

Module 6: Student AI Literacy, Verification and Responsible Use in FL Learning

Instructor notes, detailed activity design, facilitation script and answer key

Module basis

Duration: 2 hours; mode: face-to-face with TEL support; suggested CEFR level: B2.

Core aim: student AI literacy for foreign language learning, with emphasis on critical evaluation, verification, responsible AI use and task design.

Assessment is formative and based on process evidence: verification cards, responsible prompts, task redesign, reflection and homework.

Recommended 120-minute sequence

Time	Stage	Main purpose
0-10 min	Activity 1. AI or Human?	Motivation; LO1, LO2
10-20 min	Activity 2. AI-use poll + risk mapping	Diagnostic discussion; LO1, LO2
20-35 min	Theory input: AI literacy, verification and responsible use	Conceptual framing; LO1, LO2
35-60 min	Activity 3. Verify the AI	Hands-on verification; LO2, LO4
60-75 min	Activity 4. AI as partner, not ghostwriter	Responsible prompting; LO3, LO6
75-100 min	Activity 5. Redesign the task	Collaborative task design; LO5, LO6
100-112 min	Reflection: AI Literacy Compass	Self-assessment; LO1-LO6
112-120 min	Exit ticket + homework briefing	Review; LO6

Before the session: instructor preparation

- Prepare a shared workspace: Padlet, OneNote, Google Doc, Microsoft Teams channel or equivalent.
- Prepare the poll in advance with the six diagnostic statements in Activity 2.
- Check that at least one generative AI tool and at least two verification tools are accessible. Suggested verification tools: Oxford Learner's Dictionaries, Cambridge Dictionary, Longman Dictionary, SKELL, YouGlish, a coursebook, Google Scholar or institutional library resources.
- Print or share the student handout. Keep the instructor key separate.
- Decide whether participants may use personal accounts. Do not require anyone to enter personal data into AI tools.
- Prepare a slide or board with the principle: "AI may support learning, but the learner remains responsible for meaning, accuracy, ethics and disclosure."

Activity 1. AI or Human?

Purpose and timing

10 minutes. This warm-up activates assumptions about AI writing and shows why style alone is a weak basis for judging authorship or acceptability.

Learning outcomes: LO1, LO2.

Procedure

1. Put participants into pairs or groups of three.
2. Give them the four short texts below without labels. Ask them not to use AI or search tools yet.
3. They classify each text: fully AI-generated, human-written, human text improved responsibly by AI, or problematic AI-assisted text.
4. They justify their choices using evidence from the text: tone, specificity, accuracy, stance, repetition, overclaiming and ethical issues.
5. Collect answers in a shared document. Lead a brief discussion: “What made you decide? How certain are you? What would need verification?”

Texts for the activity

Text A

Artificial intelligence can be a valuable support for university students who are learning English because it gives instant suggestions, examples and feedback. It can help students organise their ideas, correct grammar and expand vocabulary. However, students should not use AI to complete assignments without understanding the language. Responsible use means checking the output, adapting it to one’s own meaning and acknowledging the support received.

Text B

I think students should be allowed to use AI in English courses, but not for everything. For example, it can help when someone is stuck or wants to check a sentence. At the same time, if the whole essay is written by AI, the student does not practise enough. In my opinion, teachers should show students how to use it and also what the limits are.

Text C

Students should be allowed to use AI tools in English courses when the purpose is learning support rather than task replacement. AI can help learners brainstorm ideas, notice grammar problems and compare alternative expressions. However, students still need to make their own decisions, check the accuracy of the output and be transparent about how the tool was used.

Text D

Students should use AI freely in English courses because AI tools are always objective and can usually identify the best answer for every learner. Since AI-generated English is grammatically correct in most cases, teachers can use it as reliable evidence of students’ language level. In addition, if students use AI to improve their work, they do not need to mention it, because the final text belongs to them.

Suggested key and instructor notes

Text	Intended category	Evidence / discussion points
A	Fully AI-generated paragraph	Fluent, balanced and generic. It uses broad phrases such as “valuable support”, “responsible use”, and “acknowledging the support received”. It is acceptable as an example but lacks a personal or situated voice.
B	Human-written paragraph	More conversational, slightly simpler, with personal stance markers such as “I think” and “in my opinion”. It is less polished but shows an individual voice.
C	Human paragraph improved by AI without obvious errors	More polished than Text B but still pedagogically sound. It preserves the idea that AI should support learning and adds clearer phrasing.
D	Problematic AI-assisted paragraph with errors/ethical risks	Contains false or unsafe claims: AI is not always objective; AI output is not reliable evidence of student proficiency; disclosure may still be required. Use this to introduce verification and responsible-use policies.

Important facilitation point

Do not present this as AI detection training. The key message is that authorship and responsibility cannot be decided from style alone. Participants should learn to examine process, accuracy, disclosure and learning value.

Activity 2. AI-use poll and risk mapping

Purpose and timing

10 minutes. This diagnostic activity links participants’ current AI habits to risks, verification and responsible-use norms.

Learning outcomes: LO1, LO2.

Poll items

- I use AI tools for language learning or teaching.
- I trust AI-generated explanations of grammar or vocabulary.
- I usually check AI-generated information before using it for language learning purposes.
- Students should be allowed to use AI in foreign-language university classes if they disclose it.
- AI can help students become more independent language learners.
- When I use AI, I know what I am still responsible for.

Instructor follow-up questions

- Which result surprised you?
- Where do you see the biggest gap: access, confidence, verification, ethics, or task design?
- Which risks are language-learning risks, and which are academic-integrity risks?
- What would students need to know before AI use is allowed in a course?

Theory bridge: 15-minute input notes

Mini-section	Core message	Suggested teacher wording
1. AI literacy	AI literacy is multidimensional: understanding, use, evaluation, creation, ethics and reflection.	“The aim is not to turn every student into a technical expert. The aim is to help students understand enough to ask better questions, check outputs and make responsible decisions.”
2. Verification	AI can produce fluent but inaccurate language, explanations, examples or references.	“In language learning, wrong information may look very correct because it is expressed in polished English. That is why verification must become part of the learning process.”
3. Responsible use	Responsible use protects learning, authorship, privacy and academic integrity.	“The key question is not only whether students used AI. The key question is whether they can explain, evaluate and justify their AI-assisted decisions.”

Board summary

Notice: Where is AI involved? Understand: What is it doing? Test: Can we trust it? Create: What can we improve or design? Reflect: Should we use it, and how should we disclose it?

Activity 3. Verify the AI

Purpose and timing

25 minutes. Participants inspect AI-generated FL-learning content, verify it with trusted sources and produce a corrected learner-friendly version.

Learning outcomes: LO2, LO4.

Group task options

Option	AI output to check	Verification focus	Expected product
A. Grammar	Explanation of used to and would for B1 learners	Overgeneralisation, examples, level appropriacy	Corrected explanation + one practice item
B. Vocabulary	Academic collocations with research	Naturalness, collocation, register and level	Verified list + example sentences
C. Email/culture	Advice on writing to a university lecturer	Politeness, tone, cultural appropriacy and formulaic language	Improved email advice + mini checklist

Task A: flawed AI grammar output

Student-facing AI output

Used to and would are both used to talk about past habits. “Used to” is usually for repeated actions in the past, and “would” is the same but sounds a little more formal. You can use “would” for past states too, for example: “I would live in a small village” or “I would know many people there.” For questions and negatives, use “did”: “Did you used to play football?” and “I didn’t used to like coffee.” A simple rule is: use “would” whenever you want the sentence to sound more natural in storytelling.

Issue	Suggested key
Correct point	Both used to and would can describe repeated past actions/habits.
Main error	Would is normally not used for past states. “I would live in a small village” is not acceptable for this meaning; use “I used to live...”
Form issue	In questions and negatives, many grammar references prefer “Did you use to...?” and “I didn’t use to...”, although “used to” also appears in informal usage. For B1 teaching, present “use to” after did.
Overgeneralisation	Would is not always more natural. It is common in narrative sequences, but only when the repeated-action meaning is clear.
Corrected B1 explanation	Use “used to” for past habits and past states that are no longer true: “I used to play tennis”; “I used to live in Pécs.” Use “would” mainly for repeated past actions in stories: “Every summer, we would visit my grandparents.” Do not use “would” for states such as live, know, believe, have in this meaning.

Task B: flawed AI vocabulary output

Student-facing AI output

Here are academic collocations with research: make a research, do a research, carry out research, perform research, heavy research, deep research, research proves, researches show, conduct research, a research about technology.

Item	Suggested judgement
make a research	Incorrect/unnatural. Use “do research” or “conduct/carry out research”.
do a research	Usually incorrect as a countable singular form. Use “do research” or “do a research project/study”.
carry out research	Natural.
perform research	Possible, but “conduct/carry out research” is usually more common in academic contexts.
heavy research	Usually unnatural for the intended meaning. “Extensive research” or “thorough research” is better.
deep research	Possible in some contexts, but not a standard general collocation for academic work. “In-depth research” is better.
research proves	Often too strong. Prefer “research suggests/indicates/shows”, depending on evidence.
researches show	Usually avoid as plural count noun in this context. Use “studies show” or “research shows”.
conduct research	Natural.
a research about technology	Usually use “research on/into technology” or “a study about technology”.

Task C: flawed AI cultural/email output

Student-facing AI output

When writing to a university teacher in English, always start with “Dear Professor” even if you do not know their title. You should apologise several times to show respect. Use very formal expressions such as “I humbly beg your forgiveness” and “I await your favourable reply.” Avoid asking direct questions because they may sound rude. End with “Yours faithfully” in all cases.

Issue	Suggested key
Title	Do not assume “Professor” unless the person holds that title or it is the local norm. Safer: “Dear Dr Smith”, “Dear Professor Smith”, or “Dear [Name]” depending on context.
Over-apology	Repeated apology can sound excessive. One brief apology is enough when needed.
Register	“I humbly beg your forgiveness” is over-formal and unnatural in most university emails.
Questions	Direct but polite questions are acceptable: “Could you please confirm...?”
Closing	“Yours faithfully” is not always appropriate. “Best regards” or “Kind regards” is common in many academic email contexts.
Teaching point	Cultural advice should be contextual, not absolute. Students need models, register awareness and local/institutional norms.

AI Verification Card: criteria for feedback

Criterion	Strong evidence
Identifies the task type	Group names whether the AI output is language, factual content, source advice, feedback or cultural advice.
Locates risk	Group identifies exact sentence/wording that requires checking.
Uses verification sources	Group uses at least one suitable source and explains why it is reliable.
Revises responsibly	Group improves the output without overcomplicating it for learners.
Explains learning value	Group shows what students learn through checking, not only what answer is correct.

Activity 4. AI as language learning partner, not ghostwriter

Purpose and timing

15 minutes. Participants design prompts that elicit feedback, questions and guided practice rather than full task completion.

Learning outcomes: LO3, LO6.

Learner profile	Weak prompt	Responsible prompt
B1 speaking exam	Write my full answer about technology.	Act as a B1 English speaking partner. Ask one question at a time about technology. After my answer, give one strength, one improvement point and one follow-up question. Do not write the answer for me.
B2 argumentative paragraph	Rewrite my essay so it is perfect.	Give feedback on my B2 paragraph. Do not rewrite it. Comment on argument structure, linking words and two language points. Ask me what I want to revise first.
A2 travel vocabulary	Give me all travel words I need.	Teach me eight A2 travel phrases. Give a simple example, then quiz me with short situations. Correct only the phrase I use incorrectly.
C1 presentation	Make my presentation sound academic.	Review my opening for a C1 academic presentation. Comment on signposting, hedging and audience engagement. Suggest options, but leave final wording to me.

Key principle

A responsible prompt protects learner agency by asking the tool to coach, question, explain, compare, give limited feedback or offer options. It avoids asking the tool to complete the assessed product invisibly.

Activity 5. Redesign the task

Purpose and timing

25 minutes. Participants transform a traditional task into an AI-literate language-learning task with structured AI use, verification, reflection and disclosure.

Learning outcomes: LO5, LO6.

Traditional task	Risk	Possible AI-literate redesign
Write a 250-word opinion essay on AI in education.	Student submits an AI-written essay.	Students first write a 100-word position without AI. Then they ask AI for counterarguments, verify one claim, revise their own text and submit an AI-use statement.
Prepare a presentation about an English-speaking country.	Generic or inaccurate AI-generated content.	Students choose one cultural claim from AI, verify it with two sources, and present what changed after verification.
Translate a Hungarian text into English.	Students accept machine translation without noticing choices.	Students compare their own translation with DeepL/AI output, highlight three differences and justify final choices using dictionaries or examples.
Write an email of complaint.	AI produces a perfect text the student cannot reproduce.	Students draft the email first, ask AI for feedback on tone and structure, accept/reject suggestions, then submit both versions with a reflection.

Required element	What to look for in group work
Before-AI step	Learners produce ideas, draft language or make predictions before using AI.
AI support step	The tool gives feedback, alternatives, questions or examples, not the final answer only.
Verification step	Learners check a claim, phrase, source, register choice or factual detail.
Human decision step	Learners accept, reject or adapt AI suggestions and explain why.
Disclosure step	Learners state how AI was used.
Assessment step	Rubric rewards process, judgement and learning evidence.

Activity 6. Reflection: AI Literacy Compass

Purpose and timing

12 minutes. Individual reflection followed by one-minute partner exchange.

Learning outcomes: LO1-LO6.

- What is one new thing you understand about AI literacy in FL learning?
- What kind of AI output do you most need to verify: grammar, vocabulary, facts, sources, tone or cultural information? Why?
- Where is the line between useful support and problematic dependence?
- How can AI help students learn more, instead of only producing better-looking work?
- What is one rule or task-design principle you would use in your own context?

Exit ticket and quiz key

Quiz question	Suggested answer key
Why can AI-generated language be fluent but unreliable?	Because generative AI predicts plausible text patterns and can produce confident, polished answers without checking truth, source quality, context or pedagogical suitability.
Name two things students should verify in AI-generated content.	Any two: facts, sources, grammar explanations, vocabulary/collocations, register, tone, cultural information, bias, level appropriacy.
What is one responsible use of AI in writing?	Using AI for brainstorming, feedback, revision options or language noticing, while writing/revising the final text oneself and disclosing use when required.
What is one problematic use of AI in language learning?	Submitting a full AI-generated product as one's own, relying on unverified explanations, entering sensitive data, or accepting all corrections without understanding.
What should an AI-use statement include?	The tool used, purpose of use, type of support received, what was checked or changed, and confirmation that the learner remains responsible for the final work.

Homework: instructor guidance and marking notes

Homework	Submission	Feedback focus
AI-use diary	One-week table + 150-200-word reflection	Patterns of use, awareness of support vs substitution, verification habits.
Verification challenge	Original AI output, two verification sources, corrected version, short reflection	Quality of source choice, ability to locate error/weakness, clarity of corrected output.
Optional responsible task design	One AI-supported FL task with disclosure and verification stages	Task alignment, learner agency, ethical clarity, assessment feasibility.