ILN JOURNAL:
INDIAN LITERARY NARRATIVES

https://doi.org/10.70396/ilnjournal.v3n2.a.04 | Volume 3, Issue 2, June 2026 | ISSN: 3048 6920

Bridging Language and Life: A Learner-Centric, AI-Assisted Model for English Fluency in Multilingual Classroom

M. Catharinal Silviya*

Abstract

In the case of lower-intermediate English speakers, they are aware of more than they can express. There is a great need to bridge this gap, as conventional classroom teaching alone does not benefit most undergraduate students. Bridging Language and Life emerged from this core idea. This paper discusses a study that lasted for about six months and involved undergraduate students at the lower-intermediate level. The purpose of the study was to enable lower-intermediate learners to express themselves in real-life situations using the English language, both in writing and speaking, rather than merely learning it theoretically. To achieve this goal, Bridging Language and Life incorporated various digital AI applications (Grammarly, Quizizz, QuillBot, ChatGPT, Gemini AI, and BBC Learning English), together with classroom-based activities relevant to the students' culture and life experiences. The highlight of this study sheds light not only on technology but also on the "how" of the extensive use of AI tools in the education sector. The study included voice journals, real-life situational dialogues, the exploration of informal vernacular English alongside formal registers, and engagement with literature in ways that encouraged learners to think about other people's experiences. These activities were designed to give learners something to say and meaningful reasons to say it. The findings of the study, which form the focus of this paper, demonstrate that AI tools were effective only when they served a larger purpose. AI usage was reframed from dependence to purposeful use. When students used AI tools to refine ideas they had already developed, their confidence grew. However, when the tools replaced their own thinking, little changed. As the study revealed, fluency, in any context, must ultimately come from the learner.

Submitted: 17.04.2026 Revised: 07.05.2026 Accepted: 22.06.2026 Published: 30.06.2026

*M. Catharinal Silviya, Assistant Professor, Department of English, Women's Christian College, Chennai – 600006, Tamil Nadu, India.

Keywords: English language teaching (ELT), learner-centric pedagogy, AI-assisted learning, digital language portfolio, bilingual fluency, communicative competence, personality development.

Introduction

English holds a peculiar place in the Indian Educational Imagination. It is a language that gives people opportunities while also making them anxious. For many regional-medium learners, the language becomes very intimidating after studying it for years. They do not feel comfortable using the language because they don't feel at home with its usage. This problem is particularly pressing for students, as cultural context is often removed from language pedagogy. These learners are not new to English. While awareness of grammar persists, usage and confidence are what many lack. So, the ability to understand the language rarely translates into an ability to use it. The way English is taught in conventional classrooms does not always help these students. Syllabi focused on examination modules reward accuracy over free expression. The English language, therefore, in such instances, is twice removed from the cultural realities of such learners. For example, grammar is taught separately from the situations in which it is used. Vocabulary is taught without considering what the words really mean. Writing is taught without considering the voice of the writer. The social and personal parts of communication, which are very important in life, are often not taught at all.

The rising use of Artificial Intelligence tools in educational settings raises major concerns in language learning processes. These tools, such as Grammarly, ChatGPT, Gemini AI and Quill Bot can give students feedback and information that no advanced language user can replicate. However, usage of generative AI tools, without pedagogical guidance poses major risks to language learners. "Decision-makers must ideally interact with AI tools in a manner that augments their capabilities without compromising their human judgment" (Nair et al. 3925). If used without reflective discretion, learners may tend to be overdependent on the tools to give them instant answers rather than understanding the language. This means that students may produce writing that's perfect, a piece that also does not really belong to them.

Another limitation is the overemphasis on ChatGPT as a central example of AI tools within the educational context. While its prominence in education is undeniable, the book could have explored a wider range of AI technologies. Including examples such as adaptive learning platforms, which personalize learning experiences based on individual student needs, speech recognition tools that facilitate language learning through interactive dialogue, and virtual reality systems that offer immersive language practice, would present a more comprehensive view of the AI landscape in education. Expanding the focus beyond ChatGPT would not only acknowledge the diversity of tools available but also highlight the different ways in which AI can enhance teaching and learning. This broader perspective would allow educators and stakeholders to make more informed decisions when

integrating AI technologies into their curricula, ultimately fostering a richer learning experience for students (Parviz 3).

This article sheds light on Bridging *Language and Life.* This six-month learner-centric program was designed to help students' language learning along with efficient implementation of AI tools. The program combines ways of teaching English including task-based learning, reflection and blended learning. The core principles of the study explore students' life, language and story as the foundation of the teaching and learning English language, not an obstacle. The goal of this program is not to produce students who can write perfectly or speak neutral English phrases. The goal is to produce students who can use English in a way that's meaningful and confident.

Review of Literature:

It is necessary to explore outside of the classroom to comprehend why intermediate students struggle with English fluency. The issue is more complex than inadequate classroom learning. It also involves how students feel about the language and whether they think they have something to say in it. The learning environment plays a role too. It needs to allow students to explore and learn.

People learn by doing, not by being taught, according to constructivist theorists like Vygotsky (1978) and Dewey (1938). We learn by experiencing things and using the language. When students see a reason to use the language, the motivation to learn increases. Learners who see a personal reason to use the language, studies consistently show, are more motivated and hold onto what they learn far longer. Kohonen captures this shift in emphasis well:

> The goal is to enable the learner to become increasingly self-directed and responsible for his or her own learning. This process means a gradual shift of the initiative to the learner, encouraging him or her to bring in personal contributions or experiences. Instead of the teacher setting the tasks and standards of acceptable performance, the learner is increasingly in charge of his or her own learning. (36)

For students who have sat through several years of grammar-focused English classes without ever feeling confident enough to speak, this kind of shift matters enormously. These concepts are put into effect in the classroom through task-based language teaching, which was created by Willis (1996) and Long (2015). The main point is simple: since communication is the aim, students should be practicing it rather than always preparing for it. Writing a letter, conducting an interview with a classmate, or recounting an actual event are examples of tasks that require students to apply their stored language abilities for genuine meaning. This type of controlled yet intentional practice tends to uncover what conventional drilling never quite achieves for lower-intermediate students, who frequently know more than they think they do.

These concepts are somewhat at odds with the subject of AI tools, and this conflict is reflected in the study. AI-based tools can provide conversational practice and feedback that a single teacher simply cannot provide to thirty students at once, and there is credible evidence that platforms like Grammarly help learners become more accurate and confident in their writing (Karyuatry 83-89). However, Selwyn (2019) raises an equally legitimate concern: learners who rely too much on these tools run the risk of producing language that is technically correct but not truly their own. The voice becomes smoother. What's left is correct, yet it seems hollow. “Although Artificial Intelligence (AI) holds immense potential to enhance the educational experience, its use also presents challenges” (Reiter et al. 12395). Therefore, the problem is not whether or not to use AI, but rather how to do so without allowing it to think for the learner. “Research on AI-mediated language learning has often emphasized aggregate measures of performance and engagement, yet little is known about how learners individually perceive and enact affordances in sustained interaction with conversational agents” (Nguyen and Doan 1).

The larger body of ELT literature has not always given adequate attention to the cultural aspect of this problem. Gay (2000) and Ladson-Billings (1995) made strong arguments that learning becomes more meaningful when it is connected to the learner’s background, community, and language. In the context of a native speaker, this entails acknowledging that pupils do not come to English with a blank slate. They carry with them a fully developed linguistic identity, and studies on translanguaging and code-switching indicate that utilizing this rather than repressing it actually speeds up the development of a second language while lowering the anxiety that frequently gets in the way. The competition is not the learner’s native tongue. It is a component of the bridge when used carefully.

Research Objectives:

Preliminary English language learning processes are often separated from cultural affirmation. This study is based on the idea that lower intermediate learners, while using grammar-based learning modules, also need to explore language in daily use. The objective of this study, thus mainly focuses on the approach that grammar doesn't have to be drilled in learners but as a mode of unfolding when learners have real reasons for communicating and are encouraged to do so with increasing confidence.

The core principle of this study is to not focus on technology. It is to rather highlight a design that can integrate AI-assisted digital tools with task-based and reflective activities. It sits in the background, supporting learners as they do the harder and more interesting work of finding their own voice in English. As M. Ross puts it, good pedagogy pushes students “to the point where they have to question what is the framework that is being used here and what would it mean for me to radically change this framework (Ross)” a provocation that captures something essential about what this program asks of its participants. Similarly, character-

driven scenarios, with an AI twist, introduce a different kind of engagement. The model not only helps with language learning but also, alongside, develops empathy and critical thinking skills in learners. Reading and responding to characters who face recognizable dilemmas asks learners to think carefully and express that thinking in English, along with AI references, which turns out to be more demanding and challenging than most grammar exercises. All the more, usage of generative AI as a mode of reference rather than complete dependence not only lets learners understand their mistakes but also helps them to improve their vocabulary effectively.

The objective of this study is to make both language and AI accessible to lower intermediate learners. AI tools are chosen for ease of use and peer collaboration is built into activities so that learners with varying levels of digital literacy and linguistic confidence can participate meaningfully. The broader focus is to develop a model that not only works in this setting but could also be adapted as a practical and learner-driven framework for English fluency that does not depend on exceptional resources or exceptional teachers, but on taking learners seriously.

Methodology:

AI tools, such as machine learning and natural language processing are increasingly being harnessed to innovate and enhance educational practices globally (Chen et al., 75264–75278). In such cases, effective usage of AI becomes an important need in classroom settings. The study was conducted with thirty to forty undergraduate students at the lower-intermediate level from a metropolitan college setting. Over six months, the program followed a qualitative, classroom-based intervention model that combined face-to-face instruction with digital learning tools in a structured blended format.

Data was gathered through several channels: voice journal recordings, written worksheets and tasks, pre- and post-program reflections, classroom observations, and peer feedback sessions. Digital tools, ChatGPT, Gemini AI, Grammarly, Quill Bot, BBC Learning English, and Canva were woven into the program to support grammar development and presentation skills, but always as aids to learner effort rather than replacements for it. The activities themselves were organized around the four core language skills of Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing, with communicative competence as the overarching aim throughout.

The listening and reading module used several exercises that infused audio-based tasks into building comprehension and empathy. Learners worked through guided reading and inference activities, then used AI tools to revisit and refine their responses: comparing what they had written or said independently with what the tool suggested, and thinking critically about the difference. The goal was not to produce correct answers but to develop the habit of reflection.

According to Crompton et al., “the use of AI significantly improved students’ pronunciation by reducing the flatness of pitch and intonation patterns (Crompton et al. 9).” The Speaking and Phonetics module built oral confidence gradually and

without pressure. Structured phonetic exercises ran alongside weekly recordings in which learners reflected on personal themes while speaking with generative AI tools. This practice turned out to be less intimidating than performing in front of a class, which allowed learners to build enough confidence before addressing their peers. Generative AI tools were used for conversational practice, giving learners a space to experiment with spoken English outside the watchful context of peer judgment which was followed by classroom discussion and peer encouragement.

Translation develops three qualities essential to all language learning: clarity, accuracy and flexibility (Duff 1994). One of the most distinctive elements of the program was the Translation and Narrative module. Learners relied on their native language, pulled out everyday phrases and worked them into structured English, with the help of AI. This was not a translation in the formal academic sense. Learners translated, discussed, received feedback from AI, and revised. The activities highlighted bilingual experiences as a resource and not as an obstacle. Personal and family anecdotes became language-learning material, and in that process, fluency and confidence moved together in a way that grammar drills rarely produce.

Data Analysis

The data gathered across the six-month program was qualitative in nature and drew on four primary sources: voice journal recordings, written worksheets and task outputs, pre- and post-program reflective responses, and structured classroom observations. Because the study was concerned with what actually changed in learners' relationship to English rather than with measurable score improvement, the analysis followed a thematic approach rather than a statistical one. Recordings and written outputs were reviewed at regular intervals across the program, and patterns were identified inductively as they emerged from the data rather than being imposed in advance.

Three major themes emerged consistently. The first was a shift in affective engagement: early voice journals tended to be brief and hesitant while entries from the final two months were noticeably more sustained and less interrupted by self-monitoring. Learners also uploaded their conversational pieces into AI sources, as the immediate feedback in checking tone, use of vocabulary and frequency shifts in sentences helped them identify and rectify errors seamlessly. The nature of this shift was observable in both the length and fluency of individual recordings, and it aligned with learners' own reflective accounts of feeling less frightened to speak.

The second theme concerned the quality of interaction with AI tools. Accordingly, "Implementing personalized approaches for a large and diverse student population is a challenging task, but AI offers adaptive learning experiences that are tuned to specific strengths and weaknesses (Ghosh 313)." Learners who had initially used platforms such as ChatGPT and Gemini AI to get ready made answers and responses for assignments and coursework, over time, began engaging differently with AI tools. The process began with questioning suggestions,

comparing AI-generated alternatives with their own drafts, and articulating why they preferred one phrasing over another. This shift from passive acceptance to critical interrogation was one of the more significant qualitative changes the program produced. Thus, making sure that with the right pedagogical mindset, AI can be used efficiently in language learning systems.

The third theme was linguistic confidence in bilingual contexts. Written and spoken outputs from the Translation and Narrative module showed an increasing willingness to work across languages rather than simply reaching for the nearest English equivalent, and learners showed growing awareness of the cultural and tonal nuances that such movement between languages requires. Using native scenarios allows learners to feel 'at home' in learning the English language rather than feeling foreign. This sense of belonging tends to reduce the anxiety and hesitation that many lower intermediate learners face in language settings. Modules included translation of native pieces, comparison of personal and AI answers and implementing AI scenarios and conversation in language learning, making digital accessibility an efficient tool in building vocabulary.

Pre- and post-program reflective responses were compared using a simple framework that looked for changes in self-description (how learners characterized themselves as language users), in attitude toward AI tools (from dependence to critical engagement), and in reported willingness to use English outside classroom settings. Across all three dimensions, the post-program responses showed a directional shift. Peer feedback sessions provided an additional layer of corroboration: the language learners used to respond to one another's work became more specific and constructive over the course of the program, suggesting that their metalinguistic awareness, their ability to talk about language rather than simply produce it, had also developed.

Discussion

One of the more important highlights of this program was a simple yet effective one: refusing to let AI do the thinking for the learner. This sounds obvious, but in practice it requires constant pedagogical intention. When generative AI flags an error, the learner has to stop and understand it clearly. When Gemini AI simulates a job interview or a workplace query, the learner still has to compose the response, make the choices, and find the words. The AI tool will be used for feedback and correction after the process, not a template to fill in before. This distinction between AI as a shortcut and AI as a mirror shaped every activity in the program. Vygotsky's notion of the more capable peer is useful here: the tools functioned as a kind of patient, always-available interlocutor that could stretch the learner just beyond what they could manage alone, without taking the task away from them entirely.

The vernacular English segment rested on a conviction that not every ELT program shares: that what learners already know is worth taking seriously. Native-English code-mixing is a daily reality for these students, not a bad habit to be trained out of them. When the program asked learners to take expressions from

Tamil (native) family life and find their English equivalents to negotiate meaning and to sit with the gap when no direct translation existed, it was asking them to do genuinely sophisticated linguistic work. That work built metalinguistic awareness in a way that vocabulary lists rarely do, and it did something else too: it made English feel less foreign. The language was no longer something imposed from outside but something that could be reached from where the learner already stood.

Voice journalling addressed a dimension of language learning that formal syllabi tend to overlook almost entirely. Krashen's (1982) *Affective Filter Hypothesis* offers a useful frame in showing how anxiety and poor self-image raise a psychological barrier that obstructs acquisition regardless of how much instruction a learner receives. Voice journals removed that social pressure. They heard themselves in English, stumbled, tried again, and over six months many of them stopped sounding like people reading from a script and started sounding like people talking.

Findings and Observations

The major finding of this approach was a change in how learners carried themselves during the process of learning with AI. The hesitation that marked the early weeks; the long pauses and the apologetic half sentences gradually became something more settled. This did not happen uniformly or dramatically, but it happened consistently enough to be meaningful. Voice journaling with the use of generative AI seemed to be the center of this observation. There is something particular about hearing yourself speak, privately and without judgment, that builds a relationship with your own voice. Several learners who had been largely silent in group settings became noticeably more willing to speak as the program progressed, and the journals documented that shift week by week.

This growing confidence was not confined to the classroom. Learners began using English in ways that extended into their daily lives, writing emails with greater ease, holding conversations that did not collapse under the weight of self-consciousness. The language, for many, started to feel like a language that could be used freely without constant study. Rather than using them to generate responses and submit them as their own, most students used them to check and interrogate work they had already done while also comparing their writing against suggestions, asking why a correction had been made, pushing back when the tool's version felt less like them.

When learners were allowed to easily move between their native language and English, the idea of bringing the texture of their own language into learning changed their perspective towards approaching English language learning as a whole. They had more to say, and they said it with more investment. The distance between the language they lived in and the language they were learning narrowed, and with it came a confidence that purely English-medium instruction had not managed to build.

Conclusion

This study set out to ask one question: what happens when Generative AI is used efficiently by lower intermediate learners in a structured environment that is also culturally embedded? Learners who had long associated English with anxiety began to use it with something closer to ease. Confidence grew not because the program made things simpler, but because it made them meaningful. The careful use of AI tools played a carefully bounded role. Generative AI, used by learners without pedagogical intention tends to produce dependence. The same tool, placed within a reflective and learner-driven framework makes it a resource that sharpens thinking rather than replacing it. The larger argument this program makes is a simple one that both linguistic development and personal development are not separate goals competing for the same instructional time when it comes to language learning. A lower intermediate learner who feels heard learns language in a very different way. While it is not a radical claim, it remains, in much of mainstream language teaching, an underacknowledged one that demonstrates fluency, at its best, is not just a skill. It is a form of confidence in one's own right to speak.

Works Cited

Ahmed, S., & Bhat, M. A. (2024). *Navigating new horizons: The impact of artificial intelligence on foreign language literacy in Indian education*. -

Barrett, H. (2007). Researching electronic portfolios and learner engagement. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 50*(6), 436–449.

Cambridge University Press. (2024, December 2). *Getting to grips with AI in the English classroom*. Cambridge ELT Blog. Cambridge ELT Blog

Canagarajah, A. S. (2011). Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. *Applied Linguistics Review, 2*, 1–28.

Chen, L., Chen, P., & Lin, Z. (2020). Artificial intelligence in education: A review. *IEEE Access, 8*, 75264–75278. https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2020.2988510

Crompton, H., Edmett, A., & Ichaporia, N. (2023). *AI in English language teaching: A systematic review*. British Council. British Council

Duff, A. (1994). *Translation: Resource books for teachers* (A. Maley, Ed.). Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford University Press.

Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice*. Teachers College Press.

Karyuatry, L., M. D. Rizqan, and N. A. Darayani. "Grammarly as a Tool to Improve Students' Writing Quality (Free Online Proofreader across the Boundaries)." *JSSH (Jurnal Sains Sosial dan Humaniora)*, vol. 2, no. 1, 2018, pp. 83–89.

Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Pergamon Press.

Long, M. (2015). *Second language acquisition and task-based language teaching*. Wiley Blackwell.

Nair, Pavithra P. M., et al. "To Solicit or Not to Solicit? Impact of AI Assistance Delivery Mechanisms on Decision-Making." *International Journal of Human–Computer Interaction*, vol. 41, no. 6, 2025, pp. 3920–3943, https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2025.2536617.-+

Nguyen, Quang Nhat, and Dung Thi Hue Doan. "Idiographic Self-Regulated Affordance Uptake in AI-Mediated Language Learning." *Cogent Education*, 2025, p. 1, article 2581414, https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2025.2581414.

Parviz, Muhammed. Review of *AI in Language Teaching, Learning, and Assessment*, edited by Fang Pan. *System*, 2025, p. 3, https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2025.2527530.

Reiter, Leonhard, et al. "Student (Mis)Use of Generative AI Tools for University-Related Tasks." *Computers & Education*, vol. 227, 2025, pp. 12390–12403, https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2025.2536617.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Ross, E. M. (2023). Embracing artificial intelligence in the classroom. *Harvard Graduate School of Education*. Harvard Graduate School of Education

Selwyn, N. (2019). *Should robots replace teachers? AI and the future of education*. Polity Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.

Willis, J. (1996). *A framework for task-based learning*. Longman.

APPENDIX

Bridging Language and Life

A Learner-Centric, AI-Assisted Model for English Fluency in Multilingual Classrooms.

- Appendix A : Programme Overview and Data Collection Framework
- Appendix B : Selected Worksheet Samples (from Units 1–6)
- Appendix C : Authenticated Student Response Samples
- Appendix D : Classroom Observation Record
- Appendix E : Pre- and Post-Programme Reflection Questionnaire

APPENDIX A

Programme Overview and Data Collection Framework

A1. Study Context

Item	Detail
Institution	Metropolitan undergraduate college, Chennai
Participants	30–40 lower-intermediate English learners
Duration	Six months (Academic Year 2025–2026)
Model	Qualitative, classroom-based intervention
Format	Blended learning (face-to-face + digital tools)
Skills Framework	Listening, Speaking, Reading, Writing (LSRW) + Translation + Digital Professionalism

A2. AI Tools Integrated in the Programme

Tool	Primary Use
ChatGPT / Gemini AI	Conversational practice, role-play simulations, counter-argument generation, feedback
Grammarly	Grammar and tone feedback on written tasks
QuillBot	Paraphrasing and sentence-level rewriting support
BBC Learning English	Listening comprehension and accent awareness tasks

A3. Data Collection Methods

Source	Purpose
Voice journal recordings	Track oral fluency, affective engagement, and confidence over time
Written worksheets and task outputs	Assess language accuracy, creative engagement, and task completion
Pre-programme reflection questionnaire	Establish baseline: self-image as language user, attitude to AI, confidence level
Post-programme reflection questionnaire	Measure directional change across all three baseline dimensions (qualitative).
Classroom observation records	Assess real-time behavioural and participatory shifts
Peer feedback session notes	Assess metalinguistic awareness and collaborative communication quality

APPENDIX B

Selected Worksheet Samples

The following are representative worksheet samples from the six-unit programme workbook. Each exercise includes its objective, cognitive level, the AI prompt given to students, and guided reflection steps.

Objective

To identify emotional subtext and tonal variation in identical linguistic structures.

Cognitive Level

Analysis + Evaluation

AI Prompt (students copy this into their chosen AI tool)

"Take the sentence: 'I didn't say you stole my money.' Write three emotionally distinct versions: one sarcastic, one angry, and one happy. Describe tone of voice, emphasis pattern, facial expression, and body language. Label them Version A, B, and C without naming the emotion."

- Step 1: AI Output Summary Version A: Version B: Version C:
- Step 2: Emotional Mapping Sarcastic: Version ____ Angry: Version ____ Happy: Version ____
- Step 3: Reflective Insight : Which version was most difficult to identify? Why?
- Extension: How does tone influence meaning more than vocabulary?

B2. Exercise 5.5 : The Context Trap: Lexical Ambiguity (Unit 5: Translation)

Objective

To understand how context determines meaning when one word carries multiple interpretations across languages.

Cognitive Level

Application + Semantic Analysis

AI Prompt

"Give me one English word with at least two distinct meanings."

- Step 1: The Word Provided by AI Word: _____
- Step 2: Write two sentences in your first language (Tamil / L1) that each point clearly to a different meaning of the word.
- Step 3: AI Translation Test Paste both sentences to AI and ask it to translate them into English. Record its output here.
- Step 4: Analysis Did AI correctly identify both meanings? ____ If not, why might it have misunderstood? What role does context play in selecting the correct meaning?

B3. Exercise 6.14 : Spoken-to-Written Pitch Transcription and Edit (Unit 6: Digital Identity)

Objective

To improve spoken-to-written clarity by transcribing a self-recorded elevator pitch and editing it for professional use.

Cognitive Level

Editing + Self-Reflection

AI Prompt

"Transcribe this audio clearly."

- Step 1: Record a 30-second elevator pitch about yourself and your career goals. Upload to AI and paste the transcript below.
- Step 2: Edited Version: Remove filler words ("um", "like", repetitions). Rewrite in clear, professional English.
- Step 3: Reflection: What differences did you notice between your spoken and written versions? What does this tell you about your spoken fluency?

B4. Exercise 6.15: The Ethics Debate on LinkedIn Customisation (Unit 6: Digital Identity)

Objective

To reflect critically on the ethical use of AI in professional self-presentation.

Cognitive Level

Evaluation + Argumentation

Step 1: My Opinion (approx. 100 words) Topic: "Is it acceptable to use AI to write my LinkedIn bio?"

AI Prompt

"Provide a counter-argument to this opinion: [paste your paragraph]."

Reflection : After reading both sides, has your opinion changed? Why or why not?

APPENDIX C

Authenticated Student Response Samples

The samples shown in this appendix are paraphrased entries of student work observed at the mid-point of the intervention. The responses are genuine student thinking that mirror actual classroom experiences, though identifying information has been altered and exact wording has been changed to protect the anonymity of all participants. In the process, the substance and pedagogic value of each example have been maintained.

C1. Exercise 6.14 : Elevator Pitch Transcription and Edit

Task Type:

Spoken-to-Written Audio Pitch Transcription and Edit

Raw AI Transcription of Student's Recorded Pitch:

"Um, hello, my name is… like… I am studying English literature. I want to tell that… um… my passion is writing stories because from childhood I, you know, love reading books. And I want to work in media company because it is my dream… like… yeah."

Student's Edited Professional Version:

"Hello, my name is [Name], and I am a student of English Literature at XYZ College. Driven by a lifelong passion for reading and creative storytelling, my career goal is to transition into professional media production, where I can apply my narrative skills effectively."

Student's Metacognitive Reflection:

"When I read the raw AI transcript of my own voice, I was shocked to see how many filler words like 'um' and 'like' I hide behind because of my nervousness. Editing it myself did not just fix the paper; it showed me the exact points where my speaking confidence drops so I can fix my real-life fluency."

C2. Exercise 6.15 : Ethics Debate on LinkedIn Customisation

Task Type:

Ethics Debate on LinkedIn Customisation

Student Opinion Submitted to AI:

"I think using AI to build my LinkedIn bio from scratch is completely fine because English is not my first language, so it helps to remove mistakes and makes me look like an expert to global recruiters. It's just smart usage."

Student's Reflection After Receiving AI Counter-Argument:

"The AI countered me by saying that if a recruiter interviews me based on a perfect bio and I cannot match that precise vocabulary in person, the trust is broken immediately. This made me change my perspective. I realised AI should only polish the words I write, not build an imaginary professional version of me."

APPENDIX D

Classroom Observation

During a translation session, students were asked to select English words with multiple meanings, such as *run*, *bank*, and *value*, and write sentences in their first language (Tamil) to test whether the AI tool could identify the correct meaning based on context alone.

A particularly engaging moment was observed when some students deliberately entered the Tamil equivalent of riverbank (ஆற்றங்கரை / āṟṟaṅkarai) and financial institution (வங்கி / vaṅki) into the software without providing any surrounding context. The AI tool produced an ambiguous translation on the first attempt. Rather than becoming discouraged, the students immediately began discussing what additional information would be needed to guide the tool toward the correct meaning. This response pointed to a clear shift in student behaviour. The students moved from being passive recipients of information to becoming active editors and critical evaluators of AI-generated text. They showed confidence in identifying the machine's error and took it upon themselves to correct it. It was also noted that the anxiety typically associated with making English grammar mistakes appeared to be reducing. Observing this, it was evident that students showed a more exploratory and playful attitude, one that was focused on analysing and improving the AI's output rather than worrying about their own errors.

APPENDIX E

Pre- and Post-Programme Reflection Questionnaire

This questionnaire was administered at the start and end of the six-month programme. The same instrument was used for both stages to allow direct comparison. Students completed it individually in writing.

How long have you been studying English?

☐ Less than 3 years

☐ 3–6 years

☐ More than 6 years

What language do you use most at home?

Section 2: Self-Assessment as a Language User

Rate yourself on a scale of 1 (very low) to 5 (very high):

Have you used AI tools (e.g., ChatGPT, Grammarly) for language learning before?

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ Not sure

5. How do you currently use AI when completing English tasks?

☐ I let AI write the full answer and submit it

☐ I use AI to check and improve what I have already written

☐ I use AI to get ideas, then write in my own words

☐ I do not use AI tools

6. In your own words, what do you think is the biggest risk of using AI for language learning?

Section 4: Open Reflection

7. Describe yourself as an English language learner in 3–5 sentences. What are you good at? What do you find difficult?

8. How confident do you feel using English in everyday situations (e.g., emails, conversations, introductions)? Give one example.

9. Has your relationship with the English language changed during this programme? If yes, how?

10. What is one thing you would like to continue working on after this programme ends?

End of Appendix