

ELITE-AI Project – Quality Assurance Manual

WP3 – Experimental Teaching Activities

Description of Applied Grammar Lessons: BA 1st Year Group

Teacher: Nechifor, Andreea | Institution: UNITBV

Fall Semester 2025/2026

Introduction and Institutional Context

The lessons described in this document were delivered at Transilvania University of Braşov (UNITBV) as part of the ELITE-AI project's experimental teaching sequence during the fall semester of the 2025/2026 academic year. They form a sequence of four Applied Grammar classes taught to BA 1st year students, assessed at B2 Upper Intermediate level, within a study programme in which mobility vocabulary and the Erasmus+ context provide the unifying thematic frame across courses. This sequence ran in parallel with the ESP and Pragmatics courses described in separate companion documents, and all three shared the same ELITE-AI experimental protocol: experimental and control group division, placement test, AI-integrated instruction for the experimental group only, and a shared final assessment at the semester's end.

The Applied Grammar course addressed two interconnected grammatical areas: the system of tense and aspect, including verb forms and auxiliary verb use; and the structures of the if clause (conditional sentences), wish, reported speech, passive voice, and topicalisation. These were not treated as isolated grammatical rules but as communicative and rhetorical tools whose functions students learned to analyse, produce, and transform within contextualised exercises grounded in the mobility register. The course explicitly connected to the ESP and Pragmatics sequences – verb aspect appeared in both the grammar and pragmatics curricula, while passive voice and topicalisation were encountered in both the grammar course and the ESP reading materials – reinforcing the shared thematic and linguistic programme across the three concurrent courses.

Four AI tools were used across the sequence: NotebookLM (Google), Gemini, Google AI Studio, and Diffit. Each was deployed at a stage where its specific affordances suited the lesson's objectives – NotebookLM for initial theory building from teacher-authored materials, Gemini for contextualised exercise generation within a translation-studies scenario, Google AI Studio for mobility-specific rephrase exercise construction, and Diffit for a differentiated, digitally enhanced version of the classical sentence transformation exercise format.

Class 1 – Tense and Aspect: Verbs and Their Forms

c. 21 October 2025

AI Tool	NotebookLM (Google)
Group	BA 1st Year 12 students
Date	c. 21 October 2025
Duration	90 minutes
Study Level	B2 Upper Intermediate
Lesson Stage	Teaching
Topic	Tense vs. Aspect; verb forms (V1, V2, V3); auxiliary verbs (To do, To be, To have); If clause and Wish – partial introduction, developed as homework
Observation Sheet	Sheet #2
Materials	Laptop/Desktop, Mobile Phones/Tablets, Wi-Fi, Video Projector, Speakers/Sound System, Paper and Pens
Source Documents for NotebookLM	Tense and Aspect and other observations (teacher's notes – 1 document); Conditional Sentences: Tenses and Forms (grammar book chapter – 1 text); Rephrase (Classical) – Proficiency Masterclass workbook (Gude & Duckworth, 1999, OUP), used as homework source
AI Use – Grammar	Grammar explanation generation, contextualised grammar examples, grammar exercise creation, tense and aspect practice, grammar rule simplification
Degree of AI Use	Under-use (teacher-directed; AI outputs presented rather than operated by students)
Student Participation	Active by request; low peer interaction frequency; motivation: Developing
Quality of AI Use	Communication with AI: effective; Prompts: effective; Interpretation of feedback: effective; Partially effective for grammar-specific critical evaluation

Source Materials and NotebookLM Preparation

The teacher assembled three source documents for this session's NotebookLM workspace, each addressing a distinct but interconnected grammatical area. The first was her own structured notes on Tense and Aspect – covering the three aspects (Simple, Continuous, Perfect), their associated auxiliary verbs (To do, To be, To have), the two core tenses (Present and Past, with Future placed in brackets to reflect its structurally distinct grammatical status in English), and the three principal verb forms (V1/Infinitive, V2/Past Simple, V3/Past Participle) illustrated with the paradigm drink-drank-drunk. The second document was a grammar book chapter on Conditional Sentence Tenses and Forms, covering the zero, first, second, third, and mixed conditionals along with their structural variations, alternative conjunctions, and implied

conditionals. The third was the Proficiency Masterclass rephrasing exercise sheet (Gude, K. and Duckworth, M., 1999, Oxford University Press), a classical 104-item sentence transformation exercise requiring students to rephrase sentences using a given keyword – assigned as homework to be completed using AI-generated flashcards and quizzes from a separate NotebookLM notebook.

From these sources, NotebookLM generated three distinct notebooks with corresponding Studio outputs. The first notebook, titled Tense and Aspect: Verbs and Their Forms, produced a podcast (two versions, male and female voice), a video, a set of grammar flashcards, and a quiz. The second notebook, titled Conditional Sentence Tenses and Forms, generated a video titled The ‘What If’ Machine, an audio overview, and a detailed mind map of conditional sentence structures. The third notebook, titled Proficiency Masterclass: Classical Rephrasing Exercises, generated a grammar quiz, a grammar flashcard set, and a transformation quiz – all three assigned as homework resources for students to use when completing the rephrasing exercise sheet independently.

NotebookLM-Generated Resources: Tense and Aspect Notebook

The podcast produced from the teacher’s Tense and Aspect notes was available in two voice versions; the male-voice version was noted in the session documentation as the stronger of the two. Its transcript, titled Tense and Aspect: Verbs and Their Forms, presented the material as a guided analytical exploration structured around the toolkit metaphor – tense as the timeline, aspect as the perspective on an action within that timeline, and the three auxiliary verbs as specialised tools for building different perspectives. The podcast opened with the diagnostic puzzle of I wrote the email versus I have written the email, using this contrast to motivate the distinction between V2 (past simple, marking a completed event cut off from the present) and the perfect aspect (have + V3, marking a completed event whose result remains relevant now). This puzzle-first structure was pedagogically deliberate: rather than presenting the rule and then illustrating it, it confronted students with a felt intuition – one utterance feels closed, the other feels current – and then gave them the analytical vocabulary to explain why.

The podcast then worked through each auxiliary in turn. For To do and the simple aspect, it noted the structural peculiarity that the auxiliary is typically invisible in affirmative statements (I write rather than I do write) and surfaces only for negation, questions, and emphatic forms – making its absence in the affirmative a structural signal rather than an omission. For To be and the continuous aspect, it established the non-negotiable formula To be + V-ing, noting that the tense information is carried by the form of To be (am/is/are for present, was/were for past) while the -ing ending remains constant as the aspect marker. For To have and the perfect aspect, it articulated the formula To have + V3, showing that this combination creates a bridge between a past event and its present relevance – the diagnostic distinction from the simple past that the podcast had opened with.

The video generated alongside the podcast presented the same content in a more compressed, visually oriented format under the same title English Tense and Aspect, using a toolbox graphic to anchor the toolkit metaphor. Students encountered both formats in the same session, with the video serving as a consolidation check after the podcast rather than a separate introduction.

The grammar flashcard set comprised 18 cards generated directly from the Tense and Aspect notes. The cards covered the three aspects and their associated auxiliaries; the three verb forms and their notation (V1, V2, V3); the paradigm drink/drank/drunk as the illustrative irregular verb; the two core tenses and the bracketed status of the future; and the three verb types (auxiliary, modal, lexical). Students used the flashcards in pairs for in-session consolidation and received them as a revision resource for independent study.

NotebookLM-Generated Resources: If Clause Notebook

The second notebook generated a video titled The ‘What If’ Machine from the grammar book chapter on conditional sentences. The video’s transcript opens with the framing of conditionals as the engine behind every what-if – a tool that lets speakers address scientific facts, make plans, daydream about alternative presents, and reflect on unalterable pasts, all through the same grammatical mechanism applied with different tense combinations. The video covered all four main conditional types in sequence: the zero conditional (if + present simple / present simple) for universal truths and habitual facts; the first conditional (if + present simple / will + infinitive) for likely future situations; the second conditional (if + past simple / would + infinitive) for unreal present situations or unlikely futures, with the past simple functioning as an unreality marker rather than a temporal one; and the third conditional (if + past perfect / would have + past participle) for hypothetical past situations and their imagined past consequences. Mixed conditionals – combining the if-part of the third conditional with the result clause of the second to draw a line from an imagined past to a different present – were introduced as the advanced extension of the system.

The video also covered alternative conjunctions (unless, provided that, as long as, supposing, what if) and implied conditionals – cases where the if-clause is absent but the conditional meaning is recoverable from context – as part of the section on how native speakers bend and modify the canonical structures in natural discourse. The closing reflection on why English treats the future differently from the past and present – the future always needing an external modal auxiliary, never having a simple inflection baked into the verb – connected directly to the bracketed future in the Tense and Aspect notes and gave students a structural question to carry into subsequent grammar sessions.

The mind map generated for the If Clause notebook provided a comprehensive visual overview of all conditional types, their structures, their variations, and their exemplifying sentences, organised as a branching hierarchy from the central node Conditional Sentence Tenses and Forms. Students received this map both as an in-session reference and as the structural template for the homework assignment that developed out of the partial classroom presentation of the If Clause content.

Homework Assignment and the Rephrasing Notebook

The If Clause and Wish content introduced in this session was deliberately left partially presented, with the observation that students would develop it further through a homework assignment. The homework took the form of the Proficiency Masterclass rephrasing exercise sheet – 104 sentences requiring transformation using a given keyword, covering wish, regret, conditionals, passive voice, reported speech, modal verbs, inversions, and idiomatic expressions at C1-C2 level. Students were directed to use the third NotebookLM notebook – Proficiency Masterclass: Classical Rephrasing Exercises – as a self-study resource for the homework, using the grammar quiz, the grammar flashcard set, and the transformation quiz generated from the exercise sheet to consolidate their understanding of each grammatical structure before attempting the transformations.

This homework design is noteworthy within the ELITE-AI framework: it transferred the AI tool use from the classroom to the student’s independent study, making NotebookLM a self-directed learning resource rather than exclusively a teacher-directed classroom tool. The transformation quiz in particular – generated from the actual exercise sentences – meant that students could check their reasoning about specific items interactively before submitting their answers.

Observations from the Teacher's Record

The observation sheet records the lesson stage as Teaching and the degree of AI use as under-use – consistent with the introductory nature of the session, where AI outputs were presented to students rather than directly operated by them. Active participation was recorded as sometimes across most indicators and never for initiating interaction, with low peer interaction frequency and motivation rated as Developing. These ratings reflect a first session at B2 level in a new course where students were simultaneously learning new grammatical content and engaging with AI-generated materials for the first time. Quality of AI use was rated as effective for communication with the AI, prompt use, and interpretation of feedback, and partially effective for grammar-specific critical evaluation – a pattern consistent with students who were willing to engage with the AI outputs but had not yet developed the metacognitive tools to evaluate grammatical accuracy independently.

Class 2 – Applied Grammar in Translation Contexts: Wish, Passive Voice, and Topicalisation

4 November 2025

AI Tool	Gemini (Google)
Group	BA 1st Year
Date	4 November 2025
Duration	90 minutes
Study Level	B2 Upper Intermediate
Lesson Stage	Practice
Topic	Wish structures; Passive Voice (including agent omission and the Spanish se construction); Topicalisation (fronting for emphasis)
Mobility/Translation Context	Erasmus+ mobility in Spain; translation studies in a multicultural university environment; four-month exchange
Materials	Laptop/Desktop, Mobile Phones/Tablets, Wi-Fi, Video Projector
AI Use – Grammar	Grammar exercise generation; contextualised grammar scenarios; drill exercises with cultural and mobility contextual clues; specialised terminology list
Shared Exercise Link	https://gemini.google.com/share/e2d385e42a50

Lesson Overview

The second class moved from the theoretical introduction of Class 1 to applied practice, using Gemini as the session's AI tool. The structural content – Wish, Passive Voice, and Topicalisation – was addressed through a two-stage Gemini interaction documented in the

session files. In the first stage, students submitted a contextual prompt specifying their communicative situation: Erasmus+ mobility students in Spain, studying translation in a multicultural university environment, over a four-month exchange, with a focus on Wish structures, Passive Voice, and Topicalisation. Gemini responded with three detailed learning scenarios situating each grammatical structure within translation-related tasks. In the second stage, students used those scenarios as the basis for a request to generate personalised grammar exercises, which Gemini produced in two sets – the first with a bilingual Spanish-English frame, the second more exclusively focused on English grammar production.

Gemini-Generated Learning Scenarios

The three learning scenarios generated by Gemini placed each grammatical structure within a translation-studies activity that also incorporated the mobility context and multicultural classroom dynamics. The first scenario, The Tourism Translation Debacle, framed the Wish structure as the appropriate tool for expressing counterfactual regret and unfulfilled desire in a translation revision task: students were asked to revise a Spanish tourism agency's internal memo written in poor English, converting weak or literal expressions of regret into strong Wish statements (We wish we had prepared more guided routes for past regret; We wish the infrastructure were adequate for present desire). The scenario included a terminology table mapping grammatical terms (counterfactual, agentless passive, rheme, theme) and translation studies concepts (calque/loan translation, functional equivalence, register) onto their definitions and contextual uses.

The second scenario, Passive Voice and Legal Register, placed students in the role of translators working on a hypothetical EU directive concerning the Comunidades Autónomas (Autonomous Communities) of Spain. Students were required to analyse each passive construction in the English source text and make a three-way decision: retain the passive (unusual in formal Spanish), switch to the Spanish *se* construction (preferred for impersonal, agentless actions), or switch to an active construction (often clearer in Spanish legal writing). This scenario made the pragmatic dimension of passive voice choice visible – in a decentralised state like Spain, the choice between *se* and active construction is not merely stylistic but carries implications about institutional agency and mandate – connecting directly to the Pragmatics content students were covering in their parallel course.

The third scenario, Topicalisation and Journalistic Impact, required students to translate dramatic headlines and ledes from El País using topicalisation – the fronting of a sentence element for emphasis. Students were asked to identify the fronted element in each Spanish source text, analyse why the author had topicalised it, and find an equivalent rhetorical strategy in English: cleft sentences (It is the migratory crisis that the government has not mentioned), emphatic adverbs, or strategic word order repositioning. Peer review of different topicalisation solutions across the class gave the activity a collaborative analytical dimension.

Gemini-Generated Exercises

Following the scenario generation, students prompted Gemini to produce personalised grammar exercises tied to the scenarios' contexts. The first exercise set maintained the bilingual Spanish-English frame: passive voice tasks required students to translate sentences using the Spanish impersonal *se* into appropriate English passive or active constructions; Wish tasks required them to express Spanish subjunctive regret structures using the correct English Wish + tense combinations; Topicalisation tasks required them to rewrite dull English sentences by fronting specified elements. The second set, generated at students' request to focus more directly on English grammar production, rephrased the same three exercise types

within exclusively English contexts: academic paper editing for passive voice; journal entries about the Erasmus experience for Wish structures; and Erasmus report introduction revision for Topicalisation.

The Q&A exercise document generated from the Gemini shared link provided 15 questions and answers covering all three structures: five Wish clause items testing past regret (Past Perfect after wish), present desire (Past Simple after wish), and irritation about a habit (would + infinitive after wish); five Passive Voice items testing active-to-passive and passive-to-active conversion across present continuous, simple past, simple future, present perfect, and modal passive constructions; and five Topicalisation items requiring students to front a direct object, an adverbial phrase, an adjective, a time element, and a complement.

Specialised Vocabulary

Gemini generated a list of key vocabulary and concepts for the session, organised under three headings: Project and Context (Erasmus+, mobility student, multicultural environment, intercultural competence, target culture, source culture); Translation Studies and Linguistics (contrastive analysis, source text, target text, translational equivalence, formal and dynamic equivalence, register); and Grammar and Stylistics Focus (Wish structures, subjunctive mood, hypothetical statements, passive voice, agent deletion, topicalisation, sentence fronting, emphasis, rhetorical function). This vocabulary list bridged the grammar course with the ESP and Pragmatics courses running concurrently, reinforcing the shared thematic architecture of all three sequences.

Class 3 – Applied Grammar in Mobility Contexts: Sentence Transformation and Structural Analysis

18 November 2025

AI Tool	Google AI Studio
Group	BA 1st Year 12 students
Date	18 November 2025
Duration	90 minutes
Study Level	B2 Upper Intermediate
Lesson Stage	Practice
Topic	Grammar structures in mobility contexts: if clause, wish, reported speech, passive voice, topicalisation – sentence transformation/rephrasing exercises with mobility vocabulary
Observation Sheet	Sheet #3
Google AI Studio Link	https://aistudio.google.com/apps/drive/1fwDPBGzWQ6H8C-xpkrokbVsMGEx7zmfq

Materials	Laptop/Desktop, Mobile Phones/Tablets, Wi-Fi, Video Projector
AI Use – Grammar	Grammar explanation generation, contextualised grammar examples, grammar exercise creation, syntax pattern identification, tense and aspect practice, sentence structure analysis
AI Use – Vocabulary	Contextual word usage examples, register-appropriate vocabulary, flashcard creation
Student Participation	Active by volition; medium peer interaction; often across all participation indicators; motivation: High
Target Language Use	Maintained
Quality of AI Use	All indicators: yes (effective); no uncritical acceptance of AI output in grammar-specific items

Lesson Overview

The third session represented a significant step forward in the class's engagement with AI tools: where Class 1 had been teacher-directed and Class 2 had introduced student-initiated prompting within a teacher-provided framework, Class 3 was recorded in the observation sheet as active by volition – the first session in the 1st year sequence where students initiated AI interactions on their own rather than exclusively at the teacher's direction. Motivation was rated High, all participation indicators were often, and peer interaction moved from low (Class 1) to medium, reflecting a group that had developed both the confidence and the practical skills to use Google AI Studio as an active grammar support tool.

The session's design brought together all five grammatical structures covered in the sequence – if clause, wish, reported speech, passive voice, and topicalisation – within a single unified exercise format: sentence transformation (rephrasing) with given structural prompts, set in Erasmus+ mobility vocabulary and contexts. The teacher's prompt to Google AI Studio specified both the grammatical and contextual parameters: exercises for 1st year students at B2 level, sentences focused on Erasmus+ mobility vocabulary and contexts, containing if clause, wish, reported speech, passive voice, and topicalisation, following classical rephrase drill formats and providing the beginning of the new sentence for each transformation.

Google AI Studio-Generated Materials

Google AI Studio generated a set of sentence transformation exercises that met all the specified parameters: each sentence was grounded in an Erasmus+ mobility scenario (applying for a programme, preparing a learning agreement, dealing with accommodation, navigating the selection process, managing academic credits), each required a specific grammatical transformation, and each provided a sentence-beginning prompt to guide the structural shift. The mobility vocabulary embedded in the exercises covered the full administrative and communicative arc of the mobility experience – eligibility, nomination, host institution, traineeship, credit recognition, bilateral agreement, grant disbursement – so that grammar practice and vocabulary consolidation occurred simultaneously.

For the if clause items, transformations required students to shift between conditional types – converting a third conditional reflection into a second conditional present consequence, or rewriting a zero conditional habit statement as a first conditional prediction – demonstrating understanding of the structural and semantic differences between types rather than just pattern-matching within a single type. Wish transformation items required students to identify whether

the context called for past regret (had + V3), present desire (past simple), or annoyance about a habit (would + infinitive) and to select the appropriate form accordingly. Reported speech items required shifts in tense, pronoun, and time/place expression across a range of mobility-relevant speech acts – requests, promises, instructions, complaints. Passive voice items focused on agent-choice decisions in institutional and academic registers: when to retain the agent for clarity and when to omit it for objectivity, and how the impersonal passive functions differently in English than in the Romance language that many students had as their strongest L2. Topicalisation items required students to front time expressions, prepositional phrases, and objects for emphasis, then to evaluate whether the fronting produced a natural-sounding English result or required further adjustment.

Students also used Google AI Studio in real time during the session to request additional examples of specific structures they found difficult, to ask for explanations of why a particular transformation was or was not grammatically acceptable, and to generate further practice sentences on demand. The vocabulary flashcard generation function was used by several students to build personal vocabulary lists from the mobility-specific terms encountered in the exercises, extending the vocabulary consolidation work from the 2nd year ESP sequence into the grammar session’s parallel track.

Observations from the Teacher’s Record

The observation sheet records this as the most actively engaged of the three observed 1st year sessions. The shift from active by request (Classes 1 and 2) to active by volition is the most significant qualitative change across the sequence: it signals that students had internalised the AI tool interaction model sufficiently to extend it beyond teacher-set tasks. All quality indicators were yes (effective), and the critical evaluation record shows that students no longer relied on the no-question-needed response pattern of Class 1 but were actively testing AI outputs against their own grammatical knowledge, flagging when a suggested transformation did not sound natural or did not match the structural requirement of the exercise. This developing critical stance is consistent with the ELITE-AI project’s pedagogical framework, in which the ability to evaluate AI-generated language – rather than simply use it – is a primary learning outcome.

Class 4 – Classical Rephrasing at B2 Level: Sentence Transformation with Diffit

AI Tool	Diffit (web.diffit.me)
Group	BA 1st Year
Study Level	B2 Upper Intermediate
Lesson Stage	Practice
Topic	Advanced sentence rephrasing: if clause, wish, reported speech, passive voice, topicalisation, inversions, idiomatic expressions – using mobility-contextualised input (Rephrase WORD)

Source Document	Rephrase (WORD) – teacher-authored exercise set with mobility-contextualised sentences
Diffit Output	Sentence Rephrasing Practice – differentiated reading, vocabulary, and comprehension package generated by Diffit from the Rephrase (WORD) source
Note	No observation sheet entry yet available for this session; documented from class materials

Lesson Overview

The fourth class in the applied grammar sequence applied the Diffit platform to a different function from its use in the 2nd year ESP course. Where the 2nd year Diffit materials were generated from published texts (the Erasmus+ history article and the lawyer-linguist text) to produce reading comprehension and vocabulary packages, here Diffit was given the teacher's own Rephrase (WORD) exercise set as input and asked to generate a differentiated learning package around it – making a teacher-authored exercise the source material rather than an external text.

The Rephrase (WORD) source document was a set of sentence transformation exercises authored by the teacher and specifically designed for 1st year students at B2 level, with all sentences grounded in Erasmus+ mobility vocabulary and contexts. Every transformation prompt was tied to a situation students would recognise: sentences about the selection process, learning agreements, host institution formalities, accommodation, course recognition, and grant administration. The grammatical structures required covered the full range of the semester's grammar content: if clause transformations across all conditional types, Wish structures for past regret and present desire, reported speech with full tense backshift, passive voice with agent-choice decisions, topicalisation for emphasis, inversions for formal register, and idiomatic rephrasing with given keywords.

Diffit-Generated Materials

Diffit processed the Rephrase (WORD) exercise set and produced a Sentence Rephrasing Practice package under the title Rephrasing Sentences with Specified Words. The package opened with a Reading and Summary section that framed the exercise activity within its academic context – crediting the Proficiency Masterclass workbook (Gude, K. and Duckworth, M., 1999, Oxford University Press) as the classical exercise format on which the teacher's mobility-contextualised version was modelled – and provided a visual illustration of what sentence rephrasing involves, using a Word document rephrase interface screenshot to make the concept concrete for students.

The differentiated nature of Diffit's output meant that the package included multiple entry points for students working at different points within the B2 band. The vocabulary section drew out key lexical items from the exercise sentences and provided definitions, contextualised example sentences, and usage notes at a register appropriate for upper-intermediate learners. The comprehension and production questions ranged from straightforward identification of grammatical structure (which structure is required by this keyword?) through analysis of why a particular transformation works (what changes in meaning when you front this element?) to more open reflection on the relationship between form and function in the sentence pairs.

The connection to Class 1's homework assignment – which had used NotebookLM to generate a quiz and flashcard set from the classical Proficiency Masterclass rephrasing exercises – was

deliberate. Students were now encountering a parallel exercise set, this time mobility-contextualised rather than drawn from a general English coursebook, processed through a different AI platform that emphasised differentiation and accessibility. The comparison between the two rephrasing sources – the Proficiency Masterclass classical exercises and the Rephrase (WORD) mobility-specific exercises – gave students a concrete basis for reflecting on what makes a grammar exercise context-specific and what remains constant across contexts: the structural requirements of each transformation type do not change whether the sentence is about a medical situation, a film, or an Erasmus+ application process.

Note on Observation Sheet

No observation sheet entry is currently available for this session. The lesson is documented through the Rephrase (WORD) source file and the Diffit-generated Sentence Rephrasing Practice output. When the observation sheet entry is completed, it can be integrated into this record to provide the participation, quality-of-interaction, and critical evaluation data that contextualise the preceding three sessions.

General Notes on the AI Tool Rotation and Pedagogical Design

The four lessons formed a coherent grammatical and methodological arc. Class 1 established the theoretical system – tense versus aspect, verb forms, auxiliary verbs, and the conditional sentence framework – using NotebookLM to synthesise teacher-authored materials into multiple resource types (podcast with two voice options, video, flashcards, mind map) that students could engage with at different depths and through different modalities. Class 2 applied the new grammatical structures within a rich intercultural and translation-studies scenario, with Gemini generating both the contextual framing and the exercise content from a single student-authored prompt. Class 3 brought all five structures together in a unified rephrasing exercise format contextualised in mobility vocabulary, with Google AI Studio both generating the exercises and serving as a real-time support tool during the session. Class 4 used Diffit to transform a teacher-authored mobility-contextualised exercise set into a differentiated learning package, extending the rephrasing format across an accessibility range and connecting the class's practice explicitly back to the classical exercise tradition that the Proficiency Masterclass homework of Class 1 had introduced.

The progression in student autonomy is one of the most notable features of the sequence. The observation sheet records a clear movement from under-use and active by request in Class 1 through to active by volition and High motivation in Class 3, with quality indicators improving across the same trajectory. This matches the pattern observed in both the 2nd year ESP sequence and the 3rd year Pragmatics sequence, suggesting that the combination of tool rotation – so students encounter different AI platforms with different affordances – and progressive handover of initiative from teacher to student is a consistent and effective design principle within the ELITE-AI experimental framework at UNITBV.

The integration of grammar instruction with mobility vocabulary across all four sessions also ensured that the Applied Grammar course reinforced rather than competed with the ESP and Pragmatics courses running in parallel. Passive voice appeared in translation-studies scenarios in Class 2, in institutional mobility communication in Class 3, and in EU legal documentation in the 2nd year ESP Class 3 reading material. Wish structures were covered in the grammar

sequence and encountered again in the pragmatics sequence's discussion of counterfactual and hypothetical meaning. Topicalisation was introduced as a grammar structure in Class 2 and then encountered as a pragmatic and rhetorical device in the 3rd year's Gricean maxims session. This cross-course coherence – all three sequences sharing the mobility frame and building on each other's vocabulary and grammatical content – represents a deliberate curriculum design choice that amplifies the impact of each individual lesson.

References

Gude, K. and Duckworth, M. (1999). Proficiency Masterclass (Workbook). Oxford University Press.

ELITE-AI Project Consortium (2025). WP3 Experimental Protocol. Internal project document, UNITBV.

Diffit for Teachers. (2025). Sentence Rephrasing Practice [AI-generated differentiated resource]. web.diffit.me.

ELITE-AI Project – Quality Assurance Manual

WP3 – Experimental Teaching Activities

Description of ESP Lessons: BA 2nd Year Group

Teacher: Nechifor, Andreea | Institution: UNITBV

Fall Semester 2025/2026

Introduction and Institutional Context

The lessons described in this document were delivered at Transilvania University of Braşov (UNITBV) as part of the ELITE-AI project's experimental teaching activities during the fall semester of the 2025/2026 academic year. They form a sequence of three ESP (English for Specific Purposes) classes taught to BA 2nd year students, assessed at C1 Advanced level. The course ran alongside the 3rd year Pragmatics sequence described in a companion document, and both shared the same ELITE-AI experimental protocol: students divided into an experimental group and a control group, a placement test at the start of the semester, AI tools integrated exclusively into the experimental group's sessions, and a shared final assessment at the end of the semester.

The ESP course was designed around the field of European student mobility – covering the theory and practice of ESP as a discipline, the Erasmus+ selection process, academic and professional writing, and the vocabulary of institutional communication – with all activities anchored in scenarios and texts that students would plausibly encounter as Erasmus+ candidates or participants. Three AI tools were used across the three sessions: NotebookLM (Google), Claude (Anthropic), and Google AI Studio, each deployed at a stage of the course where its specific affordances were most relevant.

For Class 1, the teacher assembled three source materials – her own PowerPoint introducing ESP, an interview with Jeremy Day (an experienced ESP practitioner and teacher trainer, whose interview on English for Specific Purposes: Preparation, Research and Methodology is publicly available on YouTube), and Lorenzo Fiorito's article Teaching English for Specific Purposes (2005, UsingEnglish.com) – and uploaded all three to NotebookLM. The platform synthesised them into a set of teaching resources that formed the instructional backbone of the session. For Class 2, Claude was used to generate preparation scenarios and application letter templates grounded in the actual UNITBV Erasmus+ selection process. For Class 3, Google AI Studio was used alongside Diffit-generated reading materials to explore ESP in the specific context of mobility, combining listening comprehension, vocabulary development, and text analysis within a single 90-minute session.

Class 1 – Defining and Teaching English for Specific Purposes

c. 21 October 2025

AI Tool	NotebookLM (Google)
Group	BA 2nd Year 15 students
Date	c. 21 October 2025
Duration	90 minutes
Study Level	C1 Advanced
Lesson Stage	Teaching
Topic	Introduction to ESP: definition, ESP vs ESL, needs analysis, syllabus design, teacher role
Field / Context	Mobility
Observation Sheet	Sheet #1
Materials	Laptop/Desktop, Mobile Phones/Tablets, Wi-Fi, Video Projector, Speakers/Sound System, Paper and Pens
Source Documents for NotebookLM	Introduction to ESP (teacher's PowerPoint); Jeremy Day – interview on ESP preparation, research and methodology (YouTube); Lorenzo Fiorito – Teaching English for Specific Purposes (article, 2005)
AI Use – Vocabulary	Vocabulary quiz generation, register-appropriate vocabulary, flashcard creation
AI Use – Listening	Podcast/audio content generation
Student Participation	Active by request; low peer interaction frequency; motivation: Developing
Quality of AI Use	Communication with AI: effective; Prompts: effective; Interpretation of feedback: effective

Source Materials and NotebookLM Preparation

Before the session, the teacher uploaded three source documents to NotebookLM: her own PowerPoint introduction to ESP; an audio recording of Jeremy Day's interview on ESP preparation, research and methodology; and Lorenzo Fiorito's 2005 article Teaching English for Specific Purposes, published on UsingEnglish.com. NotebookLM synthesised these three sources under the notebook title Defining and Teaching English for Specific Purposes and generated four output types from them: a podcast, a set of flashcards, a ten-item multiple-choice quiz, and a written report. The Class_1_ESP_NotebookLM presentation slide, shared with students at the start of the session, documented the three source materials and the four generated outputs, including direct links to the flashcard and quiz artifacts. A further report titled A Few Words of Encouragement for Your ESP Journey was also generated by NotebookLM in the voice of a mentor figure drawing on Jeremy Day's narrative – a companion text that gave students an accessible, first-person account of the core pedagogical principles of ESP.

This multi-source input gave NotebookLM considerably richer material to synthesise than the single-document uploads used in some other sessions. The three sources were deliberately complementary in register and perspective: the PowerPoint provided the theoretical skeleton, the Fiorito article gave an academically grounded comparative account of ESP versus ESL, and the Jeremy Day interview contributed the practitioner's voice, including the cautionary first-lesson narrative and the practical advice that proved consistently engaging for students across sessions.

NotebookLM-Generated Resources

The podcast, titled *English for Specific Purposes: The High-Speed Train to Professional Language Skills*, was generated from all three sources and ran as a two-host deep-dive in the format that NotebookLM's Audio Overview feature produces. Its opening framing – ESP as a high-speed train aimed at practical language skills rather than a general academic subject – captured the core distinction between ESP and ESL in a way that students could hold onto through the rest of the session. The podcast then moved through the three defining features of ESP: its orientation toward the learner's specific purpose rather than a general language objective; its reliance on needs analysis as the course design instrument; and its integration of English teaching with the learner's existing subject-matter expertise rather than treating language as a separate academic domain.

The syllabus design dimension received extended treatment, with the podcast noting that while ESL aims for a balanced four-skills approach, ESP privileges whatever skill or skills the needs analysis identifies as most critical. The graduate business student who needs to read dense research papers gets a reading-heavy syllabus; the aspiring tour guide gets a speaking-and-interaction-heavy one. Grammar instruction follows the same logic: rather than drilling structures in isolation, ESP teaches the grammatical forms that the specific professional function requires – modal verbs for contract drafting, passive constructions for incident reports, conditionals for policy documentation.

The teacher-role section of the podcast drew extensively on Jeremy Day's interview. The podcast presented Day's argument – that an ESP teacher does not need to be a subject-matter expert, but does need to be thoroughly prepared and genuinely committed to learning from students – alongside the first legal English class story: thirty or forty specialist legal terms on the board, a teacher who could explain none of them, and a room full of paying students whose confidence in the course visibly collapsed. The podcast used this narrative not to alarm but to clarify: preparation and honest acknowledgement of gaps are the teacher's most reliable professional tools, more valuable than any amount of field-specific knowledge. Students were able to pause playback at any point to raise questions, turning the listening activity into a live analytical discussion.

The flashcard set comprised 27 cards drawn from all three sources. The cards covered the foundational distinctions between ESP and ESL; the definition of needs analysis and its role in syllabus design; the motivational mechanisms specific to ESP; the role of subject-matter knowledge in accelerating language acquisition; and the core principles of Day's teacher-preparation approach. Because the cards were grounded in three sources rather than one, they presented the same concepts from multiple angles – Fiorito's academic framing alongside Day's practitioner framing alongside the theoretical summary from the PowerPoint – giving students a richer and more textured grasp of each idea than a single-source flashcard set would provide.

The quiz generated by NotebookLM consisted of ten multiple-choice questions with four options each, drawing on all three source documents. Questions tested the distinction between

ESP and ESL at the level of learner profile, syllabus design, and instructional aim; the role of needs analysis; Day's key pedagogical principles; and Fiorito's formulation of the motivational advantage of ESP. Students worked through the quiz individually before comparing responses and discussing the reasoning behind each answer with the class.

The report *A Few Words of Encouragement for Your ESP Journey*, also generated by NotebookLM, was structured as a seven-section mentor document: an acknowledgement of the fear that many new ESP teachers feel; Day's legal English disaster story retold in first person; the two core lessons distilled from it (preparation as a shield; honesty as a lifeline); the role of student expertise as the teacher's primary classroom resource; a redefinition of the teacher's role as process expert rather than content expert; practical scenario-based advice for getting started; and a closing reassurance. This document served a dual purpose in the session: it gave students an accessible narrative entry point into the theory of ESP, and it modelled the kind of register-appropriate professional writing that the course was designed to develop.

Theoretical Content

The session introduced ESP through Fiorito's (2005) key formulation: the most important difference between ESP and ESL lies in the learners and their purposes for learning English. ESP students are typically adults with some existing English proficiency who are learning the language to perform specific professional functions, so the programme is built on an assessment of purposes, needs, and the functions for which English is required. This needs-first orientation means that ESP concentrates on language in context rather than on grammar and structures as ends in themselves, and that it integrates English teaching with a subject-matter area that matters to the learner – whether accounting, computing, tourism, or, in this course's case, European student mobility.

The session also worked through the motivational argument: because students can apply what they learn in the ESP classroom directly to their professional or academic life, the reinforcement cycle is faster and stronger than in general English instruction. Their existing subject-matter knowledge provides what the podcast called the turbocharger effect – the conceptual framework is already in place; the English labels and structures simply need to snap into it.

Observations from the Teacher's Record

The observation sheet records the lesson stage as Teaching and the degree of AI use as under-use – a rating that reflects the introductory nature of the session, where the AI outputs were presented to students rather than operated by them directly. Student participation was recorded as active by request, with sometimes ratings across most participation indicators and low peer interaction frequency, consistent with a first session in a new course where students are still orienting to both the content and the tools. Motivation was recorded as Developing. The quality of AI use indicators – communication with the AI, prompt use, and interpretation of feedback – were all rated effective, suggesting that even in a teacher-directed mode, the AI-generated resources were landing clearly and supporting the learning objectives. Critical evaluation of AI output was limited in this session: students did not flag specific inaccuracies, and the observation sheet records that instances of uncritical acceptance occurred alongside general awareness of hallucinations as a background concern.

Class 2 – The Erasmus+ Selection Process: Writing and Specialised Vocabulary

4 November 2025

AI Tool	Claude (Anthropic)
Group	BA 2nd Year 10 students
Date	4 November 2025
Duration	90 minutes
Study Level	C1 Advanced
Lesson Stage	Practice
Topic	Selection process for Erasmus+ mobility: application file preparation, selection interview, specialised vocabulary, formal writing
Field / Context	Mobility – Erasmus+ selection and administrative process
Observation Sheet	Sheet #2
Materials	Laptop/Desktop, Mobile Phones/Tablets, Wi-Fi, Video Projector
AI Use – Writing	Formal letter/application template generation; writing task support
AI Use – Vocabulary	Specialised/technical vocabulary lists, register-appropriate vocabulary
Student Participation	Active by request; high peer interaction frequency; motivation: High
Quality of AI Use	All quality indicators: yes (effective); no uncritical acceptance of AI output

Lesson Overview

The second session moved from the theoretical introduction of Class 1 to direct practice with the genre and vocabulary of Erasmus+ mobility administration, using Claude as the session's AI tool. The group for this session was smaller at ten students, reflecting the subgroup structure of the course, and the lesson stage was Practice: theoretical content about the selection process had either been introduced previously or was introduced briefly at the start, before students moved into Claude-assisted production tasks.

The session's content followed the full arc of the Erasmus+ application and mobility experience, as documented in the class notes: beginning with the details of the selection process from the UNITBV Erasmus+ page for students, moving through the preparation of the selection file and the selection interview, covering the documentation and application file stage, and then tracing the subsequent phases of the mobility journey – from the administrative tasks of Erasmus+ coordination through travel and arrival, engagement with the educational process and extracurricular activities, submission of assessments and projects, return home, and final credit and grade validation.

Claude-Generated Activities

Students began by inserting into Claude the details of the UNITBV Erasmus+ selection process as published on the university's dedicated student mobility page. From this input, Claude was asked to generate preparation instructions, practice scenarios, and specific help for assembling a competitive selection file. The AI's outputs were then used as the basis for a structured discussion: students compared Claude's advice against their own understanding of the process, identified gaps or inaccuracies in the generated content, and supplemented it with information from the official university source.

The vocabulary dimension was central to the session. Claude was directed to include, in every generated text, the specialised vocabulary associated with the particular phase of the mobility process being addressed. This produced a rolling vocabulary set that covered the full administrative and communicative arc of an Erasmus+ mobility: terms related to the selection process (eligibility criteria, learning agreement, transcript of records, credit recognition, home institution, host institution, sending university, receiving university, grant disbursement, traineeship, bilateral agreement); terms related to the interview and application file (motivation letter, candidate profile, language certificate, academic transcript, letter of recommendation, ranking list, selection committee); and terms related to the post-selection phases (orientation programme, arrival formalities, academic calendar, credit transfer, grade validation, Erasmus+ report).

The application letter template was a particular focus. Students prompted Claude to generate a template for a formal Erasmus+ motivation letter, then worked in pairs to adapt the AI-generated template to their own academic backgrounds and mobility goals. This revision task required students to make register decisions – adjusting Claude's formulations to match their own voice while maintaining the formal institutional register of the genre – and to verify that the vocabulary Claude had introduced was used accurately in context. The observation of no uncritical acceptance of AI output in the teacher's record is consistent with the nature of this task: because students were adapting the letter to their own situation, they were by necessity engaging critically with every sentence Claude had produced.

Specialised Vocabulary in Context

One of the session's distinctive features was the way vocabulary acquisition was tied to a communicative task that students had a genuine stake in. Several of the students in the experimental group were themselves considering or actively preparing an Erasmus+ application, and the vocabulary generated by Claude in this session was therefore not abstract professional terminology but language they would plausibly need to use within months. This immediate relevance – one of the defining motivational mechanisms of ESP as discussed in Class 1 – was visibly reflected in the observation sheet's High motivation rating and high peer interaction frequency, both the highest recorded for any 2nd year session.

The connection to Class 1's theoretical content was made explicit during the session: students were asked to identify which elements of the selection process vocabulary represented a specific purpose need – terms they required for this professional-administrative function and would not encounter in general English instruction – and to consider how their existing knowledge of the Erasmus+ process had helped them recognise and acquire the vocabulary faster. This meta-reflection connected the day's practice directly to Fiorito's and Day's formulations from the previous session.

Observations from the Teacher's Record

The observation sheet records this session as the most actively participatory of the three 2nd year ESP classes. All participation indicators were rated often, peer interaction frequency was

high, and motivation was High. The quality-of-interaction indicators – communication with the AI, use of prompts, interpretation of AI feedback – were all rated yes (effective), and the critical evaluation indicators show that students were actively verifying AI accuracy rather than accepting outputs without question. The writing focus produced the highest degree of student-to-AI interaction in the entire 2nd year sequence, with students frequently returning to Claude to refine their letter drafts or request alternative formulations.

Class 3 – ESP in Mobility Contexts: Overview, Reading, and Vocabulary

18 November 2025

AI Tool	Google AI Studio
Additional Resources	Diffit (web.diffit.me) – two differentiated reading materials with vocabulary and comprehension tasks
Group	BA 2nd Year 17 students
Date	18 November 2025
Duration	90 minutes
Study Level	C1 Advanced
Lesson Stage	Teaching and Practice
Topic	Overview of ESP and its adaptation to mobility contexts; reading comprehension; listening; vocabulary development
Field / Context	Mobility – Erasmus+ programme history, impact, and professional profiles within the EU
Observation Sheet	Sheet #3
Materials	Laptop/Desktop, Mobile Phones/Tablets, Wi-Fi, Video Projector, Paper and Pens
Google AI Studio Link	https://aistudio.google.com/apps/drive/1C8B5mvxi0Pojrv-sLZ7bC56Nof4hOf7g
AI Use – Listening	Listening comprehension question creation
AI Use – Vocabulary	Specialised/technical vocabulary lists, vocabulary quiz generation, register-appropriate vocabulary, flashcard creation
Student Participation	Active by request; medium peer interaction frequency; motivation: Developing; target language use: increased
Quality of AI Use	All quality indicators: yes (effective); target language use increased relative to Class 1

Lesson Overview

The third and final session in the 2nd year ESP sequence combined two AI platforms – Google AI Studio and Diffit – to deliver a lesson that integrated listening comprehension, reading, and vocabulary development within the single thematic frame of ESP and its application to mobility contexts. At 17 students, this was the largest of the three sessions, and the lesson stage was recorded as both Teaching and Practice, reflecting the session’s dual movement between introducing content through AI-generated audio and listening tasks and then applying it through reading analysis and vocabulary work.

The session’s structure was shaped by a progression from the general to the specific: from a Google AI Studio-generated overview of ESP and its relevance to mobility, through two Diffit-generated reading materials that instantiated ESP in concrete professional and institutional contexts directly connected to the European mobility landscape, to vocabulary consolidation work that tied the session’s lexical gains to the course’s broader specialised vocabulary programme.

Google AI Studio Activities

Google AI Studio was used to generate an overview of ESP and its adaptation to mobility contexts, delivered as an audio-visual resource that students engaged with through a listening comprehension task. The platform’s capacity to generate content from a direct instructional prompt – rather than from uploaded source documents, as NotebookLM had done in Class 1 – meant that the Google AI Studio output was tailored to the specific intersection of ESP theory and the mobility context, rather than being a synthesis of pre-existing materials. Listening comprehension questions were generated alongside the audio content, giving students a structured analytical framework for processing the information rather than simply following it as passive listeners.

Students were also asked to generate, in real time, their own vocabulary-related queries to Google AI Studio: requesting specialised vocabulary lists associated with specific phases of ESP-in-mobility contexts, asking for flashcard content on the terms identified, and prompting for register-appropriate examples of each term in use. This interactive vocabulary-building mode, in which the AI responded to student-designed prompts rather than delivering a fixed vocabulary set, gave the vocabulary acquisition dimension of the session a more exploratory character than the teacher-directed flashcard use of Class 1.

Diffit Reading Materials

Two reading materials generated through Diffit’s AI-powered differentiation platform were used as the session’s primary reading input, each pairing a text with vocabulary definitions, multiple-choice comprehension questions, and short-answer tasks.

The first, *From Erasmus to Erasmus+: A Story of 30 Years*, traced the history of the programme from its launch in 1987 with just over 3,000 students from 11 EU countries to its current reach of 9 million participants across 33 countries and beyond. The text covered the programme’s expansion from higher education into vocational training, adult education, youth initiatives, and sports; its impact on employment outcomes (doubling the chances of finding work within a year of graduation; one in three traineeship participants offered a job by their host company); its contribution to social mobility (35,000 students from disadvantaged backgrounds supported in a two-year period; 100,000 refugees receiving online linguistic support); and the intercultural dimension, with 94% of youth exchange participants reporting improved intercultural understanding. The Diffit-generated vocabulary section defined key terms including integration, encompass, instrumental, traineeship, mobility, linguistic, and fostered, each with a contextualised example sentence. Comprehension questions at multiple levels required

students to retrieve specific information (the programme's founding year; the number of initial participants; the current scale) and to synthesise and evaluate (the reasons for the call for tenfold funding increase; the ways in which the programme has expanded since its inception).

The second reading, *A Day in the Life of the Lawyer-Linguists*, introduced students to a professional profile sitting at the intersection of law, linguistics, and multilingual institutional communication: the lawyer-linguist working for the European Union's legal services. The text, structured as a meeting transcript and set against the backdrop of the EU's 23 official languages framework, described the core task of ensuring that all 23 language versions of a legal text say the same thing – a task with profound implications for legal interpretation, since the EU's legislative texts are legally binding in all 23 languages simultaneously. The example of the ambiguous term *pressure* – is it a burden or political pressure? – illustrated the kind of fine-grained semantic and pragmatic judgment that the role requires, connecting directly to the linguistic concepts students had encountered in the parallel 3rd year Pragmatics course. The Diffit vocabulary section defined lawyer-linguists, laws, translation, committee, parliament, adopts, legally binding, languages, version, document, and experts, each at a register appropriate for professional English use. Multiple-choice and short-answer questions tested comprehension, vocabulary, and the ability to draw inferences from the text.

The choice of these two reading texts was pedagogically deliberate and tightly connected to the course's ESP framework. Both are authentic-style texts – the Erasmus+ history piece modelled on institutional promotional and evaluative writing; the lawyer-linguist text on professional meeting discourse – representing two of the genres that students in a European mobility context are most likely to encounter as readers and eventually as producers. The lawyer-linguist text, in particular, modelled a professional identity that some students in the programme might aspire to: it showed what happens when linguistic precision, multilingual competence, and legal expertise converge in an institutional context, making the argument for advanced English language study in terms that went well beyond the immediate goals of the Erasmus+ application process.

Vocabulary Consolidation

The session's vocabulary work drew on both AI platforms: Google AI Studio generated the specialised vocabulary lists and flashcard content for the ESP-and-mobility overview, while the Diffit materials provided their own integrated vocabulary sections. By the end of the session, students had encountered and worked with vocabulary spanning three registers: the administrative language of the Erasmus+ programme (mobility, traineeship, integration, fostered, encompass); the legal-linguistic register of EU institutional work (legally binding, lawyer-linguist, version, adopt, committee, parliament); and the theoretical register of ESP as a field (needs analysis, language in context, functional competence, subject-matter integration, syllabus design). The observation sheet records target language use as increased relative to previous sessions, consistent with the combination of listening input, reading analysis, and active vocabulary querying that characterised the session.

Observations from the Teacher's Record

The observation sheet records the lesson stage as Teaching and Practice, AI use as appropriate, and student motivation as Developing – a rating that may reflect the density of the session's content rather than disengagement: three distinct resource types (Google AI Studio audio, two Diffit reading packages) across 90 minutes gives students considerable material to process. Peer interaction was medium in frequency, and teacher-student interaction was often, consistent with a lesson that moved between teacher-facilitated listening and student-led

reading analysis. The quality-of-interaction indicators were all yes (effective), and the increased target language use recorded in the observation sheet suggests that the combination of authentic reading texts and AI-generated vocabulary support had a measurable effect on the frequency and fluency of English use in the room. The observation that students sometimes interacted with each other in the target language outside of explicitly structured peer tasks is worth noting as an indicator of growing language confidence within the group.

General Notes on the AI Tool Rotation and Pedagogical Design

The three sessions formed a coherent instructional arc: from theory (what ESP is and how it works) through application (using ESP principles to prepare a real Erasmus+ application file) to contextualisation (situating ESP within the broader landscape of European mobility and professional language use). The AI tool rotation – NotebookLM, Claude, Google AI Studio – was not arbitrary but responsive to what each stage required. NotebookLM’s multi-source synthesis capacity made it the right tool for building a rich theoretical foundation from three complementary academic and practitioner sources. Claude’s generative flexibility and responsiveness to detailed prompts made it well suited to the applied writing and vocabulary task of Class 2, where the content needed to be tailored to a specific institutional process. Google AI Studio’s capacity to generate fresh audio and vocabulary content from direct prompts, combined with Diffit’s differentiated reading materials, gave Class 3 the breadth and density of input appropriate for a Teaching-and-Practice session covering both overview content and specific professional text types.

Across the three sessions, the observation sheet data shows a consistent pattern: student motivation and active participation were highest in the session with the most direct personal relevance (Class 2, the selection process), AI use quality was consistently effective or partially effective across all sessions, and critical evaluation of AI output increased across the sequence. By Class 3, students were both using AI tools to generate vocabulary and reading support and evaluating the outputs against the authentic texts provided by Diffit – a more sophisticated and autonomous mode of AI engagement than the teacher-directed use that characterised Class 1.

The connection between the 2nd year ESP sequence and the 3rd year Pragmatics sequence is worth noting. The lawyer-linguist text in Class 3 introduced the pragmatic dimension of legal translation – specifically the problem of semantic ambiguity across languages – in a way that resonated directly with the Pragmatics content students were studying in parallel. The vocabulary of institutional communication developed across both sequences, and the shared mobility context ensured that specialised vocabulary acquired in one course was reinforced and extended in the other.

References

- Day, J. (2014). English for Specific Purposes: Preparation, Research and Methodology [interview]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dS60xK13iJY>
- Fiorito, L. (2005). Teaching English for Specific Purposes (ESP). UsingEnglish.com. <https://www.usingenglish.com/articles/teaching-english-for-specific-purposes-esp.html>

ELITE-AI Project Consortium (2025). WP3 Experimental Protocol. Internal project document, UNITBV.

European Commission (2017). From Erasmus to Erasmus+: A Story of 30 Years. European Commission publication.

European Parliament (2025). A Day in the Life of the Lawyer-Linguists. Institutional text adapted via Diffit (web.diffit.me).

ELITE-AI Project – Quality Assurance Manual

WP3 – Experimental Teaching Activities

Description of Pragmatics Lessons: BA 3rd Year Groups

Teacher: Nechifor, Andreea | Institution: UNITBV

Fall Semester 2025/2026

Introduction and Institutional Context

The lessons described in this document were delivered at Transilvania University of Braşov (UNITBV) as part of the ELITE-AI project's experimental teaching sequence during the fall semester of the 2025/2026 academic year. They belong to a Pragmatics course taught to BA 3rd year students, all assessed at C1 Advanced level, within a study programme that foregrounds European student mobility as both a thematic focus and a professional horizon. The course ran in parallel across several groups, each constituting a separate teaching unit within the same experimental design, and the AI tools used varied across sessions in a deliberate rotation consistent with the project's comparative methodology.

The overarching aim was to develop students' pragmatic competence – their capacity to interpret and produce language appropriately across social and professional contexts – while building the specialised vocabulary associated with Erasmus+ mobility. Every lesson was anchored in this dual purpose: theoretical content from the field of pragmatics was always contextualised within scenarios, vocabulary sets, and communicative tasks drawn from the world of student mobility.

In line with the ELITE-AI protocol established within WP3, students were divided into an experimental group and a control group at the start of the semester. The experimental group participated in all AI-integrated activities described below; the control group covered the same curricular content through traditional instructional methods, without AI tool support. A placement test administered at the beginning of the semester established a shared baseline, and a final assessment at the end of the semester will allow for comparative analysis between the two groups.

The AI tools deployed across the 3rd year sequence were NotebookLM (Google), Gemini, Claude (Anthropic), and Google AI Studio, each used at a specific point in the course and for purposes suited to the lesson's objectives. What follows is a lesson-by-lesson account of the experimental teaching activities, drawing on the teacher's observation sheets, the AI-generated materials, and the theoretical content of the course.

Lesson 1 – Introduction to Pragmatics

Group 1 (c. 23 October 2025) and Group 2 (c. 29 October 2025)

AI Tool	NotebookLM (Google)
Group 1	14 students c. 23 October 2025
Group 2	10 students c. 29 October 2025
Duration	90 minutes per group
Study Level	BA 3rd Year C1 Advanced
Lesson Stage	Teaching
Topic	Introduction to Pragmatics: definitions, scope, interfaces with linguistic branches
Observation Sheet	Sheet #3 (Group 1) Sheet #1 (Group 2)
Materials	Laptop/Desktop, Mobile Phones/Tablets, Wi-Fi, Whiteboard, Video Projector, Speakers, Paper and Pens
AI Use – Vocabulary	Contextual word usage examples, vocabulary quiz generation, register-appropriate vocabulary, flashcard creation, specialised/technical vocabulary lists, terminology database creation
AI Use – Listening	Podcast/audio content generation, listening comprehension question creation

Lesson Overview

This opening session introduced students to the field of pragmatics through a set of AI-generated resources produced in advance by the teacher using NotebookLM. The course slides – covering the foundational definitions, the interfaces between pragmatics and other branches of linguistics, and the core concept of utterance meaning – were uploaded to NotebookLM as source material, and the platform generated four distinct output types: a podcast, a short explanatory video, a set of flashcards, and a mind map. These four resources formed the instructional backbone of the lesson and were deployed at different stages of the 90-minute session.

The same lesson was taught twice, to two separate 3rd year groups on dates approximately one week apart. Both groups worked with the same NotebookLM-generated materials. The observation sheets for both sessions record the lesson stage as Teaching, the AI use pattern as directed by the teacher, and the students' level of motivation as Developing, with active participation occurring principally by request rather than spontaneously. Language use was maintained at C1 level throughout.

NotebookLM-Generated Resources

The first resource students encountered was the podcast titled The Hidden Rules of Real Talk: Decoding Utterance Meaning, Speech Acts and the Pragmatics of Everyday Communication. Generated by NotebookLM from the course slides, this two-host audio production ran through

all core pragmatics concepts in a conversational format designed to make theoretical content accessible without sacrificing analytical precision. The format deliberately mimics the conventions of an educational deep-dive podcast, with one host posing questions and the other elaborating – a dialogic structure that mirrors the kind of meaning-in-interaction that pragmatics itself studies.

The podcast opened by positioning pragmatics as the study of what we mean when we talk, contrasting it with semantics and grammar to show why dictionary definitions and syntactic rules alone cannot account for communicative meaning. It then moved systematically through the four interfaces between pragmatics and other linguistic branches. At the phonological level, the example of a speaker who code-switches between a local dialect at home and a standard variety in professional contexts was used to show how sound choices are pragmatically motivated. At the morphological level, the asymmetry between grateful and ungrateful – where the positive trait is the morphological default – was presented as evidence of social norms encoded in word structure. At the syntactic level, the four constructions describing the broken figurine (John broke the figurine; The figurine was broken by John; The figurine was broken; The figurine got broken) were analysed as pragmatic choices about agency and focus. At the semantic level, the topless district example illustrated how real-world knowledge supplements lexical meaning in actual language use.

The podcast then addressed utterance meaning as the central concept of the course, formalising the triadic relation – speaker means Y by X – and working through the headache example (A: Shall we see that film tonight? B: I have a headache) as an instance of a concealed refusal. The Jacob and Mark exchange about directions was used to illustrate pragmatic failure arising from mismatched contextual assumptions. The podcast was designed to allow for live student intervention: students could pause playback and pose questions, turning a passive listening activity into an interactive analytical exercise.

The second resource was a shorter video titled What We Really Mean, also generated by NotebookLM. Running at approximately five minutes, it presented the same theoretical content in a more compressed and visually oriented format, making it suitable as either a pre-class primer or a consolidation tool after the podcast. The video foregrounded the four-component model of utterance meaning – sentence meaning, speaker intention, hearer interpretation, and context – and used the same canonical examples (the headache refusal, the salt request, the figurine constructions) to anchor the theory in recognisable communicative situations. Its closing reflection – you are already a master of pragmatics – was used to open a discussion about whether metalinguistic awareness adds anything to practical communicative competence, a question directly relevant to the course's aims.

The third resource was a set of 24 flashcards generated from the slides. These covered: the three foundational definitions of pragmatics (Verschueren 1999; Thomas 1995; the functional definition as study of language use); the four linguistic interfaces with their illustrative examples; the triadic relation and utterance meaning; the headache and Jacob/Mark examples; and the functions of specific utterances including It's hot in here, Can you pass me the salt?, I'll talk to you tomorrow, and It's a beautiful day today. The flashcards were used both for in-class consolidation – students working individually or in pairs to test each other – and as a take-away revision resource.

The fourth resource was a mind map generated by NotebookLM, organising the entire theoretical content of the session into a branching visual structure centred on the node Pragmatics: The Study of Language Use. The map branched into four main areas – Definitions and Scope, Pragmatics and Linguistic Branches, Meaning in Pragmatics, and Examples of

Pragmatic Phenomena – each with second- and third-level nodes capturing the key concepts, examples, and theoretical names. Students received this map as both a study aid and an object of critical evaluation: they were asked to check it against the podcast and video content, to identify any simplifications or omissions, and to add annotations where they felt the representation was incomplete.

Theoretical Content

The session introduced three foundational definitions: pragmatics as the study of language use; as the study of linguistic phenomena from the point of view of their usage properties and processes (Verschueren, 1999); and as the study of meaning in interaction (Thomas, 1995). These three framings were presented as complementary rather than competing, each foregrounding a different dimension of the discipline – the functional, the structural, and the interactional. The question that pragmatics asks – how are language resources used? – was established as the organising question of the course.

The concept of utterance meaning was introduced in contrast to sentence meaning, with meaning characterised as dynamically generated in the process of using language rather than stable and context-independent. The triadic relation Speaker means Y by X was formalised as the core of pragmatic meaning, drawing on the Gricean tradition and anticipating the Speech Act Theory and Cooperative Principle content of the following sessions. Students were asked to identify the pragmatic function of several utterances – It’s hot in here; Can you pass me the salt?; I’ll talk to you tomorrow; It’s a beautiful day today – working in small groups before comparing interpretations with the full class.

Observations from the Teacher’s Record

The observation sheet records active participation as occurring sometimes for initiating interaction, volunteering, and seeking clarifications, and often for applying to tasks and solving them. Frequency of interaction with peers was medium, and the degree of involvement was recorded as active by request. Interaction was most frequent between teacher and student and often between students, with student-AI interaction recorded as sometimes. The quality of communication with the AI tool and use of prompts were both rated as effective for Group 1 and as yes (effective) for Group 2, while interpretation of AI feedback was also effective. Critical evaluation of AI output showed an interesting pattern: students were noted as verifying AI accuracy because they were aware of hallucinations, but not because they suspected wrong or inappropriate answers specifically. This suggests that the awareness of AI limitations was already present as a general disposition rather than triggered by a specific error encountered in the session.

Lesson 2 – Speech Acts and Social Scenarios in a Multicultural Learning Environment

Group RE_A | 6 November 2025

AI Tool	Gemini (Google)
Group	RE_A 21 students

Date	6 November 2025
Duration	90 minutes
Study Level	BA 3rd Year C1 Advanced
Lesson Stage	Practice
Topic	Social scenarios related to a multicultural learning environment; speech acts taxonomy; felicity conditions; indirect speech acts; mobility vocabulary
Observation Sheet	Sheet #2
Materials	Laptop/Desktop, Mobile Phones/Tablets, Wi-Fi, Video Projector
AI Use – Vocabulary	Mobility-related vocabulary generated in context (social scenarios)
Mobility Context	Spain / Erasmus+ multicultural environment; student as Erasmus+ participant

Lesson Overview

The second lesson in the 3rd year sequence moved from theoretical introduction to applied practice, and introduced Gemini as the session's AI tool. The group involved was RE_A, the largest of the 3rd year groups at 21 students. The lesson stage was Practice rather than Teaching, meaning the theoretical content of Speech Act Theory had either been introduced in the previous session or was introduced briefly at the start of this one before being immediately applied to AI-generated scenarios. The mobility context was Spain, and the student role was that of a participant engaged in an Erasmus+ mobility, making the scenarios directly relevant to the students' own academic trajectories.

The session's focus on social scenarios in a multicultural learning environment gave it a distinctly applied and intercultural character. Where the first lesson had been primarily analytical – examining how language works – this lesson asked students to produce and evaluate language in use, working within the constraints of specific social situations that Erasmus+ students routinely encounter.

Theoretical Content: Speech Act Theory

The session was grounded in Speech Act Theory as developed by Austin (1962) and Searle (1969). Students worked with the taxonomy of illocutionary acts: representatives (asserting, stating, claiming), directives (requesting, commanding, questioning), commissives (promising, offering, refusing), expressives (thanking, apologising, congratulating), and declarations (pronouncing, naming, sentencing). Each category was illustrated with examples from the mobility register: a confirmation email to a host university coordinator as a commissive, a coordinator's instruction about document submission as a directive, an administrative acknowledgement as a representative.

Felicity conditions received particular attention, given their relevance to the kinds of institutional communication students encounter in mobility contexts. The three-part framework – preparatory conditions, sincerity conditions, and essential conditions – was applied to mobility-specific speech acts: what are the conditions for a valid request to have a course recognised? What makes an academic supervisor's approval genuinely binding? Indirect speech acts were introduced as the category most practically significant for intercultural

communication, since the gap between literal and intended meaning is widest and most consequential in cross-cultural encounters.

Gemini-Generated Activities

Gemini was used as a scenario generation engine throughout the practice phase of the lesson. Students submitted prompts specifying the type of speech act, the communicative context, and the cultural background of the interlocutors, and Gemini returned short dialogues set in Spanish university and city contexts. The scenarios included a student negotiating a deadline extension with a Spanish academic administrator, a flat-share discussion between students from different countries, and an indirect complaint made to a local mobility coordinator about accommodation problems.

For each scenario, students were asked to identify the illocutionary force of each utterance, to check whether the relevant felicity conditions were met, and to locate any instances of indirect speech acts. Where the felicity conditions were not met – for instance, a promise made without genuine intention – students discussed what the communicative and social consequences might be, particularly in a cross-cultural context where the interlocutors may not share the same conventions for indirect communication.

Students also used Gemini to generate the specialised vocabulary of the session: terms connected to mobility administration, social interaction in a multicultural environment, and the pragmatics of polite refusal and indirect request. The vocabulary work was integrated into the scenario analysis rather than treated as a separate exercise, so that lexical acquisition was tied to communicative function throughout.

Observations from the Teacher's Record

The observation sheet records a notably high level of student engagement for this session. Active participation was recorded as often for applying to tasks, solving tasks, and volunteering, with peer interaction frequency at medium and degree of involvement at High – the only session in the 3rd year sequence to receive this rating at this stage. Interaction between students was recorded as often, and group work and collaboration were recorded as sometimes, reflecting the paired and small-group dynamics of the scenario analysis tasks. The quality of communication with the AI, use of prompts, and interpretation of AI feedback were all rated yes (effective), and students were noted as not accepting AI output without questioning. The observation that students did not flag specific inaccuracies but did not accept outputs uncritically either suggests that the scenario-generation task, by requiring students to apply their own analytical framework to the AI output, functioned as a built-in verification mechanism.

Lesson 3 – Speech Acts, Felicity Conditions, and Indirect Speech Acts

Group GE | 13 November 2025

AI Tool	Claude (Anthropic)
----------------	--------------------

Group	GE
Date	13 November 2025
Duration	90 minutes
Study Level	BA 3rd Year C1 Advanced
Lesson Stage	Teaching and Practice
Topic	Speech acts: taxonomy, indirect speech acts, felicity conditions; mobility social interactions; Netherlands context
Mobility Context	Netherlands / Erasmus+ multicultural environment; student as Erasmus+ participant
Specialised Vocabulary	Mobility vocabulary related to speech acts; social scenarios in a multicultural learning environment

Lesson Overview

The third lesson in the sequence covered the same Speech Act Theory content as the RE_A session but with a different group and a different AI tool. Group GE worked with Claude (Anthropic), and the mobility context shifted from Spain to the Netherlands. This variation was deliberate: the ELITE-AI project's comparative design required equivalent content to be delivered with different tools to different groups, allowing for analysis of how tool affordances shape the learning experience while keeping the theoretical content constant.

The Netherlands context introduced a culturally specific pragmatic dimension that was not present in the Spain-anchored session. Dutch communicative norms are widely characterised in the intercultural communication literature as more direct than those of many other European cultures, and this directness has particular pragmatic significance when students from southern or eastern European communicative backgrounds encounter it in an Erasmus+ context. Claude was used to generate scenarios that foregrounded this cross-cultural pragmatic contrast.

Claude-Generated Activities

Claude was used to generate social scenarios set in Dutch university and city environments, featuring characters from different cultural backgrounds engaged in typical Erasmus+ interactions: registration at a student services office, a conversation with a Dutch academic supervisor about course selection, a group project meeting between students from several different countries, and a housing arrangement discussion with a Dutch landlord. The scenarios were calibrated to illustrate how the same illocutionary act – a request, a refusal, a complaint – can be performed with markedly different degrees of directness depending on the cultural conventions of the speaker.

Students were asked to analyse each scenario for illocutionary force and felicity conditions, as in the RE_A session, but the additional analytical task here was to compare how the same speech act type appeared differently across the cultural pairings in the scenario. A Dutch supervisor saying That approach will not work is performing the same illocutionary act as a Spanish supervisor saying Perhaps we might consider some alternatives, but the surface form, the degree of face-threat, and the pragmatic expectations placed on the hearer differ substantially. Claude's generation of scenarios across this cultural range gave students a concrete corpus for this comparative analysis.

Mobility vocabulary was developed in parallel with the pragmatic analysis. Terms including illocutionary force, perlocutionary effect, felicity conditions, indirect speech act, preparatory conditions, sincerity conditions, and essential conditions were encountered and practised within the scenarios, so that their acquisition was tied to actual communicative contexts rather than abstract definition.

Theoretical and Cross-Cultural Dimensions

The Dutch context allowed the lesson to introduce intercultural pragmatics as a field in its own right, distinct from but continuous with the theoretical pragmatics of the first two sessions. Students discussed whether the Cooperative Principle, which would be covered in the final session of the sequence, is genuinely universal or whether its maxims – particularly the Maxim of Manner (be clear and brief) – are culturally calibrated. The Dutch examples provided by Claude offered evidence that what counts as appropriately direct varies significantly across European communicative cultures, and that Erasmus+ students need pragmatic flexibility as well as linguistic accuracy to navigate these differences successfully.

Note on Observation Sheet

The Claude session for Group GE does not appear as a separate entry in the teacher's observation sheet data currently available. The lesson is documented through the class notes file (Class_2_GE_Pragmatics_Claude_13_11_2025) and is consistent with the pedagogical design applied across all 3rd year sessions in the sequence.

Lesson 4 – Flouting Grice's Maxims of Cooperation in Mobility Contexts

Group RE_A | 20 November 2025

AI Tool	Google AI Studio
Group	RE_A 15 students
Date	20 November 2025
Duration	90 minutes
Study Level	BA 3rd Year C1 Advanced
Lesson Stage	Practice
Topic	Flouting Grice's maxims of the Cooperative Principle in mobility contexts
Observation Sheet	Sheet #3
Materials	Laptop/Desktop, Mobile Phones/Tablets, Wi-Fi, Video Projector
AI Use – Reading	Text generation for reading practice, reading comprehension question design, genre-specific text creation, professional document templates
AI Use – Vocabulary	Contextual word usage examples, register-appropriate vocabulary, flashcard creation

Participation

High – often across all participation indicators; increased target language use; high motivation

Lesson Overview

The fourth and final lesson in the 3rd year experimental sequence addressed Grice's Cooperative Principle and the four conversational maxims – Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner – with particular focus on maxim flouting and the generation of conversational implicature. Google AI Studio was the tool for this session, used to generate reading materials, comprehension tasks, and vocabulary exercises directly responsive to the lesson's theoretical content and the mobility context.

The observation sheet for this session records the highest levels of student engagement across the entire 3rd year sequence. Motivation was rated High and all participation indicators – applying to tasks, solving tasks, volunteering, and seeking clarifications – were recorded as often. Peer interaction frequency was high, and the degree of target language use increased relative to previous sessions. These indicators suggest that the combination of Gricean content – inherently tied to the analysis of real conversational behaviour – with AI-generated reading materials set in mobility contexts produced a particularly effective learning environment.

Theoretical Content: The Cooperative Principle

Students were introduced to Grice's Cooperative Principle as set out in his 1975 paper *Logic and Conversation* (in P. Cole and J. Morgan, eds., *Syntax and Semantics*, Vol. 3: *Speech Acts*, Academic Press): make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange. The four maxims operationalising this principle were covered – Quantity (be as informative as required, neither more nor less), Quality (do not say what you believe to be false), Relation (be relevant), and Manner (be clear, brief, and orderly) – with attention to the distinction between violating a maxim covertly and flouting it openly in a way that signals the hearer to generate a further inference.

Conversational implicature – the meaning that is communicated but not said, generated when a speaker openly flouts a maxim – was the central analytical concept of the session. Students worked through examples before being directed to the Google AI Studio-generated reading materials, where the implicature analysis was applied to mobility-specific texts.

Google AI Studio Activities

Google AI Studio was used to generate a set of reading texts and accompanying comprehension and vocabulary tasks calibrated to the Gricean framework and set within Erasmus+ mobility contexts. The platform took the session's theoretical content as its prompt base and produced genre-specific texts – including a student email, a coordinator's response, an informal group chat exchange, and a section of a mock institutional webpage – each designed to contain identifiable instances of maxim flouting.

One text featured a student asking their Erasmus+ buddy whether the university's international office was straightforward to deal with, and receiving the reply *They are very thorough*. Students identified the flouting of the Maxim of Quantity (the response is less informative than expected given the question), derived the implicature (dealing with the office is slow or complicated), and discussed why indirectness was chosen over a direct negative assessment in this social context.

A second text showed a coordinator responding to a course recognition query with an extended account of the history of bilateral agreements between the two institutions, flouting the Maxim of Manner through prolixity. Students analysed what this communicative choice conveyed about the speaker's attitude toward the query and toward the student asking it – a pragmatic reading that goes well beyond comprehension of the propositional content.

A third exercise reversed the direction: students used Google AI Studio to generate their own maxim-flouting exchanges set in Erasmus+ scenarios, then submitted the outputs to the class for analysis. This production task required students to think about implicature from the speaker's perspective, not only the hearer's, and to consider how reliably their intended implicature would be recovered by an interlocutor who did not share the same cultural assumptions.

The vocabulary work in this session was integrated into the reading and production tasks: register-appropriate vocabulary, contextual word usage examples, and flashcard creation through Google AI Studio ensured that the specialised lexis of pragmatics and mobility continued to develop alongside the analytical skills.

Observations from the Teacher's Record

The observation sheet for this session is the most detailed in the 3rd year sequence and records consistently high engagement across all dimensions. All quality-of-interaction indicators – communication with the AI, use of prompts, interpretation of AI feedback – were rated yes (effective). Critical evaluation of AI output showed that students both verified accuracy because of general awareness of hallucinations and suspected wrong or incomplete answers in specific instances, suggesting that by this stage of the semester students had developed a more active and discriminating approach to AI-generated content than was evident in the earlier sessions. The increased use of target language noted in the observation sheet is consistent with the high-engagement dynamics of a practice-stage lesson in which students are producing and analysing language simultaneously, and where the AI tool functions as a resource to be interrogated rather than an authority to be accepted.

General Notes on the AI Tool Rotation and Pedagogical Design

Across the four lessons, four different AI platforms were deployed in a deliberate rotation: NotebookLM, Gemini, Claude, and Google AI Studio. Each was selected for the specific affordances it offered at that point in the instructional sequence. NotebookLM's capacity to generate multiple resource types – podcast, video, flashcards, mind map – from a single uploaded document made it the appropriate choice for the introductory lesson, where establishing a coherent and multi-modal overview of the theoretical content was the primary pedagogical goal. Gemini's conversational scenario generation made it well suited to the practice stage of Speech Act Theory, where students needed a responsive, context-sensitive engine for producing the social situations they would analyse. Claude's nuanced handling of cross-cultural pragmatic contrast made it the natural fit for the Netherlands-anchored session, where the cultural specificity of the scenarios was analytically central. Google AI Studio's capacity to generate genre-specific reading texts from theoretical prompts served the reading-and-implicature focus of the Gricean session, where students needed sustained texts to analyse rather than brief dialogues.

Throughout the sequence, two principles governed the use of AI tools in the experimental group. The first was critical engagement: students were consistently directed to verify, question, and if necessary correct AI outputs, and the observation sheet data shows a clear progression from developing critical awareness in the first sessions to active and discriminating evaluation by the final lesson. The second was contextual grounding: every AI-generated resource – podcast, scenario, reading text, flashcard set – was situated within the Erasmus+ mobility context, so that pragmatic competence and mobility vocabulary developed in tandem throughout the course.

The teacher's role across the sequence combined prompt design, scaffolding of critical engagement with AI outputs, targeted linguistic and pragmatic feedback, and facilitation of the reflective discussions through which students developed metalinguistic awareness. This dual function – as AI mediator and language instructor – reflects the model of professional practice that the ELITE-AI project identifies as central to effective integration of AI tools in ESP teaching, and is consistent with the quality assurance guidelines developed within WP4 of the project.

References

- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford University Press.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics*, Vol. 3: *Speech Acts* (pp. 41–58). Academic Press.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. Longman.
- Verschueren, J. (1999). *Understanding Pragmatics*. Arnold.
- ELITE-AI Project Consortium (2025). WP3 Experimental Protocol. Internal project document, UNITBV.