The Eurasia Proceedings of
Educational & Social Sciences (EPESS)
ISSN: 2587-1730

The Eurasia Proceedings of Educational and Social Sciences (EPESS), 2025

Volume 45, Pages 125-135

ICRET 2025: International Conference on Research in Education and Technology

New Paradigms in Artificial Intelligence and Language Education: An Examination of Little Language Lessons

Mustafa Baris Basturk
Ibn Haldun University

Abstract: This study examines the transformative potential of artificial intelligence in language education through a descriptive analysis of the *Little Language Lessons* application developed by Google Labs. The research employs qualitative methods, specifically document analysis and descriptive analysis, with the application serving as the primary document for examination. The analysis reveals that the application uses artificial intelligence to overcome rote learning, instead creating contextually rich and personalized micro-lessons that establish semantic relationships between words. The findings show that AI-powered tools offer a more effective learning experience than traditional methods by personalizing the language acquisition process and potentially increasing student motivation. Various empirical studies in the field were examined to establish a connection with the topic. In this context, it is argued that artificial intelligence should be positioned not as a replacement for traditional teaching, but as a complementary resource that enriches language education.

Keywords: Language education, Artificial intelligence, Little language lessons

Introduction

The rise of artificial intelligence (AI) is instigating a fundamental paradigm shift across numerous sectors, with education standing as a principal domain for transformative change. This technological evolution is felt most acutely within the field of language education, where AI-powered tools are beginning to systematically dismantle and redefine long-standing pedagogical models. For decades, mainstream language instruction has been anchored in a one-size-fits-all methodology, a standardized approach that often struggles to accommodate the diverse learning paces, cognitive styles, and motivational profiles of individual students (Hu, 2024). Methodologies such as the *Grammar-Translation Method* and *Audiolingualism*, with their emphasis on rote memorization and decontextualized grammatical drills, have been criticized for positioning the learner as a passive recipient of information, disconnected from the dynamic and practical application of language in authentic communicative contexts (Chun et al., 2016). The inherent inability of this model to adequately address individual learner differences has underscored a critical need for innovative solutions capable of delivering personalized, interactive, and more effective learning pathways.

The historical trajectory of technology in language education, broadly termed *Computer-Assisted Language Learning* (CALL), has evolved through several distinct phases. Early iterations, often described as behavioristic CALL, largely consisted of digitized drill-and-practice exercises that mirrored the stimulus-response models of their time (Warschauer & Healey, 1998). While subsequent communicative CALL phases incorporated more interactive tasks, it is the current wave of AI-driven systems that promises the most significant pedagogical leap. Fueled by advancements in machine learning and, more specifically, *Natural Language Processing* (NLP), modern educational tools can now analyze vast datasets of learner interactions to deliver truly adaptive learning experiences. These systems dynamically adjust content, difficulty, and pacing in response to a user's real-time performance, marking a profound departure from static, linear curricula (Wang et al., 2025). This capacity for data-driven personalization offers the potential for individualized tutoring and immediate, targeted feedback at a previously unattainable scale, fostering greater learner autonomy and motivation (Pokrivcakova, 2019).

- Selection and peer-review under responsibility of the Organizing Committee of the Conference

Many of these technological innovations emerge from corporate research and development (R&D) centers like Google Labs, which function as crucial innovation ecosystems. These labs act as a conduit between theoretical scientific breakthroughs and practical, user-facing applications, translating advanced technologies into tangible products (Chesbrough, 2003). As a leader in the development of sophisticated AI and large language models, Google is uniquely positioned to create experimental educational tools. In this context, the Little Language Lessons application materializes as a direct product of such an innovative environment, serving as a compelling case study for the future of AI in education.

Developed by Google Labs, Little Language Lessons is a generative AI-based application that challenges the foundational assumptions of traditional language instruction. At its core, the application leverages one of Google's advanced language models to reframe language acquisition from a process of static information transfer to one of dynamic, relational discovery. Rather than presenting learners with isolated vocabulary or prescriptive grammatical rules, the application generates a semantic web of interconnected words and contextual phrases around a single user-selected term. This methodology allows the learner to explore the language's natural structure intuitively, reinforcing the understanding of language not merely as a set of rules, but as a living, associative system. This approach promotes a deeper, more organic form of learning that mirrors natural language acquisition processes.

Figure 1. Little language lessons website interface

The operational framework of Little Language Lessons is initiated through a learner-centered action: The selection of a single lexical item, or “seed word”, in the target language. This user-driven input triggers a multi-stage, AI-driven generative process designed to facilitate organic language acquisition. First, the system constructs a dynamic semantic map, presenting a constellation of lexically and conceptually related terms. This moves beyond simple synonymy to include words that frequently co-occur or belong to the same situational context, helping the learner to build the rich, interconnected mental lexicon characteristic of a native speaker. Subsequently, the application advances to the crucial phase of contextualization, automatically embedding the target vocabulary into authentic phrases and sentences. This demonstrates correct usage, collocation, and nuance. The final stage involves the provision of concise, just-in-time grammatical tips that are directly relevant to the structures presented, offering explicit instruction in a non-disruptive and contextually grounded manner.

This operational design marks a significant departure from traditional vocabulary instruction and aligns closely with the principles of the Lexical Approach. This innovative methodology posits that language is not acquired by learning individual words and grammatical rules in isolation, but through the acquisition of multi-word chunks, or lexical phrases, which are the building blocks of natural communication. The application's automated generation of collocations and authentic sentences directly supports this, shifting the focus from what does this word mean? to how is this word used?. Furthermore, the methodology facilitates an inductive learning process, where grammatical understanding emerges from exposure to authentic language use rather than from the explicit memorization of abstract rules. The learner observes patterns in the provided examples and can infer the underlying system, a process that mirrors natural language acquisition.

The application’s structure also embodies the principles of microlearning. By breaking down the complex task of language acquisition into manageable, on-demand lessons centered around a single word, the application reduces cognitive load and aligns with modern learning habits that favor short, focused, and self-directed interactions. This bite-sized approach enhances engagement and retention by making the learning process feel less overwhelming and more immediately rewarding. The combination of a learner-driven starting point, AI-powered semantic networking, and contextualized, just-in-time instruction positions Little Language Lessons as a practical implementation of several forward-thinking pedagogical models that prioritize meaning, context, and personalization over rote memorization.

The pedagogical efficacy of such an application is rooted in the powerful synthesis of technology and established learning theory. The NLP engine that drives the application's content generation (Chapelle, 2009) finds a strong theoretical parallel in Lev Vygotsky's (1978) *Sociocultural Theory of Development*. The personalized and responsive nature of the AI aligns with Vygotsky's concept of the *Zone of Proximal Development* (ZPD)-the cognitive space where a learner can accomplish a task with guidance that they could not yet achieve alone. In this model, the AI assumes the role of the *More Knowledgeable Other* (MKO), providing precisely tailored support, or scaffolding, to help the learner bridge this developmental gap effectively (Ohta, 2000). By providing this support, the learning process becomes more efficient, motivating, and autonomous. This evolution represents the latest stage in the maturation of CALL, moving beyond the computer as a simple tutor to its new role as an intelligent learning partner (Kern, 2006).

Method

Research Method and Design

This study was structured using a qualitative research design to facilitate an in-depth examination of the Little Language Lessons application, its functional architecture, and the linguistic content it generates. A qualitative approach is particularly well-suited for this research, as it prioritizes the detailed understanding of a phenomenon within its natural context (Creswell, 2014). Within this framework, the study specifically employs a combination of descriptive analysis and content analysis to systematically investigate the application.

In the initial phase of the research, descriptive analysis was utilized to provide a clear and systematic overview of the application's structure, user interface, and operational workflow. The goal of descriptive analysis is to present a comprehensive and accurate portrayal of a phenomenon (Patton, 2015). In this context, it was applied to map the user's journey from the input of a single seed word to the final generative output. This process involved documenting the application's features and functions to establish a foundational understanding of what the application does and how it operates.

Following the descriptive phase, content analysis was employed to conduct a systematic and rigorous examination of the linguistic data produced by the application, including the related words, example sentences, and grammatical tips. Content analysis is a method used to make replicable and valid inferences from texts (or other meaningful matter) to the contexts of their use (Krippendorff, 2019). For this study, content analysis was specifically focused on: (1) deconstructing the semantic and contextual relationships within the AI-generated word networks, (2) evaluating the contextual appropriateness and structural integrity of the automatically generated sentences, and (3) assessing the relevance and clarity of the just-in-time grammatical tips. This technique allowed for a deeper analysis of the qualitative nature of the application's output, moving beyond its function to evaluate the content itself.

Research Problem and Sub Problems

The main problem of the study has been defined as “How are little languages lessons used in language education?” Accordingly, two sub-problems have been created:

- Which level are the words generated by generative artificial intelligence appropriate for?
- In what ways do the automatically generated sentences and grammatical tips provide contextualized learning and reinforcement for the user?

The Aim of the Study

The purpose of this study is to conduct a detailed descriptive analysis of the Little Language Lessons application, focusing specifically on its generative artificial intelligence framework for language content creation. This research seeks to move beyond a surface-level overview by systematically deconstructing the multi-stage process the application employs when a user provides a single seed word. The central aim is to document how the application's AI model transitions from a simple lexical input to a complex, interconnected linguistic output, thereby presenting a functional alternative to the static vocabulary lists and decontextualized exercises found in many traditional language resources.

To achieve this, the analysis will first investigate the initial stage of content generation: the construction of a dynamic semantic map that presents a constellation of lexically and conceptually related terms. The study will examine how this process extends beyond simple synonymy to include words that frequently co-occur or share a situational context. Subsequently, the research will explore the critical phase of contextualization, in which the application automatically embeds the target vocabulary into authentic phrases and sentences to demonstrate usage and nuance. Finally, the analysis will cover the provision of concise grammatical tips that are directly relevant to the structures presented. Through this granular examination, the study intends to provide a clear exposition of an AI-driven methodology that shifts the focus from defining a word to demonstrating its practical use, offering a comprehensive look at the architecture of a tool designed for dynamic and relational language exploration.

Analysis of Data

The analysis of the data in this study was conducted in two sequential phases, directly corresponding to the descriptive and content analysis methods outlined in the preceding section. This multi-stage approach was designed to first establish a foundational understanding of the application's architecture and then to perform a granular, qualitative assessment of the linguistic content it generates.

The initial phase employed descriptive analysis to systematically map the operational framework of the Little Language Lessons application. This involved objective documentation of the user interface (UI), the user experience (UX) flow, and the sequence of actions from the initial input of a seed word to the presentation of the final generated content. The primary goal of this phase was to create a clear and replicable account of the application's functions, providing the necessary context for the subsequent content analysis.

The second and more intensive phase utilized content analysis to systematically evaluate the AI-generated linguistic output. This process was guided by a predefined coding framework to ensure consistency and rigor (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). The analysis was stratified into three core components of the application's output: the lexical network, the contextualized sentences, and the grammatical tips.

Analysis of the Lexical Network

The collection of related words generated by the AI was analyzed for both semantic relevance and linguistic complexity. To establish an objective measure of the vocabulary's difficulty and suitability for different learner levels, each word was categorized according to the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* (CEFR). CEFR provides a widely recognized international standard for describing language ability across six levels, from A1 (Beginner) to C2 (Proficient) (Council of Europe, 2020). This categorization was performed by cross-referencing the generated terms with established CEFR-aligned lexical resources. The primary tool used for this was the *English Vocabulary Profile* (EVP), which is a resource that maps words and phrases to specific CEFR levels based on extensive learner corpora (Capel, 2012). Additionally, the *English Profile* website, a program led by Cambridge University, was consulted for a comprehensive understanding of proficiency descriptors and related resources. In addition to CEFR leveling, the relationships between the seed word and the generated terms were coded (e.g., synonymy, antonymy, collocation, thematic grouping) to assess the logical coherence of the semantic web.

Analysis of Contextualized Sentences

The automatically generated sentences for each vocabulary item were subjected to a qualitative assessment based on three criteria:

- Grammatical Accuracy: Each sentence was evaluated for syntactic correctness and adherence to standard English grammar.
- Contextual Appropriateness: The analysis verified that the target word was used in a contextually meaningful and natural way, accurately reflecting its typical usage.
- Authenticity: Sentences were assessed on whether they resembled authentic language use or appeared artificial and algorithmically constructed.

Analysis of Grammatical Tips

The just-in-time grammatical tips were evaluated based on their clarity, accuracy, and direct relevance to the vocabulary and sentences presented. The analysis focused on how effectively these tips provided concise and immediately applicable information that could reinforce a user's understanding without overwhelming them with excessive detail. This multi-faceted analytical process enabled a comprehensive and systematic examination of the application's output, linking its technical functions to the qualitative attributes of the language content it produces.

Validity and Reliability

To enhance the reliability of the research, the inter-coder reliability formula proposed by Miles and Huberman (2016) was utilized: [Reliability = Number of Agreements / (Number of Agreements + Number of Disagreements)]. The calculation resulted in a reliability coefficient of 0.93. A reliability score above 0.80 is considered sufficient to establish the dependability of the research (Miles & Huberman, 2016), thus confirming the consistency of the analysis conducted in this study.

Limitations of the Study

While this study provides a detailed analysis of the Little Language Lessons application, it is important to acknowledge its inherent limitations. Firstly, the scope of the linguistic analysis is confined to the English language module of the application. The generative capabilities and semantic networking of the AI may vary across different languages due to their unique grammatical and lexical structures. Therefore, the findings and conclusions drawn from this research may not be generalizable to other languages available within the application.

Secondly, this study is temporally bound, as the analysis was conducted on the version of the Little Language Lessons application available in October 2025. As a product developed within a dynamic environment like Google Labs, the application is subject to continuous updates, algorithmic enhancements, and feature modifications. Consequently, future versions of the application may differ significantly from the version examined herein, potentially limiting the long-term applicability of these specific findings.

Findings

To address the first subproblem, a content analysis of the lexical networks generated by the Little Language Lessons application was conducted. This analysis was framed by the descriptors of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), which categorizes language proficiency from A1 (Beginner) to C2 (Proficient) (Council of Europe, 2020). The objective was to determine the proficiency level for which the application's generated content is most appropriate. The analysis of lexical sets generated from various seed words revealed a significant finding: the application does not adhere to a pre-defined, linear difficulty gradient. Instead, it generates a semantically-driven lexical field that frequently spans multiple CEFR levels within a single query. For example, when the A1-level seed word “food” was provided as input, the AI generated a diverse lexical network. This network included:

Table 1. Analysis of AI-generated lexical network for “food”

A1/A2 Level Terms	B1/B2 Level Terms	C1+ Terms
Apple	Beef	-
Bread	Delicious	
Chicken		
Vegetables		
Fruit		
Dessert		
Snack		
Cook		
Dinner		

This pattern demonstrates that the application’s generative model prioritizes semantic relatedness over leveled proficiency. This approach stands in contrast to traditional language learning curricula, which typically isolate vocabulary by CEFR level to create a structured, linear path for the learner (Richards, 2013). Then A1-level seed word "car" was provided as input; the AI generated a diverse lexical network. This network included:

Table 2. Analysis of AI-generated lexical network for "car"

A1/A2 Level Terms	B1/B2 Level Terms	C1+ Terms
Automobile	Windshield	Transportation
Tire	Freeway	
Engine	Hood	
Gas	Trunk	
Pedal		
Speed		

Later on B1 level seed Word "communication" was provided as input, the AI generated diverse lexical network. This network included:

Table 3. Analysis of AI-generated lexical network for "communication"

A1/A2 Level Terms	B1/B2 Level Terms	C1+ Terms
Message	Misunderstand	Clarify
Conversation	Articulate	
	Interact	
	Express	
	Feedback	
	Dialogue	
	Tone	
	Noneverbal	

After that C1 level seed Word "determine" was provided as input, the AI generated diverse lexical network. This network included:

Table 4. Analysis of AI-generated lexical network for "determine"

A1/A2 Level Terms	B1/B2 Level Terms	C1+ Terms
-	Asses	Verify
	Identify	Ascertain
		Establish
		Conclude
		Evaluate
		Resolve

Impact on Lexical Acquisition: Schema Theory and Depth of Processing

The application's methodology for vocabulary presentation directly operationalizes key principles from cognitive psychology, most notably *Schema Theory* (Bartlett, 1932; Anderson & Pearson, 1984) and the *Levels of Processing* (LOP) framework (Craik & Lockhart, 1972). The cognitive benefits of incorporating visual and verbal channels are supported by *Paivio's Dual Coding Theory*, which suggests that simultaneous processing through both systems enhances learning efficiency and contributes to the formation of more robust and lasting memories. Visual storytelling, in line with this theory, allows information to be encoded more effectively in both verbal and visual channels, significantly improving recall rates (Basturk & Sen, 2025). Furthermore, AI-supported visualization tools can reduce the cognitive load associated with comprehending abstract expressions, such as proverbs, thereby easing the learning process (Gun, Alkan & Basturk, 2025). This approach fundamentally diverges from traditional vocabulary instruction, which often relies on decontextualized rote memorization-a method criticized for its failure to establish the robust neural connections required for long-term retention and retrieval (Schmitt, 2000).

Schema Theory posits that knowledge is organized into cognitive frameworks, or schemata, which act as the building blocks of cognition (Rumelhart, 1980, p. 34). In language acquisition, this means that new lexical items are learned most effectively when they are assimilated into an existing, relevant schema (Anderson & Pearson, 1984). The Little Language Lessons application initiates this process by using the learner's seed word as a schema activator. The subsequent AI-generated semantic web-presenting, as shown in the findings, related B1/B2 terms like “Delicious” and “Dessert” in the context of the A1 seed word “food”-provides an explicit scaffold, guiding the learner to integrate these novel words into their established “food” schema. This method encourages the development of a rich, associative mental lexicon, which is characteristic of proficient speakers, rather than a poorly integrated” list of isolated terms (Nation, 2013; Schmitt, 2000).

This process of schematic integration is cognitively demanding and necessitates a “deeper” level of processing, as defined by Craik and Lockhart (1972). The LOP framework argues that the persistence of a memory trace is not a result of repetition, but a function of the depth of cognitive analysis performed. Shallow processing (e.g., attending to a word's orthography) leads to weak memory traces, whereas deep processing (e.g., attending to a word's semantic value and its relationship to other concepts) creates durable traces.

Traditional vocabulary tasks, such as matching a word to its L1 translation, often only require shallow processing. The Little Language Lessons application, however, inherently mandates deep, semantic-level engagement. This aligns with the *Involvement Load Hypothesis* (Laufer & Hulstijn, 2001), which proposes that vocabulary retention is contingent on the degree of cognitive involvement a task requires. Involvement is defined by three components: Need (motivation), search (locating the word/meaning), and evaluation (making a semantic judgment). The application's model, by presenting a web of related terms, compels the learner to perform the evaluation component: They must mentally assess the semantic relationship between the A1 seed word (car) and the generated C1+ term (Transportation), or between the C1 seed word (determine) and the generated C1+ terms (Ascertain, Verify). This act of semantic judgment constitutes a high-involvement task, thereby facilitating more robust and durable lexical acquisition than the passive reception of decontextualized word lists.

The analysis for the second subproblem focused on the application of lexical items, moving from the semantic network (Subproblem 1) to the mechanisms of contextualization and reinforcement. The findings indicate that the Little Language Lessons application employs a synergistic model where AI-generated sentences provide rich context, and just-in-time grammatical tips deliver targeted reinforcement.

Contextualized Learning via Generated Sentences

The primary mechanism for contextualized learning is the automatic generation of example sentences. This function is critical as it shifts the learning objective from what does this word mean? (declarative knowledge) to how is this word used? (procedural knowledge). This aligns directly with the *Lexical Approach* (Lewis, 1993), which posits that language is not acquired as individual words but as chunks, collocations, and formulaic phrases.

The application’s generative AI excels in this regard. Unlike behavioristic CALL (Warschauer & Healey, 1998) which often relies on static, templated sentences, the generative model creates dynamic and natural-sounding contexts. For instance, for the B1/B2 word windshield (generated from the seed word car), the application does not present a simple definition. Instead, it might generate a sentence like: A crack on the windshield can obstruct the driver's view.

This single sentence provides multiple layers of learning:

Semantic Context: It reinforces the word's meaning by placing it in its natural environment (driver, view, car).

Collocation: It models a natural word pairing (a crack on the windshield).

Syntactic Pattern: It demonstrates the word's function as a noun within a standard S-V-O (Subject-Verb-Object) structure.

This method provides rich, comprehensible input (Krashen, 1982) that is personalized and varied. Recent research on Generative AI in language education (Xu, 2025) confirms that this ability to produce novel, contextually appropriate sentences at scale is a primary affordance of modern LLMs, fostering incidental acquisition by exposing the learner to the word in authentic, meaning-focused use.

Reinforcement via Just-in-Time Grammatical "Tips"

The second component of this subproblem is the function of the grammatical tips. The analysis reveals that these tips are not comprehensive grammar lessons but rather function as a form of *Focus on Form* (FonF).

FonF is a pedagogical intervention that draws a learner's attention to a specific linguistic form precisely at the moment it is needed within a meaning-focused activity (Long, 1991; Doughty & Williams, 1998). This just-in-time approach is considered more effective than traditional, decontextualized grammar drills (Focus on Forms).

The Little Language Lessons application operationalizes this principle perfectly. For example, after presenting a seed word like food and generating a sentence such as, There isn't any food left in the fridge, the application might provide a concise “tip”:

Tip: Use any in negative sentences and questions (Is there any food?), and some in positive sentences (There is some food).

This intervention is highly effective for several reasons:

It is Context-Bound: The tip is not abstract; it directly explains the grammatical choice (any) in the exact sentence the user just read.

It Promotes Inductive Learning: The user sees the example first (There isn't any food...) and then receives the rule (the tip). This data > rule model aligns with inductive reasoning, which mirrors natural language acquisition.

It Manages Cognitive Load: By presenting the tip as a bite-sized piece of information, the application adheres to microlearning principles (Jomah et al., 2016). It avoids the cognitive overload (Sweller, 1988) that would come from a full lesson on determiners, providing only the necessary information for that immediate context.

This model of AI-driven, just-in-time feedback represents a significant advancement in educational technology (Montuori et al., 2021). The synergy between the rich, contextual sentences and the targeted, inductive grammatical tips creates a powerful, personalized learning loop that fosters both lexical depth and grammatical accuracy.

Results and Discussion

This study conducted a descriptive and content analysis of the Little Language Lessons application, examining its generative artificial intelligence framework as a pedagogical tool. The findings reveal a sophisticated model that deviates substantially from traditional language instruction, positioning the application as an exemplary of a new paradigm in AI-driven education.

The analysis of the first subproblem yielded a nuanced finding regarding proficiency leveling. It was determined that the generated lexical networks are, in fact, primarily anchored to the CEFR level of the initial seed-word; for instance, A1 inputs yielded a clear majority of A1/A2 terms, while C1 inputs generated a preponderance of B2/C1+ items. However, the central and more pedagogically significant finding is that the application does not restrict itself to this level. Its prioritization of semantic relatedness over a rigid, linear curriculum results in the generation of lexical fields that strategically span multiple proficiency levels. This evidence-such as an A1 seed word (car) also producing C1+ vocabulary (Transportation)-demonstrates a sophisticated pedagogical design.

This model is not focused on the mere accumulation of leveled words, but on the organization of lexical knowledge. As interpreted through *Schema Theory*, this approach leverages the learner's existing cognitive frameworks, using a seed word as a schema activator to scaffold the integration of novel, higher-level vocabulary. This process mandates deep cognitive engagement, compelling the learner to perform the semantic evaluation (Craik & Lockhart, 1972) necessary for durable memory traces and aligning with the principles of the Involvement Load Hypothesis (Laufer & Hulstijn, 2001).

The investigation of the second subproblem identified a powerful synergy between two core functions: contextualization and reinforcement. The AI-generated sentences provide rich, authentic, and varied input, effectively moving the learner from declarative to procedural knowledge. This operationalization of the *Lexical Approach* (Lewis, 1993) supplies the comprehensible input (Krashen, 1982) necessary for incidental acquisition. This contextual immersion is then sharpened by the just-in-time grammatical tips. These tips function as a highly effective, non-disruptive form of *Focus on Form* (Long, 1991). By providing an inductive, data>rule intervention precisely when it is needed, the application promotes grammatical accuracy while respecting the principles of microlearning (Jomah et al., 2016) and managing cognitive load (Sweller, 1988).

In synthesizing these findings, this study concludes that Little Language Lessons represents a significant pedagogical advancement. It successfully transitions language learning from a static, explicit, and decontextualized process (often reliant on rote memorization) to a dynamic, implicit, and highly contextualized journey of relational discovery. The application functions as an intelligent learning partner, effectively operationalizing complex cognitive and pedagogical theories (e.g., Schema Theory, ZPD, FonF) within a personalized, bite-sized format. However, the integration of generative AI is not without significant pedagogical and ethical risks. A critical concern is the potential for cognitive offloading, where reliance on external tools may lead to a measurable decline in students' core cognitive abilities, such as memory, synthesis, and critical thinking, when those tools are unavailable. Moreover, the application of these tools necessitates a crucial shift in pedagogical focus: assessment must move away from the final AI-generated product, which can be quickly produced, and instead prioritize the student's critical process of guiding and analyzing the model's output (Gun & Basturk, 2025).

While the limitations of this study, such as its confinement to English module and its temporally bound snapshot of a rapidly evolving application, must be acknowledged, the implications are clear. Future research should expand upon these findings through longitudinal studies tracking user retention and motivation, comparative analyses across different language modules, and investigations into the integration of such tools within formal curricula. Ultimately, this research affirms that generative AI applications like Little Language Lessons are not positioned to replace educators, but rather to augment their capabilities, offering a powerful, complementary resource that enriches language acquisition by personalizing and deepening the learning process.

Conclusion

This study investigated the Little Language Lessons application as a case study for the pedagogical potential of generative artificial intelligence in language education. The analysis revealed that the application's design principles represent a significant departure from traditional, linear instructional models, moving instead toward a dynamic and personalized learning framework.

The primary finding regarding lexical acquisition is that the application's generative model is highly responsive to the learner's starting point. The analysis confirmed that when a user provides a seed-word, the application primarily establishes semantic connections with other vocabulary items at the same approximate CEFR level. However, the system's key pedagogical strength is that it is not restricted by this level. Its ability to also create semantically-driven bridges to higher-level vocabulary (e.g., from A1 to C1) within a single lesson fosters the development of a rich, associative mental lexicon, a hallmark of proficient language users. This methodology inherently promotes a deeper level of cognitive processing than rote memorization.

Furthermore, the study found that the application skillfully synergizes contextualization and reinforcement. The AI-generated sentences provide authentic, meaning-focused input that models natural language use, demonstrating how a word is used rather than merely what it means. This contextual immersion is powerfully complemented by just-in-time grammatical tips, which function as a non-disruptive, inductive learning mechanism. This combination creates an effective, self-contained learning loop that addresses both lexical depth and grammatical accuracy.

Little Language Lessons exemplifies a paradigm shift in language pedagogy. By leveraging generative AI, it transforms language acquisition from a static, decontextualized process into an interactive journey of relational discovery. The findings suggest that such tools are not positioned as replacements for formal instruction but as sophisticated, complementary resources. They possess the capability to augment the learning process by providing personalized, context-rich, and cognitively deep engagement at a scale previously unattainable. This study underscores the potential of AI to enrich language education and indicates a clear need for further research into the long-term efficacy and curricular integration of such dynamic learning tools.

Scientific Ethics Declaration

* The author declares that the scientific ethical and legal responsibility of this article published in EPESS journal belongs to the author.

Funding

* This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Conflict of Interest

* The author declares that there is no conflict of interest

Acknowledgements or Notes

* This article was presented as an online presentation at the International Conference on Research in Education and Technology (www.icret.net) held in Budapest/Hungary on August 28-31, 2025.

References

Anderson, R. C., & Pearson, P. D. (1984). A schema-theoretic view of basic processes in reading comprehension. In P. D. Pearson (Ed.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 1, pp. 255–291). Longman.

Bartlett, F. C. (1932). *Remembering: A study in experimental and social psychology.* Cambridge University Press.

Basturk, M. B., & Sen, E. (2025). The level of comprehension of implicit meanings in English and Turkish proverbs by ai-based text-to-image generation tools. *The Journal of Limitless Education and Research, 10*(2), 523-572.

Capel, A. (2012). Completing the English vocabulary profile: C1 and C2 vocabulary. *English Profile Journal, 3*.

Chapelle, C. A. (2009). The relationship between second language acquisition theory and computer-assisted language learning. *The Modern Language Journal, 93*(1), 741–753.

Chesbrough, H. W. (2003). *Open innovation: The new imperative for creating and profiting from technology*. Harvard Business School Press.

Chun, D. M., Smith, B., & Kern, R. (2016). Technology in language use, language teaching, and language learning. *The Modern Language Journal, 100*(1), 64-80.

Council of Europe. (2020). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment – Companion volume*. Council of Europe Publishing.

Craik, F. I. M., & Lockhart, R. S. (1972). Levels of processing: A framework for memory research. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 11*(6), 671–684.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Sage publications.

Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (Eds.). (1998). *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*. Cambridge University Press.

Gun, M., & Basturk, M. B. (2025). Enhancing visual and cognitive intelligence memory with fine-tuning modeling based on artificial intelligence large language models. *The Eurasia Proceedings of Science Technology Engineering and Mathematics, 35*, 10-28.

Gun, M., Alkan, E. & Basturk, M. B. (2025). Yabancılara Türkçe öğretiminde yapay zekâ tarafından üretilen görsellerin kültür aktarımı bağlamında incelemesi. *International Journal of Language Academy, 13*(1), 293-308.

Hsieh, H.-F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research, 15*(9), 1277–1288

Hu, L. (2024). Utilization of differentiated instruction in K-12 classrooms: A systematic literature review (2000-2022). *Asia Pacific Education Review*, *25*(2), 507-525.

Jomah, O., Masoud, A., Kishore, X., & Aurelia, S. (2016). Micro learning: A modernized education system. *Broad Research in Artificial Intelligence and Neuroscience, 7*(1),103-110.

Kern, R. (2006). Perspectives on technology in learning and teaching. *TESOL Quarterly, 40*(1), 183–210.

Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Pergamon Press.

Krippendorff, K. (2019). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (4th ed.). Sage publications.

Laufer, B., & Hulstijn, J. (2001). Incidental vocabulary acquisition in a second language: The construct of task-induced involvement. *Applied Linguistics, 22*(1), 1–26.

Lewis, M. (1993). *The lexical approach: The state of ELT and a way forward.* LTP.

Long, M. H. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in task-based language teaching. In K. de Bot, R. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 39–52). John Benjamins.

Miles, B. M. & Huberman, M. A. (2016) *Qualitative Data Analysis* (Translate Editors: S. Akbaba Altun & A. Ersoy). Pegem.

Montuori, L., Alcázar Ortega, M., Bastida Molina, P., & Vargas Salgado, C. A. (2021, February). Application of Artificial intelligence to high education: Empowerment of flipped classroom with just-in-time teaching. *Proceedings INNODOCT/20. International Conference on Innovation, Documentation and Education* (pp. 223-231). Editorial Universitat Politècnica de València.

Nation, I. S. P. (2013). *Learning vocabulary in another language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Ohta, A. S. (2000). Rethinking interaction in SLA: Developmentally appropriate assistance in the zone of proximal development and the acquisition of L2 grammar. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 31–45). Oxford University Press.

Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice* (4th ed.). Sage publications.

Pokrivcakova, S. (2019). Preparing teachers for the application of AI-powered technologies in foreign language education. *Journal of Language and Cultural Education, 7*(3), 2019. 135-153.

Richards, J. C. (2013). Curriculum approaches in language teaching: Forward, central, and backward design. *RELC Journal, 44*(1), 5–34.

Rumelhart, D. E. (1980). Schemata: The building blocks of cognition. In R. J. Spiro, B. C. Bruce, & W. F. Brewer (Eds.), *Theoretical issues in reading comprehension* (pp. 33–58). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Schmitt, N. (2000). *Vocabulary in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.

Sweller, J. (1988). Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning. *Cognitive Science, 12*(2), 257–285.

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

Wang, Y., Zhang, T., Yao, L., & Seedhouse, P. (2025). A scoping review of empirical studies on generative artificial intelligence in language education. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 1–28.

Warschauer, M., & Healey, D. (1998). Computers and language learning: An overview. *Language Teaching, 31*(2), 57–71.

Xu, W. (2025). An analysis of the application of generative artificial intelligence in second language acquisition. *SHS Web of Conferences* (Vol. 223, p. 01003). EDP Sciences.

Author(s) Information

Mustafa Baris Basturk
Ibn Haldun University
Başak Mah. Ordu Cad. F-05 Blok No:3 P.K. 34480
Başakşehir / İstanbul, Türkiye
Contact e-mail: *mustafa.basturk@ihu.edu.tr*

To cite this article:

Basturk, M. B. (2025). New paradigms in artificial intelligence and language education: An examination of little language lessons. *The Eurasia Proceedings of Educational and Social Sciences (EPESS), 45,* 125-135.