Published Date: - 30-01-2025
Page No: - 253-255

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE-BASED ASSESSMENT METHODS FOR FUTURE PHILOLOGISTS: ACCURACY AND PROBLEMS

Nomonkhonova Muattarkhan Nasirkhan qizi
Teacher of the Department of Humanities and Physical Education
Namangan State Institute of Foreign Languages named after I. Ibrat
Uzbekistan

Abstract

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has revolutionized the field of education, offering innovative assessment methods for evaluating students' linguistic and analytical skills. This paper explores the role of AI-based assessment in philology education, emphasizing its accuracy, benefits, and challenges. AI-driven tools such as natural language processing (NLP) and machine learning (ML) facilitate automated grading, real-time feedback, and plagiarism detection, enhancing evaluation efficiency. However, AI assessments also face limitations, including contextual understanding issues, algorithmic bias, lack of critical thinking, ethical concerns, and technological dependencies. To optimize AI's role in philology education, hybrid evaluation models, bias mitigation strategies, AI literacy programs for educators, and ethical AI policies are recommended. Addressing these challenges will ensure a fair and effective integration of AI in philology education, balancing technological advancements with human expertise.

KEYWORDS

Artificial Intelligence, Assessment Methods, Philology Education, AI Accuracy, AI Bias, Ethical Concerns, Hybrid Evaluation Models.

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, artificial intelligence (AI) has significantly transformed the field of education, particularly in the assessment of students. The use of AI-driven assessment methods for future philologists has gained traction, offering efficiency and accuracy in evaluating students' linguistic and analytical skills. However, despite its advantages, AI-based assessment faces several challenges that impact its effectiveness and fairness. This paper explores the accuracy of AI-driven assessment methods in philology education, highlighting their benefits and potential drawbacks. AI technologies, including natural language processing (NLP) and machine learning (ML), are widely employed to assess students' language proficiency, comprehension, and analytical abilities. AI-driven assessment tools provide automated grading, feedback generation, and plagiarism detection, helping educators streamline evaluation processes. According to Wang, AI-powered tools can analyze students' writing and speech with high precision, detecting grammatical errors, coherence issues, and stylistic inconsistencies.

For instance, AI-based platforms like Grammarly and Turnitin offer real-time feedback on writing quality, while automated speech recognition (ASR) systems assess pronunciation and fluency. Such tools are particularly beneficial for philology students, who require continuous evaluation of their language proficiency and analytical writing skills.

One of the major advantages of AI in assessment is its ability to ensure consistency and objectivity. Traditional grading methods often involve human bias and inconsistencies, whereas AI tools apply standardized evaluation criteria to all students. Studies by McNamara et al. indicate that AI-driven assessment systems exhibit high accuracy rates in detecting language errors and assessing linguistic competence.

Moreover, AI-powered assessment methods use large datasets to refine their evaluation algorithms continuously. AI models trained on extensive corpora can recognize complex linguistic patterns, making them reliable in assessing grammar, vocabulary, and writing coherence. Additionally, AI-based tools provide instant feedback, enabling students to improve their writing and speaking skills more efficiently.

Challenges and Limitations. Despite the promising potential of AI-driven assessment, several challenges hinder its effectiveness. Some of the key issues include:

1. Contextual Understanding and Nuance. AI struggles to grasp the contextual and cultural nuances of language, which is critical for philologists. While AI can identify grammatical errors, it may fail to recognize the subtleties of literary interpretation and stylistic creativity. As noted by Bender and Koller, AI models often rely on statistical patterns rather than deep comprehension, limiting their ability to assess subjective aspects of language analysis.

2. Bias in AI Models. AI assessment tools are trained on large datasets that may contain inherent biases. If the training data primarily represents certain linguistic styles or dialects, the AI may exhibit bias in its evaluations. For example, research by Blodgett et al. highlights that AI-based NLP systems often favor dominant language varieties while underperforming in assessing regional dialects or less commonly studied languages.

3. Lack of Human-Like Critical Thinking. Language assessment, especially in philology, requires critical thinking and interpretation. AI systems lack the ability to understand metaphorical expressions, cultural references, and philosophical arguments in literary texts. While AI can analyze syntax and grammar, it falls short in assessing the depth of literary critique and contextual meaning.

4. Ethical Concerns and Data Privacy. The use of AI in student assessment raises ethical concerns regarding data privacy and security. AI systems collect and analyze vast amounts of student data, which, if mishandled, can lead to privacy breaches. As highlighted by Floridi and Taddeo, educational institutions must implement strict data protection measures to ensure student information is safeguarded.

5. Dependence on Technological Infrastructure. AI-based assessment requires sophisticated technological infrastructure, including powerful computing resources and reliable internet connectivity. In developing regions or underfunded educational institutions, access to such technology may be limited, creating disparities in AI-driven learning opportunities.

Future Prospects and Recommendations

To enhance the accuracy and fairness of AI-driven assessment methods, several measures should be taken:

- Hybrid Evaluation Models: Combining AI assessment with human grading can address the limitations of AI, ensuring that contextual and interpretative elements are adequately evaluated.
- Bias Mitigation Strategies: Developers should use diverse and inclusive datasets to train AI models, reducing biases in language assessment.

- AI Literacy for Educators: Teachers should be trained to interpret AI-generated feedback effectively and supplement it with human insights.
- Ethical AI Policies: Educational institutions should implement clear guidelines on AI usage, ensuring data privacy and ethical assessment practices.

CONCLUSION

AI-driven assessment methods offer promising advancements in the evaluation of future philologists, providing efficiency, objectivity, and real-time feedback. However, challenges such as contextual limitations, bias, ethical concerns, and technological dependencies must be addressed to optimize AI's role in education. By adopting hybrid assessment models and improving AI algorithms, educators can harness AI's potential while maintaining fairness and accuracy in student evaluation. As AI continues to evolve, its integration into philology education must be approached with a balanced and ethical perspective to ensure effective learning outcomes for future philologists.

REFERENCES

1. Perevorska O. et al. Interaction of philology, pedagogy, culture and history as a way of integrating learning. – International Science Group, 2024.
2. Nomonkhonova Muattarkhan Nasirkhan qizi. Application of information technologies in linguistic education. Science, Innovation, Education: Vital Issues Of The XXI Century, Organized By: Next Scientists Conference, Conference Location:- Florida USA, 118-120, Conference DOI: 10.55640/Nsc-07, 2023.
3. Nomonkhonova Muattarkhan Nasirkhan qizi. A comparison of traditional and artificial intelligence-supported teacher training methods. Examining the crossroads of history, education, and society: theory, practice, and policy - 30-10-2024, Page No: - 162-164.
4. McNamara K. E. et al. An assessment of community-based adaptation initiatives in the Pacific Islands //Nature Climate Change. – 2020. – Т. 10. – №. 7. – С. 628-639.
5. Blodgett S. L. et al. Stereotyping Norwegian salmon: An inventory of pitfalls in fairness benchmark datasets //Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers). – 2021. – С. 1004-1015.
6. Floridi L., Taddeo M. What is data ethics? //Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences. – 2016. – Т. 374. – №. 2083. – С. 20160360.