

USING AI TO IMPROVE STUDENTS' WRITING

Urishev Abdumajid,

ELT Senior Teacher at UzSWLU

Abstract: *This article reviews how AI tools (generative AI and automated writing evaluation) can enhance students' writing through formative feedback, iterative revision, and targeted language support. It also addresses limitations bias, reliability, and integrity and proposes a classroom workflow for responsible, learning-oriented adoption.*

Key words: *artificial intelligence, L2 writing, revision, feedback, academic integrity.*

Annotatsiya: *Ushbu maqola yozuv ko'nikmasini o'qitishda sun'iy intellekt vositalaridan (generativ SI va avtomatlashtirilgan yozma baholash) foydalanish imkoniyatlarini tahlil qiladi. SI fikr-mulohazasi grammatik aniqlik va tahrir strategiyalarini kuchaytiradi, biroq ishonchlilik va akademik halollik bo'yicha ehtiyot choralarini talab qiladi.*

Kalit so'zlar: *sun'iy intellekt, yozuv ko'nikmasini o'qitish, qayta yozish (revision), fikr-mulohaza, akademik halollik.*

Аннотация: *Статья анализирует использование инструментов ИИ (генеративный ИИ и автоматизированная оценка письма) для улучшения письменной речи студентов. ИИ-обратная связь повышает точность и качество редактирования, но требует педагогического контроля из-за надежности, предвзятости и рисков академической нечестности.*

Ключевые слова: *искусственный интеллект, обучение письму, редактирование, обратная связь, академическая честность.*

Good writing in English is important for university study and future work. However, many EFL students find writing difficult: their ideas

may be unclear, paragraphs may not be well organized, and grammar and vocabulary problems can reduce clarity. Teachers can help through feedback, but in many contexts feedback is limited because classes are large and marking takes a lot of time. When feedback is delayed or too short, students often revise less, and their writing improves slowly. AI tools can help by giving faster feedback during drafting and revision. In ELT, two types of AI are commonly used. First, **automated writing evaluation (AWE)** tools (such as grammar and style checkers) provide immediate comments on language accuracy and basic writing features. Research shows that, when used for learning (not only for scoring), AWE can improve L2 writing performance and motivation and can reduce writing anxiety (Huang et al., 2024). Second, **generative AI** tools (such as ChatGPT) can give interactive explanations and revision suggestions and help students improve wording and organization. At the same time, research warns that students may over-trust the tool, accept incorrect advice, or depend on AI instead of developing their own writing skills (Barrot, 2023). Responsible use is necessary, especially for academic integrity and fairness. For example, some AI-detection tools can wrongly flag human writing, and this problem may be stronger for non-native English writers, which creates equity risks in assessment (Myers, 2023). For this reason, a learning-focused approach is needed: teachers should set clear rules for what AI support is allowed and design writing tasks that still measure students' own progress.

This article applies an integrative review approach, combining recent research on automated writing evaluation (AWE) and generative AI in L2 writing with a classroom-oriented design that positions AI as formative support for drafting and revision. The review is guided by three practical questions: whether AI feedback improves writing outcomes over

time, how teachers can ensure that students engage with feedback critically rather than accept it automatically, and what integrity and fairness risks arise when AI detection is used in assessment (Huang et al., 2024; Barrot, 2023; Myers, 2023). Evidence indicates that AI improves writing most effectively when it **accelerates the feedback cycle** and increases opportunities for **iterative revision**; in particular, AWE tools can strengthen L2 writing performance and motivation and may reduce writing anxiety when used as learning-oriented feedback rather than as a final score or substitute for instruction (Huang et al., 2024). However, these benefits are conditional: students' gains depend on how they *process* feedback (deep revision vs surface correction), whether the teacher provides strategy instruction (e.g., identifying patterns of error, prioritizing meaning over form, and checking whether a "correction" changes the intended message), and whether classroom time and assessment criteria reward revision and learning rather than only polished final products (Huang et al., 2024). Generative AI extends feedback beyond error correction by offering explanations, alternative phrasing, and organization advice, which can be especially useful for students who lack metalinguistic knowledge or struggle to diagnose why a sentence is unclear; yet research warns that students may over-trust AI outputs, accept inaccurate or stylistically inappropriate suggestions, or outsource idea development, voice, and argumentation unless teachers explicitly teach "AI feedback literacy" (e.g., evaluating the reason behind a suggestion, comparing options, asking for rule-based explanations, and verifying recommendations through examples or reference materials) (Barrot, 2023). A robust classroom model therefore treats AI not as an "answer machine" but as a *feedback generator* whose suggestions must be tested against task requirements, genre conventions, and the writer's

communicative intention; practically, this can be operationalized through a teacher-controlled writing cycle in which students produce an initial draft, use AI only for diagnostic feedback (clarity, cohesion, grammar patterns, and vocabulary precision), and then complete a verification step—such as selecting 5–10 AI suggestions, explaining why each is accepted or rejected, and checking at least a few items using a grammar reference, a teacher-provided checklist, or corpus-style examples—before revising (Barrot, 2023). To strengthen accountability and learning evidence, students can submit a brief revision memo (“What I changed and why”), highlight one paragraph where coherence improved, and identify two recurring language problems with a plan for future drafts; such process documentation makes learning visible and discourages uncritical copy-paste practices because students must articulate the relationship between feedback and revision decisions (Huang et al., 2024; Barrot, 2023). Integrity management should also be redesigned: because some AI detectors can falsely label human writing as AI-generated—and this risk may be higher for non-native English writers—high-stakes judgments based mainly on detection can be unfair and pedagogically counterproductive, pushing students toward concealment rather than responsible use (Myers, 2023). Instead, the evidence supports governance through transparent rules (what AI use is permitted for each task), assessment designs that require authorship evidence (draft history, in-class writing checkpoints, oral explanation of key claims, or short post-submission conferences), and teacher sampling that prioritizes higher-order issues such as argument quality, coherence, and appropriate source use rather than only surface correctness (Myers, 2023; Barrot, 2023). Within this framework, AI becomes a tool for strengthening the *revision habit* and improving language control, while

the teacher remains the authority on genre, purpose, and evaluation; the net result is a sustainable feedback ecology in which students receive more timely guidance, practice decision-making about language, and develop long-term writing competence—without turning writing into a purely technical exercise of polishing AI-generated text (Huang et al., 2024; Barrot, 2023; Myers, 2023).

Overall, the research-based picture is consistent: AI can support students' writing best when it is used to **increase feedback frequency** and **strengthen revision habits**, not when it replaces student thinking or drafting (Huang et al., 2024; Barrot, 2023). AWE tools can improve L2 writing performance and motivational variables, particularly when feedback is embedded in a formative cycle where students revise repeatedly and learn how to respond strategically to comments (Huang et al., 2024). Generative AI can extend support by explaining language choices, suggesting clearer phrasing, and helping students notice weaknesses in coherence and argument structure; however, this benefit depends on explicit instruction in “AI feedback literacy,” because students may over-trust AI suggestions or accept inaccurate guidance without verification (Barrot, 2023). Integrity management should also be learning-centered: because AI detectors can misclassify human writing and may produce higher false positives for non-native English writers, high-stakes reliance on detection can create inequitable outcomes and weaken trust in assessment (Myers, 2023). Therefore, the most defensible approach is not “detection-first,” but “design-first”: clear rules for permitted AI use, process evidence (drafts, revision memos, in-class checkpoints), and teacher oversight that prioritizes higher-order writing development rather than only surface correctness (Myers, 2023; Barrot, 2023).

List of references.

1. Barrot, J. S. (2023). Using ChatGPT for second language writing: Pitfalls and potentials. *Assessing Writing*, 57, 100745. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2023.100745>
2. Huang, X., Xu, W., Li, F., & Yu, Z. (2024). A meta-analysis of effects of automated writing evaluation on anxiety, motivation, and second language writing skills. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 33(4), 957–976. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-024-00865-y>
3. Myers, A. (2023, May 15). AI-detectors biased against non-native English writers. Stanford Institute for Human-Centered Artificial Intelligence (HAI).