# AI-GENERATED TEXTS IN A FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASS: PROS AND CONS

Vladimir Fedorov*,
[0009-0005-2235-8876]
Miloš Pupavac,
[0000-0002-6179-3900]
Maja Rončević
[0000-0002-5743-9124]

Singidunum University,
Belgrade, Serbia

Abstract:
The aim of this paper is to investigate whether artificial intelligence tools can be used in text generation, as a basic teaching tool, in foreign language classes. The request listed words and phrases from which a text in the form of a monologue and a task with statements related to the text were to be generated. The texts and tasks were generated using ChatGPT and Gemini in English, Russian and Serbian. Authenticity, grammatical correctness, vocabulary, spelling, tasks and their usability in teaching were analyzed. The conclusions were reached that artificial intelligence tools can be used to generate text for a foreign language class, but they must be reviewed and corrected if errors in grammar and spelling appear. The generated texts and tasks are very useful because they provide ideas and generate teaching materials that can motivate both the teacher and those learning a foreign language.

Keywords:
AI, Text, Foreign Languages, Generating Text, Input.

## INTRODUCTION

Using AI in foreign language teaching has long been the subject of both fervent debate and eager anticipation—well before AI tools reached their current level of sophistication, making it possible to incorporate them into day-to-day teaching practice. Today, numerous AI-based resources are available online to support teachers in their work, ranging from tools that help check awkward-sounding sentences, such as https://ludwig.guru/, to comprehensive toolkits for building teaching materials from scratch, like https://twee.com/.

However, despite the wide range of AI applications already present in education, doubts remain—not only about its usefulness but, more importantly, about its reliability in terms of linguistic, cultural, and even logical or common-sense adequacy and accuracy.

On the one hand, there are many positive voices: "AI offers a plethora of novel educational insights, methodologies, and resources, empowering educators with innovative tools to enhance language learning outcomes." [1]

Correspondence:
Vladimir Fedorov

e-mail:
vfedorov@singidunum.ac.rs



DOI: 10.15308/Sinteza-2025-445-450

Some even view AI as an essential or permanent feature of the future classroom: "The classroom of the future will cleverly combine the advantages of digital learning with proven, computer-free methods, content, and tasks for face-to-face teaching, which will remain indispensable and highly significant for successful learning." [2] At the same time, others express voicing "a signifcant concern" caused by "the potential over-reliance on ChatGPT." [3]

The goal of this paper is to explore one of the most interesting and potentially beneficial ways AI can be used in the classroom. Extensive, high-quality input is essential for mastering a language, particularly because key aspects like vocabulary acquisition and natural usage depend on it: "A good part of vocabulary acquisition has to be incidental. Incidental learning is facilitated through exposure to language input, in the form of extensive reading, for example." [4]

As a result it seems a very obvious step to start using AI not only for creating tasks, questions, lesson plans etc., but also to make it produce high-quality reading and listening input. Never before did there exist a possibility of generating material which could be so perfectly tailored to the requirements a teacher might have both in the sense of its relevance to the student and its linguistic content.

We would like to focus on reading input not only because it is essential for mastering a language, but also because of the role it plays in developing general cognitive adeptness. The latter is eloquently illustrated in a detailed explanation of the reading process from a comprehensive guide by J. Willis, M.D.: "These are the parts of the reading process when the brain links the abstract orthographic representations it decodes with its system of phonological codes. This is when patterning begins to take the decoded words and process them into comprehensible categories, and when words and phrases are associated with meanings in the process of developing fluent reading. Simultaneously, ***word vocabulary is increasing*** and strategies are available to ***facilitate vocabulary-building skills***. Ultimately, the patterning of phonological coding, enriched by greater vocabulary, combines with the ***increased fluency*** to reach the later reading stages of comprehension of increasingly complex text. [*Emphasis in all cases added*]." [5]

Obviously, reading plays a crucial role in developing several vital competencies for a foreign language learner, with vocabulary being one of the most significant: "One of the primary skills a second language learner needs to develop is the knowledge of vocabulary, a skill emphasized by many researchers as a crucial feature of language learning," while "many linguistic investigations and research have pointed out that there is a close connection between reading proficiency and vocabulary knowledge." [6] Moreover, "the text... simultaneously represents both a tool and an object of teaching: a tool—insofar as it introduces new and unknown (mainly grammatical and lexical) elements," [7] thereby offering a valuable opportunity to address multiple aspects of language competence. Therefore, beginning with such a fundamental activity as reading appears to be a solid starting point for exploring AI's potential in generating input for the foreign language classroom.

In selecting (creating) material it is important to keep in mind that "the most significant factors in the reading selection process are related to the students: the students' level, interests, needs, and background knowledge. Other factors are related to the text itself: content, relevance and authenticity." [8] It seems we have every reason to expect artificial intelligence to meet both sets of criteria. In fact, no textbook or other traditional source can come even remotely close to the level of customization that AI is—at least potentially—capable of providing.

A long-standing discussion worth mentioning concerns whether to use authentic, adapted, or synthetic texts in the classroom: "Authentic texts were not created for the purpose of fulfilling some didactic goal, while synthetic texts are compiled by textbook authors and foreign language teachers, most often with the intention of illustrating a linguistic phenomenon." [7]

In our view, there is a strong case for using adapted texts, particularly in the early stages of language learning. The advantages of this approach can be summarized as follows: "Adapting materials can make them [texts] accessible, interesting, and informative. – Arranging materials around one theme allows the learner to build up background knowledge of the content… – If the text is poorly presented, it can always be improved… – They allow teachers to evaluate their students." [8]

The type of reading we are aiming for is what is commonly referred to as **intensive**—or, less commonly, **exploratory**—reading. "Exploratory reading is one of the main types of reading used in learning… a foreign language. Its goal is to maximize the full perception and understanding of the text being read. Reading takes place at a slower pace and is accompanied by rereading of individual text fragments. This type of reading involves… a whole system of exercises and tasks related to different levels of understanding of the text after reading, with progression to oral and written speech." [9]

To summarize, the goals we aim to achieve are to ensure that the generated text supports the development of various linguistic competencies, such as listening comprehension, reading comprehension, and speaking. For the purposes of our analysis, we created a text in the form of a monologue tailored to the beginner level of foreign language learning, focusing on an everyday topic—namely, daily activity schedules. According to Ginić and Ajdžanović, the length of the text must adhere to specific guidelines, which is why the length of the monologue is set at 120–150 words. [10]

## 2. ANALYSIS

To create texts and tasks using artificial intelligence tools, we employed two platforms: ChatGPT by OpenAI and Gemini by Google. We provided the same input in Serbian, specifying the elements that the text should include, along with specific phrases. For instance, we emphasized that, when it comes to names and meals, the text should reflect foods and names typical of the country where the language is spoken (in our case, Serbia, the Russian Federation, and Great Britain). Our task was:

**"Can you write a monologue with a typical name for Serbia (Russian Federation/Great Britain) on the topic "My Day" in Serbian (Russian/English)? The text should be at A2 level and contain 150 words. The names and food should be typical for Serbia (Russian Federation/Great Britain). The speaker is about 20 years old. The text should include words such as: training, showering, television, waking up, getting up, making, preparing, cooking, breakfast, drinking coffee/tea, getting ready for school, lectures, break, café, socializing, returning home, rest, washing up, dinner, going to bed, shopping, washing dishes, pet, brushing teeth, getting dressed, family."**

After generating the text, we submitted the same input, adding:

**"Can you create a task that includes statements to be answered as true/false, which would check whether the student understood the text well?"**

When assessing the generated texts, we focused on the following considerations:

A) Authenticity – We analyze whether the sentences sound natural and reflect the language as it is used in communication. Our expectation is that some sentences may not sound natural to a native speaker.

B) Logical Flow of Activities – Given the illogical sequence in our input, the listed activities may not follow a typical daily schedule. We do not expect all activities to be arranged in a logical order.

C) Grammar and Spelling – We anticipate grammatical and spelling errors, particularly in texts in Serbian and Russian.

D) Translation of Phrases and Expressions – Since the instructions are in Serbian, we expect literal translations of phrases that may not be used naturally in the target language.

E) Cultural Elements – We expect that the character's name and the food mentioned in the text will be authentic to the culture in which the language is spoken.

F) Task – We expect the generated statements related to the text will be clear and motivating for the adoption of new language material. However, we foresee some grammatical or semantic issues in these statements.

### 2.1. REVIEW OF AI-GENERATED MATERIAL IN SERBIA

When it comes to text length, we initially set the monologue to contain 150 words. However, the actual word count varied: ChatGPT generated a text with 115 words, while Gemini's text contained 124 words. Regarding authenticity, the texts were notably different. The text generated by Gemini contained sentences that aligned well with native speaker expectations, whereas the text generated by ChatGPT exhibited an unexpected word order in sentences containing reflexive verbs.

Although our request lacked logical sequencing in the listed activities, both texts presented them in a coherent and logical order. This confirms our initial assumption.

In terms of grammar and spelling, Gemini's text contained no grammatical errors but included two redundant commas, as seen in the following examples: "По повратку кући, одморим се мало уз телевизију" and "Пре спавања, перем зубе и читам књигу." In contrast, ChatGPT's text contained grammatical errors related to word order in reflexive verb constructions. For instance, in the sentence "Свако јутро будим се у 7 сати," the reflexive "се" should precede the verb "будим." Similarly, in "После факултета, враћам се кући [...]" the reflexive pronoun should also be placed before the verb: "После факултета се враћам се кући [...]."

Regarding phrases and expressions, no significant errors were detected, as the input was in Serbian.

The cultural aspect of the generated texts is particularly interesting. Both AI models selected common Serbian names: Gemini's text featured Miloš, while ChatGPT's featured Marko, both of whom are 20 years old. Additionally, the breakfast choices reflected Serbian culinary traditions. ChatGPT included eggs and bread with cheese, while Gemini mentioned proja with cheese, a dish with deep roots in Serbian cuisine. Furthermore, Gemini's text described Miloš starting his morning with strong traditional ("homemade") coffee, a widespread habit among Serbs.

Both tools generated statements that can effectively engage students in discussions. ChatGPT produced ten statements, whereas Gemini generated eight, both concluding with correct answers. Notably, Gemini incorporated traditional dishes such as gibanica and beans in its statements, providing an opportunity to expand students' lexical knowledge and cultural awareness.

In conclusion, AI tools like ChatGPT and Gemini can be valuable assets for teachers in lesson preparation. However, it is essential to review and refine the generated material before using it in class to ensure linguistic accuracy and cultural appropriateness.

### 2.2. REVIEW OF AI-GENERATED MATERIAL IN RUSSIAN

Both ChatGPT and Gemini produced texts which maintained a natural flow and were generally accurate in terms of real-life details, with a few notable exceptions. They chose the name Ivan which is indeed one of the most common male names in Russian. However, several issues are worth mentioning.

Probably the most striking was the fact that both AI models initially generated texts in Serbian despite an explicit request to use Russian. The same issue occurred in the subsequent task. An additional request was needed for them to change the language.

ChatGPT generated a text of 132 words. It made one major semantic error: while telling about his daily routines, Ivan said "варю суп и пиццу," literally "[I] boil soup and pizza." While you can "boil soup" in Russian (it is a standard phrase), you certainly cannot do that with pizza. The mistake was repeated in the True/False task after the text: "Вечером Иван варит суп или пиццу" (lit. "In the evening Ivan boils soup and pizza"). Another serious mistake was grammatical and appeared in the task instructions: "отметить каждое утверждение как ПРАВИЛЬНО или НЕПРАВИЛЬНО в соответствии с информацией в тексте," lit. "mark every statement as true or false according to the information in the text." The so called short forms of adjectives were used where the full ones would be expected ("отметить каждое утверждение как ПРАВИЛЬНОЕ или НЕПРАВИЛЬНОЕ"). Moreover, it is much more common to use the words ВЕРНО(Е) and НЕВЕРНО(Е) respectively, even though ChatGPT's choice is not strictly incorrect. Interestingly, Gemini used the more natural wording.

Both ChatGPT and Gemini also used the word "питомец" ("pet"). While neutral and fairly common, its usage is typically limited to specific contexts such as pet shops or veterinary clinics. For instance, it appears in "карта питомца" (a pet's record at a vet hospital), or when an adult addresses a child he or she does not know very well ("А у тебя есть какой-нибудь домашний питомец?" — "Do you have a pet?"). In other words, питомец always implies a certain distance (which by no means necessitates formality, however) between the addresser and the addressee.

Gemini generated a piece of 140 words. The model had its own issues. At the beginning, Ivan says "учусь в Москве" ("[I] study in Moscow"), which sounds somewhat unusual since it is more common to specify the educational institution rather than the city unless there is a particular reason to do so. Additionally, "блины" (Russian pancakes) are highly uncommon as a weekday breakfast. The phrase "готовлю ужин для семьи" ("[I] cook dinner for [my] family") also sounds unnatural: "готовлю ужин для всей семьи" ("for the whole family") or "готовлю ужин для своей семьи" ("for my family") would be more appropriate. Interestingly, Gemini corrected itself in the task section, suggesting the more natural phrase "Иван готовит ужин для своей семьи."

Furthermore, while Masha (a diminutive of Maria) is a common female name in Russia, it is almost never used for cats or dogs. Like ChatGPT, Gemini made a grave grammatical error in the task: "У Ивана есть собака в качестве домашнего питомца" (lit. "Ivan has a dog as a pet") instead of "У Ивана есть домашний питомец — собака".

In conclusion, both ChatGPT and Gemini performed well overall and can certainly be useful for generating content at this level. However, careful double-checking is necessary, even for grammar, let alone culturally specific details. In fairness to AI, the issue with питомец, is quite subtle as this nuance is rarely, if ever, explicitly articulated in Russian dictionaries or textbooks.

### 2.3. REVIEW OF AI-GENERATED MATERIAL IN ENGLISH

The AI-generated texts in English, created by ChatGPT and Gemini, meet the basic needs of beginner to pre-intermediate ESL learners. Both texts are clear, grammatically correct, and suitable for classroom use. However, there are some small differences in style, tone, and how useful they are for teaching.

Both texts followed a good structure. ChatGPT's text had 159 words, while Gemini's was a bit longer with 172 words. Each one described a typical daily routine in a logical order. The sentence structure was simple, using the present simple tense, which is appropriate for this level of learners.

Gemini's text sounds more relaxed and friendly. It starts with "Hi everyone!" and uses expressions like "It's delicious!", which make it more like spoken English. ChatGPT's version is more formal and direct, starting with "My name is James, and I am 20 years old." This can be helpful when learners need clear and simple language.

Both texts include British cultural elements. ChatGPT mentions "fish and chips" and "eggs and toast," while Gemini adds more traditional British foods like baked beans, scones with clotted cream, and English breakfast tea. Gemini also mentions "shepherd's pie," which can be used to teach new words and talk about culture in class.

Grammatically, both texts are mostly correct. However, Gemini's use of "Marmite" as the name of a cat could confuse some learners who don't know it's also the name of a British food spread. ChatGPT used a more typical name — Max — which is easier for students to understand. Also, Gemini's phrase "I usually cook something simple" is a nice and useful sentence that learners can copy when talking about their own meals.

The true/false questions in both tasks match the texts well and are easy to follow. Gemini's questions are a little shorter, but both sets are clear. The false statements, like saying Oliver wakes up at 6 a.m. or has a dog, are realistic and help students think about the details in the text.

In conclusion, both ChatGPT and Gemini created texts that are useful for English language teaching. Gemini's version is more fun and casual, while ChatGPT's is more structured and formal. Depending on the goals of the lesson, teachers can choose the one that suits their needs best. However, it is always a good idea for teachers to check and adjust the texts before using them in class, especially to make sure the words and cultural references are clear to students.

## 3. CITATIONS

To summarize, some of our expectations were confirmed, while others were not. Regarding authenticity, although a few elements were somewhat unnatural, the majority were well-formed. Logical consistency was excellent, despite the fact that the listed activities appeared in an incorrect order. Minor grammatical issues were present, as well as a punctuation problem in Serbian. However, spelling was entirely accurate. There were no instances of literal translation, even though the request was made in Serbian. That said, the issue of generating the entire content in Serbian first, rather than in Russian, persisted. Cultural elements were incorporated in all cases, though not always with full accuracy. The subsequent task was well-structured and appropriate for use, though, as expected, not entirely free from errors.

One particularly interesting observation is that AI tools provide teachers with ideas to reflect on when preparing for class. In our case, they suggested culturally specific and popular food items—ideas that were both relevant and creative, even if not immediately obvious. Overall, Gemini performed better, both in terms of producing fewer errors and in structuring tasks more effectively. For instance, it introduced a wider range of vocabulary at the appropriate level, closely related to the words in the text, yet without exceeding the requested difficulty (e.g., pairing "cat" with "dog"). Additionally, it provided a greater number of words across all three languages.

Our conclusion and recommendation are that AI tools can be a valuable resource for generating input in foreign language classes. They produce generally high-quality content and, more importantly, generate useful ideas. However, it remains the teacher's essential responsibility to thoroughly review the output for semantic, grammatical, and cultural accuracy.

## REFERENCES

[1] A. Yang, "Challenges and opportunities for foreign language teachers in the era of artificial intelligence," *International Journal of Education and Humanities*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 39-50, 2024.

[2] T. Schmidt and T. Strasser, "Artificial intelligence in foreign language learning and teaching: a CALL for intelligent practice," *Anglistik: International Journal of English Studies,* vol. 33, no. 1, pp. 165-184, 2022.

[3] F. Karataş, F. Y. Abedi, F. Ozek Gunyel, D. Karadeniz and Y. Kuzgun, "Incorporating AI in foreign language education: An investigation into ChatGPT's effect on foreign language learners," *Education and Information Technologies*, vol. 29, p. 19343–19366, 2024.

[4] S. Thornbury, "How to teach vocabulary", Pearson Education India, 2006.

[5] J. Willis, "Teaching the brain to read: Strategies for improving fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension", Alexandria, VA, USA: Ascd, 2008.

[6] V. Gavranović, "Second Language Vocabulary Acquisition Enhanced by the Use of Technology," in doi:10.15308/Sinteza-2019-621-626, Belgrade, 2020.

[7] O. Durbaba, „Reafirmacija autentičnog teksta kao novog (starog?) bazičnog elementa u nastavi stranih jezika," *INOVACIJE u nastavi,* т. XIX, бр. 3, pp. 16-28, 2006.

[8] I. J. Arias, "Selecting reading materials wisely," *Letras*, no. 41, pp. 131-151, 2007.

[9] Л. С. Крючкова and Н. В. Мощинская, "Практическая методика обучения русскому языку как иностранному", Москва: Флинта, 2009.

[10] Ј. Т. Гинић и Н. Д. Ајџановић, „Методологија организације лингводидактичког материјала у уџбенику руског језика "Ни пуха ни пера!",Филолог, бр. 23, pp. 132-149, 2021.