Bodhi International Journal of
Research in Humanities, Arts and Science

Vol. 10 Special Issue 1 January 2026
E-ISSN: 2456-5571

From Plasticity to Synthetic Metaplasticity: Conceptualizing Next-Generation Self Evolving English AI Tutors

Akhil. AS
Ph.D Research Scholar, University of Technology, Jaipur, Rajasthan

Open Access

Manuscript ID:
BIJ-SPL1-Jan26-ES-094

Subject: English

Received : 27.09.2025
Accepted : 03.01.2026
Published : 22.01.2026

DOI: 10.64938/bijsi.v10si1.26.jan094

Abstract

There are now more opportunities to rethink English language instruction (ELT) thanks to recent developments in applied linguistics, neurobiology, and educational technology. Conventional adaptive digital tutors do not modify their own educational logic over time; instead, they modify content according to learner performance. This research suggests synthetic metaplasticity as a conceptual framework for next-generation AI instructors in ELT, drawing on the neuroscientific ideas of plasticity and metaplasticity. While metaplasticity relates to the management of learning itself, allowing for dynamic adaptation to changing cognitive states, plasticity refers to the brain's capacity to remodel itself in response to experience. Applying this concept to digital pedagogy implies AI tutors that change not just in reaction to mistakes but also in terms of their teaching approaches, scaffolding techniques, and feedback systems. Using a conceptual research methodology, this study incorporates ideas from educational technology, neuroscience, and second language acquisition (SLA) theory. The resulting framework is divided into three layers: (1) Cognitive Layer, which is based on the ideas of self-regulation and neuroplasticity; (2) Pedagogical Layer, which is influenced by theories of SLA like learner autonomy, input enhancement, scaffolding, and the zone of proximal development; and (3) Technological Layer, which sees AI as a cognitive partner that adapts its pedagogical strategies on its own. The theoretical framework prioritizes conceptual clarity over practical application. It gives instructional designers and ELT researchers a road map for seeing AI systems as self-evolving collaborators that can improve long-term language development, learner autonomy, and engagement. This paper offers a fresh viewpoint on integrating cognitive science and pedagogy in the development of next-generation digital language learning systems by defining synthetic metaplasticity as a guiding concept

Keywords: synthetic metaplasticity, english language teaching (ELT), artificial intelligence, second language acquisition (SLA), conceptual framework, cognitive partnership

Introduction

English language teaching (ELT) has developed using a variety of pedagogical paradigms, including communicative, task-based, and grammar-translation techniques. Digital technologies, such as online learning environments, mobile applications, and intelligent tutoring systems, have recently added adaptive capabilities that react to student performance. However, these systems mostly function reactively: they arrange tasks based on

learner failures, modify difficulty, or offer instant feedback. Although helpful, this restricted flexibility cannot replace the intricate, self-regulating process of human learning.

A powerful model for reconsidering adaptive training comes from neuroscience. The brain's ability to rearrange neuronal connections in response to experience is known as plasticity. The brain's capacity to control its own plasticity by modifying the adaption thresholds and rules in response to past experiences is known as metaplasticity, a higher-order concept. This implies that, in the context of ELT, a digital tutor should modify its replies as well as its fundamental tactics, including scaffolding, sequencing, and feedback time, in accordance with the deve3lopmental trajectory of the student.

Theories related to second language acquisition (SLA) also contribute to this perspective. In order to support students at the edge of their competence, Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) places a strong emphasis on the value of dynamic scaffolding. Schmidt's Noticing Hypothesis emphasizes learners' awareness of linguistic forms, while Krashen's material Hypothesis emphasizes the necessity for understandable but difficult material. Swain's output hypothesis places a strong emphasis on how producing helps to reinforce learning. Together, these ideas imply that responsiveness and strategic evolution in line with the cognitive and metacognitive demands of learners are necessary for effective education.

In this work, a conceptual framework for synthetic metaplasticity in ELT is proposed. It views AI teachers as cognitive partners that are always changing and are able to reflect on and modify their own educational logic in addition to reacting to mistakes. Providing a theoretical framework for upcoming studies, instructional design, and pedagogical innovation in digital ELT is the goal. This framework brings together cognitive science, SLA principles, and educational technology to provide a comprehensive viewpoint for rethinking how AI can improve student autonomy, engagement, and long-term language development.

Materials and Methods

The materials and methods section concentrates on framework construction rather than empirical data collecting because of the conceptual character of this study. The study used a conceptual research design, which places an emphasis on combining theories from other fields to create a Peer-reviewed literature, theoretical writings, and policy documents from three domains comprised the primary materials:

1. Neuroscience: Adaptive systems were metaphorically founded on research on plasticity, metaplasticity, and cognitive self-regulation.
2. Second Language Acquisition (SLA): Pedagogical ideas were informed by texts and research on learner autonomy, input, output, ZPD, and scaffolding.
3. Educational Technology: Studies on intelligent tutoring and adaptive learning systems have shed light on the present strengths and weaknesses of digital language learning resources.

A four-step framework-building procedure was used in the study:

1. Literature Exploration: Learner-centered education, self-regulation, and adaptation were highlighted as key themes that cut across disciplines.
2. Thematic Analysis: To identify areas of intersection, recurring concepts were grouped into themes related to cognition, education, and technology.
3. Synthesis: Themes were combined into a single conceptual model that highlighted the connections between technology, education, and cognition.
4. Framework Articulation: Three layers—cognitive, pedagogical, and technological—were identified in the final model, along with descriptions of their roles, connections, and possible ELT consequences.

Since there is currently no completely functional self-evolving AI tutor, the conceptual approach was chosen. The goal was to construct relationships and principles that could direct pedagogical innovation, instructional design, and future research. Without

depending on empirical testing or coding, this study provides synthetic metaplasticity as a guiding idea for AI enhanced ELT by developing a theoretical framework.

Findings and Results

Three interconnected layers are identified by the suggested framework as encapsulating the essence of English AI instructors' synthetic metaplasticity.

1. Cognitive Layer

- Based on neuroscience, it uses metaplasticity—the self-regulation of adaptation rules—and plasticity—responsive adjustment—to model adaptability.
- Example :If students consistently have trouble using tenses, the tutor may switch from rule-based drills to immersive storytelling exercises, changing its own teaching approach

2. Pedagogical Layer

Incorporates SLA concepts, such as Swain's Output Hypothesis for production, Schmidt's Noticing Hypothesis for awareness, Krashen's Input Hypothesis for intelligible input, and Vygotsky's ZPD for scaffolding.

- Makes sure that learning activities change as the student does, striking a balance between assistance and challenge while encouraging independence.

3. Technological Layer

Converts educational and cognitive ideas into system design considerations.

- In contrast to traditional adaptive systems, synthetic metaplastic tutors would optimize results by reflexively modifying both the material and the teaching tactics, including lesson sequencing, feedback time, and instructional mode.

When combined, these layers provide a system where AI tutors develop with students, acting as self-reflective cognitive partners as opposed to static teaching aids.

Interpretation and Discussions

The framework illustrates how a paradigm change in digital pedagogy is represented by synthetic metaplasticity. Higher-order reflexivity is absent from traditional adaptive learning models, which maximize difficulty levels. On the other hand, evolutionary flexibility brought about by synthetic metaplasticity allows AI tutors to modify their teaching strategies in response to longitudinal learner development.

Integration of Layers

- The Cognitive Layer uses neuroscience to give the figurative basis for flexibility.
- The Pedagogical Layer ensures theoretical rigor in educational tactics by coordinating adaptation with SLA theories.
- By using reflexive learning algorithms, the technological layer makes sure that these adaptations can be operationalized in AI systems. ELT Implications
- Because AI dynamically adjusts scaffolding, learners acquire more autonomy.
- In addition to AI's individualized guidance, teachers can transition from remedial duties to socio-emotional and cultural facilitation.
- Rather from stagnating in fixed algorithms, instructional design gains from a path for developing AI that develops with learners.

Important issues still include protecting learner privacy, guaranteeing algorithmic transparency, and avoiding an excessive dependence on opaque AI systems. Implementing synthetic metaplasticity responsibly requires striking a balance between accountability and customisation.

Conclusion

As a conceptual framework for next-generation AI tutors in English language instruction, this paper presents synthetic metaplasticity. It offers a three-layered model—cognitive, pedagogical, and technological—that sees AI tutors as self-evolving cognitive partners, drawing on neuroscience, SLA, and educational technology. Synthetic metaplastic tutors, in contrast to conventional adaptive systems,

would evolve their adaptation logic over time and reflexively modify their teaching tactics to maximize student outcomes. According to the paradigm, AI should support human instruction rather than take its place, offering tailored scaffolding while teachers offer crucial socioemotional, cultural, and contextual direction. Prototype creation, metaplasticity principle simulation, and empirical validation are possible avenues for future study. This study offers a groundbreaking road map for combining cognitive science and pedagogy in ELT by presenting AI tutors as reflective and adaptable partners, moving the field closer to more independent, interesting, and successful language learning systems.

References

1. Anderson, J. R. (2010). Cognitive psychology and its implications (7th ed.). Worth Publishers.
2. Dehaene, S. (2020). How we learn: Why brains learn better than any machine… for now. Viking.
4. Dörnyei, Z. (2009). The psychology of second language acquisition. Oxford University Press.
5. Ellis, R. (2008). The study of second language acquisition (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
6. Krashen, S. D. (1985). The input hypothesis: Issues and implications. Longman.
7. Larsen-Freeman, D. (2011). A complexity theory approach to second language development. Language Teaching, 44(4), 369–382.
8. Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. Applied Linguistics, 11(2), 129–158.
9. Swain, M. (2000). The output hypothesis and beyond. In J. Lantolf (Ed.), Sociocultural theory and second language learning (pp. 97–114). Oxford University Press.
10. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Harvard University Press.
11. Woolf, B. P. (2010). Building intelligent interactive tutors. Morgan Kaufmann.
12. Siemens, G. (2005). Connectivism: A learning theory for the digital age. International Journal of Instructional Technology and Distance Learning, 2(1), 3–10.
13. Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. Review of Educational Research, 77(1), 81–112.
14. Mayer, R. E. (2014). The Cambridge handbook of multimedia learning (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
15. Duffy, T. M., & Cunningham, D. J. (1996). Constructivism: Implications for the design and delivery of instruction. Handbook of Research for Educational Communications and Technology, 170–198.
16. Blackwell, A. F., & Peyton Jones, S. (2003). Cognitive dimensions of notations. Applied Ergonomics, 34(5), 393–402.
17. Zohar, A., & Dori, Y. J. (2003). Higher order thinking skills and low-achieving students. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 12(2), 145–181.
18. Li, S. (2017). The effects of input enhancement on L2 acquisition: A meta-analysis. Applied Linguistics, 38(4), 713–736.
19. Yilmaz, Y. (2013). The relative effects of explicit feedback types on SLA: A meta-analysis. Language Learning, 63(1), 123–162.
20. Wenger, E. (1998). Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity. Cambridge University Press.
21. Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2009). Developing the theory of formative assessment. Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability.