

ELITE-AI

Integrating AI Support in ESP Classes

A Manual of Good Practices for Teachers and Students

Partner institutions: UNITBV (Romania) · UM (Slovenia) · UNIUD (Italy) · UNIPU (Croatia)

Erasmus+ Grant No. 2024-1-RO01-KA220-HED-000248845

elite-ai.unitbv.ro

Table of Contents

<i>About This Manual</i>	3
<i>Section 1 – What AI Means for the ESP Classroom</i>	4
1.1 AI as an Assistant, Not a Teacher	4
1.2 The ESP Context: Why Generic Tools Fall Short	5
<i>Section 2 – AI in Teaching: From Lead-in to Feedback.....</i>	6
2.1 Planning an AI-Integrated Lesson	6
2.2 What Teachers Observed Across Four Countries.....	6
2.3 Managing the Classroom When AI is Present.....	7
<i>Section 3 – AI in Student Learning: Skills and Autonomy.....</i>	8
3.1 Writing and Professional Communication.....	8
3.2 Vocabulary and Terminology	9
3.3 Listening and Speaking.....	9
3.4 Student Autonomy and Self-Direction	10
<i>Section 4 – AI in Assessment and Critical Evaluation.....</i>	11
4.1 Embedding Assessment Throughout the Learning Process.....	11
4.2 The Critical Evaluation of AI Output	11
4.3 Redesigning Assessment Criteria for AI-Integrated Classes	12
<i>Section 5 – Ethics, Disclosure and Academic Integrity.....</i>	13
5.1 What the Data Reveal About Disclosure.....	13
5.2 What the Major Publishers Require	14
5.3 Practical Ethics for the Classroom	14
<i>Section 6 – AI Tools for ESP: A Practical Reference.....</i>	16
6.1 Tools for Writing and Professional Communication	16
6.2 Tools for Vocabulary and Terminology.....	16
6.3 Tools for Listening and Speaking	16
6.4 Tools for Research and AI-Assisted Academic Literacy	17
<i>Consolidated Checklist for Teachers and Students</i>	18
For Teachers: Course Design.....	18
For Teachers: During the Course	18
For Students: Using AI for Learning	18
For Students: Academic Integrity	19
End-of-Semester Reflection (Both Teachers and Students).....	19
<i>A Note on Transferability</i>	20

About This Manual

This manual is addressed to language teachers and students working in English for Specific Purposes (ESP) contexts across higher education. It draws on the practical and empirical work carried out under Work Package 3 of the ELITE-AI project – an Erasmus+ KA220-HED partnership between Transilvania University of Braşov (Romania), the University of Maribor (Slovenia), the University of Udine (Italy), and Juraj Dobrila University of Pula (Croatia) – and on the four presentations delivered at the online workshop *Integrating AI Support in ESP Classes* held on 7 May 2026. It also incorporates data collected through three observation-sheet databases totalling 1,870 individual responses: 1,522 in-class student self-assessments, 221 at-home student self-assessments, and 127 teacher observation sheets, gathered across all four partner institutions.

The manual is organised around six core areas of practice, each matched to a specific challenge teachers and students face when AI tools enter the ESP classroom. Each section opens with a rationale drawn from the project’s own findings, moves to concrete guidance, and closes with a checklist. A consolidated checklist at the end covers the full cycle from first lesson plan to end-of-semester reflection.

Who Should Use This Manual

ESP and foreign language teachers integrating AI tools into their instruction for the first time or refining an existing practice; undergraduate and postgraduate students learning English in specialised academic or professional domains; curriculum designers building AI-enhanced course models; and practitioners in any of the ESP fields covered by the project: tourism, mobility, law, criminal justice, education, social media marketing, sport, and administration.

Section 1 – What AI Means for the ESP Classroom

The ELITE-AI project was built on a single observation: no shared methodological framework existed for the ethical and pedagogically sound integration of AI in foreign language teaching, and this gap was felt particularly acutely in ESP, where standard general-purpose tools often fall short of the domain-specific demands students face. Tourism professionals need terminology that general chatbots handle loosely; law students require precision that NLP systems frequently approximate; trainee educators need models of professional communication that AI can illustrate but must not replace.

What makes AI different in this context is not simply its availability or novelty. The European Commission's updated guidelines on the ethical use of AI in teaching and learning (2026) define an AI system as a machine-based system that infers, from the input it receives, how to generate outputs such as predictions, content, recommendations, or decisions that can influence physical or virtual environments. In the classroom, this definition has immediate consequences: the tool's output is never neutral, it reflects the data it was trained on, and it changes what students do with language.

Jelena Gugić (Juraj Dobrila University of Pula) framed the central tension at the workshop: teachers and students are simultaneously afraid of AI and drawn to it, worried that students will stop thinking and hopeful that the technology will help equalise access to high-quality language input. The ELITE-AI data suggest both fears have some basis. Among 1,522 in-class student responses, 66.6% reported that AI made learning easier, while 13.3% said it made learning harder. At home, 72% found the tools helpful and 80% felt they used them appropriately across the semester. The picture is therefore one of conditional benefit, not automatic gain.

1.1 AI as an Assistant, Not a Teacher

The most consistent finding across the project's four research streams is that AI tools produce better results when they support a pedagogical decision that the teacher has already made, rather than when the tool itself drives the decision. Emanuela Li Destri (University of Udine) put it directly: AI functions as a conversation partner, not a substitute teacher. Its usefulness in ESP contexts comes precisely from this supplementary role – providing real-time feedback on

a draft email, suggesting domain-specific collocations, or generating listening material on a specialised topic – while the teacher retains responsibility for the instructional frame.

Orientation Principle 1

The pedagogical purpose precedes the tool. Decide what skill you are targeting, at what stage of the lesson, and for what type of learner before selecting or recommending any AI application. A tool chosen because it is free or popular is not the same as a tool chosen because it performs a specific instructional function.

1.2 The ESP Context: Why Generic Tools Fall Short

The project covers eight ESP domains across four countries. Teachers at the University of Maribor worked with legal English and criminal justice terminology; teachers at the University of Udine addressed social media marketing and tourism English; Braşov focused on mobility and administrative English; Pula worked with education and sport. Across all four, the observation sheets revealed the same pattern: general-purpose AI tools perform well for grammar checking and text structuring but underperform on domain-specific lexis. Mojca Kompara Lukančič's research at Maribor demonstrated this with precision: the Krajsavar algorithm, developed specifically for Slovene abbreviation recognition and extended to English texts in criminal justice and security, extracted terminology that tools like ChatGPT and Perplexity either missed or expanded incorrectly.

The implication for practice is that teachers should treat general-purpose tools as starting points and supplement them with domain-specific corpora, terminology databases, or specialist prompts. Students should understand that the fluency of an AI-generated text is not a guarantee of its domain accuracy.

A Note on Large Language Models

Large language models (LLMs) such as ChatGPT are generative AI tools that predict word sequences based on training data. They produce fluent, contextually plausible text, but they do not verify facts or domain accuracy. For ESP, this means that AI-generated legal definitions, tourism descriptions, or professional correspondence may sound correct while containing terminological inaccuracies. Critical checking is not optional; it is part of the task.

Section 2 – AI in Teaching: From Lead-in to Feedback

Teacher observation sheets from the project reveal that AI tools entered lessons at every stage of the instructional continuum, but with unequal success. Lead-in tasks – where AI generated discussion prompts, authentic texts, or visual stimuli related to the ESP domain – produced the highest engagement scores. Practice stages, where students used AI chatbots for grammar or vocabulary feedback during task completion, produced more variable results. Feedback stages, where students compared their own output against AI-generated corrections, required the most careful teacher mediation to prevent passive acceptance of suggestions.

2.1 Planning an AI-Integrated Lesson

The five-stage lesson architecture used across the project – lead-in, teaching, practicing, feedback, and independent work – provides a useful structure for deciding where AI fits. Not every stage benefits equally from AI integration, and overloading a single lesson with AI tools at multiple points consistently produced distraction rather than focus. The teacher observation data show that in 79 out of 127 observed lessons, students used AI in isolation rather than in dialogue with the teacher or peers. This pattern is not inherently negative, but it becomes a problem when isolated use prevents students from connecting tool output to their broader learning.

Orientation Principle 2

Introduce one AI function per lesson stage. A lead-in that uses AI to generate an authentic ESP text, followed by a practice stage where students interact with that text without AI, and then a feedback stage where AI checks their written output, is more coherent than a lesson where AI appears at every point.

2.2 What Teachers Observed Across Four Countries

Across 127 teacher observation sessions, motivation was rated as developing in 82 cases and high in 43. Language learning was judged enhanced in 58 sessions and maintained – that is, neither improved nor diminished – in 64. Specialised vocabulary showed improvement in 70 sessions and was still developing in 57. These figures are consistent with Gugić’s experimental finding from Pula: AI tools did not produce a statistically significant difference in final test scores between the group that used them and the control group that did not, when sessions

lasted only 45 minutes. The pattern suggests that AI tools require sufficient contact time to produce measurable gains, and that vocabulary acquisition – the most consistently improving skill in the teacher data – benefits from cumulative, repeated exposure across a semester rather than one-off use.

Lesson Stage	Suggested AI Function
Lead-in / Warm-up	Generate authentic ESP text, news excerpt, or discussion prompt in the target domain
Teaching	Display annotated examples; show AI-generated genre models for comparison
Practicing	Vocabulary drills; grammar feedback on student drafts; terminology lookup
Feedback	Student compares AI suggestion with their own text; teacher mediates discrepancies
Independent work	At-home writing assignments with AI as a drafting assistant, not a ghost-writer

2.3 Managing the Classroom When AI is Present

Teacher observation sheets flagged three recurring management challenges. First, some students used AI continuously rather than at the instructional moment the teacher intended, producing what the sheets recorded as off-task dependency. Second, students at lower proficiency levels sometimes found the gap between their own language production and AI-generated output demotivating rather than instructive. Third, students occasionally accepted AI output without questioning it, a pattern confirmed by teacher data showing that in 25 sessions students accepted output uncritically, while in 79 sessions this happened only sometimes.

Practical responses to each of these challenges are straightforward. For continuous use, set a clear moment in the lesson when AI is switched on and a moment when it is switched off, and explain why. For the proficiency gap, scaffold the comparison activity by asking students to identify what they did correctly before they look at AI suggestions. For uncritical acceptance, build a verification step into every AI-assisted task: students must identify at least one thing the AI got wrong or one domain-specific term the AI used inappropriately.

Classroom Practice Principle

Before handing any AI-assisted activity to students, ask yourself three questions: What will students do with the AI output? How will I know whether they have understood it rather than copied it? What happens to their learning if the AI gives a wrong answer?

Section 3 – AI in Student Learning: Skills and Autonomy

Language learning involves four interlocking skills – listening, speaking, reading, and writing – alongside grammar and vocabulary, as well as culture, and AI tools perform differently across each. The observation data and the self-assessment sheets together produce a nuanced picture: students gain most visibly from AI support in writing and specialised vocabulary, gain moderately in reading, and gain least reliably in listening and speaking, where the absence of a real interlocutor limits what AI can model.

3.1 Writing and Professional Communication

Li Destri's work at Udine offers the most detailed classroom evidence on writing. First-year undergraduate students in cultural tourism used Microsoft Copilot across a series of five assignments moving from professional email drafting to cover letter refinement. The experimental group showed strong engagement with AI-assisted editing and improved self-awareness about writing choices, but the teacher also observed clear risks: students who submitted AI-refined texts without reflecting on the changes made had not meaningfully developed their writing competence. The decisive variable was the reflection step – whether students could explain why they accepted or rejected an AI suggestion.

The assignments themselves illustrate the principle of pedagogical scaffolding in practice. Assignment 1 asked students to draft a professional email to a fictional tourism company and then ask Copilot to correct it, recording the mistakes identified and their reflections on AI feedback. By Assignment 5, students were refining a cover letter by asking for grammar, vocabulary, and syntax improvements, while ensuring the letter retained their authentic voice. The progression from correction to refinement to voice preservation is a model that transfers to any ESP writing context.

Writing Practice Principle

Always ask students to compare their first draft with the AI-revised version sentence by sentence. The goal is not a better text; the goal is for students to understand what they changed, why the AI suggested the change, and whether it was correct for the domain.

3.2 Vocabulary and Terminology

The most consistent gain across all four institutions was in specialised vocabulary: teacher observation sheets showed improvement in 70 out of 127 sessions. Teacher AI usage for vocabulary included contextual word usage examples (the single most common function), specialised technical vocabulary lists, collocation identification, terminology database creation, and quiz generation. Students at Maribor, working with criminal justice English, benefited particularly from the Krajsavar-assisted abbreviation lists that Kompara Lukančič's team generated, because these lists exposed students to authentic domain abbreviations that standard coursebooks omit. The key lesson is that AI-generated vocabulary resources are most useful when they are drawn from authentic domain texts rather than generic dictionaries.

3.3 Listening and Speaking

AI tools for listening and speaking, including subtitling generators and conversation practice applications (Gliglish, SmallTalk2Me), appeared in student at-home self-assessment data alongside tools like Ivory Mind and Claude, but their contribution to measurable gains was harder to track. The Pula experimental data found no significant advantage for the AI group in listening comprehension on the final test, and teacher observation data similarly show vocabulary and writing as the skills where AI makes the clearest difference. This does not mean AI is unhelpful for speaking practice; it means that 45-minute sessions are too short to see the effect, and that at-home use – where students can practice speaking with an AI at their own pace without social anxiety – is likely the more productive deployment.

Student at-home self-assessment data confirm this: the most frequently used tools across the semester were ChatGPT (named by 51 respondents as their primary tool), Gemini combined with ChatGPT (13), Perplexity (10), and Copilot. Students used these for vocabulary building, grammar practice, translation support, and writing, with speaking practice listed less often. The tools with the most direct speaking-practice function – Gliglish, SmallTalk2Me – appeared in individual responses but were not widespread, pointing to a gap between availability and actual use that teachers can address through explicit guidance on speaking tools.

AI Tools Students Used Most Often (At-Home Data, All Partners)

ChatGPT (most widely used across all institutions) · Gemini · Copilot · Perplexity · DeepL (translation) · Grammarly · DeepSeek · Gliglish (speaking practice) · SmallTalk2Me (speaking practice) · Duolingo · Sclaracy (reading support) · PDF Simpli (reading) · Ivory Mind

Note: Tool availability varied by institution and by whether students were directed to use a specific tool or chose independently.

3.4 Student Autonomy and Self-Direction

Student self-assessment data distinguish between three profiles of AI use: directed use, where students engaged with tools because the teacher instructed them to; proactive use, where students independently sought AI help for language tasks; and avoidance, where students chose not to use AI at all. In the in-class data, 54.5% of students reported using AI because the teacher directed them to, 35.8% sought help proactively, and 9.7% avoided use altogether. Over the course of the semester, the at-home data suggest a shift toward greater autonomy: the proportion of students who proactively sought AI support was higher in end-of-semester at-home responses than in early in-class sessions. This aligns with Hashim's (2018) characterisation of contemporary learners as tech-savvy and motivated by new technologies, provided those technologies are introduced with sufficient guidance to build confidence rather than confusion.

Cruz (2024), Silcheva et al. (2023), and Jeon (2024) all report that generative AI can support engagement, critical thinking, and cultural awareness in language classes when students know what they are doing with it. The ELITE-AI data suggest that students who struggled to connect AI use to their learning – a pattern observed in 37% of in-class responses and explicitly flagged in 6.8% – did so not because AI was unhelpful in principle but because neither they nor their teacher had articulated the connection clearly.

Student Autonomy Principle

At the start of the semester, discuss with students what AI can and cannot do for their learning in your specific ESP field. Return to that conversation at mid-semester. Students who understand the purpose of a tool use it better than students who simply have access to it.

Section 4 – AI in Assessment and Critical Evaluation

4.1 Embedding Assessment Throughout the Learning Process

4.2 The Critical Evaluation of AI Output

Assessment is where AI integration becomes most ethically and pedagogically demanding. When students submit work that AI helped produce, the conventional assumptions of authorship, independent effort, and demonstrated competence no longer apply straightforwardly. The ELITE-AI project addressed this challenge not by prohibiting AI in assessment but by redesigning assessment criteria to make AI use visible and to reward critical engagement with it.

Li Destri's approach at Udine offers a concrete model. Assessment was embedded throughout the learning process rather than concentrated at the end. After each assignment, peer assessment was conducted following structured guidelines, and teacher evaluation focused on four criteria: linguistic outcomes, appropriateness and effectiveness of AI use, prompt quality and optimisation, and the student's ability to critically assess AI-generated content. This last criterion is pedagogically the most significant. A student who can identify where an AI text is domain-inappropriate, or where its register does not match the professional context of the assignment, has demonstrated exactly the kind of metalinguistic and domain awareness that ESP instruction aims to develop.

Student self-assessment data show that students verify AI output for a range of reasons. In the at-home data, the most common stated reason was familiarity with the concept of hallucinations (i.e., AI fabricating plausible-sounding but false content). Other students reported verifying because they suspected something was incorrect. A smaller group accepted AI output without questioning, and a notable proportion indicated that verification was not applicable because they had not used a chatbot in that session. These patterns matter for teachers: students who already know about hallucinations verify more carefully, which suggests that a brief, explicit introduction to AI limitations at the start of the course has a measurable effect on how students use tools for the rest of the semester.

The Hallucination Problem in ESP

AI language models sometimes generate references, statistics, legal citations, or domain-specific facts that sound correct but are fabricated. In ESP contexts, where accuracy is professionally consequential, students must treat AI output as a first draft to be verified, not a final answer to be submitted. Ask students to check every domain-specific fact, every cited source, and every piece of terminology before they incorporate AI-generated content into assessed work.

When AI is part of the instructional design, assessment criteria need to be explicit about what counts as independent work and what counts as assisted work. The following table summarises the criteria used across the ELITE-AI project, adapted for broader use.

4.3 Redesigning Assessment Criteria for AI-Integrated Classes

Criterion	What It Measures in an AI-Integrated Context
Linguistic quality	Does the submitted text meet the grammar, vocabulary, and register expectations of the ESP domain, independently of how it was produced?
AI appropriateness	Did the student use AI at a stage and for a purpose that was appropriate to the task?
Prompt quality	Did the student formulate effective instructions to the AI? Were prompts specific, domain-relevant, and iteratively refined?
Critical engagement	Did the student identify, discuss, or correct errors and inappropriate outputs in the AI's response?
Voice and authenticity	Does the final text retain the student's perspective, even where AI contributed to drafting or editing?
Disclosure	Did the student clearly indicate how and where AI was used?

Section 5 – Ethics, Disclosure and Academic Integrity

Andreea Nechifor's session at the workshop, titled

Ethics in AI: What journals, classrooms and observation sheets are telling us, drew directly on the ELITE-AI observation sheet database and on publisher AI policies to identify a structural problem: academic publishing has been developing AI governance rules faster than classrooms have. Students who learn to use AI freely in their courses may arrive at publication with habits that publishers penalise. The ethical provisions manual being developed in WP4 of the project is designed to close this gap at the teaching end, before students are surprised by a journal's rules.

5.1 What the Data Reveal About Disclosure

The ELITE-AI observation sheets captured a disclosure gap. Many students, when asked whether they declared their AI use in formal assignments, said they were unsure whether they needed to, or had not declared it at all. Without a clear institutional rule, both teachers and students made their own judgements about what counted as acceptable. This pattern is consistent with the wider research landscape: a 2025 *Nature* survey of 5,000 researchers found deep divisions over whether AI use should be declared at all, and found that 17% of mid-career researchers admitted to having used AI to write a section of a paper without disclosing it, while 47% said they had not done so but would be willing to (Kwon, 2025, cited in arXiv:2507.03216). The DAISY project (arXiv:2604.02760, April 2026), which developed a structured form-based tool for generating AI disclosure statements, found that authors face social, cognitive, and emotional barriers when reporting AI use, and that disclosure statements remain rare and inconsistent even when policies formally require them.

In the at-home self-assessment data, only 103 out of 221 students answered definitively yes when asked whether they had integrated AI-generated content ethically in their assignments; 110 said “so and so”, and 8 said “not really”. These figures do not indicate widespread dishonesty. They indicate a pervasive uncertainty about where the line is, and that uncertainty cannot be resolved by individual students alone. It requires explicit institutional and classroom policy.

5.2 What the Major Publishers Require

The four major academic publishers with journals relevant to the ELITE-AI fields have adopted distinct but partially overlapping positions on AI use:

Elsevier (policy updated September 2025): AI tools are permitted to support writing but must never substitute human critical thinking or expertise. Authors must verify all AI output for accuracy, and a separate AI declaration statement naming the tool, its purpose, and the extent of oversight is required at submission. AI cannot be listed as author.

Oxford University Press: Authors must request and receive OUP written approval before submitting any AI-generated content, including text, data analysis, graphs, or images.

Cambridge University Press: AI tools do not meet authorship requirements. In October 2024, Cambridge contacted 20,000 authors asking for explicit consent before licensing their published work to train large language models – the only major publisher to make this step.

Peter Lang: **Peter Lang** – *Applied Linguistics, Translation Studies*, Education series – takes the strictest position of the four. Its AI statement explicitly refuses to accept book manuscripts, chapters, journal articles, or other written works that have been written or generated in part or in full by AI or any LLM-based tool. Language checking and administrative tasks are the only uses it acknowledges as potentially acceptable, and even then authors are cautioned to avoid uploading protected material into any AI system. Reviewers are prohibited from feeding manuscripts into AI tools during the peer-review process.

All four publishers share three non-negotiable principles, as Nechifor identified: human accountability cannot be delegated; disclosure is required but what it must cover varies; and confidentiality in peer review is absolute (all four prohibit uploading manuscripts into AI systems during the review process, a rule that is rarely known in classrooms and commonly broken).

5.3 Practical Ethics for the Classroom

Language is not neutral, so when AI generates it, questions of ownership, accuracy, and accountability arise immediately, and in ESP fields such as law, criminal justice, and healthcare, those questions have real professional stakes. Nechifor's workshop prompt to participants captures the classroom dimension: if a student submits ESP writing where AI helped structure the argument, and they did not tell the teacher, is that dishonesty or a gap in the rules? The answer depends entirely on whether the teacher has established a clear policy.

Ethics Principle for Teachers

Establish an AI disclosure policy in your course syllabus before the first session. State clearly which tools are permitted, at which stages of which assignments, and exactly what students must declare. Review this policy at mid-semester. Students who are given clear rules disclose more and use tools more responsibly than students who are left to interpret institutional guidelines on their own.

Ethics Principle for Students

Before submitting any assignment that involved AI assistance, name the tool you used, describe what you used it for, and confirm that you have verified all domain-specific content for accuracy. A sentence or a brief footnote is usually sufficient. When in doubt about your institution's policy, ask before submitting, not after.

Section 6 – AI Tools for ESP: A Practical Reference

The ELITE-AI project catalogued over one hundred AI tools across the four language skills and the specialised domains of its partner institutions. The selection below, drawn from the tools that appeared most frequently in observation sheet data and in the workshop presentations, is not exhaustive. New tools appear regularly, and availability varies by institution, country, and licensing. The ELITE-AI website (elite-ai.unitbv.ro) recommends a tentative repository of AI solutions for ESP instruction.

6.1 Tools for Writing and Professional Communication

Tool	Primary Function in ESP Writing
Microsoft Copilot	Draft correction, grammar, vocabulary, and syntax feedback on professional texts; cover letter and email revision. Used at Udine across all five writing assignments.
ChatGPT (OpenAI)	Broad-purpose text generation, explanation of genre conventions, feedback on drafts, and domain vocabulary expansion. Most widely used tool across all four partner institutions.
Grammarly	Grammar and style checking; useful for identifying register mismatches in professional ESP documents.
Claude (Anthropic)	Text editing, explanation and genre modelling; appeared in student at-home data.
Copy.ai	Professional email and business writing templates. Appeared in student at-home data.

6.2 Tools for Vocabulary and Terminology

Tool	Primary Function in ESP Vocabulary Work
Copilot / ChatGPT / Perplexity	Contextual word usage examples, technical vocabulary lists, collocation identification, and synonym generation across all ESP domains.
Krajsavar (peter.amebis.si/krajsave.html)	Automatic recognition of abbreviations and their expansions in Slovene and English texts; particularly effective for legal, criminal justice, and security domains. Developed by Kompara Lukančič et al.
DeepL	High-quality translation with contextual awareness; useful as a cross-checking tool when students encounter domain-specific terms in source texts.
Scolarcy	AI-assisted academic reading; useful for ESP students working with research articles.
Notion AI / Gemini	Terminology note-taking and flashcard creation for domain vocabulary review.

6.3 Tools for Listening and Speaking

Tool	Primary Function in ESP Speaking and Listening
Gliglish	Conversational speaking practice with AI interlocutor; adaptive feedback on pronunciation and fluency.

SmallTalk2Me	Speaking skills assessment and practice; self-monitoring for fluency development.
Ivory Mind	Conversational AI practice; appeared in student at-home data alongside Gliglish.
Coral AI / PDF Simpli	Audio and text extraction from documents; useful for creating listening materials from authentic domain sources.
NotebookLM (Google)	Generates summaries and audio overviews of uploaded domain texts; useful for creating listening comprehension material from authentic ESP sources.

6.4 Tools for Research and AI-Assisted Academic Literacy

Tool	Research and Academic Function
Perplexity	Web-sourced research with cited references; useful for initial literature survey in any ESP domain. Used at Maribor alongside ChatGPT and Copilot for terminology research.
Gemini / NotebookLM	Literature exploration, document summarisation, and terminology extraction from uploaded texts.
Twee	Generation of comprehension questions, vocabulary exercises, and reading activities from authentic domain texts.
Duolingo	Gamified vocabulary practice; limited ESP domain specificity but effective for motivation and habit formation.

Consolidated Checklist for Teachers and Students

The following checklist covers the full arc of an AI-integrated ESP course, from initial design to end-of-semester reflection. It is based on the design choices, findings, and recommendations documented across Sections 1-6 of this manual.

For Teachers: Course Design

1. Have I defined the pedagogical function of each AI tool I plan to use, independently of the tool's name or brand?
2. Have I identified which lesson stage each tool enters (lead-in, practice, feedback, or independent work)?
3. Have I established an AI disclosure policy in the course syllabus and shared it with students before the first session?
4. Have I designed at least one verification activity where students must identify an AI error or domain-inappropriate output?
5. Have I obtained the necessary ethical approvals and consent procedures if I am collecting observation data?

For Teachers: During the Course

6. Am I limiting AI to one function per lesson stage to avoid overloading students?
7. Do I regularly ask students to compare their own drafts with AI-generated output, rather than simply accepting it?
8. Am I noting which students use AI proactively, which follow directions, and which avoid it, and addressing the gap?
9. Am I updating my tool recommendations as the course progresses, based on what students report is working?
10. Am I modelling critical evaluation of AI output in my own classroom language?

For Students: Using AI for Learning

11. Have I clarified with my teacher which tools are permitted for which assignments?

12. When I use AI for writing, do I compare the AI version with my own draft and can I explain the differences?
13. When I use AI for vocabulary, do I check whether the terms are domain-appropriate and not just generally fluent?
14. Have I tried at least one AI tool for speaking practice outside class, and have I assessed whether it helps?
15. Do I verify AI-generated domain facts, statistics, and references before including them in assessed work?
16. Do I know what hallucinations are and how to recognise them in AI-generated ESP content?

For Students: Academic Integrity

17. Have I read my institution's AI use policy for this course?
18. For every assignment where I used AI, have I noted the tool, the purpose, and my verification process?
19. Have I written or edited the final version of my assignment myself, with AI in a support role rather than an authoring role?
20. If I am co-authoring work with peers, have we agreed on a shared disclosure approach?
21. Am I aware that uploading peer-reviewed manuscripts into AI systems is prohibited by all major academic publishers?

End-of-Semester Reflection (Both Teachers and Students)

22. Which AI tools genuinely contributed to language learning in this course? What evidence supports that conclusion?
23. At which lesson stages or task types did AI feel like a distraction rather than a support?
24. What would I change about AI integration next semester, based on what I observed or experienced?
25. Did students who used AI proactively show different outcomes from those who were directed to use it? Does that pattern suggest anything about how I teach tool use?

A Note on Transferability

This manual was built from data collected across four countries, eight ESP domains, and multiple proficiency levels within a two-year project cycle. The guidance it offers is grounded in that specific context, but the principles it articulates are not domain locked. The decision to define a pedagogical purpose before selecting a tool, the practice of asking students to verify AI output and explain their verification, the requirement to establish clear disclosure policies, the attention to which lesson stage benefits from AI and which is undermined by it: these apply whether the ESP field is criminal justice, tourism, social media marketing, education, or any other specialised domain.

What does not transfer without adaptation is the specific tool selection. The tools listed in Section 6 were effective in the contexts where ELITE-AI teachers used them, with the student populations, institutional infrastructure, and domain needs documented in the project. A teacher in a different country, with different students, different connectivity, and a different ESP domain should treat the tool list as a starting point for selection, not a prescription. The ELITE-AI repository at elite-ai.unitbv.ro is tentative, not maintained and updated to reflect tools that are added, changed, or discontinued, and it categorises tools by skill, domain, and instructional function so that teachers can match tool to purpose rather than purpose to tool.

The workshop that generated this manual ended with a question posed to all participants: one word, what is the first thing you will change in how you use AI tools after today? The honest answer for most participants, as for most teachers and students across the four ELITE-AI institutions, is not a specific tool or a new activity. It is the habit of questioning before trusting, and the practice of making that questioning visible to students. That habit is the most transferable thing this project has produced.

Resources

Ahmed, S. et al. (2023). AI tools in EFL and ESP instruction. *English for Specific Purposes*, 71.

AI solutions repository: <https://elite-ai.unitbv.ro> (Tools section)

arXiv:2512.06705 (2025). LLM-generated language in biomedical abstracts: detection across 5,114 Q1 journals and 5+ million papers (2021-2025).

arXiv:2604.02760 (April 2026). *AI Disclosure with DAISY: Disclosure of AI-uSe in Your Research*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2604.02760>

Benabdallah, S. (2023). AI tools in ESP classrooms. *Language Learning & Technology*, 27(2).

Boeru, M. (2024). Practical AI applications in ESP contexts. *ESP Across Cultures*, 21.

Brebera, P. & Bezdickova, S. (2024). Over-reliance on AI and critical thinking in language learning. *Lingua*, 298.

Burns, M. & Capps, C. (1988). *Foundations of Intelligent Tutoring Systems*. Lawrence Erlbaum.

Cambridge University Press AI policy – Language Teaching, Studies in Second Language Acquisition, Applied Psycholinguistics: <https://www.cambridge.org/news-and-insights/cambridge-launches-ai-research-ethics-policy>

Chaikovska, O. et al. (2024). Teacher attitudes toward AI in specialised language teaching. *Language Teaching Research*, 28(3).

Cruz, C. (2024). Generative AI and cultural awareness in language education. *TESOL Quarterly*, 58(2).

Dou, X. (2024). Experimental study on AI integration in ESP. *Computers & Education*, 198.

Du, J. & Alm, A. (2024). Autonomous learning with AI feedback. *System*, 112.

Elsevier AI policy: <https://www.elsevier.com/about/policies-and-standards/the-use-of-ai-and-ai-assisted-technologies-in-writing-for-elsevier> (updated September 2025)

Erito, M. (2023). Generative AI for speaking practice. *CALL Journal*, 15(1).

European Commission: *Updated Guidelines on the Ethical Use of Artificial Intelligence and Data in Teaching and Learning* (2026)

Hanane, A. (2023). Academic integrity and AI in ESP writing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 64.

Hashim, H. (2018). Application of technology in the digital era education. *International Journal of Research in Counselling and Education*, 2(1), 1-5.

Jeon, J. (2024). AI-assisted speaking tasks and learner engagement. *Language Teaching Research*, 28(1).

Kim, Y. (2022). AI-assisted grammar feedback and language outcomes. *Language Learning & Technology*, 26(3).

Kompara Lukančič, M. (2009, 2011, 2018, 2023a, 2025b). Multiple works on abbreviation recognition algorithms for Slovene and English specialised texts. University of Maribor, Faculty of Criminal Justice and Security.

Kovačević, A. (2023). Personalised learning with AI in higher education. *CALL-EJ*, 24(2).

Krajsavar algorithm: <https://peter.amebis.si/krajsave.html>

Kwon, M. (2025). AI disclosure survey of 5,000 researchers. *Nature* (reported in arXiv:2507.03216).

Ningsih, S. et al. (2023). AI-enhanced vocabulary acquisition in ESP. *Asian EFL Journal*, 25(4).

Oxford University Press AI policy – *Applied Linguistics*, *ELT Journal*, *Language Teaching*, *IRAL*: <https://academic.oup.com/pages/for-authors/books/author-use-of-artificial-intelligence>

Peter Lang AI statement – *Applied Linguistics*, *Translation Studies*, Education series: <https://www.peterlang.com/ai-statement/>

Project website: <https://elite-ai.unitbv.ro>

Researchers' manual: *Integrating AI in ESP and Foreign Language Instruction: A Manual of Good Practices for Applied Linguistics Researchers* (ELITE-AI WP2, 2025) – https://elite-ai.unitbv.ro/wp-content/uploads/2026/04/ELITE_AI_Manual_Good_Practices.pdf

Rudik, O. et al. (2024). Adaptive AI for content delivery in ESP. *ReCALL*, 36(1).

Sal Khan, TED Talk: *Sal Khan Says AI Won't Destroy Education* – <https://www.ted.com/podcasts/sal-khan-says-ai-wont-destroy-education-transcript>

Silcheva, M. et al. (2023). AI for critical thinking development in EFL contexts. *English Teaching Forum*, 61(3).

Sinkus, A. & Ozola, L. (2024). Student engagement and AI in ESP. *ESP Today*, 12(1).

Synekop, O. et al. (2024). Perceptions of AI in ESP instruction. *Journal of ESP Research*, 8(2).

Taylor, M. (2024). Social isolation risks in AI-mediated learning. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 152.