

The first result concerns the distinction between linguistic correctness and pedagogical appropriateness. GenAI frequently produces grammatically well-formed sentences, but formal correctness does not establish level appropriateness. For example, the sentence "The proliferation of digital technologies has fundamentally transformed the manner in which adolescents acquire information" is grammatically acceptable, yet it may create unnecessary lexical and syntactic load for many A2–B1 learners. A teacher may reasonably revise it as "Digital technology has changed how young people find information." The second version does not correct a grammatical error; instead, it adjusts the text according to learners' processing needs. This distinction is consistent with the broader principle that teaching materials should be evaluated in relation to learners and instructional purposes [2,8].

The second result concerns epistemic responsibility. Large language models generate probable linguistic sequences rather than verified knowledge. The educational risk arises because confident and fluent wording can make uncertain information appear authoritative [10–13]. Consequently, fact-checking should be treated as an essential component of materials preparation whenever a generated text contains historical, scientific, geographical, health-related, or other verifiable claims. The teacher does not need to distrust every generated sentence; rather, professional judgment is required to identify which claims are relevant to the learning activity and therefore require reliable external verification.

The third result concerns contextual mediation. GenAI may generate examples that are distant from learners' everyday experiences or cultural knowledge in Uzbekistan. Such distance is not automatically a weakness. If the learning objective includes intercultural awareness, unfamiliar content may be productive when supported by explanation, comparison, or discussion. Adaptive expertise becomes visible in the teacher's ability to choose among several alternatives: retain and explain the content, retain and compare it with a local context, localize selected details, or replace the reference when it creates irrelevant difficulty. A fixed principle such as "localize all AI-generated content" would be

less adaptive because it disregards the possible instructional value of cultural difference.

The fourth result concerns task design. AI-generated reading materials are often accompanied by conventional comprehension questions. These activities may measure understanding, but they do not necessarily meet the central characteristics of TBLT. Ellis emphasizes the role of meaning and outcome in tasks [1], while Long conceptualizes tasks as central units of needs-based language teaching [3]. An adaptively expert teacher therefore asks whether reading input can be converted into purposeful action. A passage concerning environmental problems, for instance, can be followed not simply by five comprehension questions but by a task in which learners compare several community problems, decide which should be addressed first, and justify practical solutions. In this case, the reading text is retained, but its pedagogical function is transformed.

The synthesis further allows professional intervention to be understood at three levels. Correction addresses local linguistic, grammatical, or factual defects. Adaptation adjusts the material to learner level, cultural context, curriculum, or instructional objective. Pedagogical transformation redesigns the instructional function of the material, particularly the relationship between reading input, learner interaction, and communicative outcome. Adaptive expertise becomes increasingly visible as professional decision-making moves from isolated correction toward coordinated adaptation and transformation.

Thus, the teacher's professional work can be represented as a progression:

AI-generated draft → evaluation → verification → contextual adaptation → task transformation → reflection.

This progression demonstrates that the value of GenAI in EFL materials development depends not only on what the system generates but also on the quality of the teacher's subsequent decisions.

Discussion. The framework has two major implications. First, it reframes teacher AI competence as a pedagogical rather than merely technical construct. Prompt formulation is useful, but it cannot replace knowledge of language, learners, curriculum, assessment, culture, or task design. UNESCO's teacher framework similarly positions AI pedagogy within a broader human-centred competence structure [7]. Recent EFL evidence also indicates that teachers draw on pedagogical knowledge, learner knowledge, and language awareness when using generative AI for reading-material development [15]. Professional AI competence can therefore be understood as the coordinated application of AI literacy, language awareness, pedagogical knowledge, and contextual judgment.

Second, the framework clarifies why adaptive expertise is a productive lens for AI-mediated teaching. Routine expertise remains necessary: teachers need stable knowledge of language levels, text structure, instructional objectives, and classroom practice. However, AI-generated outputs create situations in which no single checklist can determine the appropriate pedagogical decision. A culturally

unfamiliar text may be unsuitable in one lesson and highly valuable in another. A difficult lexical item may require simplification for one group but may be worth pre-teaching for another. Adaptive expertise lies in recognizing these distinctions and explaining the pedagogical rationale behind the selected response [4,5].

This perspective also reinforces the principle of teacher agency. Current educational guidance emphasizes that AI should support rather than displace human responsibility [6,7]. In materials development, this principle has a practical meaning: generated content should remain provisional until the teacher has evaluated its accuracy, linguistic level, relevance, and instructional function. The teacher is therefore not simply an editor who repairs machine-generated errors. The teacher determines what constitutes useful, appropriate, and defensible learning material in a particular classroom.

For professional development in Uzbekistan, this implies that teacher training should extend beyond demonstrations of AI tools. Professional development activities can focus on comparing AI-generated texts of different quality, identifying linguistic and pedagogical weaknesses, verifying selected factual claims, producing alternative adaptations for A2 and B1 learners, and redesigning comprehension exercises as tasks with clear communicative outcomes. Such activities provide opportunities to practise the reasoning processes associated with adaptive expertise rather than merely the technical mechanics of using AI platforms.

On this basis, the proposed professional cycle can be formulated as follows:

Generate → Evaluate → Verify → Adapt → Taskify → Reflect

Generate refers to obtaining a preliminary text or activity from GenAI. Evaluate involves reviewing the material according to linguistic, textual, factual, cultural, curricular, and task-related criteria. Verify concerns claims requiring reliable external confirmation. Adapt involves adjusting the content to learners, context, and instructional objectives. Taskify refers to converting useful material into a meaning-focused task with an identifiable outcome where appropriate. Reflect involves reconsidering the pedagogical decisions made during preparation and, where relevant, after classroom implementation.

The cycle is iterative rather than linear. Reflection may lead to a new prompt, further verification, additional adaptation, or rejection of the generated material altogether. In this sense, the cycle reflects the central characteristics of adaptive expertise: flexible decision-making, sensitivity to context, integration of multiple forms of knowledge, and willingness to revise an initial solution.

The framework has several limitations. It is a conceptual synthesis and does not claim to represent the behaviour of a representative sample of Uzbek EFL teachers. The proposed categories therefore require empirical validation. Future research should examine how novice and experienced teachers differ in identifying problems, how consistently teachers apply the six criteria, and whether targeted professional development improves the quality of their modifications. Think-aloud

protocols, stimulated recall, classroom observation, and pre- and post-training designs would be particularly useful because they can reveal the reasoning underlying observable modifications rather than relying solely on attitude questionnaires.

Conclusion. Generative AI can significantly reduce the time required to produce reading materials, but speed of production should not be equated with instructional quality. For secondary EFL classrooms in Uzbekistan, AI-generated reading texts require professional evaluation across six interconnected dimensions: linguistic appropriateness, readability, factual accuracy, cultural and contextual relevance, alignment with learning objectives, and TBLT suitability. These dimensions demonstrate that classroom readiness is not an inherent property of an AI-generated text but the result of pedagogical judgment.

Adaptive expertise provides a useful framework for describing this judgment. Teachers demonstrate increasingly adaptive practice when they move from correcting isolated linguistic or factual problems to modifying materials for particular learners and contexts and, when necessary, transforming their instructional function. In TBLT-oriented instruction, this may involve transforming recall questions into comparison, information-gap, problem-solving, or decision-making tasks with meaningful outcomes.

The proposed Generate–Evaluate–Verify–Adapt–Taskify–Reflect cycle provides a practical structure for responsible integration of GenAI into EFL materials development. It emphasizes that artificial intelligence can support teachers in generating and modifying instructional resources, but it cannot assume responsibility for determining their pedagogical appropriateness.

The principal implication is that teacher professional development should focus not simply on generating more AI-based content but on evaluating, adapting, and transforming content more effectively. Technical familiarity with GenAI is valuable, but responsible integration ultimately depends on professional knowledge, critical verification, contextual sensitivity, and pedagogical flexibility. These capacities enable AI-generated texts to become pedagogically defensible classroom materials rather than merely fluent machine-produced outputs.

References:

1. Ellis R. Task-based language teaching: Sorting out the misunderstandings. International Journal of Applied Linguistics. 2009;19(3):221–246. doi:10.1111/j.1473-4192.2009.00231.x.

2. Tomlinson B. Materials development for language learning and teaching. Language Teaching. 2012;45(2):143–179. doi:10.1017/S0261444811000528.

3. Long M.H. Second Language Acquisition and Task-Based Language Teaching. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell; 2015.

4. Hatano G., Inagaki K. Two courses of expertise. In: Stevenson H., Azuma H., Hakuta K., editors. Child Development and Education in Japan. New York: W.H. Freeman; 1986. p. 262–272.

5. Carbonell K.B., Stalmeijer R.E., Könings K.D., Segers M., van Merriënboer J.J.G. How experts deal with novel situations: A review of adaptive expertise. Educational Research Review. 2014;12:14–29. doi:10.1016/j.edurev.2014.03.001.

6. UNESCO. Guidance for Generative AI in Education and Research. Paris: UNESCO; 2023.

7. UNESCO. AI Competency Framework for Teachers. Paris: UNESCO; 2024. doi:10.54675/ZJTE2084.

8. Council of Europe. Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment – Companion Volume. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing; 2020.

9. Kohnke L., Moorhouse B.L., Zou D. ChatGPT for language teaching and learning. RELC Journal. 2023;54(2):537–550. doi:10.1177/00336882231162868.

10. Kasneci E., Sessler K., Küchemann S., et al. ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. Learning and Individual Differences. 2023;103:102274. doi:10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274.

11. Tlili A., Shehata B., Adarkwah M.A., et al. What if the devil is my guardian angel: ChatGPT as a case study of using chatbots in education. Smart Learning Environments. 2023;10:15. doi:10.1186/s40561-023-00237-x.

12. Lo C.K. What is the impact of ChatGPT on education? A rapid review of the literature. Education Sciences. 2023;13(4):410. doi:10.3390/educsci13040410.

13. Farrokhnia M., Banihashem S.K., Noroozi O., Wals A. A SWOT analysis of ChatGPT: Implications for educational practice and research. Innovations in Education and Teaching International. 2024;61(3):460–474. doi:10.1080/14703297.2023.2195846.

14. Xin J.J. Investigating EFL teachers' use of generative AI to develop reading materials: A practice and perception study. Language Teaching Research. 2024. doi:10.1177/13621688241303321.

FAN VA TA'LIM YANGILIKLARI
JURNALI

2026-yil
9(1)-son

Muassis - "FAN VA INNOVATSIYA YANGILIKLARI" MCHJ
Jurnal hamkori - «PROFI UNIVERSITY»

Jurnal O'zbekiston Respublikasi Prezidenti Administratsiyasi huzuridagi axborot va ommaviy kommunikatsiyalar agentligi tomonidan 2024-yil 24-may kuni № 454068-sonli guvohnoma bilan ro'yxatga olingan.

Jurnal 2024-yilda tashkil etilgan, 1 oyda bir marta o'zbek, tojik, qozoq, qirg'iz, qoraqalpoq, rus va ingliz tillarida nashr etiladi.

Tahririyat manzili: 190110, Toshkent shahri Uchtepa tumani, Bog'iston MFY, 14-mavze, 8-uy.

Telefonlar: +998 90 749 00 00
+998 90 749 77 77
+998 91 902 05 01
E-mail: saen_2024@mail.ru
Jurnal sayti: www.saen.uz
Telegram kanali: **https://t.me/saen_2024**

Maqolada keltirilgan fakt va ma'lumotlarning to'g'riligi uchun mualliflar mas'uldirlar.

"Fan va ta'lim yangiliklari" ilmiy-amaliy jurnali Oliy attestatsiya komissiyasi Rayosatining qarori (25.08.2025 y., №374/5) bilan pedagogika va psixologiya fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD) va fan doktori (DSc) ilmiy darajasiga talabgorlarning dissertatsiyalari asosiy ilmiy natijalarini chop etish tavsiya etilgan milliy ilmiy nashrlar ro'yxatiga kiritilgan.

ISSN: 3093-8694