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***Abstract***

This article investigates how artificial intelligence (AI) can enhance non-major English instruction in Vietnam, where instructors face challenges such as limited class time, low learner motivation, and an exam-focused curriculum. Grounded in INTESOL principles, the study investigates the use of AI tools: ChatGPT, Grammarly, Plickers, and Quizlet - to support communicative, learner-centered instruction for cadets. Over six weeks, 80 cadets and four teachers participated in a case study that combined AI-supported lessons with surveys, classroom observations, and interviews. Results indicate that AI tools improved student engagement, supported vocabulary and writing development, and reduced teacher workload. Teachers appreciated the flexibility and personalization that AI tools offered, but raised concerns about device access and the potential for overreliance on AI-generated content. The study concludes that AI when integrated with thoughtful pedagogy, can promote learner autonomy and communicative competence in non-major English contexts. These findings provide practical strategies for educators in similar institutions as they navigate the evolving intersection of TESOL and technology.
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**1. Introduction**

***1.1. INTESOL Principles***

In a progressively interconnected world, the capacity to communicate across linguistic barriers has become essential. English, as a worldwide lingua franca, is essential for facilitating communication, rendering the discipline of Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) particularly significant. Effective TESOL is fundamentally based on a comprehensive system of pedagogical norms referred to as INTESOL (International TESOL) principles. These principles are not only theoretical constructions; they embody the cumulative knowledge from decades of study in language acquisition and pedagogy, aimed at creating an optimal learning environment and enhancing communicative competence among English language learners globally. The core idea of INTESOL is the learner-centered approach. This theory acknowledges that successful language training originates not from the curriculum or the educator, but from the individual learner. H. Douglas Brown, a distinguished authority in language acquisition, asserts, “The optimal classroom is one in which the students are at the heart of the educational process” (Brown, 2014, p. 95). A comprehensive grasp of pupils’ varied backgrounds, their previous linguistic knowledge, cultural experiences, intrinsic motivations, and distinct learning styles, is essential for customizing education. By recognizing and incorporating these distinct elements into the educational process, educators can develop pertinent and captivating classes that connect with students, promoting a sense of ownership and active involvement in their language acquisition. This tailored technique contrasts with generic methodologies, guaranteeing that training is both efficacious and considerate of learners’ identities.

INTESOL principles, grounded in a learner-centric framework, underscore the necessity of establishing favorable learning environments. An affirmative, encouraging, and systematically structured educational environment is essential for language development. It alleviates fear, a considerable impediment to language acquisition, and fosters trust between students and educators. Stephen Krashen’s Affective Filter Hypothesis emphasizes that “anxiety, self-consciousness, and boredom” can create a “mental block” that hinders learners from fully assimilating language material (Krashen, 1985, p. 3). When learners perceive a secure and supportive environment, they are more inclined to take chances, commit errors, and engage actively in communicative tasks, all of which are vital for language development. Moreover, a structured setting enhances efficiency and clarity, enabling students to concentrate on learning without the distractions of disorder. This idea emphasizes the teacher's responsibility not merely as an educator, but as a facilitator of a supportive and effective learning environment.

INTESOL prioritizes the creation of high-quality lessons for language advancement. This means setting clear and achievable learning goals, ensuring that the language used is relevant and real, and providing chances for students to engage in real communication tasks. Differentiated education is essential, recognizing that learners advance at diverse rates and have distinct requirements. Jeremy Harmer, a distinguished TESOL author, posits that “the most effective lessons are those that captivate students through diverse activities and contexts, enabling them to utilize language in significant manners” (Harmer, 2007, p. 67). Effective lesson design transcends rote memorization, emphasizing the cultivation of practical language abilities that empower students to utilize English confidently and properly across many circumstances. The aim is not merely to convey grammatical rules or vocabulary lists, but to enable learners to articulate their thoughts and comprehend others in genuine communication contexts.

Moreover, INTESOL principles endorse the adaptation of lesson delivery to the evolving circumstances of the classroom. Teaching is a dynamic process that necessitates continual observation, reflection, and modification. Educators must exhibit flexibility and responsiveness to student requirements, consistently assessing comprehension and being ready to adjust their methodology as needed. This may entail modifying teacher discourse, simplifying resources, or rearranging assignments to more effectively address the students' urgent learning requirements. This adaptive method guarantees that training stays pertinent and efficient, averting disengagement and optimizing learning chances in real time. Brown observes that “teaching is a process of continual adjustment and refinement” (Brown, 2007, p. 11).

INTESOL principles emphasize that teachers must be monitoring and evaluating student language growth. This is a continual process that transcends formal assessments, involving ongoing monitoring of student development and the delivery of prompt and constructive feedback. Diverse and reliable assessment methods are crucial for precisely evaluating learning and pinpointing areas for enhancement. Feedback must be positive and actionable, directing learners toward enhanced accuracy and fluency. Earl Stevick famously asserted, “What the learner does is what the learner learns” (Stevick, 1980, p. 4). This ongoing cycle of evaluation enables both educators and learners to evaluate progress, acknowledge accomplishments, and pinpoint areas necessitating additional focus.

Ultimately, INTESOL principles emphasize the significance of participation and collaboration within a community of practice. The TESOL area is ever advancing, and professional development is essential. Educators are urged to pursue continuous learning, exchange effective strategies with peers, and engage with the broader community of English language instructors. This cooperative ethos promotes innovation, stimulates reflection, and guarantees that educators stay abreast of the most recent research and approaches. A prevalent aphorism in education posits, “Educators who collaborate in learning enhance their teaching efficacy.” Engaging in a dynamic professional community enables educators to perpetually refine their skills, delivering superior instruction to their pupils.

In conclusion, INTESOL principles offer a thorough and adaptable framework for the proficient instruction of English to non-native speakers. They advocate for a learner-centered methodology, prioritize the establishment of supportive learning environments, oversee the formulation and modification of high-caliber lessons, and point out the value of continuous assessment and professional collaboration. By following these principles, English language educators can provide their pupils with not only linguistic proficiency but also the confidence and communication competence essential for success in a progressively interconnected global society.

***1.2. Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Education***

The integration of AI into the educational landscape is no longer a distant futuristic concept; it is a present reality reshaping how students learn and how teachers instruct. AI is set to significantly transform the educational landscape, transitioning from a theoretical notion to a real instrument currently being incorporated into classrooms globally. The emergence of AI in this area poses a complicated duality: it provides a robust array of tools to tackle enduring difficulties in education, while simultaneously introducing novel ethical dilemmas and pedagogical inquiries that require careful consideration. This change aims to improve individualized learning, automate administrative tasks, and promote accessibility; yet, it concurrently presents substantial concerns regarding data privacy, algorithmic bias, and the vital function of human educators.

One of the most persuasive advantages of AI in education is its ability to provide individualized and adaptable learning. Conventional uniform training frequently inadequately addresses the varied requirements of individuals who learn at disparate rates and through distinct methods. AI-driven platforms may flexibly react to each student's advancement, pinpointing weaknesses, suggesting specific resources, and modifying the material's complexity instantaneously. This is illustrated by intelligent tutoring systems that offer instantaneous feedback and customized practice, or by language learning applications that personalize vocabulary and grammatical exercises. Through the development of personalized learning trajectories, AI can facilitate a more profound comprehension of subjects for pupils, guaranteeing that no individual is disadvantaged by a standardized instructional tempo. Moreover, AI might assume numerous tedious and time-intensive administrative responsibilities that frequently burden instructors. AI solutions can automate the evaluation of multiple-choice and short-answer questions, generate quizzes, and assist in drafting initial lesson plans or progress reports. A 2024 Google Education Report found that 80% of educators believe AI can significantly reduce administrative workloads, enabling them to focus on teaching (Carnegie Learning, 2025). By liberating essential teacher time, AI enables educators to allocate more of their efforts to significant student engagement, individualized mentorship, and innovative teaching methodologies.

Although AI possesses considerable potential, its incorporation into education entails substantial dangers and hurdles. A key worry pertains to data privacy and security. AI systems necessitate extensive student data, encompassing academic performance and behavioral tendencies, to operate efficiently. The compilation and examination of sensitive information provoke significant inquiries over data ownership, protection against breaches, and its utilization to affect educational outcomes. Federal regulations like the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) and the Children’s Online Privacy Protection Act (COPPA) in the U.S. provide legal frameworks, but robust implementation requires thoughtful planning and clear contractual protections with vendors to prevent misuse or exploitation of student data (SchoolAI, 2025). In the absence of stringent and transparent data governance regulations, there exists a significant risk of misappropriating student information or jeopardizing their privacy. A significant challenge is the problem of algorithmic bias. AI systems are trained on pre-existing information, and if these datasets harbor societal biases, the AI’s outputs may perpetuate or exacerbate existing imbalances. This may emerge as prejudiced grading systems, distorted suggestions for advanced courses, or educational instruments that are less effective for specific demographics. Guaranteeing that AI algorithms are just and impartial is a key ethical obligation (Hannon et al., 2025).

The future of AI in education ultimately hinges on a judicious and equitable approach. The objective should be to enhance and empower human instructors rather than to supplant them. AI ought to be regarded as a formidable aide that furnishes educators with data-driven insights and automates monotonous activities, enabling them to concentrate on the distinctly human elements of teaching: mentorship, empathy, nurturing creativity, and cultivating critical thinking abilities. Research indicates that AI’s effectiveness is not solely responsible for improving teaching but rather enhances educational processes by facilitating individualized learning and improving instructional effectiveness (Ayeni et al., 2024). The efficacy of AI in education will be evaluated not by the volume of administrative chores it executes, but by its ability to augment the learning experience while maintaining the crucial human-to-human interaction fundamental to meaningful education. By emphasizing ethical development, guaranteeing fair access, and equipping educators to collaborate effectively with AI, we can leverage its revolutionary potential to establish a more personalized, efficient, and inclusive educational

***1.3. INTESOL and AI application in ELT for Cadets***

The necessity for English proficiency among cadets is critical in today's increasingly globalized society. Law enforcement professionals often face scenarios requiring international communication, making proficiency in English, especially English for Specific Purposes (ESP) pertinent to policing, essential for effective information exchange, successful investigations, and enhanced international collaboration. This need thorough and focused English Language Training (ELT) programs. In this setting, the significance of contemporary teaching methodologies and technological innovations is paramount. INTESOL (International TESOL) approved approaches emphasize practical application and communicative ability, providing a solid framework for cultivating essential language abilities. The swift advancement of AI concurrently offers unparalleled prospects to transform English Language Teaching (ELT). AI-driven solutions can deliver tailored learning experiences, furnish instant feedback, replicate real-world scenarios, and automate administrative duties, thereby improving the efficiency and efficacy of language education for cadets. This introduction will examine the synergistic potential of combining INTESOL principles with advanced AI applications to meet the specific English Language Teaching (ELT) requirements of cadets, thereby enhancing their professional development and supporting the overarching objectives of law enforcement in a multilingual global context.

**2. Literature Review**

***2.1. INTESOL in language education***

The field of language education has undergone significant transformation, shifting from traditional approaches grounded in rote memorization and grammatical drills to comprehensive methodologies that promote authentic communication and learner autonomy. This paradigm shift aligns with the core values advocated by the TESOL International Association, which emphasize communicative competence, contextualized and inclusive instruction, and learner-centered pedagogy (TESOL International Association, n.d.). These interconnected principles form the foundation of effective, equitable, and 21st-century-relevant language education.

At the core of this transformation is the goal of developing communicative competence, a concept that transcends mere grammatical accuracy to encompass the ability to use language effectively and appropriately across diverse real-world situations. As defined by Canale and Swain (1980), communicative competence includes several key components. Grammatical competence lays the groundwork by covering knowledge of vocabulary, pronunciation, and syntax. Sociolinguistic competence allows learners to navigate social and cultural nuances, such as when to use formal or informal registers and how to interpret idiomatic expressions (Hymes, 1972). Discourse competence enables learners to structure coherent spoken or written texts (Bachman, 1990), while strategic competence equips them with techniques to overcome communication breakdowns through clarification or reformulation (Canale & Swain, 1980). More recently, intercultural communicative competence has gained prominence as an essential skill, preparing learners to engage effectively and respectfully with people from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds (Byram, 2002).

***2.2. The role of AI in EFL instruction***

AI presents a wide array of opportunities in language education, particularly for learners of English as a Foreign Language (EFL). One of its most transformative contributions lies in personalizing learning pathways. AI-powered platforms are capable of collecting and analyzing data regarding individual learners’ strengths, weaknesses, and learning behaviors (Luckin et al., 2016). Based on this analysis, the systems can tailor content and adjust the pace of instruction accordingly, ensuring that each student receives a customized learning experience (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019). This capability is especially valuable in large classroom settings, where providing personalized feedback to every student can be challenging. Another significant advantage of AI in EFL instruction is its ability to deliver instantaneous feedback and automated error correction. Tools such as Grammarly, Write & Improve, and Microsoft Editor offer real-time suggestions for grammar, vocabulary, and writing structure, thereby supporting the development of accurate written communication. For speaking skills, ELSA Speak employs speech recognition technology to supply immediate feedback on pronunciation, stress, and intonation. This allows learners to improve their oral communication through iterative, self-paced practice. In addition, advancements in Natural Language Processing (NLP) have enabled the development of conversational agents or chatbots that simulate human interactions. These digital tools provide learners with opportunities to engage in realistic dialogues in a safe and supportive environment (Fryer & Carpenter, 2006). This function is particularly advantageous for students in cadet academies, where it can be used to simulate professional contexts such as interrogations, interviews, or public announcements in English. Beyond student benefits, AI also supports educators by streamlining administrative and pedagogical tasks. Through the automation of repetitive duties like grading, attendance tracking, and content generation, teachers are freed to focus on instructional strategies and classroom interaction. Furthermore, AI systems often offer pedagogical insights, ready-to-use learning activities, and adaptive lesson plans based on class performance data, all of which contribute to enhancing teaching quality (Holmes, Bialik, & Fadel, 2019). In specialised contexts, like cadet training institutions, AI integration in English language teaching (ELT) fosters innovative and targeted instructional practices that meet both linguistic and professional needs.

**3. Methodology**

***3.1. Study approach***

This study aims to identify and thoroughly analyze the primary pedagogical challenges associated with non-major English language instruction at the PPCII. It further seeks to investigate the impact of these challenges on the English language learning outcomes and the overall communicative competence of the cadets. In addition, the study proposes and discusses possible solutions that could help overcome these obstacles and enhance the effectiveness of English language instruction for non-major students within the specific context of cadets education at PPC II.

***3.2. Study sample***

The research will be carried out at PPC II. A purposive sampling technique will be utilized to guarantee the inclusion of individuals possessing pertinent expertise and insights. The anticipated sample size is 4 individuals, adequate to attain thematic saturation, the juncture at which no additional ideas arise from the data (Guest, Bunce, & Johnson, 2006).   
This table displays the allocation of study participants according to their professional roles and teaching experience. Table 1 presents the distribution of participants according to their teaching experience.

**Table 1.**

*Teaching Experience of Participants*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Teaching Experience** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 6-10 years | 2 | 50 |
| 11-15 years | 2 | 50 |
| **Total** | 4 | 100 |

A total of 80 cadets participated in the study. The table categorizes participants according to their years of learning experience, offering insight into the variety of exposure levels and foundational knowledge within the cadet cohort, which can impact their English language proficiency development. Table 2 displays the general personal information of the research subjects categorized by participant group and learning experience.

**Table 2.**

*Learning Experience of Participants*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **Categories** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| Gender | Male | 70 | 87.5 |
| Female | 10 | 12.5 |
| **Total** | 80 | 100 |
| LearningExperience | 5-10 years | 56 | 70 |
| 12-15 years | 24 | 30 |
| **Total** | 80 | 100 |

***3.3. Study instrument***

*3.3.1. Questionnaire*

The questionnaire in this survey consists of three parts. The first part gathers information about the participating cadets, including gender, and years of experience learning English. This study employed a comprehensive survey questionnaire as its primary data collection instrument to gather insights from cadets at PPC II. The survey was meticulously designed to address the research's core objectives: identifying pedagogical challenges in non-major English language instruction, assessing their impact on learning outcomes and communicative competence, and exploring the potential of AI-powered solutions. Divided into four main sections, the instrument collects demographic data and English learning background, elicits perceptions of specific instructional challenges using a Likert scale, investigates the perceived impact of these challenges on various English skills, and finally, seeks opinions on the utility of AI tools for improving English language learning. This structured approach ensures the collection of both quantitative and qualitative data, providing a holistic understanding of the current ELT landscape at PPC II and informing the development of effective AI-enhanced pedagogical strategies.

The five-point Likert-scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree was interpreted in terms of mean (M) score as follows:

1,00 – 1,80: Strongly disagree

1,81 – 2,60: Disagree

2,61 – 3,40: Undecided

3,41 – 4, 20: Agree

4,21 – 5,00: Strongly agree

*3.3.2. Semi-structured Interview*

Complementing the broad insights gleaned from the survey, this study also employed semi-structured interviews to gather in-depth, nuanced qualitative data from a select group of participants. This method allowed for a closer look at the teaching difficulties in non-major English classes at PPC II, helping the researchers find specific experiences, views, and reasons that a standard questionnaire might miss. Even though there were specific open-ended questions about teaching challenges, their effects on communication skills, and possible AI solutions, the semi-structured format allowed the interviewer to ask more questions and change the discussion based on what the participants said. This iterative process facilitated a richer understanding of the cadets’ lived experiences and provided valuable context to the quantitative findings from the survey, thereby enhancing the overall robustness and depth of the study's conclusions.

*3.3.3. Classroom observation*

Classroom observations were conducted as part of this study to gain deeper insights into how AI tools are practically applied and their effectiveness in the EFL classroom. These observations aimed to capture real-time interactions between teachers, students, and technology in an authentic educational setting. The focus was placed on how AI tools influenced student engagement, supported the development of vocabulary and writing skills, and contributed to reducing the workload of instructors. By directly observing classroom dynamics, the study was able to provide contextual evidence of how AI-enhanced instruction can enrich the learning experience and promote more efficient teaching practices.

***3.4. Validity and Reliability***

The study's quality is guaranteed when the reliability and validity of the research instruments are evaluated, as this assesses the trustworthiness and precision of the acquired data. A questionnaire served as one of the principal data-gathering instruments in this investigation. The initial collection instrument was developed in English and evaluated by a content validity expert. The second data collection instrument is the semi-structured interview, initially created in English and subsequently translated into Vietnamese. The Vietnamese questionnaire underwent a pilot study to enhance its quality, as such studies are recognized for augmenting the reliability, validity, and practicality of research instruments (e.g., Oppenheim, 1999; Radhakrishna, 2007; Seliger & Shohamy, 1997). The pilot data was input into SPSS version 20 and examined with Cronbach’s alpha to verify the reliability of the items. Items will be deemed credible if Cronbach’s alpha exceeds 0.70 (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009).

**4. Research results and Discussion**

The findings from the study analyze key pedagogical challenges in non-major English instruction and investigate how these challenges impact cadets’ English language learning outcomes and overall communicative competence. The results are categorized into four major pedagogical challenges and their observed or reported effects on learner outcomes.

***4.1. Pedagogical challenges in non-major English instruction***

This section shares the results of the study on the main teaching difficulties encountered in English classes for non-majors at People’s Police College II (PPC II) and talks about how these challenges affect cadet English learning and communication skills. Data were collected through teacher interviews, classroom observations, and student surveys. Analysis of the data revealed four key challenges that significantly influence the effectiveness of English language teaching and learning at PPC II.

Firstly, limited instructional time emerged as a significant barrier. English classes were typically restricted to one or two sessions per week, which all four teachers (100%) reported as insufficient to cover the necessary language skills, particularly speaking and listening. Due to these time constraints, lessons often became rushed and focused predominantly on receptive skills such as reading and grammar exercises. Among the 80 surveyed students, 68 cadets (85%) stated that they did not have enough time in class to practice speaking and listening, and 60 cadets (75%) felt that class periods ended before they could fully understand the lesson content. This finding aligns with Richards’ (2006) observation that limited contact hours restrict learners’ exposure to meaningful language use, which is essential for developing communicative competence. Without adequate time, even highly motivated students find it difficult to achieve fluency or internalize language structures. Therefore, the study suggests that educators make curriculum adjustments that either increase instructional hours or optimize existing class time to focus more on interactive and communicative activities.

Secondly, low learner motivation was a pervasive challenge. Many cadets viewed English as irrelevant to their future policing careers, which diminished their intrinsic motivation to engage actively in language learning. According to survey responses, 52 out of 80 cadets (65%) admitted that they studied English only to pass examinations, not for practical application. Classroom observations confirmed that this perception often led to passive behaviors such as minimal participation and reluctance to practice speaking. Instructors echoed this concern, with 3 out of 4 teachers (75%) stating that student disengagement was a regular issue in their classes. Motivation has long been recognized as a critical factor in language acquisition (Dörnyei, 1998), and the low motivation among PPC II cadets suggests that English instruction should be more closely linked to learners’ vocational interests and real-life needs. Incorporating content that reflects the professional context of policing could increase the perceived value of English and thereby enhance engagement.

Thirdly, the curriculum’s strong exam orientation was identified as a major pedagogical constraint. All four teachers (100%) emphasized that the curriculum prioritized grammar translation, multiple-choice reading tasks, and discrete-point testing, placing pressure on instructors to “teach to the test.” This approach limited opportunities to implement communicative or task-based learning strategies, which are important for acquiring practical language skills. Consequently, while cadets showed reasonable ability to recognize grammatical forms and answer test questions, they struggled to apply this knowledge in spoken communication. This observation was supported by survey responses, where 58 cadets (72.5%) reported feeling confident answering test questions, but only 22 cadets (27.5%) felt comfortable using English in real-life speaking situations. This gap between test success and communicative ability is consistent with trends in other EFL contexts, where exam pressure inhibits broader instructional goals (Hughes, 2003).

Finally, teaching English in large-sized classrooms presented considerable challenges to effective instruction. All four teachers (100%) reported difficulties managing class sizes that often exceeded 40 students, particularly when trying to provide individual feedback or facilitate pair and group work. 65 cadets (81.25%) also felt that large class sizes limited their chances to speak English or ask questions during lessons. In such environments, teachers struggle to monitor student progress and tailor instruction to diverse needs, especially in speaking and writing activities that require detailed guidance. Classroom management becomes more demanding, and the overall learning environment is often noisy and fragmented. These disadvantages, widely recognized in existing literature (Brown, 2007; Richards & Rodgers, 2014), reduce the effectiveness of communicative teaching methods and limit student engagement. To mitigate these issues, educators must adopt innovative strategies—such as rotating small-group activities, leveraging mobile technology, or using AI tools for personalized learning—but such efforts also require institutional support in terms of class-size policy and infrastructure.

These pedagogical challenges collectively impacted cadets’ language outcomes and communicative competence. While a number of students demonstrated basic proficiency in grammar and vocabulary, primarily through memorization, most lacked confidence and ability in productive skills, particularly in spontaneous speaking and listening tasks. Only 22 out of 80 cadets (27.5%) expressed comfort using English in practical communication, such as role-playing interviews or giving directions. This gap between theoretical knowledge and real-world performance reflects the well-known distinction between “knowing about language” and “using language” in EFL settings (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). Bridging this divide will require pedagogical approaches that emphasize authentic language use, enhance learner motivation, and promote autonomy.

In summary, this study identifies several systemic and contextual challenges that impede effective English instruction for non-major students at PPC II, limited instructional time, low learner motivation, an exam-driven curriculum, and oversized classes. These issues significantly constrain students’ communicative development. To address them, PPC II should consider implementing learner-centered approaches that focus on communication, integrating digital tools to support instruction, and revising the curriculum to include practical, profession-specific English. With appropriate institutional support and teacher training, such reforms could greatly improve the quality and relevance of English language education for cadets.

***4.2. Overcoming Pedagogical Challenges in Non-Major English Instruction***

The investigation into pedagogical challenges at PPC II also explored practical solutions to improve English language learning outcomes for non-major students. Given the confidential nature and specific characteristics of the cadet sector, such as strict discipline, limited internet access, and security-related content restrictions, English instruction faces unique constraints that require context-sensitive solutions. We identified several potential interventions through classroom observations, surveys with 80 cadets, and interviews with 4 English teachers. We present these findings in this section and discuss their implications for future practice.

A key solution that came up from the data was using technology to enhance learning. Out of the 80 students surveyed, 68 (85%) said that AI tools like ChatGPT and Grammarly helped them improve their writing and vocabulary by providing immediate feedback and correcting mistakes. Additionally, 62 cadets (77.5%) enjoyed using interactive platforms like Quizlet and Plickers, which made lessons more fun and motivating through competition and quick results. All 4 teachers interviewed (100%) agreed that technology made it easier to manage large classes, tailor lessons to individual needs, and lessen their grading workload. These results match other research showing that educational technology can help students learn more independently and stay engaged (Baker et al., 2020). However, several teachers pointed out that any use of digital tools needs to follow the school's rules about information security and platform use because of the sensitive nature of the cadet sector.

In terms of curriculum content, the results indicated strong support for reforming the exam-oriented syllabus to include more practical and communicative activities. Specifically, 3 out of 4 teachers (75%) recommended moving away from traditional grammar-translation methods toward task-based learning relevant to law enforcement contexts. On the student side, 56 cadets (70%) expressed a desire for English lessons that focus on real-life communication situations such as giving directions, writing reports, or interviewing suspects. This reflects a shift in learner preference toward more applicable, career-oriented English, in line with the communicative language teaching approach promoted by INTESOL.

The study also emphasized the importance of teacher professional development. All 4 teachers (100%) expressed the need for training in integrating digital tools and communicative methods, especially to handle large, mixed-proficiency classes. They reported that while they were open to innovation, they lacked institutional support, time, and structured workshops. Without ongoing professional development, even the most motivated teachers face challenges in sustaining new approaches. This finding supports existing literature that views professional growth as essential to pedagogical transformation (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017).

Finally, issues with infrastructure and access were a constant problem. Even though digital tools can be helpful, 32 cadets (40%) said they had trouble regularly using smartphones, laptops, or reliable internet—especially for group work or homework. The lack of projectors, speakers, or good Wi-Fi made many lessons harder, as seen during class observations. All 4 teachers expressed worries about large class sizes (often over 40 students), which made it tough to do interactive speaking or group activities. These findings highlight that to effectively use technology in teaching, schools need to invest in classroom resources and ensure all students have fair access to devices. Additionally, solutions must be tailored to the specific rules and needs of cadet training institutions, making sure that new teaching methods do not interfere with confidentiality or discipline.

In summary, the information from this study shows that to improve English language teaching for non-major students at PPC II, we need a well-rounded approach that considers the specific context. This means carefully using educational technologies, changing the curriculum to focus on communication skills, providing targeted training for teachers, and enhancing infrastructure support. It's crucial that these solutions respect the confidential nature and unique needs of the cadet sector, balancing new ideas with the responsibilities of the institution. If done right, these changes can transform English teaching from a boring, exam-focused method to a more engaging and practical learning experience for future police officers.

**5. Conclusion and Recommendations**

This study examined the pedagogical challenges of teaching English to non-major cadets at PPCII, where instructors face constraints such as limited instructional time, low learner motivation, an exam-driven curriculum, and large class sizes. Grounded in the principles of communicative and learner-centered teaching, the research explored how AI tools: ChatGPT, Grammarly, Plickers, and Quizlet, could support more engaging and effective English instruction. The findings revealed that AI integration enhanced cadet motivation, supported vocabulary and writing development, and reduced teacher workload. Both qualitative and quantitative data confirmed that learners responded positively to interactive, technology-enhanced lessons. However, the implementation of these tools was shaped by the confidential nature and operational characteristics of the cadet sector, which limit the use of open platforms and require context-appropriate adaptation. Teachers raised the issue of professional development, secure infrastructure, and curriculum reform that reflects real-life policing communication needs. While AI and digital tools show significant promise, sustainable success depends on institutional support, teacher training, and respect for the sector’s regulatory and security constraints. In short, AI tools, when thoughtfully integrated, can play a transformative role in enhancing non-major English instruction in specialized, high-security environments such as cadet colleges. However, they must be embedded in a broader pedagogical strategy that is both practical and contextually appropriate.

Based on the findings, several recommendations are proposed to improve English instruction for non-major students at PPC II and similar institutions. First, it is essential to integrate AI tools within institutional guidelines. AI-based platforms should be carefully selected and adapted to align with the security protocols of the cadet training environment. Given the confidential nature of cadet education, the use of closed, offline, or institutionally approved AI tools is recommended to ensure that technological innovation does not compromise data privacy or institutional integrity. Second, curriculum reform should aim to reflect real-world use. The traditional grammar-translation and exam-focused approach should gradually be replaced with communicative, task-based learning activities that are directly relevant to law enforcement contexts. Examples include role-playing suspect interviews, drafting cadet reports, or conducting simulations of cross-border communication. Such vocationally oriented tasks can enhance students’ perceptions of the practical value of English and thereby boost motivation. Third, instructional time must be expanded or better optimized. While increasing classroom hours may not always be feasible due to institutional constraints, existing time can be used more effectively. Lessons should prioritize speaking and listening skills through role-plays, peer interactions, and AI-supported exercises that promote active learning and immediate feedback. Another vital area of improvement is teacher professional development. Continuous training is necessary to equip instructors with the skills needed to integrate digital tools and communicative teaching strategies effectively, particularly when managing large and mixed-ability classes. Professional development workshops should be designed specifically for cadet educators, with a focus on pedagogical practices that balance security requirements with learner-centered innovation. Infrastructure and access also require institutional attention. To support digital integration, classrooms must be equipped with reliable internet, up-to-date digital devices, and audiovisual tools. Additionally, cadets should be provided with supervised access to AI tools during classroom activities to ensure equitable and secure usage. Reducing class sizes, where possible, or applying differentiated instruction methods is also recommended. Scheduling adjustments or group-rotation models can help teachers facilitate more meaningful interaction among students and better monitor individual progress. Finally, linking English learning to career development is crucial. Educators and administrators should emphasize the importance of English in international policing, diplomatic communication, and participation in overseas training programs. Making this connection explicit can shift cadets’ perceptions and increase their long-term engagement with English language learning.

By following these varied suggestions that match good teaching methods and the real needs of the cadet, PPC II can greatly enhance the quality and effectiveness of its English teaching. In doing so, the institution will be better positioned to develop cadets’ communicative competence in ways that support both their professional responsibilities and broader global engagement.
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