Journal of Language Teaching, *6*(1), 1-8, 2026
https://doi.org/10.54475/jlt.2026.002

Check for updates

Feature

OPEN ACCESS

Curricular alignment in AI-mediated language teaching: An exploratory study on Russian as a foreign language

Bastian Fuchs

Language Learning Center, Rhenish Friedrich Wilhelm University of Bonn, Germany

Received: December 11, 2025 / Accepted: January 8, 2026 / Published Online: January 12, 2026
© 2026 Bastian Fuchs. Published by Pioneer Publications Ltd.
This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0).

Abstract

The adoption of generative AI tools in language education has provided teachers with new opportunities to personalize learning, design syllabi, create and modify content, and offer their learners more detailed feedback (Chaika et al., 2025; Kohnke et al., 2023; Wan & Moorhouse, 2025). However, most implementations remain decentralized and are often driven by individual teachers' practices rather than institutional strategy, and frequently lack a solid theoretical or pedagogical foundation. This is particularly true for languages other than English, where empirical research is still limited. Without explicit curricular alignment, AI-generated materials can fall short of instructional goals, leading to missed opportunities for meaningful and sustainable integration. This article addresses these gaps by exploring how GenAI can assist teachers in lesson planning and content creation in alignment with CEFR-based curricular requirements. Drawing on the author's own teaching experience with a university-level Russian as a foreign language course (B1.1), it illustrates how AI tools like ChatGPT can be used to generate a syllabus, level-appropriate vocabulary lists, learning materials, text type templates, and communicative tasks. In addition to practical applications, the article critically reflects on the evolving role of teachers in AI-mediated classrooms, advocating for a human–AI co-teaching approach instead of the commonly perceived "AI versus teacher" dichotomy still prevalent in professional discourse. By combining a review of current research with classroom-based insights, this article offers a practice-oriented exploration of GenAI's potentials and challenges for curriculum-aligned language teaching. While the case study focuses on Russian at the university level, the observations can be applied to other languages and contexts. The article is intended for language instructors and curriculum developers working within CEFR-based frameworks, especially in higher education and language learning centers.

Keywords GenAI, AI-mediated language teaching, curriculum design, CEFR, RFL

1. Introduction

In the past three years, a growing body of educational research and teaching practices has demonstrated the potential of generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) to support language learning, particularly in developing subskills such as writing (Tseng & Lin, 2024) and speaking (Du & Daniel, 2024). However, existing studies emphasize the learners' use of GenAI, with far less attention paid to the teachers' perspective with integration of GenAI in lesson planning, material creation, or curriculum alignment (Dogan et al., 2023; Tolstykh & Oshchepkova, 2024). Moreover, most of this work has focused on English, while other languages such as Russian remain underrepresented (for Russian, see Dornicheva & Birzer, 2023; Fuchs & Rönnau, 2025; Pape & Steinbach, 2025; Pribble, 2024).

GenAI tools can be used for a wide range of purposes, including lesson planning, personalized instruction, assessment, and professional development (Akinsemolu & Onyeaka, 2025; Kasneci et al., 2023; Pegrum, 2025). As a result, many educators have begun experimenting with them to create differentiated learning content. Yet, the extent to which GenAI is transforming teaching practices remains contested. Some scholars describe this shift as a *reconfiguration* or *recalibration* of classroom activities, involving adjustments to traditional teaching (Alm, 2025; Barrot, 2023; Muñoz-Basols et al., 2023). Others go further, framing the current developments as a *fundamental reshaping* of education, a *paradigm shift*, or even a *revolution* in language teaching (Daud et al., 2025; Isemonger, 2023; Kim et al., 2025; Muñoz-Basols & Fuertes Gutiérrez, 2025). While these perspectives highlight the positive and transformative potential of GenAI, they may also contribute to teachers' hesitation, skepticism, or resistance, especially when they are uncertain about how to adapt their established practices to a new teaching and learning reality (Kasneci et al., 2023; Ukwandu et al., 2025). Due to the lack of institutional AI-guidelines in schools and universities, implementation of GenAI is often decentralized, relying on individual teachers' motivation, AI literacy, and available time (Al-Mughairi & Bhaskar, 2025; Daud et al., 2025; Stockwell,

2025). Empirical studies on the systematic integration of GenAI into curriculum implementation are still rare (Karataş et al., 2024; see also Gupta & Bhaskar, 2020, for a review of motivating and inhibiting factors of AI-based teaching).

One key challenge is that AI-generated materials rarely meet curricular standards. Even with carefully constructed prompts specifying the CEFR level (e.g., B1; Council of Europe, 2001) or thematic focus area (e.g., vocabulary on hobbies), but without access to the underlying curriculum, syllabus, or assessment expectations, the outputs tend to be generic or superficial, causing teachers' frustration or leading them to abandon GenAI tools at this point. A recent meta-study by Daud et al. (2025) illustrates this gap: fewer than 20% of the reviewed studies (4 out of 22) addressed curriculum and instructional design as a use case, while 45% (10 out of 22) focused on incorporating GenAI tools, and 27% (6 out of 22) examined GenAI for assessment and feedback (p. 683). On the one hand, this imbalance is understandable. The targeted use of GenAI for writing assistance or grammar check is more tangible and immediate than abstract curricular elements such as learning objectives. On the other hand, this lack of curricular focus is concerning, since the thorough use of GenAI requires well-founded pedagogical and methodological considerations (Tolstykh & Oshchepkova, 2024). Similarly, Ukwandu et al. (2025) advocate for a "more intentional and considered application [of GenAI] within teaching and learning" (p. 5), while Karataş et al. (2024) highlight the potential of GenAI to "dynamically tailor educational content to the diverse needs of students" (p. 156). Other scholars emphasize the value of GenAI in offering personalized learning, including differentiated content, pacing, objectives, and activities (Muñoz-Basols & Fuertes Gutiérrez, 2025, p. 303).

Based on these desiderata, the present article explores the following questions: 1) How can GenAI tools facilitate the teaching process while aligning with curricular requirements? and 2) What roles do GenAI and teachers play in AI-mediated instruction? The insights presented are based on the author's own classroom experience and exploratory use of GenAI in a university-level Russian language course (CEFR B1.1). The article focuses on curricular alignment in lesson planning and content creation, using ChatGPT-5/5.1 (OpenAI, 2025, Plus version) and the GPT-4/GPT-5 models offered by *fobizz* (2025). It does not address learner-centered GenAI applications (Karataş et al., 2024b; Kohnke et al. 2023), AI-driven reformulation of learning objectives (Neumann et al., 2023), broader curriculum adaptations (Karataş et al., 2024a), or theoretical frameworks for AI-mediated instruction (Ukwandu et al., 2025).

2. AI-Mediated Lesson Planning and Content Creation

AI-mediated lesson planning can take place at multiple levels, which can also be addressed independently, and does not imply that every step must involve GenAI. Rather, teachers can selectively integrate GenAI tools depending on their needs, goals and available time. The main question is *why* teachers should use GenAI for lesson planning and content creation. The most immediate reason is increased efficiency through saving time while enhancing teaching quality (Hubbard & Schulze, 2025; Wan & Moorhouse, 2025). Beyond efficiency, Karataş et al. (2024a), for example, highlight "AI's transformative potential in curriculum adaptation, making education more engaging, relevant and personalised" (p. 154).

Moundridou et al. (2024) proposed a classification of GenAI tools for education, outlining four primary functions:

1. *Planning*: supporting the design of instruction for "individual activities, lesson plans, or entire courses";
2. *Content creation*: generating learning materials in different formats;
3. *Evaluation*: assisting in evaluating students' learning;
4. *Teaching assistants*: aiding in the delivery of instruction (p. 4).

This article focuses on the first two areas—*lesson planning* (in terms of syllabus design) and *content creation* (in terms of vocabulary, learning materials, text types, and tasks)—for a university-level Russian course (CEFR B1.1). The curriculum design drew on principles of backward design (Richards, 2013, 2017; Wiggins & McTighe, 2005) and incorporated learning objectives (communicative competences), progression from adjacent sublevels (A2 and B1.2), relevant text types, and targeted grammar structures.

2.1. Syllabus Design

Syllabus design in language education is a complex and multilayered process shaped by a range of factors, including institutional frameworks, curricular requirements, target groups, context of language use, and teacher experience (Robinson, 2011). For language teachers, this process might be particularly time-consuming: unlike disciplines such as mathematics or history, both social discourse and language teaching materials evolve rapidly. As a result, instructional materials must be regularly reviewed to ensure their relevance and topicality, even though underlying grammar structures remain stable over time. It is no longer feasible to teach modern languages using textbooks from 2016, just as today's materials will likely be outdated by 2036.

Teachers are required to align their syllabi with institutional curricula, though implementation often varies across individual teachers and languages and depends heavily on available learning resources. In this context, GenAI offers promising support. Several studies point to the potential of GenAI tools to assist in lesson planning (Kasneci et al., 2023; Moundridou et al., 2024; Pegrum, 2025). For example, ElSayary (2023) found that foreign language teachers reported the greatest benefits of using ChatGPT in *lesson planning*, while areas such as *teaching and learning*, *assessment and feedback*, and *benefits and challenges* scored slightly lower. However, the category *lesson planning* did not include any items related to curriculum alignment, limiting its relevance for the present article (p. 937). In another study, Edmett et al. (2024) reported that 43% of English teachers surveyed had used GenAI to create lesson plans, though the extent to

which these were aligned with curricular objectives remained unspecified. A more detailed account is provided in a longitudinal case study by Octavio et al. (2024), in which an English teacher used ChatGPT over several months to develop curriculum-aligned lesson topics, materials, and activities (p. 10). Alignment with the curriculum and the student profiles (age and language proficiency) was confirmed through the appropriateness of the generated outputs.

The level of syllabus design support GenAI can offer depends largely on the underlying curriculum. In curricula guided by backward design—as in the case of the described Russian course—the responsibility for selecting lesson topics lies with the teacher, who then connects these topics to targeted communicative competences and progression criteria. For the Russian course, a GenAI-generated syllabus was created by providing the chatbot with structured input (number and duration of sessions, topics, focus areas, and the CEFR level). It is important to note that high-quality output is rarely achieved on the first attempt. Multiple iterative reprompting was required to meet the desired level of specificity and alignment. As Heaps (2024) suggests, uploading previous syllabi can enhance GenAI's performance (p. 75); however, this strategy was not used in the present case due to significant curricular changes from the last semester. Furthermore, particular care was taken to avoid sharing any personal or institutional data. As Ukwandu et al. (2025) caution, information entered into LLMs may be used for future training and "publicly disclosed" (p. 5). To ensure data protection, all identifying details were added manually only after downloading the output.

2.2. Thematic Vocabulary Creation

Vocabulary instruction in language teaching is typically more dependent on topical content than grammar, which can be taught independently of the topics covered. Most textbooks provide ready-made vocabulary lists organized by unit or topic. However, these lists may not always align with institutional curricula or the specific needs of a current learning group. GenAI tools offer an efficient way to generate thematic vocabulary lists that can supplement or replace textbook resources while giving teachers more freedom in their methodological decisions and reducing their dependence on textbooks. In the Russian course, vocabulary lists were created for seven topics covered throughout the semester: *Travel and tourism, Student life in Germany and Russia, Lifestyle and priorities of young people, Hobbies and interests, Society and volunteering, Russian language in the world,* and *Exam periods in German and Russian universities*. These lists served as core vocabulary sets to support curriculum goals and make the course and exam requirements more transparent for the learners.

However, teachers must always critically review AI-generated lists to ensure that the suggested vocabulary corresponds to the targeted CEFR level. Adjustments were necessary with Russian, as the outputs included both overly simple—already covered at A2—as well as overly advanced items—expected at B2—indicating that the progression criteria between sublevels were not consistently respected. Uchida's (2025) findings on ChatGPT(4o)'s alignment with the CEFR levels in English support this observation: „While the texts generated by ChatGPT may appear to vary by level on the surface, they do not adequately reflect CEFR levels upon closer examination. […] Specifically, the A1 and A2 levels tend to be overly simplified, B1 exhibits some variability, and the B2, C1, and C2 levels are excessively complex." (p. 10). Since Uchida's (2025) study focused on English, it would be important for future research to explore the alignment between CEFR and AI-generated texts in other languages and with other GenAI tools. The CEFR alignment becomes even more relevant when sublevels are finely graded (e.g., B1.1 and B1.2) and defined locally by teachers or curriculum developers.

GenAI tools can also assist in the organization of vocabulary within broader topics. For example, within the topic *Travel and tourism*, the generated vocabulary was grouped into eight subcategories providing a clear structure for the learners: *Travel preparation and general information*, *Accommodation*, *Transportation and mobility*, *Flights and tickets*, *Luggage and documents*, *Types of tourism and activities*, *Culture and sightseeing*, and *Experiences and orientation*. The generated lists entailed core functional and thematic vocabulary for the Russian course, while focusing on describing facts, routines and experiences, as required by the curriculum.

2.3. Learning Materials Creation and Customization

Another area of GenAI-supported teaching is the creation and customization of learning materials that align with curricular requirements (Tolstykh & Oshchepkova, 2024). As Ukwandu et al. (2025) note, GenAI can produce "new and original content, such as images, computer codes, videos, and texts that cannot be easily differentiated from human-created content" (p. 3), making it highly applicable to language teaching. This form of GenAI integration is already being actively practiced by teachers worldwide. In a study by Edmett et al. (2024), 57% of English teachers reported using GenAI for material creation, although the study does not specify the types or purposes of the materials generated. In the context of language teaching, GenAI tools can produce a variety of formats, including written text, audio files (e.g., via *ElevenLabs*), podcasts (e.g., *NotebookLM*), and avatar-based videos (e.g., *HeyGen*), which is especially useful for intermediate levels such as B1 due to the difficulties in finding level-appropriate materials (for an overview of tools and their applications, see Pegrum, 2025, and Tolstykh & Oshchepkova, 2024).

In the Russian course, a wide range of texts was created using GenAI, based on predefined grammar structures, vocabulary lists, and other curricular requirements. As with the syllabus, the initial outputs were refined through iterative prompting to ensure appropriateness to the CEFR and alignment with curricular requirements. This process significantly improved efficiency, as it reduced the need for time-consuming searches for suitable materials in external sources.

If teachers, however, prefer to work with existing (i.e.,

not initially GenAI-generated) materials, these can be adapted or customized with the help of GenAI. According to Chaika et al. (2025), this process takes into account "learners' proficiency levels, interests, and learning objectives, ensuring relevance and engagement" (p. 13). While this is not content creation in the strict sense, since the original materials are being revised rather than generated, it is still a valuable approach. Needless to say, copyright must be considered while working with external materials. There are various ways to customize such content. In the Russian course, authentic texts (e.g., online articles) were shortened and reformulated to reduce their grammatical, lexical, and syntactic complexity. At the same time, they were enriched with target grammar structures and vocabulary items. As in previous use cases, teacher intervention was necessary to ensure the level-appropriateness of the customized materials. Nonetheless, the use of GenAI reduced the teacher's workload significantly. In the future, more dynamic and adaptive content could replace "rigid curricula, standardised assessments, and limited personalisation" (Timon, 2023, p. 5; Gentile et al., 2023).

A common concern among language teachers is whether AI-generated content qualifies as "authentic." *AI-generated* does not automatically mean inauthentic. On the contrary, this approach offers teachers greater flexibility in controlling the grammar and vocabulary in accordance with curricular specifications. As with the previous point, this is particularly beneficial at intermediate levels, at which authentic materials are often only partially suitable due to their lexical and syntactic complexity and therefore require extensive adaptation by the teacher. Furthermore, it is time to reconsider what authenticity means in the age of GenAI. Traditionally, authentic linguistic material has been defined as content produced by humans, usually L1 speakers. Yet, in learners' increasing daily interactions with AI chatbots outside the classroom, this view is reversed. It is the AI-generated input that defines *authentic* in terms of interactional relevance, compared to texts produced by human communication partners.

2.4. Text Types Templates Creation

Another valuable function of GenAI is its ability to create curriculum-aligned templates for various text types (Hubbard & Schulze, 2025). A major advantage of using AI-generated templates is that they can be tailored directly to curricular specifications, including the CEFR-based *can-do* descriptors. This is not always the case with external sources, such as exemplary texts in textbooks or materials found online, which may diverge from the established learning goals and cannot be modified directly by the teacher.

In the Russian course, templates for five text types required by the curriculum were generated: a *social media announcement*, a *blogpost*, an *email*, an *interview*, and a *personal experience report*. Each template was aligned with the B1.1 requirements in terms of grammar and vocabulary and evaluated by the teacher as fully meeting the curriculum requirements. Such templates have proven effective, as they provided learners with text templates that reflected the level-specific requirements expected in both classroom activities and the final written exam. These included progression criteria such as text length and structure, content complexity, lexical range, and grammatical accuracy. This support is especially beneficial in heterogeneous groups in university language classes, where learners often come from diverse academic backgrounds and possess varying degrees of communicative experience. In classroom implementation, it is useful to present one template per text type while highlighting alternative textual structures and formulations, encouraging stylistic variation.

2.5. Task Creation

Another application of GenAI in language teaching is the creation of tasks and classroom activities based on curriculum requirements, vocabulary lists, and external materials such as YouTube videos or podcasts. These tasks can be applied at different stages of the lesson (e.g., warm-up, practice, review), include both separated (e.g., writing) and integrative (e.g., writing based on previous listening or reading) skills and be used for interaction and mediation activities.

In the Russian course, GenAI was used, for example, to generate an integrated writing task focused on the text type of *email*. According to the curriculum, an email at this level was defined as a "written, semi-formal to formal message in digital format for communication in familiar one-to-one situations in study-related and daily contexts." The curriculum also provided the following productive *can-do* descriptors, which were embedded directly into the prompt:

- *Can formulate the salutation, introduction, main body, closing formula, and greeting in a manner appropriate for the addressee*
- *Can state the reason for the email directly*
- *Can formulate the request in a concrete and understandable manner*
- *Can ask for information/support or offer help/support*

The resulting task generated by the chatbot was as follows:

You have met a classmate who wants to enroll in the Russian course B1.2 in the summer term 2026. He has sent you an email asking you to tell him about your experience learning Russian and to give him some advice. Write him a reply (120–150 words):

1. *Greet your classmate and explain why you are writing him an email.*
2. *Tell him when and where you started learning Russian and why you decided to learn it.*
3. *Describe what you like and what you find difficult about learning Russian.*
4. *Watch the linked video about Ira's tips on learning Russian (turn on the Russian subtitles!). Choose one of Ira's tips. Briefly describe it and explain whether you agree with her.*
5. *Give your own tip: What helps you learn Russian?*
6. *Ask a question or ask your classmate to share his*

experience of learning other languages.

7. *Say goodbye.*

Don't forget to use the correct email structure (greeting, introduction, main body, conclusion, farewell) and a semi-formal style!

The task design was directly informed by the curricular communicative descriptors, ensuring that the targeted productive skills were addressed. In addition, although not explicitly stated, the task was designed to encourage active use of grammar structures and vocabulary covered in class so far. This aligns with the action-oriented approach of the CEFR, where learners are expected to use language in real-world scenarios. For example, learners were guided to express their opinions using phrases like *я согласен* 'I agree', *я так не думаю* 'I don't think so', *это зависит от* 'it depends on'; justify their views using connectors like *потому что* 'because'; give advice using imperatives like *читай/смотри/слушай* 'read/watch/listen' or modal constructions like *тебе можно/нужно/следует* 'you can/have to/should'; engage the recipient by asking questions. When compiled, this AI-generated task fully met the curricular requirements.

3. Advantages of GenAI for Teachers

After illustrating various use cases of GenAI in lesson planning and content creation, this section summarizes its advantages for language teachers. Recognizing the added value of GenAI is crucial for its integration into everyday teaching practice as a "part of the regular activities of a language teacher" (Hubbard & Schulze, 2025, p. 12). Otherwise, GenAI would become an additional burden and time waste leading to rejection among teachers (Kim, 2024).

One of the main advantages is the increase in efficiency, as content can be generated with much less time spent on searching for appropriate materials in textbooks and on the Internet (Karataş et al., 2024a). A further advantage is the ability to align materials with institutional curricula and the CEFR levels from the outset. However, a common misconception is that it is enough to simply mention a CEFR level (e.g., B1) in a prompt and to expect the chatbot to generate level-appropriate output. While some CEFR-based lexical classifications exist—for example, in the Oxford Learner's Dictionaries (n.d.), which assign words to CEFR levels (e.g., *apartment* as A1, *campsite* as B1, *itinerary* as C1)—the exact criteria behind these classifications are not always fully transparent. It remains questionable to what extent vocabulary alignment with CEFR scales is both language-independent and empirically validated (Hulstijn, 2014; Wisniewski, 2018). Furthermore, CEFR levels are not inherent categories of any language and must be explicitly "taught" to GenAI.

GenAI also provides access to dynamic linguistic corpora (Barrot, 2023). While content for beginner levels (A1–A2) can often be drawn directly from textbooks, it becomes more difficult to find up-to-date, high-quality material for more complex topics at higher proficiency levels (B2–C2). Moreover, existing online content may quickly become outdated. GenAI can be used for material creation according to specific learning objectives or language usage contexts (e.g., academic or professional).

Until recently, ChatGPT was designed only for individual use. The launching of group chats by OpenAI in November 2025 represented a significant step forward towards collaborative learning and teaching. These chats function like group messengers, with ChatGPT embedded as a shared assistant among multiple users. Teachers can now create lesson plans together and share and discuss their ideas and tasks with each other. They can also be better supervised by curriculum developers via shared group chats.

Last but not least, GenAI offers potential for sustainable teaching. As teachers interact more with a chatbot over time, they develop an efficient workflow. The chatbot begins to deeply "understand" its human conversation partner and his/her preferred teaching methods, task formats, and needs. Teachers can reuse the same chats for future courses, either with new learners at the same level (e.g., B1.1) or with the same learners progressing to the next level (e.g., B1.2), allowing the chatbot to "learn" the targeted language as well.

4. Human–AI Co-Teaching

A critical dimension of working with GenAI is developing a clear understanding of the roles that teachers and GenAI play. This final section reflects on the concept of *human–AI co-teaching* as a collaborative mode. A common concern among teachers is the fear of being replaced by GenAI and the devaluation of their professional expertise. Given the rapid development and wide range of capabilities GenAI tools offer, such concerns are not unfounded. Consciously or not, many teachers see a choice between them and GenAI. However, this "replacement perspective" is misleading. There is a need to shift towards an "augmentation perspective", where "[h]umans and AI are considered equal team members, co-orchestrate complex teaching activities, and achieve the effect that neither humans nor AI can complete independently" (Kim, 2024, p. 8696). Recent literature on GenAI in education refers to this co-teaching process as *co-literacy* (Alm, 2025), *joint work* (Cogo et al., 2024) or *symbiotic relationship* (Stockwell, 2024). Together with learners, this relationship results in what UNESCO (2024) calls a "triangular interaction" (p. 18).

Developing co-teaching should be accompanied by the awareness of humans' and GenAI's strengths and limitations. Alm (2025) argues that "while AI excels in information synthesis and organisation, it lacks contextual awareness and ethical judgement, requiring human input to verify the output" (p. 62). Similarly, Hubbard and Schulze (2025) highlight "speed, accuracy, consistency, and task focus" as GenAI's advantages, but also its "lacking [...] emotional intelligence, awareness of the institutional context, and personal memory" as its deficits (p. 4).

Integration of GenAI into teaching does not require educators to discard their established practices. On the contrary, teachers can use GenAI to update, adapt, or revise existing resources and come up with new, innovative

ideas without losing their materials. As Hubbard and Schulze (2025) recommend in their principles of GenAI-SIPD (*Sustained Integrated Professional Development*), teachers might "find existing tasks or activities that look promising in terms of increasing efficiency or effectiveness and try using GenAI as a tool to improve them" (p. 12–13).

As mentioned earlier, teachers should keep in mind that GenAI-generated content is not always reliable (Karataş et al., 2024a) and that fulfilling the curricular requirements remains their responsibility (Kostka & Toncelli, 2023; Schulze, 2025). Teachers must evaluate GenAI outputs on their linguistic accuracy, level appropriateness, and cultural biases, among many other factors. Regardless of whether educators view using GenAI as *recalibration*, *fundamental reshaping*, or a *paradigm shift*, its thoughtful implementation is not a short process. As UNESCO (2024) emphasizes, it is rather a "complex, context-dependent process that is neither hierarchical nor linear" (p. 21–22). While institutional and collegial support is important, teachers must also explore the possibilities and limitations of GenAI at their own pace (Colpaert, 2025; Stockwell, 2025).

5. Conclusion

This article set out to explore two questions: 1) How can GenAI tools facilitate the teaching process while aligning with curricular requirements? and 2) What roles do GenAI and teachers play in AI-mediated instruction? Drawing on both current educational research and the author's personal classroom experience, this exploratory reflection examined the integration of GenAI into lesson planning and content creation in a Russian language course at CEFR level B1.1. With regard to the first question, the use of GenAI was shown to be highly supportive, particularly in generating curriculum-aligned materials, despite the time invested and need for iterative refinement. In addressing the second question, the article emphasized the importance of teachers' critical thinking, reflection, and role awareness in AI-mediated instruction. As with all digital competences in the last few decades, teachers will develop their AI expertise at their own pace, but it is crucial to start now. Sooner or later, teachers may need to confront a rhetorical question: "GenAI might not replace teachers, but will teachers using it replace those who don't?" (Cogo et al., 2024, p. 376).

Dr. Bastian Fuchs is Research Assistant and Instructor of Russian at the Language Learning Center of the Rhenish Friedrich Wilhelm University of Bonn, Germany. He is responsible for the curriculum design of language courses. His research and professional interests include the implementation of the CEFR in higher education language programs, the integration of generative AI in language teaching and learning, bilingualism and heritage linguistics, and the teaching of Russian as a foreign and heritage language.
Email: bastian.fuchs@uni-bonn.de

References

Akinsemolu, A. A., & Onyeaka, H. (2025). The role of Artificial Intelligence in transforming language learning: Opportunities and ethical considerations. *Journal of Language and Education*, *11*(1), 148–152. https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2025.22118

Alm, A. (2025). Reconceptualising literacy as co-literacy in language education with AI. In Y. Wang, A. Alm, & G. Dizon (Eds.), *Insights into AI and language teaching and learning* (pp. 53–76). Castledown.

Al-Mughairi, H., & Bhaskar, P. (2025). Exploring the factors affecting the adoption AI techniques in higher education: Insights from teachers' perspectives on ChatGPT. *Journal of Research in Innovative Teaching and Learning*, *18*(2), 232–247. https://doi.org/10.1108/JRIT-09-2023-0129

Barrot, J. S. (2023). Using ChatGPT for second language writing: Pitfalls and potentials. *Assessing Writing*, *57*, Article 100745. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2023.100745

Chaika, O., Sharmanova, N., & Berezovska-Savchuk, N. (2025). Designing English and Ukrainian language courses with AI tools: Comparative approach. In O. Chaika (Ed.), *Educational policy and reforms: The impact of globalization* (pp. 5–34). Technology Center PC. https://doi.org/10.15587/978-617-8360-20-7.ch1

Cogo, A., Patsko, L., & Szoke, J. (2024). Generative Artificial Intelligence and ELT. *ELT Journal*, *78*(4), 373–377. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccae051

Colpaert, J. (2025). The added value of AI for language teaching and learning. In Y. Wang, A. Alm, & G. Dizon (Eds.), *Insights into AI and language teaching and learning* (pp. v–ix). Castledown.

Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. https://www.coe.int/en/web/common-european-framework-reference-languages

Crosthwaite, P., & Ma, Q. (2025). AI and language assessment. In Y. Wang, A. Alm, & G. Dizon (Eds.), *Insights into AI and language teaching and learning* (pp. 77–96). Castledown.

Daud, A., Aulia, A. F., Muryanti, Harfal, Z., Nabilla, O., & Ali, H. S. (2025). Integrating Artificial Intelligence into English language teaching: A systematic review. *European Journal of Educational Research*, *14*(2), 677–691. https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.14.2.677

Dogan, M. E., Goru Dogan, T., Bozkurt, A. (2023). The use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in online learning and distance education processes: A systematic review of empirical studies. *Applied Sciences*, *13*(5), Article 3056. https://doi.org/10.3390/app13053056

Dornicheva, D., & Birzer, S. (2023). Playing at conversation. Chatbots in Russian language teaching. In S. V. Nuss, & V. V. Kogan (Eds.), *Dynamic teaching of Russian. Games and gamification of learning* (pp. 190–208). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003369721

Du, J., & Daniel, B. K. (2024). Transforming language education: A systematic review of AI-powered chatbots for English as a foreign language speaking practice. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *6*, Article 100230.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100230
Edmett, A., Ichaporia, N., Crompton, H., & Crichton, R. (2024). *Artificial Intelligence and English language teaching: Preparing for the future* (2nd ed.). British Council. https://doi.org/10.57884/78EA-3C69
ElSayary, A. (2023). An investigation of teachers' perceptions of using ChatGPT as a supporting tool for teaching and learning in the digital era. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, *40*(3), 931–945. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12926
Fuchs, B., & Rönnau, M. (2025). Russisch lernen mit Künstlicher Intelligenz im universitären Kontext: Ein niveau-übergreifender Methodenkurs. *SlavUn – Slavische Sprachen Unterrichten, Themenheft „KI-basierte Anwendungen in der Vermittlung slavischer Sprachen"*, *2*, 13–29. https://doi.org/10.20377/slavun-9
Gentile, M., Città, G., Perna, S., & Allegra, M. (2023). Do we still need teachers? Navigating the paradigm shift of the teacher's role in the AI era. *Frontiers in Education*, *8*, Article 1161777. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2023.1161777
Gupta, K. P., & Bhaskar, P. (2020). Inhibiting and motivating factors influencing teachers' adoption of AI-based teaching and learning solutions: Prioritization using analytic hierarchy process. *Journal of Information Technology Education: Research*, *19*, 693–723. https://doi.org/10.28945/4640
Heaps, T. (2024). *Generative Artificial Intelligence: Practical uses in education*. Red River College Polytechnic and Campus Manitoba. https://pressbooks.openedmb.ca/aiineducation/ (04.12.2025)
Hubbard, P., & Schulze, M. (2025). AI and the future of language teaching: Motivating Sustained Integrated Professional Development. *International Journal of Computer-Assisted Language Learning and Teaching*, *15*(1), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.4018/IJCALLT.378304
Hulstijn, J. H. (2014). The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: A challenge for applied linguistics. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *165*(1), 3–18. https://doi.org/10.1075/itl.165.1.01hul
Isemonger, I. (2023). Generative language models in education: Foreign language learning and the teacher as prompt engineer. *TEFL Praxis Journal*, *2*(1), 3–17. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10402411
Karataş, F., Eriçok, B., & Tanrikulu, L. (2024a). Reshaping curriculum adaptation in the age of Artificial Intelligence: Mapping teachers' AI-driven curriculum adaptation patterns. *British Educational Research Journal*, *51*(1), 154–180. http://doi.org/10.1002/berj.4068
Karataş, F., Abedi, F. Y., Ozek Gunyel, F., Karadeniz, D., & Kuzgun, Y. (2024b). Incorporating AI in foreign language education: An investigation into ChatGPT's effect on foreign language learners. *Education and Information Technologies*, *29*, 19343–19366. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-12574-6
Kasneci, E., Sessler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., Gasser, U., Groh, G., Günnemann, S., Hüllermeyer, E., Krusche, S., Kutyniok, G., Michaeli, T., Nerdel, C., Pfeffer, J., Poquet, O., Sailer, M., Schmidt, A., Seidel, T., … Kasneci, G. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *103*, Article 102274, 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274
Kim, J. (2024). Leading teachers' perspective on teacher-AI collaboration in education. *Education and Information Technologies*, *29*, 8693–8724. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-12109-5
Kim, J., Yu, S., Detrick, R., Lin, X., & Li, N. (2025). Designing AI-powered learning: Adult learners' expectations for curriculum and human-AI interaction. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-025-10549-z
Kohnke, L., Moorhouse, B. L., & Zou, D. (2023). ChatGPT for language teaching and learning. *Regional Language Centre Journal*, *54*(2), 537–550. https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882231162868
Kostka, I., & Toncelli, R. (2023). Exploring applications of ChatGPT to English language teaching: Opportunities, challenges, and recommendations. *The Electronic Journal for English as Second Language*, *27*(3), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.55593/ej.27107int
Moundridou, M., Matzakos, N., & Doukakis, S. (2024). Generative AI tools as educators' assistants: Designing and implementing inquiry-based lesson plans. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *7*, Article 100277. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100277
Neumann, M., Rauschenberger, M., & Schön, E.-M. (2023). "We need to talk about ChatGPT": The future of AI and higher education. *2023 IEEE/ACM 5th International Workshop on Software Engineering for the Next Generation (SEENG)*, 29–32. https://doi.org/10.1109/SEENG59157.2023.00010
Octavio, M. M., González Argüello, V., & Pujolà, J.-T. (2024). ChatGPT as an AI L2 teaching support: A case study of an EFL teacher. *Technology in Language Teaching and Learning*, *6*(1), 1–25. https://doi.org/10.29140/tltl.v6n1.1142
OpenAI. (2025). *ChatGPT* [Large language model]. https://chat.openai.com/
Oxford University Press. (n.d.). Apartment. In *Oxford Learner's Dictionaries*. Retrieved December 9, 2025, from https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/apartment?q=apartment
Oxford University Press. (n.d.). Campsite. In *Oxford Learner's Dictionaries*. Retrieved December 9, 2025, from https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/campsite?q=campsite
Oxford University Press. (n.d.). Itinerary. In *Oxford Learner's Dictionaries*. Retrieved December 9, 2025, from https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definiti

on/english/itinerary?q=itinerary
Pape, R., & Steinbach, A. (2025). Personalized and individualized Russian learning enabled by AI: The pilot of the *Language Coach*. *SlavUn – Slavische Sprachen Unterrichten, Themenheft „KI-basierte Anwendungen in der Vermittlung slavischer Sprachen“*, *2*, 57–75. https://doi.org/10.20377/slavun-19
Pegrum, M. (2025). From revolution to evolution: What generative AI really means for language learning. *Language Teaching*, 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444825000151
Pribble, K. (2024). Fostering critical AI literacy in the Russian language classroom. *Russian Language Journal*, *74*(1), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.70163/0036-0252.1399
Richards, J. C. (2013). Curriculum approaches in language teaching: Forward, central, and backward design. *Regional Language Centre Journal*, *44*(1), 5–33. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688212473293
Richards, J. C. (2017). *Curriculum development in language teaching* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press
Robinson, P. (2011). Syllabus design. In M. H. Long, & C. J. Doughty (Eds.), *The handbook of language teaching* (pp. 294–310). Wiley-Blackwell.
Schulze, M. (2025). ICALL and AI: Seven lessons from seventy years. In Y. Wang, A. Alm, & G. Dizon (Eds.), *Insights into AI and language teaching and learning* (pp. 11–31). Castledown.
Stockwell, G. (2024). ChatGPT in language teaching and learning: Exploring the road we're travelling. *Technology in Language Teaching and Learning*, *6*(1), Article 2273. https://doi.org/10.29140/tltl.v6n1.2273
Stockwell, G. (2025). Professional development and learner training for AI. In Y. Wang, A. Alm, & G. Dizon (Eds.), *Insights into AI and language teaching and learning* (pp. 203–218). Castledown.
Timon, S. (2023). Artificial Intelligence – Scary paradigm shift or opportunity to evolve? *Journal of Language Teaching*, *3*(9), 1–6. https://doi.org/10.54475/jlt.2023.022
Tolstykh, O. M., & Oshchepkova, T. (2024). Beyond ChatGPT: Roles that Artificial Intelligence tools can play in an English language classroom. *Discover Artificial Intelligence*, *4*, Article 60. https://doi.org/10.1007/s44163-024-00158-9
Tseng, Y.-C., & Lin, Y.-H. (2024). Enhancing English as a foreign language (EFL) learners' writing with ChatGPT: A university-level course design. *Electronic Journal of E-Learning*, *22*(2), *Special Issue: Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Education*, 78–97. https://doi.org/10.34190/ejel.21.5.3329
Uchida, S. (2025). Generative AI and CEFR levels: Evaluating the accuracy of text generation with ChatGPT-4o through textual features. *Vocabulary Learning and Instruction*, *14*(1), Article 2078. https://doi.org/10.29140/vli.v14n1.2078
Ukwandu, E., Omisade, O., Jones, K., Thorne, S., & Castle, M. (2025). The future of teaching and learning in the context of emerging Artificial Intelligence technologies. *Futures*, *171*, Article 103616, 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2025.103616
UNESCO. (2024). *AI competency framework for teachers*. https://doi.org/10.54675/ZJTE2084
Wan, Y., & Moorhouse, B. L. (2025). Challenges of AI in language education. In Y. Wang, A. Alm, & G. Dizon (Eds.), *Insights into AI and language teaching and learning* (pp. 32–52). Castledown.
Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (2005). *Understanding by design* (2nd ed.). Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
Wisniewski, K. (2018). The empirical validity of the Common European Framework of Reference scales. An exemplary study for the vocabulary and fluency scales in a language testing context. *Applied Linguistics*, *39*(6), 933–959. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amw057

Author's Statement on Academic Integrity and AI Use

During the writing and editing of this article, ChatGPT-5 (OpenAI, 2025) was used exclusively for stylistic refinement of the text; no content was generated by AI, unless explicitly stated. In addition, the manuscript was proofread for cohesion, readability, and style by a professional writing assistant. The author takes full responsibility for the content of the published article.

Conflict of Interest

The author declares that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

JLT Journal of Language Teaching

Peer-reviewed | Open Access | Google Scholar | MLA | Crossref | DOI

Call for Papers

Submit via https://jlt.ac/

Areas of Interest:

Language teaching intervention and experiments; Curriculum development; Language teacher education; Bilingual education; New technologies in language teaching; Testing, assessment, and evaluation; Educational psychology, and more.

We accept the following types of submission:

1. Research article: (6,000 to 8,000 words)
2. Review: (3,000 to 8,000 words)
3. Book review: (up to 3,000 words)
4. Features: (3,000 to 8,000 words)

Scan to submit your articles* & read more articles for free.

*Article Processing Charges Apply.

Contact: editor@jlt.ac

Pioneer Publications

ISSN (Online) 2770-4602