T I E Journal
Volume 4 Issue 3, 2026
http://ijtie.com/v403/n40353
ISSN: 2820-7521

The International Journal of Technology, Innovation, & Education

The Role of Generative AI in Shaping Students' Communication Accommodation

Soumia Largou* **and Abdellah El Boubekri**

Applied Communication in Context Lab, English Department, Mohammed First University, Oujda, Morocco

soumia.largou.d24@ump.ac.ma

Received: July 24, 2026; **Accepted**: September 16, 2026; **Published**: October 31, 2026

Abstract

Artificial intelligence (AI) is impacting communication practices within academic institutions, including the English Department at Mohammed First University, where AI use is increasing. This empirical study examines how generative AI influences university students' interpersonal competencies. It investigates whether AI helps students overcome linguistic barriers or generates challenges such as language standardization and over-reliance. Using a quantitative methodology, the research employs a structured questionnaire to assess AI's impact on students' communication accommodation behaviors. Findings reveal that students tend to adopt AI-generated linguistic patterns that are more formulaic and standardized than their natural writing style. Sustained dependence may weaken individuality and personal voice. The study highlights subtle changes in student expression within AI-mediated environments and underscores the pedagogical and ethical need to promote AI literacy, critical engagement with digital tools, and instructional frameworks that preserve communicative authenticity.

Keywords: artificial intelligence, communication accommodation, interpersonal communication, communication behaviors

1. Introduction

Communication in all its forms has evolved over the years, from the Industrial Revolution to the advent of modern technology. Technological advancements have provided us with new means of connecting; this has changed how we interact regardless of geographic boundaries or cultural differences, diminishing physical distances and redefining global social networks and exchanges (Chen & Zhang, 2010). Communication tools such as video conferencing, instant

CC BY

messaging, and emailing are the new norm. The subsequent rise of social media platforms further broadened our horizons in a way that allows us to broadcast our thoughts, experiences, and knowledge to a worldwide audience at the click of a button. This shift in communication dynamics has left an indelible mark on our society, how we communicate, form relationships, conduct businesses, and perceive our roles.

Verily, with the development of even more advanced technology in the guise of artificial intelligence, we are observing further changes in communication. These tools are penetrating every conceivable facet of our existence. Currently, individuals utilize AI-driven technologies for a wide range of tasks, from seeking answers to personal questions to tackling complex professional problems. Given that AI can perform the roles of virtual assistants, language translators, and even creative collaborators in tasks that previously necessitated human-to-human interaction. For example, within education, students consult AI for research support, linguistic acquisition, and problem-solving (Arbab et al., 2024).

Notwithstanding, the reliance on AI for communication and the fulfilment of tasks presents a formidable challenge to traditional modes of communication and possesses some implications for social structures. While AI enables quicker and more efficient information exchange, it may also affect the development of interpersonal and social skills. The subtleties of human communication, including the many ways in which individuals converse or write, may be obfuscated by AI-mediated exchanges. This raises serious concerns regarding the preservation of authentic and genuine human discourse, as well as the safeguarding of human diversity.

Chiefly, this paper seeks to address an existing gap in the literature by investigating whether AI tools influence students' communication behaviors, with a particular focus on the Communication Accommodation Theory. While existing research has examined the impact of AI on social relationships and interactions within online communities, the specific effects of AI on communication behaviors remain underexplored. The goal of this research is to address the existing knowledge gap and deepen our understanding of how AI affects communication dynamics, thereby addressing the following research question:

- How do AI tools influence students' communication accommodation behaviors?

2. Literature Review

2.1. Communication and Interpersonal Communication

Communication is pervasive in daily life and essential for social cohesion and survival. From intimate family interactions to formal workplace meetings and the broader context of public

discourse. Language, as the primary vehicle of communication, functions as a refined instrument that allows for the articulation of intricate ideas, the expression of subtle emotions, and the elucidation of intentions (Sari & Kholia, 2024). Through this, we are capable of forging a network of interpersonal relationships and collaborative efforts.

While communication takes many forms, this paper focuses on a specific type: interpersonal communication. This type constitutes a dynamic and coordinated process. It involves two individuals harmonizing their communicative behaviors into a structured and synchronized exchange (Manning, 2020). The majority of communication elements are meticulously coordinated from facial expressions to nonverbal vocal conduct, kinesics, visual activity, and proxemics. This synergy suggests that coordination is a fundamental component of human behavior. For instance, one speaker's selection of particular phrases or words primes the listener to respond in a particular manner. Similarly, in natural conversation, an interactant's word-level language influences their partner, akin to how one person's movement might affect another's nonverbal behavior (Niederhoffer & Pennebaker, 2002).

2.2. Human-Machine Communication and Linguistic Alignment

The essence of communication is an exchange of information between two or more parties; in human–machine interaction, it transpires between people and digital systems. These interactions consist of symbolic messages, which must be processed and interpreted by both parties. Through this continuous cycle of exchange and interpretation, humans and machines partake in meaning-making, connection-building, and social interaction (Etzrodt et al., 2022). This flow of communication depends on the nature of the interaction; it may take the form of a one-way transmission or a reciprocal exchange.

In an age where algorithms mediate human relationships, the very core of interpersonal communication stands at a crossroads. AI tools are leaving discernible imprints on human interaction; thus, it is imperative to carefully consider the ramifications of these technological advancements and their effects on human engagement. Beyond changing the ways individuals connect, the proliferation of digital technologies has begun to affect the basic features of language and social interaction (Oliinyk et al., 2022). To fully grasp the broader implications for social cohesion, cognitive functions, and the growth of interpersonal connections, ongoing scholarly investigation is needed.

In this regard, research conducted by Wilkenfeld et al. (2022) analyzed language patterns in nearly 30,000 Reddit-sourced conversations between people and Replika, an AI companion

chatbot. The analysis revealed that users' communication style gradually began to mirror that of their AI companions. Interestingly, this linguistic alignment increased as users developed stronger bonds with their Replika chatbots. Such findings suggest that people may accommodate their language to an AI agent in similar ways as they do with human partners. This research indicates that chatbot interactions can shape human communication patterns and that even meaningful connections can form between people and AI companions.

As generative AI technology advances, particularly with innovations like ChatGPT, its constant use for both personal and professional purposes increased (Kelly, 2024; Von Garrel & Mayer, 2023; Weerasinghe & Abeysinghe, 2024). These language models may manage a variety of communication tasks (Yang et al., 2024). ChatGPT produces interactions that closely mimic human communication patterns by integrating emotional intelligence with technological prowess. According to research, these interactions have several effects on users, behaviorally, emotionally, and cognitively (Xiao et al., 2023).

Apart from this, there is also a growing interest in how Artificial Intelligence-Mediated Communication (AI-MC) shapes interpersonal interactions and its implications for human communication. AI-MC refers to communication mediated by computational agents that operate on behalf of individuals, modifying, augmenting, or generating messages to achieve specific communication or interpersonal goals. This framework bestows a lens for understanding how people employ technology to accomplish interpersonal objectives (Hancock et al., 2020). A key issue here is the potential of AI-MC to influence human language and cognition. The processes of language production and comprehension have an intricate relationship that can cause linguistic alignment between interlocutors. While AI-generated text may influence lexical choices and conversational norms, as suggested by Mieczkowski et al. (2021) and Sussman & Carter (2025), this raises critical concerns about the erosion of organic linguistic variation.

In the same vein, Cirillo et al. (2022) demonstrated that human interlocutors exhibited a conceptual alignment when engaging with artificial agents internalizing the machine's lexico-semantic structures. This linguistic convergence suggests that human subjects modulate their expressive modality to resonate with the machine's communicative schema, suggesting a meaningful alignment with the machine's mode of expression. For that reason, extended exposure to specific linguistic styles, whether those of other individuals or AI-generated content, can lead to an unconscious adoption of stylistic features, vocabulary, and even rhetorical embellishments from the source.

Further, there are many doubts concerning how AI may affect the development of identity. Computer-Mediated Communication's concept of identity shift postulates that people's perceptions of their true selves vary as a result of their chosen self-presentation. However, it is still unclear how this process might unfold when AI modifies one's communication behavior. Will the sender's impression of themselves change, for example, if AI constantly makes their communications more extroverted, hilarious, or positive, will the sender begin to internalize this new persona as part of their identity? (Hancock et al., 2020). Interesting queries concerning the long-term impacts of AI-MC on individual identity are brought up by this.

2.3. Effects of AI on Social Relationships, Cognition, and Critical Thinking

AI can affect many aspects of life, and social relationships are no exception. Moreover, a study examining the effect of artificial intelligence on students' social relationships found that while AI can enhance learning efficiency and outcomes, it also risks diminishing face-to-face interaction and fostering overdependence on technology. AI provides students with various advantages, such as tailored learning experiences, enhanced individual progress tracking, and immediate feedback. However, this dependency can lead to social isolation; students may prefer virtual interactions over real-world connections. Consequently, the frequent use of smart electronic devices could adversely affect adolescents' interpersonal relationships and social adaptability (Puteri et al., 2024). Social interactions are important for effective interpersonal communication; changes in interaction patterns may impact the development of communication skills typically acquired through in-person experiences.

Subsequently, the discourse surrounding artificial intelligence in academia also poses a question regarding cognitive autonomy. To what extent does reliance on AI facilitate intellectual engagement, and at what point does it become an impediment to independent reasoning? The issue is not the tool itself, but the passivity it may engender. When individuals cease to interrogate AI-generated suggestions and accept them as authoritative, they relinquish an important aspect of scholarly inquiry (the capacity to assess, critique, and refine) (Vieriu & Petrea, 2025). Cognitive biases and heuristics magnify this issue by encouraging uncritical acceptance of AI results and deviating from reasonable judgment. Equally concerning are the ethical implications associated with AI chatbot systems. AI systems, no matter how sophisticated, remain susceptible to biases, misinformation, and breaches of intellectual integrity (Zhai et al., 2024). Besides engaging in superficial information acquisition, a student who relies on algorithmic output may unintentionally reinforce systemic inaccuracies.

The decline in critical thinking affects writing, too. Writing is not just about stringing words together; it is a process of reasoning, argumentation, and revision. It is a form of thinking itself, structuring ideas, questioning assumptions, and assessing information (Rahmat et al., 2020). Uncritically accepting AI-generated text converts writing from an act of cognitive creation into one of passive copying; the writer here, instead of being the architect of meaning, risks becoming a messenger of algorithmic formulations. Under such a process, the student risks a homogenization of language alongside a gradual attrition of independent thinking itself (Kosmyna et al., 2025).

By the same token, researchers have explored the impact of artificial intelligence in education (AIEd) on adolescents' emotional perception, a skill that helps recognize and understand emotions in oneself and others to guide social behavior. In two experiments, it was found that students using AI-based learning had slower response times in recognizing facial expressions compared to control groups. These effects are attributed to reduced real interpersonal interactions in AI-based education; this means that it may diminish nonverbal intimacy behaviors and promote indifference to interpersonal relations, which leads to weak emotional perception skills (Lai et al., 2023).

The studies explored in this paper illuminate both the advantages and drawbacks of AI-mediated interactions. While these technologies can enhance engagement, efficiency, and emotional connection, they also pose risks, such as overdependence, reduced face-to-face interaction, and potential attenuation of critical thinking skills. Furthermore, the broader implications of AI for human identity, social adaptability, and emotional perception suggest the possibility of linguistic homogenization and disruption of traditional interpersonal dynamics. These observations call for a theoretical lens to interpret how AI integration influences communication patterns. Accordingly, the following section introduces Communication Accommodation Theory (CAT) as the framework guiding this study's inquiry.

3. Theoretical Framework

Recent studies have examined the intricate nexus between digital mediation and the dynamics of interpersonal communication (Lai et al., 2023; Puteri et al., 2024; Wilkenfeld et al., 2022; Yang et al., 2024). As individuals frequently interact with generative artificial intelligence and machine learning algorithms, pertinent questions arise concerning the potential for linguistic and communicative adaptation. In light of this, the present study adopts the Communication Accommodation Theory (CAT) as its theoretical framework alongside the concept of linguistic synchronization to examine whether and how students adjust their communication style when

interacting with AI tools. CAT, initially developed to elucidate adjustments in face-to-face interactions, provides a framework for exploring these phenomena in human-AI communication.

CAT provides a method for predicting and elucidating the changes people make to establish, sustain, or minimize social distance during interactions. It focuses on several key aspects: the various ways people accommodate their communication, the motivations behind these adjustments, and the consequences of such accommodations (Giles, 2016). CAT identifies three basic ways in which people can adjust their communicative behaviors relative to one another, as noted by Dragojevic et al. (2015). The first is convergence, which involves adapting one's communication style to become more similar to another's. The second is divergence, which refers to modifying one's communication style to become more dissimilar to another's. The third is maintenance, involving sustaining one's default communication style without adjusting for others.

Building on this framework, Giles et al. (2023) argue that CAT has historically been confined to human interaction but could be expanded to include non-human agents. Social robots are becoming more prevalent in fields such as healthcare, education, and the workplace, making the ontological limits of "interaction" porous. However, applying CAT to human–AI communication is not straightforward, as a machine agent lacks the social cognition and motivations that characterize human interlocutors. Humans might still adjust their speech when engaging with AI, but such adjustments are one-sided, driven by the human user's perceptions or by the design constraints of the AI. This limitation suggests that while CAT provides a useful lens, its explanatory power in non-human contexts is still fundamentally limited.

To address this gap, the present study also incorporates the concept of linguistic synchronization into its theoretical framework. This perspective acknowledges that even without an actively accommodating interlocutor, humans may unconsciously align their linguistic patterns with the language input they are exposed to (Gonzales et al., 2009; Ireland & Pennebaker, 2010; Shen & Wang, 2023). Indeed, humans naturally exhibit an innate tendency towards synchronization, which includes physical behaviors and extends to language. This synchronization occurs subconsciously, such that individuals may unintentionally start to mirror the lexical choices, syntactical patterns, and rhetorical devices of authors whose works they engage with on a deep level (Ireland & Pennebaker, 2010). This reflects a deeper, perhaps innate, disposition toward cognitive alignment. The act of speaking or writing is thus not wholly autonomous, but is impacted by prior exposure, which reveals the intersubjective nature of linguistic expression.

Hence, just as individuals modulate their linguistic choices to converge with or differentiate themselves from their human interlocutors, this study hypothesizes that prolonged and

immersive interaction with AI language models may engender a form of technological accommodation within communicative behaviors. This accommodation could manifest in various ways. To illustrate, individuals may exhibit a propensity towards a more precise, direct, and unambiguous mode of linguistic expression when engaged with AI tools. Such interactions could lead to changes in how individuals structure their own verbal and written discourse.

4. Materials and Methods

4.1. Participants

The study population comprised 81 fifth-semester undergraduate students enrolled in the English Department at Mohammed First University in Oujda. This specific population was selected due to its association with the English language, which serves as the primary medium for most AI tools. Additionally, these students are required to develop advanced academic vocabulary and writing skills, making them particularly relevant for exploring the impact of AI on their communicative behaviors.

4.2. Assessments and Measures

The use of AI for communication behaviors challenges traditional assumptions of agency, originality, and productivity. This research aims to establish a framework for understanding the effects of generative AI on students; it offers a research agenda that revisits critical areas such as linguistic and communication processes, as well as relational and interpersonal dynamics.

To answer the research question which is how do AI tools impact students' communication accommodation behaviors? the study adopts a quantitative research approach. This approach is particularly suitable for this investigation as it facilitates the collection of measurable data.

The study utilizes a Likert-scale questionnaire, designed to capture students' perceptions and behaviors when engaging with AI tools. The scale ranged from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). The items were informed by Communication Accommodation Theory (CAT), which conceptualizes communicative adaptation through three primary strategies: convergence, divergence, and maintenance. These elements guide the assessment of how students interact with and adapt to generative AI tools. The questionnaire is provided in the Appendix.

Prior to full administration, the questionnaire was piloted on a small sample of students from the same population to check item clarity and identify any wording issues, and minor adjustments were made accordingly.

To ensure the reliability and validity of the data analysis, this study employed SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences). SPSS is particularly advantageous in research due to its strong statistical capabilities. By using SPSS, we can efficiently explore correlations between variables, spot trends, and test hypotheses.

4.3. Ethical Considerations

The questionnaire was administered in paper format directly in the classrooms. Students were informed of the purpose of the study and gave their consent to participate before answering the questions. Participation was voluntary, and responses were treated anonymously and used solely for the purposes of this research.

5. Results and Discussion

This section is dedicated to both presenting and analyzing the data; it is structured into two distinct parts to ensure clarity and depth of analysis. The first part focuses on descriptive statistics. This includes examining patterns, frequencies, and trends within the collected data to provide an understanding of the dataset at a surface level. The second part deals with inferential statistics, that is, to delve deeper into the relationships within the data. To be more precise, this part conducts a correlational analysis to investigate and evaluate the relationships between variables, as well as any possible connections and their consequences.

5.1. Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 presents the findings related to students' communication behaviors following AI utilization. The first inquiry focuses on exploring the frequency of AI tool usage among students. The result reveals that the majority (mode = 3) of respondents use AI tools regularly, from a few times a week to multiple times a day. This question aims to determine the extent to which students incorporate AI tools into their daily routines. Through this consistent use of the tools, a subsequent question arises: to what extent do students prefer communicating with AI tools over their classmates? The outcome in item (2) with a mode = 2 indicates that more than half of the respondents expressed a preference for interacting with AI rather than reaching out to their friends. This highlights the extent to which students rely on technology more than their classmates.

Correspondingly, this is related to the findings of Puteri et al. (2024) as reviewed in the literature, where the frequent use of smart electronic devices, particularly AI tools, could have negative consequences on adolescents' interpersonal relationships and social adaptability. The study emphasizes the importance of social interactions in promoting effective communication

skills; without genuine face-to-face exchanges, true communication becomes difficult to maintain. This illustrates that there is a growing reliance on AI for communication and problem-solving, potentially at the expense of human connection. Does the growing use of AI by students for communication and problem-solving indicate a simple adaptation to contemporary tools, or does it indicate an emerging dependency in which human-to-human interaction is no longer the norm? The ramifications touch on the very basis of social connection, going beyond the mechanics of conversation. As AI-mediated exchanges proliferate, the question is no longer whether AI can replicate human communication, but whether, in doing so, it diminishes the necessity of human connection altogether.

Table 1. *Students' communication behaviors*

Items	N	Mode
(1) How frequently do you use AI tools	81	3
(2) Have you ever chosen to ask an AI instead of a friend or classmate	81	2
(3) Do you feel that AI tools have increased your reliance on external assistance for language-related tasks	81	3
(4) I believe AI tools generate better results than I can produce on my own	81	3
(5) After using AI for a long time, do you find yourself using AI's style when communicating with others in English	81	3
(6) AI helps improve my language skills	81	4
(7) Using AI tools made you more aware of specific language rules (like grammar or formal tone) when you write	81	4

Note. *1. Strongly disagree; 2: Disagree; 3: Neutral; 4: Agree; 5: Strongly agree.*

Additionally, item (3) scores a mode of 3; that is, the majority of respondents selected the neutral option when asked about their reliance on AI. This suggests that most students are uncertain about the extent to which they depend on AI tools. Such neutrality highlights ambivalence in their perceptions. While students may recognize the usefulness and convenience of AI, their neutral stance implies hesitation or a lack of clarity about whether this usefulness translates into overreliance. This uncertainty also extends to how students perceive their abilities relative to the capabilities of AI tools. Item (4) indicates that many are unsure whether AI tools produce better results than they could achieve on their own. Most respondents chose neutral choices, revealing that they neither totally rely on AI nor fully trust their abilities. This conclusion is indicative of a conflict in students' relationship with AI, where the perceived reliance on AI and confidence in one's abilities are both questioned.

A critical finding, item (5), concerning students' convergence towards the tool portrays that the majority of participants find themselves adopting an AI communication style. This implies that students' communication behavior is influenced by AI tools, either intentionally or

inadvertently. Students' use of AI-generated language or structure in their writing is a subtle example of how extended usage of AI technologies can influence language use, frequently without conscious intent. Paradoxically, item (6) reveals a disjunction among students; that is, while they demonstrably emulate the stylistic tendencies of AI-generated language, they do not perceive this mimicry as conducive to the improvement of their linguistic competence. In contrast, item (7), with a modal value of 4, indicates that a majority of respondents affirm that engagement with AI has heightened their awareness of particular grammatical conventions. To delve further into the linguistic changes students discern in their expression, item (8) gives them options for the changes they have noticed; Table 2 provides a more detailed description.

Table 2. *Observed Changes in Language Use Following Frequent AI Tool Usage*

(8) Changes in Language Use	Percentage
Greater focus on grammar and punctuation	28%
Increased use of formal language	24%
Simplification of sentence structure	15%
Less use of creative or complex expressions	13%
More use of the AI tool's suggested words/phrases	10%
No noticeable change	9%

The data above show that students report varied effects of AI-generated language on their writing: increased attention to grammar and punctuation (28%) and more formal language (24%) were most common, followed by simplified sentence structures (15%), reduced creative or complex expression (13%), and greater reliance on AI-suggested wording (10%), while some observed no significant change. AI appears to strengthen technical aspects of writing but may shape stylistic choices and limit creativity for certain users.

5.2. Inferential Statistics

The previous section was devoted to describing the findings; this section is focused on the correlation between variables, frequency of AI use (independent variable) and students' communicative convergence (dependent variable). employing both Spearman's and Pearson's correlation methods. The analysis aims to determine whether increased engagement with AI is associated with convergence, divergence, or maintenance of individual communication styles.

To analyze this relationship, Spearman's correlation coefficient was calculated using SPSS. The frequency of AI utilization among students is associated with their communication tendencies. Spearman's correlation coefficient provides values ranging from -1 to 1; the magnitude indicates the strength of the relationship, and the sign indicates its direction. A

positive correlation suggests that as the frequency of AI usage increases, students are more likely to converge toward AI-generated linguistic styles. Conversely, a negative correlation would imply that increased AI usage is associated with greater divergence or retention of their unique communication styles.

5.2.1. *Passive Use & Language Development*

One of the initial and most conceptually significant themes to surface from the analysis is the dialectical relationship between students' frequency of AI tool usage and their perceived linguistic development. This section interrogates the nature of student engagement with AI through the lens of passivity, specifically, the uncritical acceptance of AI-generated suggestions without revision, and how such behavior reflects and reinforces students' beliefs about the utility of AI in improving language learning. This analysis examines how reliance on AI may reduce the cognitive effort students need to develop their language skills meaningfully. Table 3 presents the correlation between students' frequency of AI use and their passive engagement. Two items stand out: a strong negative correlation between AI use and the belief that AI improves language skills ($r = -.880$, $p < .001$), and a strong positive correlation between AI use and accepting AI-generated responses without modification ($r = .896$, $p < .001$).

Table 3. *Correlation Between Students' Frequent AI Use and Their Passive Engagement*

Items		How frequently do you use AI tools
(6) AI helps improve my language skills	Correlation Coefficient	-.880**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	81
(9) How likely are you to accept an AI-generated response without making any modifications	Correlation Coefficient	.896**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	81

Accordingly, Spearman's correlation analysis provides critical insights into the influence of AI tools on students' linguistic behaviors. As indicated in item 6, the results reveal a very strong negative correlation. Given that a coefficient of −1 represents a negative relationship, the observed coefficient, being relatively close to −1, suggests that higher frequency of AI use is associated with a lower likelihood of students perceiving AI tools as helpful for their language development. One possible explanation for this trend is overreliance on AI; that is, frequent users may depend on these tools to generate outputs such as writing or translation, and this does not provide opportunities to actively practice and develop their skills but just passively absorb the output. Additionally, many AI tools are built to prioritize speed and productivity and are

not designed for language learning, which may further explain why students doubt AI's ability to enhance their linguistic skills.

Interestingly, item (9) adds an additional layer to this dynamic. It showcases that many students tend to accept AI-generated responses without making modifications. This is passive consumption of AI outputs which explains the strong negative correlation observed in item (6). When students forgo critical engagement and personal input in favor of unaltered acceptance, they forfeit the cognitive and linguistic processes essential to learning.

5.2.2. *Intentional Convergence & Academic Style*

Beyond passive engagement, a second thematic strand that emerges from the data is the intentional stylistic alignment. This section explores the paradoxical stance students adopt toward AI-mediated communication, while they strategically draw upon the formal, polished style provided by AI tools to enhance the perceived professionalism of their writing, they also disclose critical reservations about the authenticity and academic sufficiency of such language.

Having examined passive engagement, the analysis now turns to accommodation behaviors specifically, how students' frequency of AI use relates to their perceptions of AI's stylistic fit for academic writing and their tendency to retain their own voice despite AI suggestions, as presented in Table 4.

Table 4. *Correlation between Students' Frequent AI Use and Their Accommodation Behaviors*

Items		How frequently do you use AI tools
(10) The style of language used by AI tools is accurate and appropriate for academic writing	Correlation Coefficient	-.817**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	81
(11) Have you ever found that, despite AI-generated suggestions, you preferred to keep your own style	Correlation Coefficient	-.819**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	81

Students express somewhat a conflicted attitude toward AI-generated language, as reflected in Item (10) with a strong negative correlation coefficient of -0.817. While many students consciously adopt the formal and structured style suggested by AI tools to enhance their writing, they simultaneously express reservations about the true appropriateness of that style for academic contexts. This perspective suggests that while students recognize and even benefit from the clarity and fluency AI-generated language provides, they are critically aware that such language may lack certain elements required for genuine academic rigor.

Despite these reservations, the preference for AI's style appears to stem from its formal tone and clear structure, a feature learner probably find useful in producing work that looks neat and clear. In addition, item (11) with a strong negative correlation of -0.819 signals an inverse relationship between the frequency of AI use and the retention of personal writing style. Students who engage more frequently with AI-assisted tools are significantly less inclined to preserve their own linguistic identity, which indicates a trend toward stylistic convergence. This assimilation, whether conscious or not, points to an erosion of individual voice.

This finding aligns with the research conducted by Wilkenfeld et al. (2022), who have shown that interactions with chatbots and other AI systems can actively shape human communication patterns. The study suggests that through repeated and consistent interactions, individuals may begin to adopt the linguistic and conversational styles exhibited by AI tools.

5.2.3. *Individuality vs. Standardization*

The challenge of preserving individual voice amid stylistic convergence is a subtle but important tension that comes from the merging of human thought and machine-generated language. This section interrogates the interaction between the preservation of individuality and the imposition of standardization.

Table 5. *Correlation Between Students' Frequent AI Use and Their Individuality*

Items		How frequently do you use AI tools
(12) How often do you intentionally adopt AI-suggested formal or structured communication styles to sound more academic or professional?	Correlation Coefficient	.855**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	81
(13) AI tools limit individuality by promoting a more uniform or standardized communication style across users	Correlation Coefficient	-.769**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	81

Drawing from item (12), the correlation coefficient of 0.855 accentuates a strong positive relationship: students who frequently use AI intentionally adjust their communication style based on its suggestions. Their motivation appears strategic, as they recognize that AI-generated language mirrors formal and academically acceptable structures and draw on this to enhance the perceived quality of their work. This reflects a deliberate form of convergence aimed at meeting academic expectations. At the same time, repeated exposure to AI-generated text may normalize certain discursive patterns, students might start to internalize these conventions without deliberate intention. The result is a hybrid form of convergence that combines conscious strategy with habitual assimilation.

This observation resonates with the hypothesis proposed by Hancock et al. (2019); they posit that the integration of AI-generated text into human dialogue has the potential to shape not only the content of what is said but also the structure of interpersonal communication. When AI-generated language is used in conversational exchanges, it does not function in a vacuum; instead, it shapes the speaker's linguistic decisions and, therefore, the interlocutor's communication style. Language is not a static medium, but a dynamic, interactive process that artificial agents can influence.

To investigate students' perspectives on this issue, item (13) addresses the concern that AI tools may limit individuality by promoting a more uniform or standardized style of communication. The result discloses that students largely do not agree with this perspective; instead, they perceive these tools as augmenting their ability to express themselves, perhaps because AI provides diverse suggestions, enhances clarity, and offers new vocabulary in ways they might not achieve independently.

AI-driven systems provide language recommendations based on patterns derived from extensive datasets, it is based on widely accepted or neutral phrasing. This could inadvertently guide users toward similar stylistic choices, potentially reducing variability and distinctiveness in communication over an extended period. The full scope of this impact is challenging to measure immediately due to the relative novelty of AI tools.

Moreover, the adaptability of AI tools might evolve, as developers could introduce more customizable options. Future advancements might prioritize encouraging unique expression by tailoring outputs to individual preferences, creative nuances, and diverse linguistic trends. Therefore, while current perceptions among students are optimistic, the potential for long-term effects on linguistic and communication styles remains an open area for further exploration and study.

6. Conclusion

It is reasonable to conclude that every interaction with generative AI leaves a slight imprint on our linguistic choices. This raises questions we cannot ignore: Are we finding new clarity, or losing the messy, spontaneous parts of how we express ourselves? The objective of this study is to critically investigate and examine how our language adapts as well as what is gained, what is compromised, and how these changes may be reshaping our understanding of communication itself.

The findings illuminate a change in students' linguistic accommodation, one that is caused by the constant integration of generative AI into their communicative behaviors. A salient revelation is

the discernible convergence towards AI-generated linguistic structures, which beckons scrutiny regarding the ramifications on students' authentic linguistic expression. A cardinal observation herein pertains to the ambivalence exhibited by students regarding their reliance on AI tools. The statistical neutrality recorded in their self-assessment is suggestive of an uncertainty on the boundaries between facilitation and dependency.

In summation, this study emphasizes the dualistic nature of AI's role in students' linguistic development. While generative AI indubitably affords efficiency and structural precision, its omnipresence heralds a potential diminution of individualized expression and critical linguistic engagement. The findings point to a deeper ontological structuring of how individuals articulate thought, construct meaning, and engage in academic discourse.

6.1. Theoretical Implications

This study hypothesizes that a form of technological accommodation can exist; it draws this conclusion from two established communication theories. First, the Communication Accommodation Theory (CAT) suggests that individuals tend to modify their communication styles, such as tone, speech patterns, or word choice, to synchronize with their interlocutors during interaction. Second, the Linguistic Alignment Theory posits that prolonged exposure to a particular language style can lead to changes in a person's linguistic behavior. Building on these frameworks, the study argues that extended interaction with technological platforms, systems, or AI tools can similarly influence and reshape users' language and communication styles over time.

The linguistic patterns encoded in AI-driven tools and the frequency of use, highlight an intriguing trend in which regular use of generative AI actively readjusts the stylistic and structural outlines of student expression as opposed to increasing communicative effectiveness. The frequency of AI-mediated interactions is associated with the probability of linguistic convergence. This directly supports the study's central hypothesis: prolonged exposure to AI-assisted writing is correlated with changes in student writing styles and communicative behavior. What emerges is an ontological question of whether this change signifies a dilution of individual expressiveness or a paradigmatic shift toward a new linguistic modality, one where human and machine-generated discourse converge into a hybridized communicative form.

Nevertheless, these findings carry significant implications for educators and curriculum designers tasked with overcoming the disadvantages (reduced peer interaction, passive learning habits, and diminished originality etc.) of using AI for educational purposes. Careful

pedagogical approaches are needed. In practical terms, establishing guidelines for AI usage, such as using AI for brainstorming ideas not for completing assignments, integrating collaborative projects to preserve human contact, and educating students in digital literacy so they can assess AI outputs critically. Curriculum designers on the other hand might craft activities where students compare AI-generated work with human-crafted work to stimulate discussions about creativity, originality and nuance aspects where human involvement is still essential. Without sacrificing their agency or critical social and cognitive abilities, educators can assist students in becoming astute users who gain from AI augmentation.

6.2. Limitations

No inquiry can proceed without acknowledging its epistemic and methodological constraints. This study sheds light on how students orient their communication in response to generative AI; however, its scope is limited to students' self-perceived assessments. The reliance on students' introspective accounts of their linguistic behaviors, while valuable in surfacing subjective dispositions, does not provide empirical access to the phenomenology of actual linguistic production.

Equally delimiting is the scale and scope of the sample itself. Drawn exclusively from a cohort of 81 English majors, the findings constrain the generalizability of the results. A broader and more diverse sample would be necessary to extend these findings across different educational, linguistic, or cultural contexts. Further, the instrumentation employed adheres to the framework of Communication Accommodation Theory, but may not yet fully capture the ontological distinctiveness of human–machine interaction.

Consequently, these constraints indicate that future research should implement mixed-method or experimental designs, which ought to include real-time writing tasks and cross-sectional samples, so as to further our understanding of the concrete ways in which AI technologies change linguistic agency, communicative autonomy, and interpersonal fluency.

Disclosure Statement

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this article. No financial, personal, or professional relationships have influenced the research, analysis, or conclusions presented in this work.

Notes on Contributors

Soumia Largou is a PhD student at Mohammed First University, Oujda, within the Laboratory of Applied Communication in Context. Her research focuses on digital tools, internationalization, global citizenship and cross-cultural communication. Supported by the "PhD-Associate Scholarship (PASS)" program, she is actively engaged in research that bridges theoretical knowledge with practical applications, aiming to innovate in the fields of international education and intercultural competence.

soumia.largou.d24@ump.ac.ma

Abdellah El Boubekri is a researcher in Moroccan cultural studies. He got his Master degree in colonial/postcolonial discourses from the University of Mohammed I, Oujda, in January 2007. He got a Ph.D. degree in Moroccan cultural studies from the University of Mohamed Ben Abdellah, Fez, Morocco, in November 2013. He is a former Fulbright FLTA at Drury University, Missouri State from 2007-2008. He is also a former full-time trainee trainer at Teacher Training Center (CRMEF), Oujda. Currently, he is a full-time professor of Cultural Studies at the University of Mohamed I, and a part-time instructor of English at the American Language Center, Oujda. He has taken part in Collaborative Online International Learning (COIL), spring and fall 2017. Currently, he is the ETII coordinator and teacher trainer at the Oujda ALC

ORCID

Soumia Largou *https://orcid.org/0009-0000-1210-4331*

Abdellah El Boubekri *https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1882-1598*

References

Arbab, A. N., Dhuhli, B. A., Krishnan, Y., & Crisostomo, A. S. (2024). Student's Utilization and Assistance of AI tools in assessment completion: Perceptions and implications. *International Linguistics Research*, *7*(3), p1. https://doi.org/10.30560/ilr.v7n3p1

Chen, G., & Zhang, K. (2010). New media and cultural identity in the global society. In *Handbook of Research on Discourse Behavior and Digital Communication: Language Structures and Social Interaction*. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-61520-773-2.ch051

Cirillo, G., Runnqvist, E., Strijkers, K., Nguyen, N., & Baus, C. (2022). Conceptual alignment in a joint picture-naming task performed with a social robot. *Cognition*, *227*, 105213. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2022.105213

Dragojevic, M., Gasiorek, J., & Giles, H. (2015). Communication Accommodation Theory. In *Wiley online library*. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/9781118540190.wbeic006

Etzrodt, K., Gentzel, P., Utz, S., & Engesser, S. (2022). Human-machine-communication: introduction to the special issue. *Publizistik*, *67*(4), 439–448. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11616-022-00754-8

Giles, H. (2016). Communication Accommodation Theory. *The International Encyclopedia of Communication Theory and Philosophy*, 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118766804.wbiect056

Giles, H., L Edwards, A., & B Walther, J. (2023). Communication accommodation theory: Past accomplishments, current trends, and future prospects. *Language Sciences*, *99*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2023.101571

Gonzales, A. L., Hancock, J. T., & Pennebaker, J. W. (2009). Language style matching as a predictor of social dynamics in small groups. *Communication Research*, *37*(1), 3–19. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650209351468

Hancock, J., Naaman, M., & Levy, K. (2020). AI-Mediated Communication: Definition, Research Agenda, and Ethical Considerations. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, *25*(1). https://doi.org/10.1093/jcmc/zmz022

Ireland, M. E., & Pennebaker, J. W. (2010). Language style matching in writing: Synchrony in essays, correspondence, and poetry. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *99*(3), 549–571. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020386

Kelly, R. (2024). *Survey: 86% of Students Already Use AI in Their Studies*. Campus Technology. https://campustechnology.com/articles/2024/08/28/survey-86-of-students-already-use-ai-in-their-studies.aspx

Kosmyna, N., Hauptmann, E., Yuan, Y. T., Situ, J., Liao, X., Beresnitzky, A. V., Braunstein, I., & Maes, P. (2025, June 10). *Your Brain on ChatGPT: Accumulation of Cognitive Debt when Using an AI Assistant for Essay Writing Task*. arXiv.org. https://arxiv.org/abs/2506.08872

Lai, T., Zeng, X., Xu, B., Xie, C., Liu, Y., Wang, Z., Lu, H., & Fu, S. (2023). The application of artificial intelligence technology in education influences Chinese adolescent's emotional perception. *Current Psychology*, *43*(6), 5309–5317. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-023-04727-6

Manning, J. (2020). Interpersonal Communication. In *The SAGE International Encyclopedia of Mass Media and Society*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/339032259_Interpersonal_Communication

Mieczkowski, H., Hancock, J. T., Naaman, M., Jung, M., & Hohenstein, J. (2021). AI-Mediated Communication. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, *5*(CSCW1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1145/3449091

Niederhoffer, K. G., & Pennebaker, J. W. (2002). Linguistic style matching in social interaction. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *21*(4), 337–360. https://doi.org/10.1177/026192702237953

Oliinyk, L., Romaniuk, N., Kuznetsova, H., Horbenko, I., & Senchylo-Tatlilioglu, N. (2022). The impact of digital and internet technologies on language development. *Revista De Tecnología De Información Y Comunicación En Educación*, *16*(3). https://doi.org/10.46502/issn.1856-7576/2022.16.03.3

Puteri, S. A., Saputri, Y., & Kurniati, Y. (2024). The Impact of Artificial Intelligence (AI) Technology on Students' Social Relations. *BICC Proceedings*, *2*, 153–158. https://doi.org/10.30983/bicc.v1i1.121

Rahmat, N. H., Aripin, N., Lin, N. M., Whanchit, W., & Khairuddin, Z. (2020). Exploring the Connection between Critical Thinking Skills and Academic Writing. *International Journal of Asian Social Science*, *10*(2), 118–128. https://doi.org/10.18488/journal.1.2020.102.118.128

Sari, N. M., & Kholia, S. L. (2024). The function of communication in human life. *Semantik Journal of Social Media Communication and Journalism*, *2*(1), 24. https://doi.org/10.31958/semantik.v2i1.11396

Shen, H., & Wang, M. (2023). Effects of social skills on lexical alignment in human-human interaction and human-computer interaction. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *143*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2023.107718

Sussman, K., & Carter, D. (2025). Detecting effects of AI-Mediated communication on language complexity and sentiment. *arXiv.org*. https://doi.org/10.1145/3701716.3717543

Vieriu, A. M., & Petrea, G. (2025). The impact of artificial intelligence (AI) on students' academic development. *Education Sciences*, *15*(3), 343. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15030343

Von Garrel, J., & Mayer, J. (2023). Artificial Intelligence in studies—use of ChatGPT and AI-based tools among students in Germany. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, *10*(1), 799. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-02304-7

Weerasinghe, W., & Abeysinghe, H. M. P. P. K. (2024). Usage of artificial intelligence (AI) tools for academic activities by undergraduate students: a quantitative study at the Sri Lanka Institute of Information Technology (SLIIT) Library. In *Zenodo*. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13959107

Wilkenfeld, J. N., Yan, B., Huang, J., Luo, G., & Algas, K. (2022). "AI Love You": Linguistic Convergence in Human-Chatbot Relationship Development. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, *2022*(1). https://doi.org/10.5465/ambpp.2022.17063abstract

Xiao, C., Xu, S. X., Zhang, K., Wang, Y., & Xia, L. (2023). Evaluating Reading Comprehension Exercises Generated by LLMs: A Showcase of ChatGPT in Education Applications. *ACL Anthology*. https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.bea-1.52

Yang, S., Zhao, H., & Luo, W. (2024). The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Intercultural Communication. In *Understanding Multiculturalism and Interculturalism in Cross Cultures [Working Title]*. https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.1006172

Yang, X., Liao, T., Wang, Y., Ren, L., & Zeng, J. (2024). The association between digital addiction and interpersonal relationships: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clinical Psychology Review*, *114*, 102501. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2024.102501

Zhai, C., Wibowo, S., & Li, L. D. (2024). The effects of over-reliance on AI dialogue systems on students' cognitive abilities: a systematic review. *Smart Learning Environments*, *11*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-024-00316-7

Appendix

Questionnaire

1) How frequently do you use AI tools?

☐ Multiple times a day
☐ Once a day
☐ A few times a week
☐ A few times a month
☐ Never

2) Have you ever chosen to ask an AI tool instead of a friend or classmate?

☐ Yes
☐ No

3) Do you feel that AI tools have increased your reliance on external assistance for language-related tasks?

☐ Yes, I rely more on AI tools now
☐ Sometimes
☐ No, I still prefer to develop my own content

4) I believe AI tools generate better results than I can produce on my own.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

5) After using AI for a long time, do you find yourself using AI's style when communicating with others in English?

☐ Always
☐ Often
☐ Sometimes
☐ Rarely
☐ Never

6) AI helps improve my language skills.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

7) Using AI tools made you more aware of specific language rules (like grammar or formal tone) when you write.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

8) Have you noticed any of the following changes in your language after using AI tools frequently? *(Check all that apply)*

☐ Simplification of sentence structure
☐ Increased use of formal language
☐ Greater focus on grammar and punctuation
☐ Less use of creative or complex expressions
☐ More use of the AI tool's suggested words/phrases
☐ No noticeable change
☐ Other: _____

9) How likely are you to accept an AI-generated response without making any modifications?

☐ Very likely
☐ Likely
☐ Neutral
☐ Unlikely
☐ Very unlikely

10) The style of language used by AI tools is accurate and appropriate for academic writing.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

11) Have you ever found that despite AI-generated suggestions, you preferred to keep your own style?

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

12) How often do you intentionally adopt AI-suggested formal or structured communication styles to sound more academic or professional?

☐ Always
☐ Often
☐ Sometimes
☐ Rarely
☐ Never

13) AI tools limit individuality by promoting a more uniform or standardized communication style across users.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree