

GenAI for speech writing in the training of Maltese conference interpreters for the European Union

Amy Colman

Lecturer, Department of Translation, Terminology and Interpreting Studies
Faculty of Arts, University of Malta
amy.colman@um.edu.mt

Abstract

The present paper explores the potential of GenAI tools in generating speeches to prepare for the European Union's interinstitutional accreditation test. A small-scale experimental empirical study was conducted in which interpreting students were instructed to annotate, critically assess and compare English and Maltese speeches generated by three GenAI tools, viz., Gemini, Copilot and ChatGPT, to be used for beginner consecutive interpretation practice. The GenAI tools were prompted to generate three English and three Maltese speeches modelled on those in the European Commission's Speech Repository. The analysis focuses on compliance with the prompt, suitability for purpose and linguistic output quality. The results indicate that, upon initial analysis, the speeches in both languages satisfy many of the criteria in the prompt. However, more thorough scrutiny reveals that the speeches may prove challenging for trainees to interpret, primarily due to their poor argumentative structure, low factual density, lack of clear links and intent, and low terminological complexity. In addition, the speech topics are excessively simplistic, not well-researched and insufficiently nuanced. The differences between English, a high-resource language, and Maltese, a low-resource language, are minimal. The main discrepancy between the two is the higher number of linguistic errors in Maltese. Overall, the results indicate that the speeches in both languages require extensive post-editing to meet their intended use.

Keywords: *GenAI; conference interpreting; interpreter training; European Union; speech writing; Speech Repository; Maltese; low-resource language; interinstitutional accreditation test*

1 Introduction

Conference interpreting has been inextricably linked with technology since the 1920s (Fantinuoli, 2022: 508), when simultaneous interpreting was first used at the International Labour Organisation (Baigorri-Jalón, 2021: 5). At the time, technology referred solely to the equipment required for this new form of interpretation, which replaced consecutive interpretation.

A century later, simultaneous interpretation is still the main interpreting mode in conference settings, particularly in institutional contexts such as the European Union. However, the interpreting landscape is rapidly evolving at all levels, from training to industry, and technology now encompasses a wide range of tools and applications, some of which are perceived as disruptive (Šveda and Poláček, 2025). In this digital age, interpreters are required to master a range of fast-moving technologies which are used in the interpreting process, from preparation to delivery, both in training and industry.

Broadly, five types of digital technologies now underpin the interpreting process. Fantinuoli (2022) identifies computer-assisted interpreting training (CAIT) tools, computer-assisted or computer-aided interpreting (CAI) tools, remote or distance interpreting, and machine interpreting as the four

main technologies in the field. These have recently been supplemented by emerging technologies such as Generative AI (GenAI), which is defined in section 2.

Through freely accessible tools such as Chat Generative Pre-Trained Transformer (ChatGPT), GenAI has facilitated assignment preparation for interpreters by simplifying and accelerating tasks such as information extraction and terminology management (Mei, 2024). It has also been incorporated into training curricula and research into interpreting pedagogy (Colman, 2025; Hatiarová, 2025).

Survey research provides an insight into the adoption and perception of new technologies, including AI-based tools, in translation, interpretation and training. Some surveys were administered on a smaller scale and are country-specific (e.g., Šveda and Poláček, 2025), while others were conducted in a wider geographical context, such as the European Language Industry Survey 2025 (ELIS, 2025). The common denominator in the responses to these surveys is a cautious approach towards AI. Respondents acknowledge that the further growth and spread of AI-based tools cannot be halted, and therefore professionals and trainees should embrace their adoption. The potential of such tools is recognised, but so are their shortcomings and the associated ethical concerns (Kollárová and Tonková, 2025: 68).

In order to appropriately prepare the future generation of interpreters for this highly dynamic work environment marked by rapid technological advancements, training programmes should incorporate the use of these tools into the curriculum (Defrancq, 2023: 302; Kollárová and Tonková, 2025: 68; Pym and Hao, 2025: xxiii). Practical training should be supplemented with critical assessment of and reflection on the potential and limitations of these tools.

The present paper advocates the incorporation of Generative AI tools into the conference interpreter training curriculum to supplement CAIT tools, more specifically speech repositories, so as to create additional training material for aspiring EU interpreters in English, a high-resource language, and in Maltese, a low-resource language¹.

By means of a small-scale experimental study involving trainee interpreters, this paper analyses the following research questions:

- (1) To what extent do GenAI speeches comply with the DG SCIC beginner consecutive criteria for speech writing?
- (2) How do GenAI outputs differ in suitability for interpreter training across a high-resource language (English) and a low-resource language (Maltese)?
- (3) What types of deficiencies most significantly affect the usability of GenAI speeches for consecutive interpreting practice in both languages?

Following an in-depth analysis distinct for the two languages in section 4, these research questions are answered in section 5.

¹ See section 2 for a definition of high-resource and low-resource languages.

2 Generative AI (GenAI)

The incorporation of Generative AI (GenAI) tools into the curriculum requires an understanding of the concepts underpinning these technologies, and their relevance to interpreter training so as to allow for proper selection and adoption of tools, as well as a well-substantiated critical assessment of their outputs.

GenAI is a more advanced form of Artificial Intelligence (AI) (Yusuf et al., 2024: 3). It is important to note that scholars have not reached an agreement on the definition of AI (Sheikh et al., 2023: 15-16). Definitions range from broad task-based descriptions, such as “technology that enables machines to imitate various complex human skills” (*ibid.*) to cognitive-based definitions centred around the replication or emulation of human intellect in a computerised format (Green, 2018: 10). These definitions present limitations as they are vague and do not clarify the underlying components, viz., human skills and intellect. A more comprehensive definition of AI is “a system’s ability to correctly interpret external data, to learn from such data, and to use those learnings to achieve specific goals and tasks through flexible adaptation” (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2019: 15). AI-enabled tools rely on large data sets to feed and train their algorithms and neural networks, enabling pattern recognition and learning, and increasing the accuracy of their outputs.

AI refers to a range of technologies, such as machine learning, which trains algorithms to identify patterns in data and subsequently generate predictions or decisions from those data patterns (Aldoseri, 2023: 1). Machine learning encompasses deep learning, by means of which multilayered neural networks process speech or images (*ibid.*). Another AI technology, which is particularly relevant to interpreting, is natural language processing (NLP). This refers to the analysis, interpretation and generation of human-like language in spoken or textual form (*ibid.*). An example of an NLP application is machine translation.

NLP lies at the basis of many tools based on Generative AI (GenAI). This is a type of AI which produces content in various formats, such as text and images, and analyses consolidated data from various sources (Fui-Hoon Nah, 2023: 277). The content is generated based on prompts, viz., inputs formulated by the user and inputted into the GenAI tool to elicit the desired output. Examples of GenAI tools based on NLP with a chatbot interface are OpenAI’s ChatGPT, Microsoft’s Copilot, and Google’s Gemini. These tools employ Large Language Models (LLMs), viz., AI systems which are trained on extensive data sets to learn and emulate patterns in human language. The exact origin of the training data is unknown. The data is drawn primarily from publicly accessible, unfiltered internet sources, which may result in the re-use and replication of biased, unethical or incorrect information (Horváth, 2022: 7). Therefore, the use of data generated by means of LLMs should be verified and assessed critically. In an educational context, trainee interpreters should be made aware of the capabilities and limitations of these models (Giustini and Dastyar, 2024: 197).

The GenAI tools which are generally used in interpreting and translation are based on LLMs and rely on prompts to execute language tasks (Pym and Hao 2025: xi). These tasks include, but are not limited to, translation, document summarisation and information extraction, speech-to-text and text-to-speech conversion, and speech generation. LLMs are rapidly evolving and are now capable of generating not only text but also audio and video materials which can be used for interpreting practice (Li, 2026: 120).

It must be noted that the most widely used GenAI tools, such as ChatGPT, have been trained mostly on English-language data, resulting in lower performance in low-resource languages (Bang et al., 2023: 676). The data set used to train the main GenAI tools is composed mainly of English-language data (Bang et al., 2023; Lin et al., 2022). As a result, these tools have been shown to perform less accurately in low-resource languages (Bang et al., 2023). These are languages which lack sufficiently large data sets and online content for NLP tools to produce high-quality outputs. Maltese, one of the languages used in the present study, is an example of a low-resource language. Given this lack of efficiency, it is recommended that GenAI tools are prompted with an English template rather than in the language in which the output is required (Lin et al., 2022). This approach was therefore adopted in the methodology for this study, as illustrated in section 3. However, it must be noted that research is being conducted into AI-powered tools for Maltese, including Maltese-trained LLMs, speech recognition and machine translation tools.² These tools are actively being fine-tuned, and could be used for future research in the field of interpreter training.

2.1 GenAI-enabled speech writing in interpreter training

GenAI tools may be integrated into the interpreter training curriculum in various manners, for example for assignment preparation, speech writing, the development of mock debates and the analysis of feedback logs (Colman, 2025). However, the practical integration of GenAI into training programmes has not been thoroughly researched. The present paper seeks to fill this gap by means of a small-scale experimental empirical study centred around speech writing and delivery, which are essential skills for interpreters (Gillies, 2024: 117; Tiselius, 2025: 69).

Trainee interpreters have access to speech repositories, which are classified as CAIT tools. These are arguably the most widely used technological aid in interpreter training (Fantinuoli, 2022: 510). The first speech databases date back to the 1990s, originating in the universities of Granada and Trieste and developed to provide students with sufficient training material (Amato et al., 2025: 156). Given the limited contact hours in most interpreter training courses, speech writing, and subsequent audio and/or video recording, is encouraged in interpreter training. Not only does this exercise provide trainee interpreters with an understanding of the structure of various speech types and registers, as well as differences between languages and cultures (Tiselius, 2025: 69), it also helps improve interpreting output and create material for peer practice (*ibid.*).

To prepare for the European Union's interinstitutional accreditation test, students use the Speech Repository³, a database developed by the European Commission's Directorate-General for Interpretation (DG SCIC). It contains video-recorded speeches in all the official EU languages, as well as some additional languages such as Russian and Mandarin Chinese. The speeches are similar to the ones used in the interinstitutional accreditation test and they are labelled according to their use (consecutive without notes, consecutive and simultaneous) and difficulty level (beginner, intermediate, advanced/test type and very advanced). While the levels are not explicitly described, DG SCIC has drawn up a table listing the criteria which speeches should adhere to at each level.⁴

² For an overview up to late 2025, see <https://businessnow.mt/maltese-language-risks-falling-behind-in-the-age-of-ai/> (last accessed on 14 January 2026)

³ <https://speech-repository.webcloud.ec.europa.eu> (last accessed on 30 November 2025)

⁴ https://knowledge-centre-translation-interpretation.ec.europa.eu/sites/default/files/communities/description_of_the_speech_repository_levels.pdf (last accessed on 30 November 2025)

Users may sort the speeches by type (real-life or pedagogical speeches) and by domain, for example ‘general’ or more specific topics such as ‘institutional affairs’. The database also allows for the creation of dedicated collections. Users can log in to gain access to transcripts and download the videos. Trainers also have access to the Dedicated Speech Repository for Trainers, which contains video-recorded speeches non-accessible to the general public.

The database for some languages is quite extensive. The publicly available speeches in English, across all levels and uses, for example, exceed 500⁵. The database for other languages is far more limited. The Maltese speeches in the Speech Repository total just over 50⁶ due to operational constraints. Pedagogical speech writing and recording is done by staff interpreters, trainees within DG SCIC and interpreter trainers. Hence, smaller language units cannot devote the same number of resources to this task as larger language units. Therefore, it is useful for students to draft and record their own practice speeches, so as to have access to additional training material. This is particularly relevant to aspiring Maltese interpreters working in return, who require Maltese source speeches.

GenAI tools may be used to facilitate the process of speech writing (Tiselius, 2025: 62), enabling students to create additional practice material. The present paper aims to explore this possibility through experimental empirical research involving GenAI.

3 Methodology

The current empirical study builds on a previous small-scale survey study (Colman, 2025), which was conducted following the integration of GenAI tools in the curriculum of the Master in Interpreting Studies at the University of Malta. In this study, interpretation students were asked, by means of a survey, to indicate the efficacy of GenAI tools for various tasks, including speech preparation, in the context of individual and group practice in preparation for the European Union’s interinstitutional accreditation test. The three tools surveyed were Gemini, Copilot and ChatGPT. The students questioned the usefulness of GenAI for speech writing, mainly due to ineffective prompting and the need for extensive post-editing (*ibid.*: 36).

The present paper follows up on these results through an experimental empirical study in which speeches generated by three GenAI tools are analysed and critically assessed. Three first-year students in the Master in Interpreting Studies at the University of Malta participated in this study. They were informed by means of an information letter at the beginning of the academic year and they were asked to sign a consent form. The three students represented the full cohort for the academic year 2025-2026. Their language profiles were either Maltese A and English B, or Maltese A, and English and German C.

Three speeches were generated based on an English prompt, inputted by the lecturer, in three different GenAI tools, viz., Gemini, Copilot and ChatGPT, which had been piloted the previous academic year. These tools were chosen because they are freely accessible.

⁵ 538 speeches at the time of writing (November 2025)

⁶ 56 speeches at the time of writing (November 2025)

Each student was assigned two speeches generated by one of these tools, one in English and one in Maltese. The prompt, inputted in all three tools verbatim, was based on the Speech Repository speech grading criteria drawn up by DG SCIC.

A single prompt was used, in English, to generate two speeches on a single topic, one in Maltese and one in English. The GenAI tools were prompted to generate speeches on an ‘evergreen’ topic, without further clarification. The link to the DG SCIC grading criteria was not included so as to tweak the speech length in the prompt, as explained below, and thus prevent inconsistencies between the prompt and the grading criteria.

The prompt read as follows:

Generate two 4-minute speeches, one in English and one in Maltese, to be used by trainee interpreters at beginner consecutive level. The speeches should be modelled on the beginner consecutive speeches in the Speech Repository, which was developed by the European Commission’s Directorate-General for Interpretation. Both speeches should have the following characteristics: the topics should be evergreen and predictable, with neither specialised vocabulary nor idiomatic expressions. The speeches may include some numbers, names, and/or brief lists. In terms of structure and content, the speeches should be simple and linear with clearly defined links. Students should be able to easily follow the structure and flow of the information presented, and some visual descriptions may be included to enable the students to visualise parts of the speeches. The speech rate should be comfortable, with some natural hesitations and pauses.

The speech level chosen for this exercise is beginner consecutive. Such speeches, which are used by students in the initial stages of their consecutive interpreting training, are generally no longer than 4 minutes. While the DG SCIC grading criteria specify the maximum length at 3 minutes, an analysis⁷ of the publicly accessible beginner consecutive speeches in the Speech Repository reveals that the average length for Maltese speeches⁸ is 4 minutes and 54 seconds, and that of English speeches⁹ is 4 minutes and 17 seconds. These speeches generally include a brief introduction in which the speaker announces the topic and shares terminology which might prove challenging for interpreters without preparation.

The topic should be predictable and not specialised, with neither specialised vocabulary nor idiomatic expressions. The speeches may include some numbers, names, and/or brief lists. In terms of structure and content, these speeches are simple and linear with clearly defined links. Students should be able to easily follow the structure and flow of the information presented, and some descriptions may be included to enable the students to visualise parts of the speech. The speech rate should be comfortable, with some natural hesitations and pauses.¹⁰

⁷ Analysis conducted in November 2025

⁸ 7 at the time of writing

⁹ 72 at the time of writing

¹⁰ The author of this study familiarised with the Speech Repository speech grading criteria during DG SCIC’s ‘Training for Trainers’ programme organised in September 2023, which included a speech writing module.

The students received the prompts and the generated speeches in a Word document. They were asked to annotate them and critically assess their suitability for purpose and linguistic output quality. In doing so, they were asked to focus specifically on the extent to which the generated speeches meet the instructions in the prompt.

Prior to participating in this exercise, the students familiarised with the basics of AI and GenAI by means of an introductory theoretical lecture, followed by a hands-on practical class-based session on how to prompt Gemini, Copilot and ChatGPT for speech writing. They also tested these tools with more limited prompts.

4 Analysis and findings

The following descriptive analysis, distinctive for the English and Maltese speeches, combines the students' insights with the lecturer's critical analysis of the speeches. The English speeches can be found in Annex A, while the Maltese speeches can be found in Annex B. The findings are summarised visually in tables listing the DG speech grading criteria in Annex C.

4.1 Analysis of the English speeches

4.1.1 Topic

It is striking that all three English generated speeches centre around similar topics, viz., nature and green spaces. Student A worked on a speech generated by Gemini, titled 'The Joy of Public Gardens'. Student B analysed a speech generated by Copilot, titled 'A Walk Through the Seasons' and student C worked on a speech generated by ChatGPT on 'The Importance of Urban Green Spaces'. These are all widely known, familiar topics, which are predictable and do not require any specialised domain knowledge. As such, in terms of topic, the three GenAI tools produced results in accordance with the prompt.

Pronouns and explicitation further strengthen the sense of familiarity. The Gemini speech begins with the pronouns *our*¹¹ and *we* ('in the heart of *our* cities and towns' and 'places *we* often take for granted') to set the tone, and then proceeds with the pronoun *you*. The Copilot speech explicitly introduces the topic as 'something we all experience'. The ChatGPT speech does the same with the phrase 'something we all see every day'.

It must be noted that the topics of the English beginner consecutive speeches in the Speech Repository are more elaborate and well-researched. By means of example, the Speech Repository contains English speeches on cocoa in Ghana¹², organ donation¹³ and cybersickness¹⁴. Such topics are more demanding and thus better suited to training at postgraduate level.

¹¹ Italics added for emphasis

¹² Speech number 29355

¹³ Speech number 28227

¹⁴ Speech number 27811

4.1.2 Structure

Upon cursory analysis, all three English speeches appear to meet the criteria in the prompt in terms of structure. However, a more detailed analysis shows that the speeches present a number of shortcomings.

The three speeches introduce the topic with an introductory sentence. However, it is striking that none of the speeches includes an introduction preceding the start of the speech, which is customary in the Speech Repository and generally includes some terminology. This requirement was not specified in the prompt, but the GenAI tools did not scan the Speech Repository speeches to emulate their structure. In this context, it must be noted that the Speech Repository does not allow access to speech transcripts to users who have not logged in with a username and password, which might explain this shortcoming.

All speeches follow a simple, linear structure. The speech generated by Gemini features a straightforward sequence of ideas, starting with an opening and general introduction, an overview of the benefits of public gardens, a description of their typical layout, a reference to history, an example and a conclusion. However, the different parts of the speech are neither explicitly announced nor appropriately linked. While it might be argued that the intention is to highlight the benefits of public gardens, overall, the speech is more descriptive than argumentative, particularly the parts about the design and history of public gardens. The lack of a clear intention, as well as the missing transitions between ideas hinder anticipation and note-taking.

The speech generated by Copilot proceeds in a predictable chronological order, starting with an introduction, a description of each season starting from spring, and a brief summary and conclusion. The different sections are introduced explicitly ('Next comes ...', 'Then we have...', 'Finally') and are easy to visualise through the mention of colours and familiar sensory experiences. Despite these strong, clear transitions between the main sections of the speech, and distinct visual and experiential elements, the excessive use of brief sentences in quick succession, without explicit transitions between ideas, does not allow for proper deverbalsation and note-taking. An example is 'Many families go on holiday. Beaches are full. Children play outside. Ice cream becomes very popular. In the countryside, fields turn golden. Farmers harvest crops like wheat and barley'. It is difficult for trainee interpreters to keep up with such short, unrelated sentences. The speech also ends with a summary consisting of excessively short sentences, 'Spring is fresh and green. Summer is hot and lively. Autumn is colourful and calm. Winter is cold and quiet'. The Maltese speech generated by Copilot presents this same structure, as illustrated in section 4.2.2. Finally, content-wise, the speech is overly reductive as it does not elaborate on any of the ideas presented.

The speech generated by ChatGPT follows a clear, well-ordered structure. The introduction and definition of the topic, viz., 'green spaces', is followed by three benefits, a problem statement, an example and finally a conclusion. The different sections of the speech are announced with enumeration markers (e.g., 'first of all', 'secondly'), which facilitate note-taking in the initial stages of training. However, similarly to the Copilot speech, the staccato nature of the sentences in some parts of the speech may prove challenging for trainee interpreters. Visually, this is evident in the stand-alone sentences, each of which starts on a new line. Finally, this speech also exhibits a marked content simplicity, which hinders comprehension and deverbalsation.

Despite the three speeches having a relatively clear structure, and to some extent, identifiable links, the intention of the speeches is not entirely clear and overall, they are more descriptive than argumentative. In addition, the Copilot and ChatGPT speeches are characterised by a fragmented sentence structure. These issues pose a challenge for trainee interpreters as they impede proper understanding and hinder the deverbalisation and note-taking process.

4.1.3 Language level

The speeches generated by Gemini, Copilot and ChatGPT mostly satisfy the criteria in terms of language level. They all lack challenging vocabulary and idioms. The register is typical of general-interest speeches. However, compared to the English beginner consecutive speeches in the Speech Repository, they feature excessively simplistic terminology and content. The Speech Repository speeches are generally characterised by more advanced vocabulary.

None of the speeches contain idiomatic expressions. As for specialised vocabulary, while still very accessible, the speech generated by Copilot contains a number of terms which may be challenging for trainee interpreters who have not yet created dedicated glossaries on the topics of nature, agriculture and horticulture. Examples are names of flowers, viz., ‘tulips’, ‘daffodils’ and ‘cherry blossoms’, as well as terms such as ‘harvesting’, ‘wheat’, ‘barley’ and ‘hibernate’. Aside from these terms, the speech is very simple, with visual triggers in the form of colours (‘fields turn golden’, ‘leaves change colour – from green to yellow, orange, and red’) and identifiable descriptions (‘people drink hot drinks like tea or cocoa [...] It’s a time for family gatherings and warm meals’).

The speech generated by Gemini contains only a few words and phrases which may pose challenging, e.g., ‘oak tree’, ‘ornamental pond’ and ‘conservation’. Likewise, in the ChatGPT speech only a handful of terms may pose difficulties, such as ‘carbon dioxide’ and ‘city planners’.

All students described the English speeches as too elementary in terms of vocabulary and content, particularly compared to Speech Repository speeches of the same difficulty level. In addition, a few minor linguistic errors were identified in one of the English speeches, as detailed in section 4.1.5.

4.1.4 Speed/density

None of the speeches include natural repetitions and hesitations. The speech generated by ChatGPT in particular is excessively segmented, consisting of a series of stand-alone sentences.

While none of the speeches are dense in numbers, in line with the prompt, they do feature a lot of sequences of nouns and/or adjectives which may prove challenging in note-taking exercises for beginners. Two examples in the Gemini speech are ‘the gentle sound of a small water fountain’ and ‘bright red roses, deep purple lavender, and sunny yellow sunflowers’.

The Copilot speech in particular contains a lot of lists, such as ‘shorts, t-shirts, sandals’, ‘apples, pumpkins, and grapes’ and ‘coats, gloves, and boots’. The summary consisting of short sentences at the end of the speech, as mentioned in section 4.1.2, is particularly challenging for trainee interpreters due to constraints in note-taking technique.

The ChatGPT speech also presents low redundancy, with sentences such as ‘They also provide homes for birds, insects, and small animals’ and ‘Families go there for picnics, children play, and older people sit on benches and talk’. While not factually dense, such lists are not suited to note-taking at beginner level.

In terms of length, the longest speech is the one generated by ChatGPT, with a word count of 416, which, at a comfortable pace of 130 words per minute, can be read out in approximately 3 minutes. The Gemini speech has a word count of 329 and the Copilot speech has a word count of 349 words. As such, none of the speeches satisfy the criteria in the prompt.

4.1.5 Linguistic features

There are no spelling errors in any of the English speeches. Overall, the grammar and syntax of all three speeches is predictable, presenting predominantly SVO structures and limited use of subordination. These features support oral clarity and facilitate interpretation.

The ChatGPT speech presents the most complex syntax, with a few compound sentences, e.g., ‘When people go for a walk in the park, they breathe cleaner air, and they feel more relaxed’. However, these add variety and are not excessively complex.

The speech generated by Gemini contains two unidiomatic phrases, namely the definite article preceding ‘St. Anne’s Park’ and ‘a *resource*¹⁵ for relaxation’.

4.1.6 Overall assessment

Overall, while the three English speeches meet many criteria in the prompt, the GenAI tools fall short in terms of suitability for purpose. The English speeches, which were interpreted into Maltese in class, proved too basic in terms of topic and content for trainee interpreters and given the issues identified, such as excessive segmentation, they are not suited to consecutive note-taking. They thus require extensive post-editing.

4.2 Analysis of the Maltese speeches

4.2.1 Topic

For the Maltese section of this task, student A worked on a speech generated by Gemini, titled ‘L-Importanza tal-Qari’, which translates as ‘The Importance of Reading’. Student B worked on a speech generated by Copilot, titled ‘Il-Ħajja ta’ Kuljum f’Raħal Żgħir’, which translates as ‘Everyday Life in a Small Village’. Student 3 analysed a speech generated by ChatGPT, titled ‘Il-Benefiċċji tal-Isport fil-Ħajja ta’ Kuljum’ (‘The Benefits of Sports in Everyday Life’). Unlike the topics of the English speeches, the Maltese output was more varied and did not centre around a common topic. The topics are all widely known and relatable, which aligns well with the prompt.

¹⁵ Italics added for emphasis

Analogously to the English speeches, the Gemini speech introduces an element of familiarity from the outset through the use of pronouns, by introducing the topic as ‘suġġett li jmiss lilna lkoll’ (‘a topic that concerns *us*¹⁶ all’) but then switches to the second person singular from the second paragraph onwards (e.g., ‘tista’ titgħallem’, which translates as ‘*you* can learn’; ‘jekk taqra dwar ix-xjenza’, which translates as ‘if you read about science’). Comparably, the ChatGPT speech begins with phrases that appeal directly to the audience, ‘suġġett li jolqot lil kulhadd’ (which also translates as ‘a topic that concerns *us* all’). The speech continues in the second person plural, e.g., ‘meta naghmlu attività fiżika’ (‘when *we* exercise’) and is concluded with a call to action, which also adds a further layer of relatability, ‘Għalhekk, ejjew nippruvaw inkunu ftit aktar attivi kuljum — anke b’mod żgħir’ (‘So, let’s try to be a bit more active every day – even in small ways’).

The Copilot speech stands out for its purely descriptive nature. Aside from the sentence ‘Tista’ tisma’ l-għasafar ikantaw u tara l-ewwel xemx tidli fuq id-djar’ (‘You can hear the birds singing and see the first sun shining onto the houses’), the sentences are rather impersonal, starting with generic subjects, e.g., ‘xi nies’ (‘some people’), ‘ħafna nies’ (‘a lot of people’), or with subjects which are not further defined or elaborated upon, e.g., ‘il-bdiewa’ (‘the farmers’), ‘it-tfal’ (‘the children’), and ‘il-familji’ (‘the families’).

In line with the findings concerning the English speeches, the topics of the Maltese beginner consecutive speeches in the Speech Repository are more challenging and explored in greater depth. The Speech Repository includes Maltese speeches on subjects such as abortion in Malta¹⁷, the G7¹⁸ and the history of Malta¹⁹, among others.

4.2.2 Structure

Similarly to the English speeches, none of the Maltese speeches include an introduction comparable to the Speech Repository introductions. However, all three speeches begin with an introductory sentence.

In terms of structure, the three speeches are simple and linear, in line with the prompt. The Gemini speech begins with an introduction, followed by four arguments in favour of reading, viz., (1) reading increases knowledge, (2) reading provides relaxation and stress relief, (3) different genres appeal to different audiences, and (4) reading from a young age supports language development and fosters creativity. This argumentation is followed by a brief summary and a concluding remark. The Copilot speech follows a linear chronology, detailing activities in a small village on a typical day, from morning to night, followed by a concise recap and closure. Finally, the ChatGPT speech presents an argumentative structure following an explicit point-by-point sequence, starting with an introduction and subsequently detailing four benefits of sports, viz., (1) sports improve physical health, (2) sports boost mental health, (3) sports foster a sense of community, and (4) sports encourage discipline and perseverance in children. This is followed by a common objection, namely the lack of time, and a real-life example. As illustrated in section 4.2.1, the conclusion also includes a call to action, which increases relatability and avoids an abrupt ending.

¹⁶ Italics added for emphasis

¹⁷ Speech number 33113

¹⁸ Speech number 32193

¹⁹ Speech number 22453

The Gemini and ChatGPT speeches are mildly argumentative, supported by minimal factual information. The Gemini speech elaborates each argument briefly, supported by some facts, e.g., ‘Kien hemm studju fl-Università ta’ Malta li wera li tfal li jaqraw għal 20 minuta kuljum għandhom vokabularju ferm akbar minn sħabhom’ (‘A study at the University of Malta showed that children who read for 20 minutes a day have a much larger vocabulary than their peers’). The ChatGPT speech presents comparable patterns, e.g., ‘Hafna tobba jgħidu li anke 30 minuta kuljum ta’ eżerċizzju jistgħu jagħmlu differenza kbira’ (‘Many doctors say that even 30 minutes of exercise a day can make a big difference’).

In contrast, the Copilot speech is primarily descriptive, consisting of sentences which are neither clearly connected nor introduced by proper transitions. An example is the description of a typical afternoon in a small village: ‘It-tfal jilagħbu barra. Xi nies joħorġu għal mixja. Il-knisja tiftaħ għall-quddiesa ta’ filgħaxija. Il-ħwienet jerġgħu jifthu. Il-ħanut tal-ħelu jkun mimli bi tfal u ġenituri’ (‘Children play outside. Some people go out for a walk. The church opens for the evening mass. The shops open again. The sweet shop is full of children and parents.’). This lack of coherence and links impedes comprehension and effective note-taking.

As for transitions and links, the Copilot speech uses explicit time markers to create temporal cohesion, such as ‘filgħodu’ (‘in the morning’) and ‘filgħaxija’ (‘in the evening’), or exact timestamps, such as ‘12:30’. While these temporal cues may aid note-taking, the low factual density and swift succession of unconnected ideas may prove challenging.

The speech generated by Gemini presents a limited number of links and transitions, viz., ‘l-ewwel nett’ (‘firstly’), ‘aspett ieħor’ (‘another aspect’) and ‘bħala konklużjoni’ (‘to conclude’). This finding aligns with the issues identified in the English speech generated by the same tool, which was also rather segmented.

The ChatGPT speech is characterised by the strongest links, viz., ‘nibda bil-punt l-aktar ċar’ (‘I will begin with the clearest point’), followed by ‘it-tieni punt’ (‘the second point’) and ‘it-tielet punt’ (‘the third point’). Each idea is clearly structured and, despite the lack of informational density, the intention of the speech is more evident. Similarly to the English speech, each sentence begins on a new line, but unlike the English speech, the information presented is more coherent.

Overall, in terms of structure, the speech generated by Copilot appears the most challenging for trainee interpreters, mostly due to its highly descriptive nature, low factual density and segmented sentence structure.

4.2.3 Language level

In line with the prompt, none of the Maltese speeches contains idiomatic language. In addition, the register appears lower, and the vocabulary more simplistic, than that of the English speeches.

The Copilot speech contains only one culture-specific term which may be challenging to interpret, namely ‘ftira’, a type of bread typical of the Maltese islands. This speech ends very abruptly with a summary consisting of a list of very basic terms, e.g., ‘Filgħodu: ħwienet, skola, xogħol. F’nofsinhar: ikla u mistrieħ’ (‘Morning: shops, school, work. Midday: lunch and rest.’). This poses a challenge in note-taking, as it is nothing but a list of words presented in quick succession, without

context. Beginner trainee interpreters may not yet possess the speed and note-taking technique required to deal with this challenge.

The Gemini and ChatGPT speeches are straightforward in terms of vocabulary, presenting no difficulties other than perhaps the term ‘endorphins’ in the ChatGPT speech, which was left in English despite there being a Maltese equivalent, ‘endorfini’.

Finally, the Maltese speeches contain a greater number of linguistic errors and unidiomatic expressions than the English speeches, as illustrated in section 4.2.5.

4.2.4 Speed/density

None of the speeches present any natural hesitations. However, the Gemini speech appears to have some degree of redundancy through repetitions, e.g., in “[...] l-importanza tal-qari. Il-qari [...]” (‘[...] the importance of reading. Reading [...]’) and ‘kull ktieb, kull artiklu, u kull rivista’ (‘every book, every article, and every magazine’). This supports the trainees’ note-taking efforts.

The Copilot speech features neither repetitions nor hesitations. On the contrary, it is very dense in unlinked sentences, as explained in section 4.2.2, making it challenging for aspiring interpreters working in consecutive mode.

The ChatGPT speech presents no redundancy but given that each argument is elaborated upon and predictable, it is perhaps the least challenging to interpret in terms of speed and density.

When read at a comfortable pace, all the speeches are shorter than the length specified in the prompt. The Copilot speech is the shortest (with a word count of 220, which translates into under two minutes at a comfortable pace of 130 words per minute), followed by the Gemini speech (with a word count of 239) and the ChatGPT speech (with a word count of 332).

4.2.5 Linguistic features

Unlike the English speeches, the Maltese speeches present a higher density of linguistic errors. An example in the Gemini speech is ‘dwar il-istorja’. This should read ‘dwar l-istorja’ because nouns which start with a vowel in Maltese take the definite article ‘l-’. Some phrases are also unidiomatic, such as ‘il-moħħ tiegħek’, which should read ‘moħħok’. Likewise, the Copilot speech contains unidiomatic phrases, such as ‘jiejdu ffit mistrieħ’, which student B indicated should be replaced with ‘jistrieħu ffit’. In addition, the word ‘pasta’ has a Maltese equivalent, namely ‘għaġin’, as does the word ‘butcher’, viz., ‘tal-laħam’. Student B also corrected the word ‘belliegħa’ into ‘qanpiena’. The first word of the ChatGPT speech, ‘bongu’ is spelled incorrectly (it should read ‘bongu’). In addition, ‘endorphins’ was left in English, despite there being a Maltese equivalent, ‘endorfini’, as mentioned in section 4.2.3.

While an exhaustive analysis of the Maltese linguistic output falls beyond the scope of the present paper, these examples illustrate how all three tested GenAI tools failed to produce linguistically correct output in Maltese, a low-resource language.

4.2.6 Overall assessment

The Maltese output of all three GenAI tools complied with some of the criteria in the prompt, but broadly, the speeches require substantial post-editing, both linguistic and in terms of structure and content. When interpreted into English, in return, the Maltese speeches were deemed too simplistic, like the English speeches. In addition, all three GenAI tools generated outputs not suited to consecutive note-taking at this stage of training.

5 Findings

This section systematically summarises the findings for each research question listed in section 1.

Firstly, to what extent do GenAI speeches comply with the DG SCIC beginner consecutive criteria for speech writing?

At first glance the generated speeches in both languages seem to meet the DG SCIC criteria for speeches at beginner consecutive level, as illustrated in the tables in Annex C. However, upon closer inspection it is evident that the speeches present a number of shortcomings which apply to both languages.

In terms of topic, structure and language level, there appear to be no significant differences between the speeches generated in English, a high-resource language, and those generated in Maltese, a low-resource language. In both languages, the output is rather poor as the topics are too elementary and not well elaborated upon. In addition, the terminology used is too basic for practice at this level of training. Overall, the speeches lack a clear intent, as well as an explicit argumentative structure. In addition, generally in both languages the links and transitions between ideas are either missing or unclear, which hinders effective note-taking.

The language level in both English and Maltese is comparable – all generated speeches were deemed excessively simplistic. The main difference between the English and the Maltese speeches is that the latter present a lower register and a significant number of linguistic errors, specifically unidiomatic language and spelling errors.

Finally, in terms of length and density, the speeches in both languages are comparable. None meet the criteria in the prompt as they are too short and lack the redundancy required for beginner speeches.

These findings apply to all the GenAI tools used.

Secondly, how do GenAI outputs differ in suitability for interpreter training across a high-resource language (English) and a low-resource language (Maltese)?

As evidenced above and illustrated by means of examples in section 4, overall the outputs in both languages are comparable and not well suited to interpreter training at beginner level without extensive post-editing, particularly due to the poorly elaborated topics, the lack of clear links and transitions, and the elementary language level.

The only significant difference between English, a high-resource language, and Maltese, a low-resource language, lies in the number of linguistic errors, which is limited to non-existent in English, while it is significantly high in Maltese. Thus, the Maltese speeches require extensive linguistic correction.

This finding once again applies to all the GenAI tools tested in this study.

Thirdly, what types of deficiencies most significantly affect the usability of GenAI speeches for consecutive interpreting practice in both languages?

Beginner speeches should promote the development and refining of note-taking skills. The main issue which hinders effective note-taking across all speeches in both languages is their highly segmented nature, notably due to the lack of a clear intent, explicit links and transitions between ideas, and low redundancy.

6 Conclusion

This small-scale empirical study confirms the findings which had emerged from the survey conducted the previous academic year, namely the lack of effectiveness of GenAI tools for speech writing and the need for thorough post-editing, particularly in Maltese.

At first sight, the speeches generated by Gemini, Copilot and ChatGPT appear to satisfy many of the criteria in the prompt, in both languages. However, upon closer analysis, none are well-suited to consecutive note-taking at beginner level due to a range of challenges both in English and Maltese, such as a poor argumentative structure, low factual density, a lack of clear links and intent, and low terminological complexity. The speeches therefore require extensive post-editing. In addition to this, the output in Maltese, a low-resource language, features a high number of linguistic errors, thus demanding thorough linguistic correction.

Very little to no research has been conducted into the use of GenAI for speech writing in interpreter training, particularly for a low-resource language like Maltese. In addition, hardly any research is available on the training of Maltese interpreters specifically for the EU institutions and their engagement with technology as part of the curriculum. In this context, the present study is particularly relevant as it provides an initial framework for further empirical studies in the field. These could focus on more effective prompting, including in low-resource languages, and an in-depth analysis and comparison of the output in multiple languages, either high-resource or low-resource, or a combination of the two. It is hoped that the present study will be replicated on a larger scale, with other languages and for both consecutive and simultaneous practice at various levels.

References

- Aldoseri, A., Al-Khalifa, K. N., & Hamouda, A. M. (2023). Re-Thinking Data Strategy and Integration for Artificial Intelligence: Concepts, Opportunities, and Challenges. *Applied Sciences*, 13(12), 7082.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/app13127082>

- Amato, A., Russo, M., Carioli, G., & Spinolo, N. (2025). *Technology for training in conference interpreting*. In E. Davitti, T. Korybski & S. Braun (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Conference Interpreting, Technology and AI* (pp. 156-177). Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003053248-13>
- Baigorri-Jalón, J. (2021). Once upon a time at the ILO: The infancy of simultaneous interpreting. In K. G. Seeber (Ed.), *100 years of conference interpreting: A legacy* (pp. 1–24). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Bang, Y., Cahyawijaya, S., Lee, N., Dai, W., Su, D., Wilie, B., Lovenia, H., Ji, Z., Yu, T., Chung, W., Do, Q. V., Xu, Y., & Fung, P. (2023). A Multitask, Multilingual, Multimodal Evaluation of ChatGPT on Reasoning, Hallucination, and Interactivity. *AAACL*, 675–718.
- Colman, A. (2025). GenAI for self-directed individual and collaborative learning in the training of conference interpreters for the European Union institutions. *L10N Journal*, 1(4), 21–44.
- Defrancq, B. (2023). Technology in interpreter education and training: A structured set of proposals. In G. Corpas Pastor & B. Defrancq (Eds.), *Interpreting technologies – Current and future trends* (pp. 302–319). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- ELIS. (2025). *ELIS report*. https://elis-survey.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/ELIS-2025_Report.pdf. Last accessed on 29 November 2025.
- Fantinuoli, C. (2022). Conference interpreting and new technologies. In M. Albl-Mikasa & E. Tiselius (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of conference interpreting* (pp. 508–522). Routledge.
- Fui-Hoon Nah, F., Zheng, R., Cai, J., Siau, K., & Chen, L. (2023). Generative AI and ChatGPT: Applications, challenges, and AI-human collaboration. *Journal of Information Technology Case and Application Research*, 25(3), 277–304.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15228053.2023.2233814>
- Gillies, A. (2024). *Conference interpreting: A student's practice book* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Giustini, D., & Dastyar, V. (2024). Critical AI literacy for interpreting in the age of AI. *Interpreting and Society*, 4(2), 196–213.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/27523810241247259>
- Green, B. P. (2018). Ethical reflections on artificial intelligence. *Scientia et Fides*, 6(2), 9–31. <https://doi.org/10.12775/SetF.2018.015>
- Hatiarová, P. (2025). AI in interpreting training. *L10N Journal*, 1(4), 45–66.
- Horváth, I. (2022). AI in interpreting: Ethical considerations. *Across Languages and Cultures*, 23(1), 1–13.
<https://doi.org/10.1556/084.2022.00108>

- Kaplan, A., & Haenlein, M. (2019). Siri, Siri, in my hand: Who's the fairest in the land? On the interpretations, illustrations, and implications of artificial intelligence. *Business Horizons*, 62(1), 15–25.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2018.08.004>
- Kollárová, K., & Tonková, L. (2025). The use of generative artificial intelligence in interpreter preparation. *L10N Journal*, 1(4), 67–109.
- Li, Z. (2026), A Study on the Impact and Insights of Technology on Interpreting Education, In A. K. F. Cheung, D. Li, K. Liu & R. Moratto (Eds.), *Technology and Interpreting, Navigating the Digital Age* (pp. 109-120). Routledge.
- Lin, X. V., Mihaylov, T., Artetxe, M., Wang, T., Chen, S., Simig, D., Ott, M., Goyal, N., Bhosale, S., Du, J., Pasunuru, R., Shleifer, S., Koura, P. S., Chaudhary, V., O'Horo, B., Wang, J., Zettlemoyer, L., Kozareva, Z., Diab, M., Stoyanov, V., & Li, X. (2022). Few-shot Learning with Multilingual Generative Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing* (pp. 9019–9052). Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mei, L. (2024). Human-Machine Interaction Translation under Artificial Intelligence and Big Data: Analysis from the Perspective of Text Stratification and Corpus Construction. *Edelweiss Applied Science and Technology*, 8(4), 1007–1025.
<https://doi.org/10.55214/25768484.v8i4.1478>
- Pym, A., & Hao, Y. (2025). *How to Augment Language Skills: Generative AI and Machine Translation in Language Learning and Translator Training*. Routledge.
- Sheikh, H., Prins, C., & Schrijvers, E. (2023). Artificial Intelligence: Definition and Background. In *Mission AI: The new system technology* (pp. 15–41). Springer.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-21448-6_2
- Šveda, P., & Poláček, I. (2025). Interpreter Training in the Age of AI. *L10N Journal*, 1(4), 5–20.
- Tiselius, E. (2025). *Conference interpreting explained*. Routledge.
- Yusuf, A., Pervin, N., & Román-González, M. (2024). Generative AI and the Future of Higher Education: A threat to Academic Integrity or Reformation? Evidence from Multicultural Perspectives. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 21, 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00453-6>

Annexes

Annex A – English speeches

Speech 1 (student A) – English speech generated by Gemini in November 2025

🗣️ *English Speech: "The Joy of Public Gardens"*

(Topic: Leisure/Local Green Spaces - Evergreen and Predictable)

Good morning, everyone.

I want to talk today about public gardens—those wonderful green spaces right in the heart of our cities and towns. They are places we often take for granted, but they offer so much to our daily lives.

For many people, public gardens are a fantastic place to relax and escape. Imagine a sunny afternoon: you can sit on a bench under a large oak tree, listen to the gentle sound of a small water fountain, and just watch the world go by. This peaceful environment is essential for mental well-being. It provides a quick, easy way to reduce stress without having to travel far away.

The design of a typical public garden is simple but effective. When you first enter, you usually see a main path lined with carefully maintained flower beds. These flower beds might display vibrant colours like bright red roses, deep purple lavender, and sunny yellow sunflowers. As you walk further in, the path often leads you to a central feature—perhaps a small, ornamental pond or a historic statue. In many gardens, there is also a designated children's play area, often visible from the main café.

These gardens also have a long and important history. For example, the Botanical Garden in Cambridge, England, was established way back in 1762. Even today, gardens are important not just for beauty, but for education and conservation. They often grow rare plants and serve as living libraries for students and researchers.

In my local city, we are lucky to have the St. Anne's Park. It covers an area of approximately 40 acres and includes a lovely rose garden, a dedicated dog park, and a small area for growing vegetables. Last year alone, over 50,000 visitors enjoyed the park.

So, the next time you feel the need for a moment of peace, remember your local public garden. It's a resource for relaxation, a place for learning, and a beautiful piece of nature preserved just for you.

Speech 1 (student B) – English speech generated by Copilot in November 2025

 *English Speech: “A Walk Through the Seasons”*

Good morning everyone.

Today, I'd like to talk about something we all experience — the four seasons. Spring, summer, autumn, and winter. Each season has its own charm, its own colours, and its own rhythm. Let's begin with spring.

Spring usually starts in March and ends in May. It's the season of renewal. Trees begin to grow new leaves. Flowers bloom. You might see daffodils, tulips, and cherry blossoms. The days become longer, and the weather gets warmer. People often feel more energetic. Birds return from migration, and you can hear them singing in the morning. It's a time when many animals have their young.

Next comes summer.

Summer lasts from June to August. It's the warmest season. Temperatures can reach 30 degrees Celsius or more in some places. People wear lighter clothes — shorts, t-shirts, sandals. Many families go on holiday. Beaches are full. Children play outside. Ice cream becomes very popular. In the countryside, fields turn golden. Farmers harvest crops like wheat and barley. It's also the season of festivals and outdoor concerts.

Then we have autumn.

Autumn begins in September and ends in November. The weather becomes cooler. Leaves change colour — from green to yellow, orange, and red. Eventually, they fall to the ground. It's a beautiful sight. People start wearing jackets and scarves. In many countries, schools reopen in autumn. It's also the time for harvesting apples, pumpkins, and grapes. Some animals prepare for winter by storing food or growing thicker fur.

Finally, winter.

Winter lasts from December to February. It's the coldest season. In some places, it snows. Roads and rooftops turn white. People wear coats, gloves, and boots. Days are shorter, and nights are longer. Many animals hibernate. Indoors, people drink hot drinks like tea or cocoa. In December, many countries celebrate holidays like Christmas and New Year. It's a time for family gatherings and warm meals.

So, to sum up:

Spring is fresh and green.

Summer is hot and lively.

Autumn is colourful and calm.

Winter is cold and quiet.

Each season brings something special. And together, they make the year complete. Thank you.

Speech 1 (student C) – English speech generated by ChatGPT in November 2025

Speech 1 – English (Topic: The Importance of Urban Green Spaces)

Good morning, everyone.

Today, I would like to talk about something we all see every day — green spaces in our towns and cities.

By green spaces, I mean parks, gardens, and trees that grow along our streets.

Let's start with why these places are so important.

First of all, green spaces improve our health.

When people go for a walk in the park, they breathe cleaner air, and they feel more relaxed.

A short walk among trees can reduce stress and improve concentration.

In cities where there are many cars and buildings, people often feel tired or stressed.

Green spaces give them a chance to slow down and reconnect with nature.

Secondly, these areas are important for the environment.

Trees help to clean the air by absorbing carbon dioxide and releasing oxygen.

They also help to cool the city during hot summer months.

If you imagine a street with no trees, the pavement becomes very hot under the sun.

But when there are trees, their shade makes a big difference.

They also provide homes for birds, insects, and small animals.

In this way, parks can support biodiversity, even in the middle of a busy city.

The third reason is that green spaces bring people together.

Families go there for picnics, children play, and older people sit on benches and talk.

Many cities organise community events in parks — concerts, open-air cinema nights, or sports activities.

These shared experiences help people feel connected to each other and to their city.

However, not all cities have enough green areas.

In some places, land is used mainly for buildings and roads.

As a result, children grow up without much contact with nature.

This is a challenge for many governments and city planners.

They need to find a balance between development and nature.

A simple example:

The city of Copenhagen decided that every resident should live no more than 15 minutes' walk from a park.

This clear goal helps the city plan where to plant trees and create new green zones.

It's a small idea, but it makes a big difference.

To conclude, green spaces are not just decoration.

They are essential for healthy, happy, and sustainable urban life.

They help our bodies, our minds, our environment, and our communities.

So next time you walk through your local park, take a moment to notice the trees, the grass, and

the people around you.
You are not just in a park — you are in the heart of your city's well-being.

Thank you.

Annex B – Maltese speeches

Speech 2 (student A) – Maltese speech generated by Gemini in November 2025

▀ Diskors bil-Malti: "L-Importanza tal-Qari"

L-ghodwa t-tajba lil kulhadd.

Illum nixtieq nitkellem dwar suggett li jmiss lilna lkoll: l-importanza tal-qari. Il-qari huwa attivita li mhix biss pjaċevoli, iżda li għandha benefiċċji kbar għal haġġitna.

Il-qari, l-ewwel nett, iżid l-għarfien tagħna. Kull ktieb, kull artiklu, u kull rivista joffrulna informazzjoni għdida. Jekk taqra dwar il-istorja antika, tista' titgħallem dwar iċ-ċiviltajiet tal-passat, bħall-Griegi jew ir-Rumani. Jekk taqra dwar ix-xjenza, tista' tifhem kif jaħdmu affarijiet kumplessi bħall-magni jew l-ispazju. Dan l-għarfien kollu jgħinna nikbru bħala persuni.

Aspett ieħor pożittiv ħafna tal-qari huwa l-effett rilassanti tiegħu. Meta tgħaddas ruhek fi ktieb, il-moħħ tiegħek jinqata' minn dak li jkun qed jiġri madwarek. Tista' timmaġina l-xenarju li jiddeskrivi l-awtur—forsi raħal żgħir mal-baħar, jew muntanja għolja mgħottija bil-borra. Dan l-ivjaġġar mentali jgħin biex innaqqsu l-istress u l-ansjeta.

Hemm diversi tipi ta' qari li nistgħu nagħzlu minnhom. Xi nies jippreferu l-fizzjoni, bħal rumanzi polizjeski jew stejjer fantastiċi. Ohrajn jippreferu l-non-fizzjoni, bħal kotba tat-tisjir, bijografiji ta' nies famużi, jew gwidi tal-ivjaġġar. M'hemmx qari aħjar minn ieħor; l-importanti hu li ssib dak li jogħgħbok.

Il-qari jibda minn età żgħira. Għat-tfal, huwa kruċjali għall-iżvilupp tal-lingwa u l-kreattività. Ħafna skejġel jibdew jgħallmu l-qari fl-età ta' bejn ħames u sitt snin. Kien hemm studju fl-Università ta' Malta li wera li tfal li jaqraw għal 20 minuta kuljum għandhom vokabularju ferm akbar minn shabhom.

Bħala konklużjoni, kemm jekk qed taqra ktieb stampat qadim jew ktieb elettroniku fuq tablet, il-qari huwa wieħed mill-aħjar modi kif tqatta' l-ħin tiegħek.

Speech 2 (student B) – Maltese speech generated by Copilot in November 2025

 *Maltese Speech: “Il-Hajja ta’ Kuljum f’Raħal Żgħir”*

Bongu lil kulhadd.

Illum, se nitkellem dwar il-hajja ta’ kuljum f’raħal żgħir. Raħal bħal dan jista’ jkun f’nofs il-kampanja, b’popolazzjoni ta’ madwar elf persuna.

Nibda bil-ghodwa.

Filghodu, ir-raħal jibda jieħu l-hajja. Il-ħwienet jifthu. Il-ħanut tal-ħobż, il-butcher, u l-ħanut tal-merċa. Xi nies imorru mixja jew jiġru fit-triq principali. Tista’ tisma’ l-ghasafar ikantaw u tara l-ewwel xemx tidli fuq id-djar.

It-tfal imorru l-iskola.

L-iskola tinsab qrib il-knisja. Hija bini sempliċi, b’żewġ sulari. Il-ġenituri jgħibu lit-tfal bil-karozza jew bil-mixi. Fit-triq, tara ħafna karozzi żgħar u xi muturi. Il-belliegħa tal-iskola tindaqq fis-7:45.

Wara, il-hajja tkompli.

Xi nies jaħdmu fl-uffiċċji lokali, oħrajn fl-ghelieqi. Filghodu, tara tratturi jgħaddu mit-toroq. Il-bdiewa jaħdmu fuq il-ħsad jew jitimghu l-annimali. Il-postijiet tax-xogħol mhumiex ‘il bogħod — kollox f’distanza ta’ mixja.

Fis-12:30, il-ħin tal-ikel.

Ħafna nies jirritornaw id-dar għal ikla sempliċi — bħal platt soppa, ftira, jew pasta. Wara l-ikel, xi nies jieħdu ftit mistrieħ. Il-ħwienet jagħlqu għal siegħa jew tnejn.

Filghaxija, ir-raħal jerga’ jieħu l-hajja.

It-tfal jilagħbu barra. Xi nies joħorġu għal mixja. Il-knisja tiftaħ għall-quddies ta’ filghaxija. Il-ħwienet jerggħu jifthu. Il-ħanut tal-ħelu jkun mimli bi tfal u ġenituri.

Fl-aħħar tal-ġurnata, kulhadd jirritorna d-dar.

Il-familji jieklu flimkien. Jara xi programm fuq it-televiżjoni. U mbagħad, jmorru jorqdu.

Bħala sommarju:

Filghodu: ħwienet, skola, xogħol.

F’nofsinhar: ikla u mistrieħ.

Filghaxija: mixjiet, quddies, ħin mal-familja.

Il-hajja f’raħal żgħir hija sempliċi, iżda mimlija ritmu u tradizzjoni.

Grazzi.

Speech 2 (student C) – Maltese speech generated by ChatGPT in November 2025

Speech 2 – Maltese (Topic: Il-Benefiċċji tal-Isport fil-Ħajja ta' Kuljum)

Bongu lil kulhadd.

Illum nixtieq nitkellem dwar sugġett li jolqot lil kulhadd — l-isport u l-benefiċċji tiegħu fil-ħajja ta' kuljum.

Mhux neċessarjament qed nitkellem dwar kompetizzjonijiet jew atleti professjonali, imma dwar l-attività fiżika ta' kuljum li tista' tagħmel kull persuna.

Nibda bil-punt l-aktar ċar: l-isport jagħmel tajjeb lis-saħħa.

Meta nagħmlu attività fiżika, bħalma hi mixja, ġiri ħafif jew rota, il-qalb u l-pulmuni tagħna jaħdmu aħjar.

Il-ġisem isir iktar b'saħħtu u nħossuna iktar enerġetiċi.

Ħafna tobba jgħidu li anke 30 minuta kuljum ta' eżerċizzju jistgħu jagħmlu differenza kbira.

It-tieni punt hu li l-isport jgħin ukoll lis-saħħa mentali.

Wara ġurnata twila ta' xogħol jew ta' studju, eżerċizzju jgħin biex nillaxkaw u nneħhu l-istress.

Meta niġru jew inħaddmu ġisimna, il-moħħ jipproduċi sustanzi li jsejnhom endorphins, li jagħtuna sens ta' kuntentizza.

Għalhekk ħafna nies jgħidu li wara li jagħmlu sport iħossuhom aktar pożittivi u kalmi.

It-tielet punt hu li l-isport jgħaqqad in-nies.

Fil-kwartieri tagħna naraw tfal jilagħbu futbol fit-triq jew adulti jiġru flimkien fil-ġonna pubbliċi.

L-isport joħloq sens ta' komunità.

Jgħallimna naħdmu f'tim, nirrispettaw lil xulxin, u ninkoraġġixxu lil min ikun magħna.

Dan jgħin ukoll biex jinbnew relazzjonijiet soċjali sodi.

Irrid insemmi wkoll il-benefiċċju edukattiv.

Meta t-tfal jipparteċipaw fl-isport, jitgħallmu dixxiplina u perseveranza.

Jitgħallmu li biex tirbaħ trid taħdem u thejji ruħek.

U xi drabi, jitgħallmu wkoll kif taċċetta t-telfa — ħaġa importanti ħafna fil-ħajja.

Naturalment, hemm min jgħid li m'għandux hin.

Imma l-verità hi li sport ma jfissirx dejjem gym jew kompetizzjoni.

Tista' sempliċement tagħzel li titla' t-taraġ flok l-lift, jew timxi f'fit wara x-xogħol.

Dawn huma passi żgħar, imma jgħinu ħafna.

Bħala eżempju, f'ċerti bliet bħal Amsterdam jew Copenhagen, ħafna nies imorru għax-xogħol bir-rota.

Dan mhux biss jipromwovi saħħa aħjar, imma jnaqqas ukoll it-tniġġis u t-traffiku.

Huwa eżempju sempliċi ta' kif l-attività fiżika tista' tkun parti naturali mill-ħajja ta' kuljum.

Biex nagħlaq, nista' ngħid li l-isport hu investiment fih innifsek.

Jagħmel tajjeb lill-ġisem, lill-moħħ, u lis-soċjetà kollha kemm hi.

Għalhekk, ejjew nippruvaw inkunu f'fit aktar attivi kuljum — anke b'mod żgħir.

Il-ġisem tagħna żgur jirringrazzjana.

Grazzi ħafna.

Annex C – Analysis tables

Annex C1: English speeches

Annex C2: Maltese speeches

Annex C1: English speeches

DG SCIC grading criteria	Gemini (student A)	Copilot (student B)	ChatGPT (student C)
TOPIC	'The Joy of Public Gardens'	'A walk through the seasons'	'The Importance of Urban Green Spaces'
Widely known	✓	✓	✓
Predictable	✓	✓	✓
General approach	✓	✓	✓
No specialised knowledge required	✓	✓	✓
STRUCTURE			
Simple	✓	✓	✓
Linear	✓	✓	✓
Strong and clear links	X	X	✓
Clear intention	X	X	X
Clear sequence of events	X	✓	✓
Preferably argumentative	X	X	X
May present some descriptive elements easy to visualise	✓	✓	✓
"Bone with very little meat"	✓	✓	✓
LANGUAGE LEVEL			
Native speaker	N/A ²⁰	N/A	N/A
Standard conference level	N/A	N/A	N/A
No specialised vocabulary/terminology used	✓	✓	✓
No vocabulary difficulties	✓	✓	✓

²⁰ N/A (not applicable) refers to mostly oral features, which have not been tested thoroughly in the framework of this study.

Avoid use of idioms	✓	✓	✓
SPEED/DENSITY			
Oral	✓	✓	✓
Natural repetitions and hesitations	X	X	X
Comfortable pace	✓	X	X
Very few or no enumerations of figures or names	X	X	X
Little factual information	✓	✓	✓
LINGUISTIC FEATURES			
Spelling and/or syntax errors	X	X	X
Unidiomatic language usage	✓	X	X

Annex C2: Maltese speeches

DG SCIC grading criteria	Gemini (student A)	Copilot (student B)	ChatGPT (student C)
TOPIC	‘L-Importanza tal-Qari’ (‘The Importance of Reading’)	‘ <i>Il-Hajja ta’ Kuljum f’Raħal Żgħir</i> ’, (‘Everyday Life in a Small Village’)	‘ <i>Il-Benefiċċji tal-Ispport fil-Hajja ta’ Kuljum</i> ’ (‘The Benefits of Sports in Everyday Life’)
Widely known	✓	✓	✓
Predictable	✓	✓	✓
General approach	✓	✓	✓
No specialised knowledge required	✓	✓	✓
STRUCTURE			
Simple	✓	✓	✓
Linear	✓	✓	✓
Strong and clear links	X	X	✓
Clear intention	X	X	✓
Clear sequence of events	X	✓	X
Preferably argumentative	X	X	✓
May present some descriptive elements easy to visualise	✓	✓	✓
“Bone with very little meat”	✓	✓	✓
LANGUAGE LEVEL			
Native speaker	N/A	N/A	N/A
Standard conference level	N/A	N/A	N/A
No specialised vocabulary/terminology used	✓	✓	✓
No vocabulary difficulties	✓	✓	✓
Avoid use of idioms	✓	✓	✓
SPEED/DENSITY			
Oral	✓	✓	✓

Natural repetitions and hesitations	X	X	X
Comfortable pace	✓	X	✓
Very few or no enumerations of figures or names	✓	✓	✓
Little factual information	✓	✓	✓
LINGUISTIC FEATURES			
Spelling and/or syntax errors	✓	✓	✓
Unidiomatic language usage	✓	✓	✓