Theoretical

Social constructivism, UDL, and instructional design in the AI-Enhanced Spanish L2 classroom: Operationalizing theoretical and practical implementation

Melissa Fiori

Empire State University, USA, melissa.fiori@sunyempire.edu

Abstract: Despite growing interest in AI-enhanced (language) learning, there remains a lack of conceptual models that demonstrate how AI can be pedagogically operationalized within established learning frameworks in ways that preserve learner agency and reaffirm the educator's role. Existing literature often emphasizes technological affordances or learner outcomes without articulation about how instructional design serves as a mediator. This paper posits that social constructivism offers the theoretical framework and UDL offers the practical framework that anchor the educator's role as critical to the AI-enhanced learning environment, when mediated by instructional design, and does so on the backdrop of interpersonal communication at the elementary level, Spanish as a second language (L2-Spanish), and higher education courses. It is a conceptual contribution that integrates theory through a design-based, illustrative example.

Keywords: Social constructivism, UDL, Universal Design for Learning, AI, ChatGPT, technology in higher education, instructional design

1. Introduction

How do Social Constructivism, Universal Design for Learning, and Artificial Intelligence work together to make learning more helpful, accessible, engaging, and sustainable? Social Constructivism (SC) is a learning theory that posits that learners learn best through social interactions mediated by experts (Vygotsky, 1979). Universal Design for Learning (UDL) principles center on designing lessons accessible to all learners (CAST, 2025). AI is a tool that can align with both frameworks to support educators and learners alike. By using ChatGPT in a UDL-centered classroom, educators set the stage for the collaborative learning that Social Constructivism encourages while remaining anchored in the process. While the alignment among Social Constructivism, UDL, and AI is readily imagined, the literature has yet to provide clear models for how this alignment can be pedagogically operationalized in instructional practice. Despite the rapid growth of scholarship on artificial intelligence in (language) education, much of the existing literature emphasizes technological affordances, learner outcomes, or ethical concerns without sufficiently articulating how AI can be pedagogically operationalized within established learning frameworks. In particular, there is a lack of theoretically grounded, design-oriented models that demonstrate how AI can be integrated into instructional practice in ways that preserve learner agency and reaffirm the educator's role. This paper is a conceptual piece that addresses that gap by advancing Social Constructivism as the theoretical framework and Universal Design for Learning as the practical framework through which AI-enhanced instruction can be intentionally designed and mediated. Using an interpersonal communication task in the second language Spanish classroom as an illustrative example, this paper demonstrates

how these frameworks can be operationalized through instructional design, while positioning the educator as an essential facilitator of learning. It further discusses the need for institutional investment in professional development for educators and the support personnel offices (Centers for Teaching and Learning, Instructional Design, Instructional Technology, Accessibility Officers) that are the cornerstones of 21st-century education.

2. Literature Review

Artificial Intelligence refers to computer programs designed to mimic human intelligence. Generative AI is a specialized subset of AI that uses large datasets to generate new content. Large Language Models (LLMs) are a subset of generative AI systems that produce human-like output based on the datasets they are trained on. Educational applications of AI have enabled gamified learning tools such as Kahoot!, Quizlet, and Duolingo; auto-generated practice, scoring, and adaptive learning options that textbook publishers now offer; planning assistant apps and rubric generators; and grammar-assist tools, among others. ChatGPT, My Conversation Trainer, and CallAnnie offer conversational practice, while Google Arts & Culture invites virtual field trips, city and museum tours, and free cultural exploration.

Studies on AI and Generative AI's application in language learning are abundant and build on decades of technology-mediated language learning research (Bax, 2003; Fiori, 2005; Hubbard, 2008; Warschauer, 1996, 2000;). While AI offers immediate, personalized feedback (on writing) (Alharbi, 2023; Obaidoon & Wei, 2024), which can result in learning autonomy and self-regulation (Ng et al., 2024; Wu et al., 2025), there are concerns about overreliance (Ducar & Schocket, 2018) and the quality of the output learners were exposed to (Niño, 2009; Sharma et al.,2025). AI can scaffold reading tasks to improve comprehension, thereby reducing task anxiety (Yuan, 2025) and promoting emotional well-being (Rezai et al., 2024), but there are concerns about the distinction between shallow and deep learning (Kos'Myna, 2025). AI can expand learning opportunities beyond the classroom (Crompton et al., 2024; Hockly, 2023; Ji et al., 2022), thereby increasing equity and inclusion, a focal point of technology access for social justice (Dooly & Comas-Quinn, 2025). However, not all learners have access to internet resources, which can contribute to unequal access to learning (Hockly, 2023). AI has the potential to help to improve academic performance (Deng et al., 2025; Zhou, 2023), and L2-speaking skills (Hao & Min, 2025), but with increased use are increased concerns about transparency and ethics surrounding that use (Crompton et al., 2024; Dwivedi et al., 2023; Hockly, 2023; Vinall et al., 2023; Zhu & Wang, 2025), concerns about content accuracy, quality, and reliability (Lee, 2025; Dwivedi, 2023), and a stated need to integrate AI literacy (Lee et al., 2025) into learning contexts.

Benefits for instructors include, but are not limited to, support (Ji et al., 2022), educational efficiency (Delello et al., 2025), innovation in task design (Pérez-Núñez, 2024; Amin, 2023), and improved feedback efficiency and consistency (Amin, 2023). However, there are fears about the role of the educator (student-teacher relationships) in AI-enhanced learning environments (Delello et al., 2025), the long-term pedagogical impact of introducing such tools (Crompton et al., 2024; Lee, 2025; Zhu & Wang, 2025), and a need for training (Kohnke et al, 2025).

Concerns about educational technology are nothing new, however. From resistance to the use of overhead projectors (Allen, 1963) to microcomputers (Hannafin et al., 1993) to graphing calculators (Fisher, 1995), educators have long feared the impact of technological advancements on teacher autonomy and professional identity. Nonetheless, roles have shifted from the educator as the knowledge transmitter to the educator as the facilitator and mediator. As early as the 1980s and 1990s, student-centered approaches were taking shape (Barr & Tagg, 1995; Chickering & Gamson, 1989; King, 1993), with empirical studies in the early 2000s reinforcing the value of student-centric teaching methodologies (Bosworth, 2013; Prince, 2004; Weimer, 2012).

In the era of the AI-infused (language) classroom, instructors are increasingly framed as interpreters of technological affordance (Crompton et al., 2024). While AI can support classroom operations such as assessment (Amin, 2023), writing (Alharbi, 2023; Ducar & Schocket, 2018; Niño, 2009; Obaidoon & Wei, 2024), reading comprehension (Yuan, 2025) and well-being (Rezai et. al, 2024; Yuan, 2025), learner engagement (Wu et al., 2025) and self-regulated learning (Ng et al., 2024), in addition to speaking practice (Zou et al., 2025; Leis, 2025), instructors retain critical judgment and remain central to the educational experience. Researchers consistently report on the need for educators to be adaptable in the face of technological advancements (Allen, 1963; Ducar & Schocket, 2018; Warschauer, 2000), in order to shape technological integration (Bax, 2003), scaffold experiential learning (Ji et al., 2022), and align with the principles of critical pedagogy.

3. Frameworks: Social Constructivism & UDL

Social Constructivism (SC) is a theoretical framework that holds that knowledge is constructed through social interactions in specific contexts. It frames cognitive development as a socially mediated process where interaction with a more capable, knowledgeable peer facilitates movement through the zone of proximal development (ZPD), the space where a knowledge gap is identified and is ripe for amelioration and favorable to intervention, thereby helping the learner move from other-regulated (controlled by the task) to self-regulated.

With scaffolded, strategic support, learners can bridge the gap between what they can achieve with guidance and what they can accomplish independently.

Universal Design for learning (UDL) is an educational framework centered around "learner agency that is purposeful & reflective, resourceful & authentic, strategic & action-oriented" (CAST, 2024). UDL guides learner development through three main principles: Multiple Means of Representation, the "what" of learning, which focuses on how information is processed and perceived consequently emphasizes offering learners different avenues to acquiring information; Multiple Means of Engagement, the "why" of learning, which focuses on motivation, interest, and persistence, and consequently emphasizes challenging learners and motivating them to learn; and Multiple Means of Action & Expression, the "how" of learning, which focuses how learners demonstrate what they know, and consequently emphasizes offering choice with respect to how learners demonstrate acquired knowledge. Consult the CAST UDL Guidelines on the CAST website for a deep dive into their supporting principles (https://udlguidelines.cast.org).

Both frameworks emphasize active, student-centered, collaborative learning, rather than receptivity. Social constructivism holds that knowledge is created (constructed) through social engagement, and UDL encourages collaboration in pairs, small groups, and as a class. Both frameworks emphasize the importance of scaffolding learning activities. Social Constructivism emphasizes providing strategic support within learners' ZPD as central to facilitating eventual learner autonomy (whereby skill gaps are addressed through guided, scaffolded interventions and feedback), whereas UDL emphasizes task sequencing, presenting information in a variety of ways, and providing timely feedback. Both frameworks center on learner agency and encourage learners to take ownership of their learning, recognizing that motivation to learn is linked to personal interests and goals, and that progress is connected to ongoing, meaningful assessment, in which learners have the liberty to choose how to demonstrate their acquired abilities. Naturally, a safe learning environment is a critical component for learning to blossom, and both frameworks recognize the importance of creating the supportive and welcoming space needed for social and emotional well-being and, subsequently, for learning to take root. Both frameworks embrace technological integration as instruments for enhancing social interaction, personalization, collaboration, and expression to personalize and enhance learning. Finally, both frameworks view the role of the educator not as a lecturer or knowledge transmitter, but rather as an expert facilitator and mediator. How do these aforementioned frameworks come to life in an AI-enhanced classroom?

4. Operationalizing SC and UDL in the AI-Enhanced L2 Classroom through Instructional Design

Operationalizing the theoretical and practical frameworks invites a robust, learner-centric experience, which involves the following: identifying measurable learning objectives, designing assessments, and creating learning activities that a) reflect the social context in which they will take place, b) account for learner variability, and c) leverage the tools that facilitate the process. Let us explore this through the lens of interpersonal communication (information exchange between two or more interlocutors) in the second language classroom on the topic of planning a vacation.

Step 1: Identify the desired results

First, identify the desired results. If the goal is to build interpersonal communication skills, then providing opportunities to a) negotiate meaning, b) adopt and adapt conversational strategies, and c) refine their ability to engage with an interlocutor is essential. If the objective is for the learner to plan a vacation, the central question concerns designing the context that facilitates this by considering what learners will be able to do and how they can apply it to contexts beyond the classroom.

Step 1 Example: Plan a vacation in L2 Spanish.

Step 2: Evidence of Learning

Then, establish what constitutes evidence of learning. In the context of planning a vacation, an authentic task, evidence might consist of the learner's ability to formulate and respond to questions involved in planning, and their ability to negotiate meaning with their interlocutor to reach mutual comprehension, manage trip planning, and synthesize elements of the exchange that help them reach their communicative objective.

Step 2 Example

Evidence of Learning: I can discuss and plan a vacation with a more capable peer (AI-interlocutor, the course professor, or an L2 speaker (friend, family, coworker, instructor).

Step 3: Activities and Assessments

Subsequently, determine what learning activities and assessments (formative and summative) best facilitate learning, measure progress, and measure achievement. Focus on application and construction of meaning that require learners to apply their knowledge to new challenges and true-to-life scenarios, rather than merely recalling facts.

Step 3 Example

Prior Knowledge: Students build vacation-focused lexical and grammatical knowledge through a series of activities (interpretive communication (reading, listening) and presentational communication (writing, speaking) that begin with comprehension checks, progress into short-answer responses, and advance into full production of short sentences. They engage with audio and video content that models the topic to build both linguistic and metalinguistic awareness, beginning with comprehension checks and progressing to the examination of how interlocutors negotiate meaning to reach mutual understanding. They will apply the rubric for interpersonal communication to the samples and identify conversational strategies used throughout the process. Infused into creating this background knowledge **is** social constructivism through observation and direct participation, and the UDL principles of Representation (strategic task scaffolding utilizing a variety of resources, examples of successful vacation planning, metacognitive analysis of negotiation of meaning tactics, and discussing strategies for successful communication) and Engagement (activating and building knowledge through meaningful activities).

Step 4: Rubrics

Rubrics that articulate the success criteria are valuable here, as they clarify for all parties what success (evidence of learning) entails and help anchor alignment between task design and assessment from the outset. In the context of vacation planning in the L2, the GPT can be prompted to provide scaffolded feedback based on a set of criteria, and the conversation log can serve as an informative and rich data set that reveals how the learner is negotiating meaning, adopting and adapting conversational strategies, and refining their ability to engage in interpersonal communication. This, in turn, invites opportunities for deeper, individualized, instructor-based feedback that paves the way for success.

Step 4 Example Rubric

Interpersonal Communication Rubric:
- Strong: Participates in and advances the exchange.
  - Responses are appropriate (simple and compound sentences or phrases).
  - Responses are a mix of practiced content and original productions
  - Negotiates meaning through rephrasing for clarification or asking questions (practiced and original)
  - Maintains appropriate register (formal, informal) for the context
- Good: Participates fully in the exchange.
  - Responses are appropriate (simple words and simple sentences).
  - Responses reflect practiced content
  - Negotiates meaning through word substitution for clarification or asking practiced questions
  - Partially maintains appropriate register (formal, informal) for the context
- Developing: Participates partially in the exchange.
  - Some appropriate responses (simple words and formulaic/chunked phrases).
  - Responses reflect memorization
  - Attempts to negotiate meaning through word substitution for clarification or simple questions (¿qué? ¿cómo? ¿repite(s)?
  - Minimally maintains appropriate register (formal, informal) for the context
- Emerging: Participates minimally in the exchange.
  - Some appropriate responses (simple words or lists of words).
  - Responses are either single-word responses or gestures
  - Attempts to negotiate meaning through English
  - Does not maintain appropriate register (formal, informal) for the context

Step 5: Build your Scaffolds

Next, configure the experience. Activate prior knowledge to connect with what the learner brings to the table through prior instruction and lived experience, to provide context for learning, and to increase motivation (UDL

engagement). Chunk and scaffold information (UDL-representation) around social interaction and collaboration (SC), leverage the technology that reinforces the process (SC, UDL), and guide learners (rather than lecture).

Step 5 Example

The Interpersonal Communication Experience:

Students build interpersonal communication (information exchange between two or more interlocutors) skills by conversing with AI (Learner-AI), peers (Learner-Learner), and native/heritage/proficient speakers of the language studied (Learner- L2Speaker), where they have graduated levels of support enabling them to practice communicating in a way that reflects their interest in the topic (UDL-Action & Expression).

Learner-AI

First is a learning activity between the learner and the AI, in which the learner can respond to the AI-interlocutor's feedback and incorporate it into subsequent attempts.

GTP Student Instructions: You are meeting with your travel agent to plan a trip. To begin, type (or say), "Quiero planear un viaje" (I want to plan a trip). The AI-travel agent will ask you questions. Answer in Spanish as best you can. Do not worry about mistakes because the agent will give you feedback and help you improve. You can repeat this activity as many times as you would like. Each time, the questions may be slightly different, providing additional practice with the topic and with incorporating feedback into the exchange. Click on the link to get started: Agente de Viajes.

This activity can be followed up in various ways. The instructor can review the transcript to provide individualized feedback; peers can review the transcripts and recommend ways to respond to the feedback; peers can observe their peer when they engage with the AI-travel agent and coach the conversation from the sideline; peers can examine how meaning was negotiated and identify what learning strategies were useful for advancing the conversation; peers can review the exchanges against the grading criteria and brainstorm ways to make improvements and/or identify or expand on their personal goals for the activity type. At this point, learners may return to the GPT for additional practice, or they might dive into peer conversations.

Learner-Learner

Next is the opportunity to measure progress through peer-to-peer conversations. Role-plays in which learners take turns as travel agents and travelers provide formative assessment opportunities with feedback from both the instructor and peers. Learners practice with assigned partners until they're ready to work with a randomly assigned partner, seeking feedback along the way.

Learner-L2 Speaker

Communication culminates with a conversation (summative assessment) and a reflection. Learners select the interlocutor with whom they believe they'll have the best chance to demonstrate their ability to plan a vacation in the L2 (UDL-Action & Expression). They may choose from among the AI-interlocutor, the course professor, or an L2 speaker (friend, family, coworker, instructor). With or directly following their submission, they submit a reflection (UDL-Engagement) on the learning process and assess themselves against the grading criteria.

Step 6: Reflection

Finally, encourage learners to engage in metacognitive reflection beyond what they completed during the AI-Learner and Learner-Learner activities, through self-assessment (see Appendix C for ideas), as well as through task reflection and refinement for future variations of the activity by educators. Educators can create their own reflection forms or consider using preexisting tools such as Waterloo's Reflection Framework and the DEAL model, purchasing access to Penn State's CCEDIR, or adopting education-based AI tools, such as MirrorTalk or Perplexity.

5. Discussion: Theoretical, Pedagogical, and Institutional Implications

5.1 Theoretical Implications: Social Constructivism and UDL as Anchors for AI Integration

At the intersection of SC and UDL is the shared understanding that learning is socially mediated, scaffolded, and supported through intentional design. Both frameworks advocate learner agency, focus not on how a task is completed but on supporting the journey to realization, and encourage the intentional inclusion of tools that account for variability while supporting meaningful engagement. When applied to AI-enhanced instructional contexts, these frameworks position artificial intelligence not as an autonomous instructional agent but rather as a mediating tool embedded within educator-designed learning experiences. Educators are central to education;

learning is neither passive nor automated, and the human aspects of teaching are not easily replicated by artificial intelligence. From a Social Constructivist perspective, learning occurs within the zone of proximal development through interaction with more capable peers or experts, with scaffolding gradually withdrawn as learners move toward self-regulation. UDL complements this process by emphasizing flexibility in representation, engagement, and action and expression, ensuring that learners have multiple pathways to access content and demonstrate understanding. Together, these frameworks provide a coherent theoretical foundation for integrating AI in ways that support, rather than supplant, human mediation, thereby addressing persistent concerns about the erosion of instructional authority in AI-enhanced classrooms. Recent publications emphasize that AI achieves its greatest pedagogical value when implemented within instructor-mediated, scaffolded designs that center on intentional instructional strategies (Ji et all, 2022), and where educators and learners demonstrate an adaptive mindset (Zhu & Wang, 2025), ensuring that AI complements rather than replaces human facilitation.

5.2 Pedagogical Implications: The Educator's Role in AI-Enhanced Instruction

Arguably, concerns about educators' roles in the face of artificial intelligence have more to do with the shift from knowledge transmitters to facilitators and mentors. Many educators enter higher education as subject-matter experts (SMEs) who have not received formal training in the science of teaching. Often, promotion and tenure focus on research and publication, and on institutional service, rather than on the ability to foster dynamic, engaging andragogical environments. Assuming that the subject matter expert is inherently a skilled educator is flawed and has implications for student success and retention. Framing AI within Social Constructivist and UDL principles reframes concerns about the educator's role in technology-infused classrooms. While artificial intelligence excels at pattern recognition, scalability, and efficiency, it lacks the capacity for sociocultural interpretation and professional judgement that educators bring to instructional contexts. Although AI-generated feedback can approximate human feedback in some domains (Kaliisa, et al., 2025) learner engagement and self-regulated learning are strengthened when AI use is embedded within intentional pedagogical design (Ng et. al., 2024; Wu et al., 2025), underscoring the centrality of the educator and educator judgement. These human dimensions of teaching are central to scaffolding learning, interpreting learner needs, and responding to the affective elements that shape educational experiences. The instructional example presented in this paper highlights the pedagogical labor involved in AI-enhanced instructional design. Behind seemingly simple learner-facing activities lies an iterative process of development, testing, refinement, and alignment with learning objectives and assessment criteria. This design work reflects the educator's role as facilitator, mediator, and designer, roles that are amplified rather than diminished by AI integration. For educators unfamiliar with Social Constructivist or UDL frameworks, engaging in this design process may present challenges, underscoring the importance of pedagogical preparation alongside technological fluency. This aligns with calls for AI literacy development among educators (Kohnke et al., 2025) and longstanding CALL scholarship emphasizing pedagogy over tool adoption (Bax, 2003; Hubbard, 2008).

5.3 Institutional Implications: Supporting Design-Based, AI-Enhanced Pedagogy

The design-intensive nature of today's classrooms, especially those with AI-enhanced instruction, carries important implications for institutions of higher learning. Effective integration of AI requires more than access to tools; it demands sustained professional development and institutional support structures that enable educators to design, implement, and refine pedagogically sound learning experiences. Professional development and institutional support are critical to effective AI integration (Crompton et al., 2024; Zhu & Wang, 2025), particularly given documented educator uncertainty surrounding adoption (Parviz & Arthur, 2025). Investment in professional development should be recognized and rewarded in ways comparable to research and service, acknowledging the expertise required to facilitate inclusive, learner-centered instruction and to integrate AI tools. Consider differentiating between research and teaching lines: research lines focus on grant acquisition and publication, whereas subject-matter experts with classroom assignments are required to actively engage in and document teaching-focused CEUs (continuing education units) through reputable organizations such as the Online Learning Consortium or Quality Matters. Support continuing education through funding and credit reassignment; 150 hours of documented continuing education through approved programs can earn a 3-credit release, with the expectation that the education is completed within a time frame, or conversely, every specified period of time SMEs would be granted a 3-credit release for focused training, with the expectation of x-hours of ongoing continuing ed per semester or academic year; or even require professional development hours be scheduled in the same manner that office hours are held.

In addition to educator-centric professional development, institutions must invest in support offices, such as the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL), Instructional Design, Instructional Technology, and Accessibility Specialists. These offices play a critical role in supporting educators as they navigate pedagogical frameworks, accessibility standards, and emerging technologies, consistent with research on UDL and accessible online

learning that emphasizes collaboration among faculty, instructional designers, and accessibility specialists (Behling & Tobin, 2018; Lowenthal & Lomellini, 2023). Institutional commitment to these support offices signals recognition that effective AI integration is a pedagogical endeavor rooted in human expertise, collaboration, and intentional design.

6. Conclusion

As artificial intelligence becomes increasingly embedded in (language) education, educators face a persistent challenge: how to integrate these tools in ways that enhance learning without undermining learner agency or diminishing the educator's pedagogical role. From the SC perspective, educators are responsible for scaffolding (the instructor creates the conceptual framework that AI plugs into), facilitating learning in the ZPD (AI can provide practice, feedback, and adaptive learning), curating tools (such as AI), and fostering metacognition (AI strengthens internalization). Through the lens of UDL, the educator's role is to recruit interest, help learners persist, and facilitate learner agency (Engagement); curate resources and create meaningful contexts for learning (Representation); and encourage creative, student-driven demonstrations of achievement (Action & Expression). AI offers numerous options that align with UDL principles. At the foundation of both frameworks, however, is the educator. When the educator is at the helm as a facilitator, concerns about AI overreliance, diminished pedagogical readiness, shallow learning, cognitive load, transparent and ethical use, and related issues are rendered negligible in the classroom. The educator interprets and designs learning with human values, empathy, and context. AI scales and adapts support, provides multimodal access, and reduces administrative burden, while UDL ensures flexibility and inclusion in the shared learning space where human mediation and AI scaffolding converge (ZPD). This paper contributes a theoretically grounded, design-oriented model that integrates Social Constructivism and UDL as complementary frameworks for AI-enhanced instruction. By illustrating how these frameworks can be operationalized in an L2 Spanish interpersonal communication task, the paper demonstrates that AI can serve as a scaffolded resource in educator-mediated learning environments. Although the example presented is situated within an L2-Spanish classroom, the framework integration and design principles advanced here are transferable across disciplines and instructional contexts where educators seek to align emerging technologies with inclusive, learner-centered pedagogy. Ultimately, Social Constructivism and UDL not only anchor the educator's role in AI-enhanced environments but also reveal it as more critical than ever. As AI continues to evolve, pedagogical frameworks that foreground human mediation, intentional design, and learner variability will be essential to ensuring that technological innovation serves educational purposes.

Appendices

A. Instructor Preparation – Custom GPT Generation

1. Register for a paid plan with ChatGPT.

   a. Log into your account, click on your profile icon to upgrade your plan.

2. Fill in the basics: activity name; description, and category.

3. Enter your prompt and test it. Note what is working well and not yet working and refine it by modifying and testing.

4. Migrate that version into a custom GPT by selecting GPTs Explore > +Create > Create / Configure. In Create you will chat with the builder about what you want to create and in Configure you will input the

prompt you've already generated to refine it further. This is where you're building your scaffolded instructions. The benefit to creating a custom GPT is that it keeps the prompt details behind the scenes.

5. The builder will offer the option to configure "starter lines" for learners, that will activate the behind-the-scenes prompt when learners launch their activity.

6. Next, you'll configure details such as restricting file uploads or web browsing (for controlled language tasks), as well as the share/publish settings (private, anyone with the link, everyone), and get the link to the custom GPT.

7. Finally, distribute the link to learners through the LMS.

8. Note that these instructions are general. The shape the steps take reflects the way you engage with ChatGPT and how you iterate the process.

    a. The steps for Instructor Preparation were generated collaboratively with ChatGPT.

B. Custom GPT Hidden Instructions

Role & Level: You are a friendly agente de viajes. Speak A1-A2, ACTFL-novice, level Spanish. Use short, clear sentences.

Flow: Start with "Quieres planear un viaje con tu familia o con tus amigos?, and then ask 5 follow-up questions about: destination, month/season, trip length, activities, budget/cost.

Feeback each turn: 1) one positive note, 2) one small improvement with a corrected model in Spanish. If the learner produces a correct statement, you don't need to submit a correction; submitting a small improvement to a correct statement can confuse and frustrate learners. Rather, offer praise, and provide an equivalent so that they have an additional way to express their idea.

Vary across attempts: When the learner restarts, rephrase questions and change details (e.g., playa vs lago; Julio vs Agosto) while keeping the same difficulty and sequence.

If code-switching occurs: Rephrase the learner's answer in correct Spanish and invite them to repeat it.

Tone: Encouraging, patient, supportive.

C. Learner Self-Assessment Option

How well can you do the following tasks? Use the scale provided.

1. I can discuss and plan vacations.

2. I can talk about my next vacation.

3. I can discuss travel destinations.

4. I can talk about the seasons.

5. I can talk about the weather.

6. I can talk about clothing options.

7. I can ask and respond to questions about vacation activities.

8. I can talk about the days of the week, the months of the year.

9. I can communicate clock-hours.

10. I can communicate the time of events.

11. I can ask and respond to questions for checking into a hotel.

12. I can ask and respond to questions for checking out of a hotel.

13. I can ask and respond to questions about restaurants and food.

14. I can discuss budgets and costs associated with the vacation.

15. I can discuss transportation options.

Scale:

- Excelente (Excellent): I know this well enough to teach it to someone.

- Muy bien (very well): I can do this with little or no mistakes.

- Más o menos (more or less): I can do this in general terms, but I still have some questions.

- Es difícil (It's difficult): I can only do this with help.

- Ayúdame (Help me!): I struggle with this, even with help.

References

ACTFL. (2015). National Standards Collaborative Board. (2014). *World-readiness standards for learning languages* (4th ed.). ACTFL.

Alharbi, W. (2023). AI in the Foreign Language Classroom: A Pedagogical Overview of Automated Writing Assistance Tools. *Educational Research International, 2023.* https://doi.org/10.1155/2023/4253331

Allen, W. H. (1963). Improving Instruction through Audio-Visual Media: Techniques in Teaching Science, Mathematics, and Modern Foreign Languages.

Amin, M. Y. M. (2023). AI and Chat GPT in Language Teaching: Enhancing EFL Classroom Support and Transforming Assessment Techniques. International Journal of Higher Education Pedagogies, 4(4), 1-15. https://doi.org/10.33422/ijhep.v4i4.554

Amjad, A. I., Aslam, S., & Tabassum, U. (2024). Tech-infused classrooms: A comprehensive study on the interplay of mobile learning, ChatGPT and social media in academic attainment. *European Journal of Education, 59*(2). https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12625

Barr, R. B., & Tagg, J. (1995). From Teaching to Learning - A New Paradigm For Undergraduate Education. *Change (New Rochelle, N.Y.), 27*(6), 12–26. https://doi.org/10.1080/00091383.1995.10544672

Bax, S. (2003). CALL—past, present and future. System, 31(1), 13–28. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(02)00071-4

Behling, K. T., & Tobin, T. J. (2018). Reach everyone, teach everyone: Universal design for learning in higher education. West Virginia University Press.

Call Annie. (2024). Callannie.ai. https://callannie.ai/

Carmona, C. E. (2022). Neuroeducación y diseño universal de aprendizaje: Una propuesta práctica para el aula inclusiva. Spain: Ediciones Octaedro.

CCEDIR | The Grove Center. (2024). Psu.edu. https://ccedir.science.psu.edu/

Chickering, A. W., & Gamson, Z. F. (1989). Seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education. Biochemical Education, 17(3), 140–141. https://doi.org/10.1016/0307-4412(89)90094-0

Crompton, H., Edmett, A., Ichaporia, N., & Burke, D. (2024). AI and English language teaching: Affordances and challenges. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 55, 2503-2529.* https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13460

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

Delello, J. A., Sung, W., Mokhtari, K., Hebert, J., Bronson, A., & De Giuseppe, T. (2025). *AI in the Classroom: Insights from Educators on Usage, Challenges, and Mental Health. Education Sciences, 15(2), 113.* https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15020113

Deng, R., Jian, M., Yu, X., Lu, Y., & Liu, S. (2025). Does ChatGPT enhance student learning? A systematic review and meta-analysis of experimental studies. *Computers & Education, 227.* https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2024.105224

Dooly, M., & Comas-Quinn, A. (2025). Access to technology and social justice. In J. Muñoz-Basols, M. Fuertes Gutiérrez, & L. Cerezo (Eds.), Technology-mediated language teaching: From social justice to artificial intelligence (pp. 21–?). Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781800419889-005

Bosworth, D. A. (2013). Learner-Centered Teaching: Putting the Research on Learning Into Practice - By Terry Doyle. *Teaching Theology & Religion*, 16, e107.

Ducar, C., & Schocket, D. H. (2018). Machine translation and the L2 classroom: Pedagogical solutions for making peace with Google translate. *Foreign Language Annals*, *51*(4), 779–795. https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12366

Dwivedi, Y. K., Kshetri, N., Hughes, L., Slade, E. L., Jeyaraj, A., Kar, A. K., … Wright, R. (2023). *So what if ChatGPT wrote it? Multidisciplinary perspectives on opportunities, challenges and implications of generative conversational AI for research, practice and policy. International Journal of Information Management, 71, 102642.* https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2023.102642

Fiori, M. L. (2005). The Development of Grammatical Competence through Synchronous Computer-mediated Communication. *CALICO Journal*, *22*(3), 567–602. https://doi.org/10.1558/cj.v22i3.567-602

Fisher, Nancy Lockwood (1995). An analysis of the attitudes of high school students toward mathematics after instituting the use of graphing calculators. Graduate Theses and Dissertations. 2659. https://ecommons.udayton.edu/graduate_theses/2659

Gordon, D., Meyer, A., & Rose, D. (2016). Universal Design for Learning. CAST Professional Publishing.

Greer, A., & Mott, V. (2009). Learner-centered teaching and the use of technology. *International Journal of Web-Based Learning and Teaching Technologies, 4*(4), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.4018/jwbltt.2009091501

Hannafin, R. D., & Savenye, W. C. (1993). Technology in the Classroom: The teacher's new role and resistance to It. Educational Technology, 33(6), 26–31. http://www.jstor.org/stable/44428000

Hockley, N. (2023). Artificial intelligence in English Language Teaching: The good, the bad, and the ugly. RELC Journal, 54 (2), 445-451. https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882231168504

Yu, H., Guo, Y., Yang, H., Zhang, W., & Dong, Y. (2025). Can ChatGPT Revolutionize Language Learning? Unveiling the Power of AI in Multilingual Education Through User Insights and Pedagogical Impact. *European Journal of Education*, *60*(1). https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12749

Hou, Z. & Min, S. (2025). Dialogue-based computer-assisted language learning systems for second language speaking development: A three-level meta-analysis. ReCALL FirstView, 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0958344025100268

Huang, S., & Cassany, D. (2025). Spanish language learning in the AI era: AI as a scaffolding tool. Journal of China Computer-Assisted Language Learning. https://doi.org/10.1515/jccall-2024-0026

Hubbard, P. (2008). CALL and the future of language teacher education. CALICO Journal, 25(2), 175-188. https://doi.org/10.1558/cj.v25i2.175-188

Ji, H., Han, I., Ko, Y. (2022). A systematic review of conversational AI in language education: Focusing on the collaboration with human teachers. *Journal of Research on Technology IN Eduction, 55(1), 48-63.* https://doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2022.2142873

Kaliisa, R., Misiejuk, K., López-Pernas, S., & Saqr, M. (2025). How does artificial intelligence compare to human feedback? A meta-analysis of performance, feedback perception, and learning dispositions. Educational Psychology, 1–32. https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2025.2553639

Kessler, G. (2018). Technology and the future of language teaching. Foreign Language Annals, 51(1), 205–218. https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12318

King, A. (1993). From Sage on the Stage to Guide on the Side. *College Teaching*, *41*(1), 30–35. https://doi.org/10.1080/87567555.1993.9926781

Kohnke, L., Zou, D., Ou, A. W., & Gu, M. M. (2025). *Preparing future educators for AI-enhanced classrooms: Insights into AI literacy and integration.* Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2025.100398

Kos'myna, Nataliya. (2025). Your Brain on ChatGPT: Accumulation of Cognitive Debt when Using and AI Assistant for Essay Writing Task. MIT Media Lab. https://www.media.mit.edu/publications/your-brain-on-chatgpt

Lee, S., Choe, H., Zou, D., & Jeon, J. (2025). Generative AI (GenAI) in the language classroom: A systematic review. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2025.2498537

Leis, A. (2025). How speech-to-text technology affects pronunciation gains and self-confidence in EFL learners. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2025.2534498L

uo, S., & Zou, D. (2024). University Learners' Readiness for ChatGPT-Assisted English Learning: Scale Development and Validation. *European Journal of Education.* https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12886

Lowenthal, P. R., & Lomellini, A. (2023). *Accessible Online Learning: A Preliminary Investigation of Educational Technologists' and Faculty Members' Knowledge and Skills. TechTrends: Linking Research and Practice to Improve Learning, 67(2), 384–392. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-022-00790-1*

Meyer, A., Rose, D. H., & Gordon, D. T. (2024). Universal Design for Learning: Principles, Framework, and Practice: Updated Edition of Anne Meyer and David H. Rose's Foundational Text. CAST Professional Publishing.

Miller, M. (2023). *AI for educators: Learning strategies, teacher efficiencies, and a vision for an artificial intelligence future*. Ditch That Textbook.

MirrorTalk - Reflect with AI. (2025, October 23). Swivl. https://mirrortalk.ai

Mohsen, M. A., Althebi, S., Alsagour, R., Alsalem, A., Almudawi, A., & Alshahrani, A. (2024). Forty-two years of computer-assisted language learning research: A scientometric study of hotspot research and trending issues. ReCALL, 36(2), 230–249. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0958344023000253

Muñoz-Basols, J., Fuertes Gutiérrez, M., & Cerezo, L. (Eds.). (2025). *Technology-mediated language teaching: From social justice to artificial intelligence*. ISBN 9781800419889

Ng, K., Chee Wei Tan, & Lok, K. (2024). Empowering student self-regulated learning and science education through ChatGPT: A pioneering pilot study. *British Journal of Educational Technology.* https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13454

Niño, A. (2009). Machine translation in foreign language learning: Language learners' and tutors' perceptions of its advantages and disadvantages. ReCALL, 21(2), 241-258. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0958344009000172

Novak, K. (2023). *Dua ahora!: una guía del profesor para aplicar el diseño universal para el aprendizaje* (Tercera edición). IPG-ACADEMIC.

Obaidoon, S., & Wei, H. (2024). ChatGPT, Bard, Bing Chat, and Claude generate feedback for Chinese as foreign language writing: A comparative case study. *Future in Educational Research*, *2*(3), 184–204. https://doi.org/10.1002/fer3.39

Parviz, M., & Arthur, F. (2025). AI anxiety in English language education: A study of Iranian EFL teachers' perceptions and demographic influences. International Journal of Computer-Assisted Language Learning and Teaching, 15(1), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.4018/IJCALLT.386135

Alba Pastor, C. (Coord.) (2022). Enseñar pensando en todos los estudiantes. El modelo de Diseño Universal para el Aprendizaje (DUA). Madrid, Ediciones SM, 320 pp. *Estudios Sobre Educación : ESE*, *45*, 219–221. https://doi.org/10.15581/004.45.219

Pérez-Núñez, A. (2024). ChatGPT in Spanish language instruction: exploring AI-driven task generation and its implications for teaching practices. Journal of Spanish Language Teaching, 11(1), 61–82. https://doi.org/10.1080/23247797.2024.2366053

Perplexity AI. (2024). *Perplexity AI*. Www.perplexity.ai. https://www.perplexity.ai

Prince, M. (2004). Does Active Learning Work? A Review of the Research. *Journal of Engineering Education*, *93*(3), 223–231. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2004.tb00809.x

Reflection Framework and Prompts | Centre for Teaching Excellence. (2016, January 8). Centre for Teaching Excellence. https://uwaterloo.ca/centre-for-teaching-excellence/resources/reflection-framework-and-prompts

Rezai, A., Soyoof, A., & Reynolds, B. (2024). Disclosing the Correlation Between Using ChatGPT and Well-Being in EFL Learners: Considering the Mediating Role of Emotion Regulation. *European Journal of Education*. https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12752

Sharma, N., Murray, K., & Xiao, Z. (2025). *Faux-Polyglot: A Study on Information Disparity in Multilingual Large Language Models. 8090-8107*. *10.18653/v1/2025.naacl-long.411*

Son, J.-B., Ružić, N. K., & Philpott, A. (2025). Artificial intelligence technologies and applications for language learning and teaching. Journal of China Computer-Assisted Language Learning, 5(1), 94–112. https://doi.org/10.1515/jccall-2023-0015

Thorpe, D. (2020, December 15). *Be SMART About Your Goal Setting*. Business Advisor, Mentor and Executive Coach - Doug Thorpe. https://dougthorpe.com/be-smart-about-your-goal-setting/

van Lier, L. (1995). Vygotskian approaches to second language research. Lantolf, James P. and Appel, Gabriela (Eds .). Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1994. Pp. viii + 221. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 17(3), 416–418. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100014303

Varghese, M., Morgan, B., Johnston, B., & Johnson, K. (2005). Theorizing language teacher identity: Three perspectives and beyond. Journal of Language, Identity & Education, 4(1), 21–44. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327701jlie0401_2

Vinall, K., Wen, W., & Hellmich, E.A. (2024). Investigating L2 writers' uses of machine translation and other online tools. *Foreign Language Annals, 57(7), 499-526)*. https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12733

Warschauer, M. (1996). Computer-assisted language learning: An introduction. In S. Fotos (Ed.), *Multimedia language teaching (pp 3-20). Tokyo:* Logos International.

Warschauer, M. (2000). The changing global economy and the future of English teaching. TESOL Quarterly, 34(3), 511-535. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587741

Weimer, M. (2013). *Learner-centered teaching: Five key changes to practice* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Wu, X., Li, R., Y Gwendoline Quek, C.L. (2025). When AI chatbots meet self-determination: unpacking Chinese EFL learners' engagement in chatbot-assisted language learning. *Interactive Learning Environments,* 1-21. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2025.2538756

Xiao Feiwen, Zhao Priscilla, Sha Hanyue, Yang Dandan, & Warschauer Mark. (2023). Conversational agents in language learning. Journal of China Computer-Assisted Language Learning, 4(2), 300–325. https://doi.org/10.1515/jccall-2022-0032

Yuan, H. (2025). Artificial intelligence in language learning: biometric feedback and adaptive reading for improved comprehension and reduced anxiety. *Humanities & Social Sciences Communication, 12(1), 1-16.* https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-025-04878-w

Zhou, Anju (2023). Investigating the impact of online language exchanges on second language speaking and willingness to communicate Chinese EFL learners: a mixed methods study. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *14*, 1177922. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1177922

Zhu, M., & Wang, C. (2025). A systematic review of research on AI in language education: Current status and future implications. Language Learning & Technology, 29(1), 1–28 https://doi.org/10.64152/10125/73606

Zou, B., Wang, C., Yan, Y., Du, X., & Ji, Y. (2025). Exploring English as a Foreign Language Learners' Adoption and Utilisation of ChatGPT for Speaking Practice Through an Extended Technology Acceptance Model. International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 35(2), 689–704. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12658