Harnessing AI for Students' Writing Feedback: A Case Study at Military Technological College

Einas AL Maqbali,*[1] Taef AL Riyami,[1] Najah AL Siyabi,[1] Ayoub AL Rashdi,[1] Kauthar AL Mawali,[1] Yusra AL Kiyumi,[1] Mandhar AL Farsi,[1] and Halima AL Siyabi[1]

[1]Foundation Programme Department, Military Technological College, Muscat, Oman

einas.almaqbali@mtc.edu.om

ABSTRACT

This study examines the impact of teacher-provided feedback versus AI-generated feedback on improving the writing of Arabic-speaking students in IELTS Writing Task 1. A total of 48 students from the Foundation Program at the Military Technological College in Oman participated, divided into two groups: one received feedback from AI tools (ChatGPT and DeepSeek), while the other received feedback from an English language teacher. Revisions between the first and second drafts were analyzed using a comparative qualitative approach. Findings revealed that AI feedback improved content development, idea expansion, and clarity, while teacher feedback focused on grammar, vocabulary, and sentence structure. The delivery of feedback also affected engagement; teacher feedback was clearer and more structured, while AI feedback encouraged broader and more independent revisions. The study concludes that combining teacher and AI feedback may provide more comprehensive support for writing development.

KEYWORDS

AI-generated feedback, Teacher feedback, IELTS Writing Task 1, EFL students, Writing revision.

1. INTRODUCTION

In an increasingly globalized world, writing in English has become a vital communication skill for academic, professional, and personal purposes. As English remains the most widely used international language, the ability to write effectively is no longer optional—it is essential. While some scholars emphasize the technical aspects of writing [1] contended that students prioritize writing as a means of identity exploration. Beyond self-discovery, writing in higher education

serves as a foundational tool for fostering critical thinking, refining clarity of expression, and achieving academic success. Moreover, proficiency in writing is not only a key indicator of language competence but also a central component of both educational assessment and effective real-world communication [2].

To formally assess English proficiency, many institutions around the world rely on standardized exams. Among the key assessments for English proficiency, the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) is one of the most widely recognized exams globally. It evaluates candidates in four skills: listening, reading, writing, and speaking. For many EFL (English as a Foreign Language) learners, the writing component, particularly Task 1, poses a considerable challenge. In this task, students are asked to describe and analyze visual data (such as graphs or charts). Their performance is assessed based on four criteria: Task Achievement, Coherence and Cohesion, Lexical Resource, and Grammatical Range and Accuracy.

Traditionally, writing feedback has been the responsibility of teachers, and while teacher feedback plays an important role in students' development, it has some limitations. First, teacher feedback may not always be student-centered or easy to understand. Many students find teacher comments unclear or difficult to apply, especially if handwritten or inconsistently presented. Second, providing personalized feedback for every student in a large class is time-consuming, which can reduce the frequency and quality of the feedback. Third, human errors or subjective judgments can affect how students interpret and use the feedback. Finally, some learners feel disconnected from teacher feedback, especially when correction symbols or vague comments are used.

With the advancement of educational technology, Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools are gaining attention for their potential to enhance feedback practices. AI-powered platforms such as ChatGPT and DeepSeek are increasingly used in educational settings to provide automated, personalized writing feedback. These tools are capable of generating detailed and immediate responses based on standardized criteria, offering students consistent, structured support. In addition to reducing teacher workload, AI tools can promote student autonomy and engagement by making feedback more interactive and accessible. Despite the essential role of feedback in writing development, traditional teacher feedback is often limited by time constraints, lack of clarity, and inconsistencies. There is a growing need to explore whether AI tools such as ChatGPT and DeepSeek can provide clearer, more student-friendly feedback that better supports writing improvement in EFL contexts.

1.1 Research objectives

This study aims to explore how AI tools—specifically ChatGPT and DeepSeek—can support or enhance feedback practices on IELTS Writing Task 1 for Arabic-speaking EFL students in a foundation program. The study compares the effectiveness of AI-generated feedback to traditional teacher feedback in promoting student writing development**.**

1.2 Research questions

- How does AI-generated feedback (e.g., ChatGPT, DeepSeek) differ from traditional teacher feedback?
- How do students respond to AI feedback in terms of engagement and writing improvement?
- Is AI feedback more accurate, clearer, or more helpful to students than human feedback?

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Foundations of writing feedback in education.

Feedback is one of the most significant characteristics in teaching writing skill. It has been applied for ages in the educational process the traditional way where teachers read students' work and comment on it in order for them to develop their understanding and enhance their writing skill. As [3] mention that enhancing students' writing skills via feedback can be summarized in three suggested mechanisms. First of all, leveling up to the desired performance needs formative feedback. Secondly, personalized feedback provides scaffolding to simplify and break down the load for students. Thirdly, personalized feedback helps to highlight the areas where students lack and need to be focused on to address their misunderstandings.

However, providing effective feedback has always been a challenge that faces instructors due to lack of time and large numbers of students [4]. But now with the AI revolutionary era, teachers are given the chance to bridge the traditional way of providing feedback to the most recent way [5]. In addition, these generators have been tested several times and educators were impressed with how human-like the feedback is [3]. It made educators have a second

thought on how it would be efficient and applicable to be used in classrooms whether by teachers or students [6].

2.2 Development of AI in education.

Since the release of the first free AI generator in November 2022, educators worldwide have expressed concerns about its impact on academic integrity, as these tools can generate unlimited academic texts and solve assignments [7]. While teachers traditionally spend significant time correcting errors and giving feedback, many now encourage AI use to streamline editing and save time [7].

As AI tools become integrated into education, educators are increasingly open to their use to stay aligned with global advancements. [3] note that this is a new and complex field, prompting research and conferences to explore its educational potential. However, [7] argue that students should not be assessed using generative AI. [6] stresses the importance of teaching students to use AI as a support tool—not a replacement—since it can produce errors, misinformation, and biased content. He emphasizes that students need to build critical thinking skills, while AI tools often offer pre-packaged answers. [4] suggest it's time for educators to embrace AI and promote active learning in the classroom.

2.3 Effectiveness of AI in writing feedback.

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is experiencing remarkable and widespread growth within the education sector. This transformative technology holds the potential to reshape traditional educational models by offering more personalized, inclusive, and adaptive learning experiences. [6] notes that one of the most significant impacts of AI in education is its ability to create individualized learning pathways tailored to students' specific needs, learning styles, and unique abilities. This ensures that all learners receive the necessary support and resources to succeed, regardless of their backgrounds or skill levels.

According to [5] and [6], AI also assists educators in identifying students' knowledge gaps and delivering targeted feedback to enhance learning outcomes. Through AI-powered chatbots and virtual assistants, teachers can offer immediate support and guidance beyond the classroom, helping students stay engaged and motivated. While [3] explicitly discuss the AI's

early identification of struggling students, [8] negotiate that AI is allowing a timely and effective intervention to promote students' academic success.

Among AI's most profound effects is its capacity to revolutionize the way we learn, moving away from rigid, traditional classroom models toward more dynamic and interactive approaches [9]. For instance, AI-enhanced virtual and augmented reality tools allow students to explore complex concepts in immersive and innovative ways, bringing the learning experience to life and making it more engaging and stimulating, as emphasized by both [9] and [10].

2.4 Limitations and ethical considerations.

Many educators are concerned about students using chatbots to complete their assignments, thereby bypassing the intellectual effort required to formulate and refine their own ideas and arguments. This is a legitimate concern and serves as a starting point for discussion. Submitting unedited work generated by artificial intelligence as one's own creation constitutes academic misconduct, a point on which most educators agree [9] .

However, the perspective on artificial intelligence becomes more complex. AI is already pervasive, and its capabilities and integrations are expected to grow in the coming years, with scholars like [11] noting that students in primary and secondary schools are also utilizing generative AI, and these students will enter university with the expectation of doing the same.

Artificial intelligence (AI), despite its remarkable analytical and predictive capabilities, remains constrained by its reliance on pre-programmed parameters, which limits its ability to replicate the creative intuition that is uniquely human. According to [7], while AI systems can process and analyze vast datasets with efficiency, they lack the flexibility and depth of human cognition. [6] similarly emphasizes that AI cannot mirror the subtle, intuitive skills that individuals use in complex problem-solving. Furthermore, [3] argue that AI operates only within the bounds of its programming, rendering it incapable of inventing or generating original thought in the way humans can.

Moreover, [12] asserts that the growing integration of AI into everyday life has raised concerns about overreliance and diminished human effort. [4] note that the widespread use of automation and digital assistants may lead to reduced engagement in routine tasks, fostering a passive approach to problem-solving. [5] supports this view, highlighting that individuals

increasingly depend on AI for basic activities such as calculations and memory tasks, which may, over time, erode essential cognitive skills.

In addition to these limitations, generative AI poses specific challenges in educational contexts. As [7] explain, generative systems are programmed to produce responses regardless of their factual accuracy. Therefore, [3] caution that students must take full responsibility for verifying AI-generated content, as the tool itself cannot be held accountable for misinformation. Educators, as [6] points out, play a critical role in helping students understand both the strengths and weaknesses of AI technologies. In agreement, [4] and [5] stress the importance of promoting digital literacy and critical thinking, ensuring that students learn to evaluate, question, and validate AI outputs rather than accepting them at face value.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study employed a comparative qualitative design to examine the impact of teacher-generated versus AI-generated feedback on students' writing development in IELTS Writing Task 1. The participants were Arabic-speaking students enrolled in the Foundation Program at the Military Technological College in Oman. Although the students had studied English as a second language since their school years, this was their first experience with the IELTS exam format.

3.1 participants

The study was conducted with 48 students enrolled in two Foundation Program classes (24 students each) at the Military Technological College in Oman. All participants were Arabic-speaking EFL learners, and their proficiency levels were comparable, allowing for a balanced comparison between the two feedback groups.

3.2 Instruments and Data Sources

The study utilized the following tools and sources of data:

- Writing Prompt: An IELTS Writing Task 1 (data analysis type) was used to assess students' academic writing.
- Feedback Tools:
- Teacher Feedback, based on the official IELTS Writing Band Descriptors

- AI Feedback, generated through ChatGPT and DeepSeek, both prompted to

simulate IELTS examiners. The feedback included estimated band scores (whole numbers), qualitative comments, and direct corrections on grammar, vocabulary, spelling, and word choice. Feedback was categorized under the four IELTS criteria: Task Achievement, Coherence and Cohesion, Lexical Resource, and Grammatical Range and Accuracy, with each criterion including two sub-sections: "What Went Well" and "Issues."

- Qualitative Data Sources:

- Student first and second drafts
- Student reflections on the feedback experience
- Teacher observation notes

3.3 Procedure and Data Collection

Data collection took place in two phases:

Phase 1: Writing and Feedback

- All 48 students completed a handwritten IELTS Writing Task 1 essay under exam-like conditions.
- Essays were split into two groups:
- Group A received teacher-generated feedback.
- Group B received AI-generated feedback using ChatGPT and DeepSeek.
- Each student then revised their essay and submitted a second draft electronically.

No grades were assigned to either draft; the focus was on the quality of revisions.

Phase 2: Reflection and Observation

Three types of qualitative data were collected:

- Student Drafts: The original and revised essays were analyzed for improvements aligned with IELTS scoring criteria.
- Student Reflections: Students' reflections were gathered informally through their verbal questions and comments during the in-class revision process. These spontaneous interactions offered insights into their perceptions of the clarity, usefulness, and practicality of the feedback they received.

- Teacher Observations: Classroom behavior, engagement levels, student preferences, and difficulties were recorded during the feedback and revision process.
- This mixed-method approach provided a comprehensive view of how human and AI-generated feedback influenced students' writing development and revision practices. Also, no numerical scores were assigned to essays. Instead, the focus remained on qualitative improvements and perceived effectiveness of each feedback type.

4. DATA ANALYSIS

4.1 Data Overview

The writing task required students to compose a data description essay of no more than 150 words based on two pie charts provided on a given topic. The task resembles Part 1 of the IELTS writing exam and was completed under in-class conditions. It was designed to align with the academic writing objectives of the research report component in the curriculum.

Each student submitted two drafts: a pre-feedback draft, written independently, and a post-feedback draft, revised after receiving feedback. The participants were randomly divided into two groups. Group A received feedback from an artificial intelligence (AI) tool, which highlighted and provided suggestions on content grammar, lexical resource organization and clarity. Group B received through additional teacher written feedback that addressed similar aspects using instructional rubrics as well as correction codes.

A total of 48 students participated in the study with 24 students in each group. The purpose of comparing the two groups was to evaluate the effectiveness of AI-generated feedback in comparison to teacher feedback in enhancing students' writing. The analysis focused on the extent and quality of revisions made between the drafts.

4.2 Analytical Approach

Qualitative comparative approach was adopted to analyze students' second drafts. The focus was on text-level changes, including how students modified organization, content, and language after receiving feedback. Scoring was not applied; instead, the analysis centered on the type and depth of second drafts, distinguished between surface-level edits and deeper

content related changes. This method enabled a more detailed understanding of how feedback influenced students' writing development.

4.3 Coding of Revisions

The revisions made by students in their second drafts were analyzed using specific coding categories drawn from two main sources: the IELTS Writing Band Descriptors for Group A (AI feedback) and the right thing marking descriptor used by the institution for Group B (teacher feedback). The analysis focused on four main areas: task achievement, coherence and cohesion, lexical resource, grammatical range and accuracy. These categories allowed for consistent evaluation of the quality and depth of student revisions in response to the type of feedback received.

For Group A, the AI feedback was automatically aligned with the IELTS scoring components, identifying areas such as grammar issues organization and vocabulary precision. In contrast, group B's feedback was guided by a structured rubric developed by the English department, which included descriptors across five performance bands. In addition to this, teacher feedback also incorporated a correction code system to identify errors, using symbols for issues like grammar (G), word choice (WW), word form (WF), spelling (Sp), punctuation (P), and unclear meaning (?).

4.4 Patterns of Revision across Groups

Students exposed to the feedback generated by AI were often observed making content-focus revisions and improvements. Such changes included elaborating on their ideas, giving specific examples, or rephrasing sentences for better clarity and for avoiding plagiarism. In common cases, it was evident that the feedback encouraged students to review and reconsider their arguments and descriptions originally or to extend their ideas and supporting points, indicating that the AI-generated feedback invited wider engagement and implementation. Despite this, it was sometimes inaccurate due to misreading and misinterpreting students' drafts which is considered a common concern when using AI (specifically ChatGPT) in feedback as using this tool "alone would not provide students with the feedback necessary to make adjustments and meaningful revisions" [13]. This may indicate that inaccuracy can still be encountered in AI feedback, as emphasized by [13]. Vocabulary and grammar categories,

corrections related to language, were addressed in the feedback yet responses were limited, and changes were minimal by students.

By comparison, students provided with teacher feedback were more likely to focus on revisions related to language, greatly form-related changes including addressing grammatical issues, improving word choice and refining sentence structure. These revisions, though helpful in enhancing accuracy in linguistic categories, structure and content improvements appeared less frequently. Some students' samples showed only surface-level edits when revised their work which can be the result of teachers' approach in delivering feedback in terms of to what extent the feedback is direct and specific.

4.5 Analysis of Feedback Types

The features of both feedback types significantly differed in nature and form. The feedback generated from AI tended mainly to be more direct and explicit, suggesting areas of improvements and how to achieve them in second drafts, focused on a more advanced level of tone and clarity. It was also observed that such feedback encouraged students to freely adapt the feedback and suggestions as many targeted enhancing rather than correcting which may be evident to the main observation found in students' samples of ideas and content revisions rather than language revisions. Also, key in-class observations from the AI feedback group expressions were that the length of the revision process appeared to be longer than teacher feedback, more questions for clarification of the AI feedback were directed to teachers, and students found it sometimes challenging to follow and understand that type of feedback. The same area was observed to be the opposite in teacher feedback, as students directed less questions to teachers and spent less time conducting the feedback. This specific observation is extended more in the next section, recommendations, as literacy levels can affect the revision process.

On the other hand, clearer tailored and well-defined feedback addressing mainly lexis, grammar, structure, and sentence functions was observed with the teacher feedback group. This aligns with similar observations found in [14] which discussed and addressed accuracy of language as a primary focus concerned when teachers instruct learners with written feedback [14]. It targeted mainly grammatical issues as it was important to address expected issues among EFL learners, usually varied grammar aspects, using the code of corrections that included very specific feedback codes including "sp" for spelling and "?" for unclear expression due to a language expression issue. This personalized teacher feedback with the feature of using an instructional tone, suggesting a common and familiar feedback language

to the students' level, thus, a clear guide for revisions. This was clearly seen in second drafts samples as changes were very direct and literal following the teacher feedback, which is characterized by using a specific code of correction.

4.6 Sample Excerpts and Illustrations

Addressing minimal linguistic revision in the AI-generated feedback, students made changes in simple and partial grammatical aspects of capitalization and article use like the revision observed as follows: corrected capitalization & article use: 'united states' → 'the United States'. The majority of the AI feedback group made key main revisions in body paragraphs and sometimes in conclusions including significantly expanding ideas, adding supportive details and extending important information such as improving the summary section and concluding sentences with a better choice of data and information, reflecting moving from writing generally to writing specifically with a well-defined word choice, for example, improved word choice: from 'same' → 'equal', 'it has'→ 'accounted for' and added a better summary of the trends observed. This may indicate more depth and frequency in content-level feedback in the AI group.

In contrast, main revisions found in the teacher feedback group involved partial corrections in second drafts in language categories, grammar and vocabulary. Clear instances of these revisions are: corrected grammar forms: 'the less one' → 'the lowest', corrected spelling: 'amownt' → 'amount', corrected spelling: 'tow' → 'two' and improved paragraphing, well paraphrased the writing question which was copied prior to the feedback.

4.7 Summary of Analytical Insights

Noticeable variations and contrasts raised from the data and analysis examined above in regards with different types of feedback, AI-generated feedback and teacher feedback, provided to two EFL groups of students. Major observations found that students in different groups engaged distinctly and relatively to specific feedback categories mainly content-level feedback, groups received AI feedback, and language-level feedback, those who received teacher feedback. These noted patterns may imply that content, ideas, structure and textual development feedback may be effectively generated by AI, while linguistic accuracy can be better noticed in teacher feedback. The results point out that integrating both sources and methods, AI and teacher, to provide and instruct students writing tasks with feedback can achieve better efficiency to address both depth and quality for content feedback and specificity and accuracy for language feedback. This is directly in line with the findings

concluded in [16] in which the combination of both types of feedback, AI and teacher feedback, found to enhance the quality of students' revisions.

5.RECOMMENDATIONS

Drawing on the findings of the study, main recommendations can be initiated with encouraging instructors to introduce in practice the implementation of integrated feedback instruction in EFL writing tasks that utilize both AI-generated feedback and teacher-delivered feedback to harness the top compatible qualities and advantages provided by both feedback types. Combining these qualities from both kinds of feedback can result in better improved product and output from students.

Shifting this into practice by starting with AI-feedback followed by teacher feedback, offering high efficiency revisions as it addresses students' level and needs of following a gradual and coherent process of feedback.

Educators and instructors are also encouraged to enhance and prepare students for such a sequential process, AI feedback followed by teacher feedback, by considering feedback literacy as a main area that can affect the responses of students towards the feedback provided, fostering their cognitive abilities.

This required literacy to comprehend AI-generated feedback in an EFL context also prompts teachers to offer introductory training sessions for learners to highlight key benefits and limitations of AI-generated feedback. It will stress that AI is not replacing teacher feedback, but it is an additional supporting tool that still needs to be ensured and reviewed to be relevant, accurate, and meets the expected outcomes [17].

6.FUTURE STUDIES

This study has shown that AI and teacher feedback each offer unique benefits—AI promotes content development, while teacher feedback enhances language accuracy. Future research could explore blended feedback approaches, where both methods are combined to improve overall writing quality.

It would also be useful to conduct longitudinal studies that track student progress over time to assess the lasting impact of each feedback type. In addition, future studies may examine student perceptions in more depth to understand how feedback is received and applied, and whether it influences motivation and engagement.

A potential gap for future research can be investigating how students' responses, behaviors, and perception of both approaches—AI and teacher—can impact their revision practices. Exploring how the initiation and structure of both feedback types affect students' interaction and engagement with feedback could provide deeper insights into the dynamics of revision.

Finally, expanding the research to include different writing tasks, proficiency levels, and quantitative measures of improvement could offer a more comprehensive understanding of feedback effectiveness in EFL contexts.

7.CONCLUSION

This study explored how AI generated feedback compares to teacher feedback in helping EFL students improve their IELTS writing task 1 essays. The results showed that both types of feedback helped students make revisions but in different ways. Students who received AI feedback were more likely to improve the content and organization of their writing, while those who received teacher feedback focused more on correcting grammar and vocabulary.

The way students responded to the feedback seemed to depend on how clear and detailed it was. Teacher feedback was often easier to understand and follow, while AI feedback gave students more freedom to explore their ideas but sometimes lacked accuracy or clarity. In both cases, students engaged with the feedback to some extent, though not always fully.

These findings suggest that using both AI and teacher feedback together might give students more balanced support. AI can offer quick, detailed suggestions, while teacher feedback can provide guidance on language and structure. Further studies could look at how students' understanding of feedback - known as feedback literacy - affects how they use and benefit from it during the revision process.

8.REFERENCES

[1] Zumbrunn, S., Carter, Y. M., & Conklin, S. (2014). Unpacking the value of writing: Exploring college students' perceptions of writing. Virginia Commonwealth University.

[2] Suastra, I. M., & Menggo, S. (2020). Empowering students' writing skill through performance assessment. *International Journal of Language Education, 4*(3), 432–441. https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v4i3.15060

[3] Lee, S. S., & Moore, R. L. (2024). Harnessing generative AI (GenAI) for automated feedback in higher education: A systematic review. Online Learning Journal, 28(3), 82–104. https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v28i3.4593

[4] Chu, H. Y., Salam, A. R., & Rahman, A. A. (2025). AI-driven tools in providing feedback on students' writing. International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, 9(3S), 58–67. https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.903SEDU0006

[5] Pitychoutis, K. M. (2024). Harnessing AI Chatbots for EFL Essay Writing: A Paradigm Shift in Language Pedagogy. Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Special Issue on ChatGPT, April 2024: 197-209. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/ChatGPT.13

[6] Qaffas, A. A. (2024). Harnessing artificial intelligence for enhanced efficiency in academic writing and research. Fusion: Practice and Applications (FPA), 16(2), 126–146 https://doi.org/10.54216/FPA.160209)

[7] Elstad, E., & Eriksen, H. (2024). Harnessing AI in secondary education to enhance writing competence. University of Oslo & Oslo Metropolitan University.

[8] Nguyen, T. N. T., Lai, N. V., & Nguyen, Q. T. (2024). Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Education: A case study on ChatGPT's influence on student learning behaviors. Educational Process: International Journal, 13(2), 105–121. https://doi.org/10.22521/edupij.2024.132.7

[9] Dr. Mohamed Al Saidi, "Artificial Intelligence and the Sustainability of Educational Services: An Overview." World Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities, vol. 10, no. 1 (2024): 8-17. doi: 10.12691/wjssh-10-1-2.

[10] Alharbi, M. (2024). The role of artificial intelligence in advancing English as a foreign language teaching at Saudi universities. World Journal on Educational Technology: Current Issues, 16(3), 181–200. https://doi.org/10.18844/wjet.v16i3.9311

[11] Al-Kharusi, A., & Al-Saadi, M. (2019). The Future of Artificial Intelligence in Oman's Education: A Review of Current and Future Trends. International Journal of Advanced Research in Education, 12(2), 74-89.

[12] Mirzayeva, A. (2025). Harnessing AI tools in teaching English: Innovations and implications. Path of Science, 1(1), 1-14. https://www.ssoar.info/ssoar/bitstream/handle/document/99681/ssoar-pos-2025-1-mirzayeva-Harnessing_AI_Tools_in_Teaching.pdf

[13] S.-Y. Yoon, E. Miszoglad, and L. R. Pierce, "Evaluation of ChatGPT Feedback on ELL Writers' Coherence and Cohesion," arXiv

preprint arXiv:2310.06505v1 [cs.CL], Oct. 10, 2023. [Online]. Available: https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.06505

[14] J. Bitchener and D. R. Ferris, Written Corrective Feedback in Second Language Acquisition and Writing. New York, NY, USA: Routledge, 2012. [Online].Available: https://www.routledge.com/Written-Corrective-Feedback-in-Second-Language-Acquisition-and-Writing/Bitchener-Ferris/p/book/9780415872447

[15] Mohammed, S.J., Khalid, M.W. Under the world of AI-generated feedback on writing: mirroring motivation, foreign language peace of mind, trait emotional intelligence, and writing development. Lang Test Asia 15, 7 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-025-00343-2

[16] T. T. T. Tran, “Enhancing EFL Writing Revision Practices: The Impact of AI- and Teacher-Generated Feedback and Their Sequences,” Education Sciences, vol. 15, no. 2, p. 232, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://www.mdpi.com/2227-7102/15/2/232

[17] T. Y. Pang, A. Kootsookos, and C.-T. Cheng, "Artificial Intelligence Use in Feedback: A Qualitative Analysis," Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice, vol. 21, no. 6, 2024. [Online]. Available at: https://open-publishing.org/journals/index.php/jutlp/article/view/809