



## The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning™

2026

Volume 16/Issue 2

Article 3

### Voices through the EFL Classroom: Student Reflections upon AI and Teacher Feedback in Writing Instruction

Duygu Alaçam Dehneliler, Gazi University, Ankara, Türkiye, [duygu-alacam@hotmail.com](mailto:duygu-alacam@hotmail.com)  
Asuman Aşık, Gazi University, Ankara, Türkiye, [asuman.asik@gazi.edu.tr](mailto:asuman.asik@gazi.edu.tr)

#### Recommended Citations:

##### APA

Alaçam Dehneliler, D., & Aşık, A. (2026). Voices through the EFL classroom: Student reflections upon AI and teacher feedback in writing instruction. *The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning*, 16(2), 33-51.

##### MLA

Alaçam Dehneliler, Duygu, and Asuman Aşık. "Voices through the EFL Classroom: Student Reflections upon AI and Teacher Feedback in Writing Instruction." *The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 33-51.

<https://doi.org/10.66887/jltl.v16i3.1071>

The JLTL is freely available online at [www.jltl.com.tr](http://www.jltl.com.tr), with neither subscription nor membership required. Contributors are invited to review the Submission page and manuscript templates at [www.jltl.org/Submitonline](http://www.jltl.org/Submitonline)



As an online journal, the JLTL adopts a green-policy journal. Please print out and copy responsibly.



[www.jltl.com.tr](http://www.jltl.com.tr)

*The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning*, 2026(2), 33-51.

## Voices through the EFL Classroom: Student Reflections upon AI and Teacher Feedback in Writing Instruction

Duygu Alaçam Dehneliler<sup>1</sup>, Asuman Aşık<sup>2</sup>

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article History:

Received 25 Nov 2025

Published 19 May 2026

#### Key Words:

EFL writing

Teacher feedback

AI-based feedback

AI tools

### ABSTRACT

This study investigates how EFL students perceive AI-powered feedback (AIF) and teacher feedback (TF) in the context of EFL writing instruction. Data were collected from the written reflection papers of sixty-five preparatory-level students through thematic analysis. The results indicate that students prefer TF due to its contextualised sensitivity and interactive features. They trust its reliability in providing relevant and accurate feedback, while also valuing AIF for its immediacy, clarity, and effectiveness in addressing surface-level linguistic features such as grammar, lexis, and mechanics. Pedagogical implications include implementing a hybrid feedback approach, increasing feedback literacy, and adopting cyclical writing practices. These findings highlight the complementary nature of TF and AIF and suggest the importance of balanced, pedagogically driven feedback strategies for EFL writing instruction.

© Association of Applied Linguistics. All rights reserved

<sup>1</sup>School of Foreign Languages, English Preparatory Program, Gazi University, Ankara, Türkiye, [duygu-alaçam@hotmail.com](mailto:duygu-alaçam@hotmail.com)

<sup>2</sup>Department of Foreign Languages Education, English Language Teaching Program, Gazi University, Ankara, Türkiye, [asuman.asik@gazi.edu.tr](mailto:asuman.asik@gazi.edu.tr)

Alaçam Dehneliler, D., & Aşık, A. (2026). Voices through the EFL classroom: Student reflections upon AI and teacher feedback in writing instruction. *The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning*, 16(2), 33-51.

In a globalised and highly technological world where English is widely spoken and written, one of the most current phenomena is the integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into English as a foreign language teaching (EFL) (Phan, 2023). Instructors, officials, and software developers anticipate that AI will create more engaging and dynamic classroom environments for EFL learners (Loncar et al., 2023). Specifically, the incorporation of AI tools into writing instruction has become common in EFL education, as writing ability is seen as a key skill to develop for EFL learners to improve their lexical, linguistic, contextual, and syntactical abilities, such as producing and organising clear and accurate paragraphs for readers (Barrot, 2023). However, Hyland (2019) argues that writing is regarded as one of the most demanding language skills to master due to its complex nature, which requires learners to demonstrate grammatical accuracy, coherence, cohesion, vocabulary diversity, and critical thinking all at once.

Regarding the instruction of writing skills in EFL classrooms, EFL learners are expected to develop micro-level (e.g., lexical density) and macro-level (e.g., organisation) abilities that constitute EFL writing skills (Sulis, 2022). To address the challenges of writing, there has been a growing demand to teach EFL learners key micro and macro writing skills to achieve proficiency in English and communicate effectively in written form (Han, 2020). Feedback plays a vital role in enhancing both micro and macro skills. It is provided in various forms, such as teacher feedback (TF), peer feedback (PF), and AI feedback (AIF). The increasing need for personalised feedback in large classroom settings, coupled with time constraints faced by instructors, has created challenges in delivering timely and reliable feedback. Consequently, the emergence of AI-powered writing chatbots offers new opportunities to overcome these issues. AI technologies utilise Natural Language Processing (NLP) algorithms to detect syntactic errors, suggest lexical corrections, and evaluate the cohesion and coherence of written paragraphs automatically, thereby promoting autonomous learning and reducing instructors' workload (Sysoyev et al., 2024). However, there are some concerns regarding AI, including the individualisation, qualification,

and depth of AI-based responses, especially when dealing with macro or higher-order writing skills (Ranalli, 2021). EFL students' opinions and perceptions of feedback types play a crucial role in shaping writing practice and maintaining the effectiveness of writing instruction (Escalante et al., 2023).

While TF remains a crucial element in EFL writing (Kim, 2024), new evaluation methods have been introduced due to the integration of AI tools in educational contexts. The reliability and effectiveness of AIF have been the subject of recent research (Zhai & Ma, 2023). However, few studies have explored how EFL learners perceive and compare AIF and TF once both are used in writing instruction (Sekewael & Anaktototy, 2024). Finally, although some research suggests AIF may help with superficial writing difficulties, it can be questioned for lacking contextual awareness and emotional connections with learners (Tang, 2024; Yun, 2024). It highlights a significant gap in understanding how EFL learners in writing classroom settings perceive both forms of feedback in terms of cognitive, emotional, and pedagogical aspects. Therefore, this study aims to explore the perceptions of Turkish EFL students towards AIF and TF comprehensively in EFL writing instruction and aims to address the following research questions:

1. How do Turkish EFL students perceive the effectiveness of AI-generated and teacher feedback in enhancing their writing skills?
2. What are Turkish EFL students' preferences regarding AI-generated and teacher feedback?

## **2. Theoretical Framework**

The theoretical framework of the study is based on Sociocultural Theory (SCT), Cognitive Feedback Theory (CFT), and the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM). SCT, proposed by Vygotsky (1978), emphasises the importance of interaction in the language learning process, proposing that learning occurs through scaffolded and social communication. TF and PF are closely linked to SCT, as this theory offers external support that helps students develop within their individual Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). ZPD, defined by Vygotsky (1978), describes the difference between what a student can achieve independently and what

they can accomplish with the help and encouragement of a more knowledgeable person, such as an instructor, peer, or tutor. SCT suggests that human feedback improves writing performance and supports learners in expanding their cognitive development. CFT, developed by Butler and Winne (1995), states that feedback acts as a metacognitive tool helping learners identify their mistakes, evaluate their writing performance, and adjust their writing strategies. AIF and TF types can support self-regulation; however, this theory suggests that detailed, personalised feedback—especially when provided by teachers or peers—promotes deeper learning.

TAM, initiated by Davis (1989), explains how users of technological tools such as AI instruments accept and use technology. TAM is a widely used framework for understanding users' acceptance, adaptation, and tolerance of new technological tools. It can be easily adapted to various situations in language learning settings to predict students' expected learning behaviours and actions. This model assesses learners' use of technology through four principles: perceived usefulness (PU), perceived ease of use (PEU), attitude towards use (ATU), and behavioural intention (BI) to apply the technology. PU, the primary focus of this study, describes the users' belief that a technology will improve their performance; it is the first step where users assume that applying a technology-based tool will enhance their performance in specific activities (Davis, 1989). TAM has been developed to explain attitudes, manners, and behaviours towards technology adoption, owing to its stability, simplicity, and usefulness across diverse settings related to technology acceptance and use (Du & Gao, 2022). The TAM framework mainly focuses on assessing Turkish EFL students' perceptions of AIF, as it highlights factors such as perceived usefulness and ease of use, which influence students' perceptions of AI tools.

### **3. Feedback in EFL Writing Instruction**

The role of feedback in EFL writing instruction has evolved through instructive and pedagogical writing as well as technological integrations into writing classes. Feedback in writing instruction was mainly provided by teacher-oriented methods,

where instructors gave written comments on students' paragraphs or tasks. When communicative language teaching gained prominence in the 1970s and 1980s, feedback gradually shifted from a focus on structure to more process- and content-centred approaches, rather than emphasising linguistic and syntactic errors. That period marked the advancement of opinions, organisation, and overall coherence (Hyland, 2019).

TF has long served as the foundation of EFL writing feedback instruction. This traditional feedback approach includes both corrective responses and constructive support regarding mechanics, structures, content, and style (Hyland & Hyland, 2019). The effectiveness of TF has been studied for decades; therefore, in line with these findings, the most efficient feedback method might be identified as TF among various feedback types, such as teacher, peer, automated, or AIF. This is because it enhances specific awareness of grammatical points, syntax, coherence, cohesion, content, and paragraph organisation (Zeevy-Solovey, 2024). TF can help students write accurately and proficiently. Although TF is described as a highly detailed and complex process in writing classes, learners often prefer feedback directly from their teachers, trusting their teachers' expertise and authority (Linuwih et al., 2024). TF can be beneficial for clarity and precision but may also cause unease due to its complex and elaborate nature (Wahyudi et al., 2024). Providing thorough feedback requires significant time and effort, which might delay the revision process or reduce the time dedicated to correction. Feedback may also be influenced by individual preferences, leading to biased judgments by instructors (Zeevy-Solovey, 2024). Nonetheless, writing instructors can offer comprehensive, holistic feedback that addresses both local errors (e.g., grammar, spelling, punctuation) and global issues (e.g., cohesion and coherence).

The rise of Natural Language Processing (NLP) technologies in the 21st century has advanced AI tools that are effective in suggesting micro-level corrections and structural improvements, such as lexical variation, unity, and coherence (Lim & Aryadoust, 2022). AI devices have become more common in EFL writing instruction due to their

speed, stability, and user-friendliness. AI tools like ChatGPT, Gemini, and Copilot utilise NLP algorithms to identify lexical and syntactic errors, spelling and punctuation mistakes, and textual inconsistencies (Kim, 2024). One of the main benefits of AIF is its ability to deliver quick and instant individualised corrections, enabling learners to identify and correct mistakes in real time (Masoudi, 2024). In addition to providing instant feedback, these tools can effectively reduce errors, especially mechanical aspects such as syntax, lexis, spelling, and punctuation. They can even strengthen traditional feedback in paragraph content, organisation, and audience engagement (Yıldız & Gonen, 2024). AI tools offer consistent and objective feedback across learners' written work; however, human feedback may be influenced by personal biases. AI devices support self-evaluation and independent learning, aligning with the characteristics of self-directed learning (Lim & Aryadoust, 2022). Although AI systems present various advantages for language learners, they may also have limitations that hinder language development. AI programmes primarily focus on syntax, grammar, spelling, and punctuation, sometimes neglecting higher-order features such as cohesion, coherence, paragraph organisation, content, and critical thinking (Ranalli, 2021).

Instructive AI implications offer numerous benefits for enhancing EFL learners' writing skills through providing constructive, insightful, or tailored corrective feedback (Wang, 2022). These advanced tools, such as ChatGPT and Gemini AI chatbots, aim to improve the quality of EFL students' writing by offering both micro- and macro-level feedback (Tu & Ego-ugan, 2024). These chatbots can generate quick and comprehensive responses, encouraging learners to practise their language skills in real-life contexts. Such reciprocal, humanised interaction may help to improve learners' writing abilities and boost their self-confidence (Bibi & Atta, 2024). Therefore, the main advantage of AI tools in EFL writing instruction is the delivery of instant, customised feedback (Loncar et al., 2023). In contrast, some recent studies have highlighted drawbacks of AI use, such as providing incorrect and overly mechanical responses due to a lack of pedagogical understanding of AI tools (Pace-

Sigge & Sumakul, 2021). Escalante et al. (2023) noted that responses generated by AI resulted in fewer improvements in EFL learners' writing performance compared to those given by teachers. The study indicated there was no superiority between AI-powered and teacher-generated responses regarding syntactic and grammatical progression.

On the other hand, numerous findings suggest that AI-powered tools' responses are more understandable and personalised than those of the TF type (Chiu et al., 2023; Wang, 2022; Zeevy-Solovey, 2024). According to Cheng et al. (2021), as instructors typically provided mechanical or corrective responses, learners often tried not to make linguistic mistakes. They were inclined to overlook some context-specific writing elements. In line with these findings, a recent study by Muliyah et al. (2020) found that EFL students may not focus sufficiently on holistic or macro-level corrections such as coherence and cohesion, since lecturers frequently give explicit corrective feedback, including grammatical and structural corrections, which leads to more attention being paid to syntactic errors rather than also providing cohesive devices and organisational holistic feedback. The analyses and findings mentioned above present diverse viewpoints and beliefs regarding the evaluation of TF and AIF. This comparison remains a debated topic in the literature; therefore, the current research aims to offer new insights by assessing EFL students' perspectives on writing instruction.

## **4. Methodology**

### *4.1. Research Design*

The present study employs a qualitative research design. Qualitative data analysis was deemed most applicable, given the investigative nature of the research questions and the need to comprehend contributors' experiences, viewpoints, and interpretive procedures in depth (Creswell & Poth, 2018). To analyse qualitative data, thematic analysis was used to explore EFL students' perceptions of AIF and TF in EFL writing instruction. The thematic analysis is a flexible and theoretically independent qualitative process for interpreting documented data by identifying patterns, themes, and categories.

It is especially designed for research seeking to deeply understand participants' perspectives and experiences as expressed in language. Additionally, thematic analysis is suitable for examining complex phenomena from participants' perspectives (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

The present thematic analysis was performed inductively, namely, themes emerged directly from the data rather than fitting pre-existing theories, allowing the results to be rooted in the students' own written reports (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Therefore, using written responses in a thematic analysis, the researcher aimed to gather in-depth data from EFL students' self-reflection reports regarding their perceptions of AIF and TF; this process can help the investigator classify and gain a deeper understanding of their opinions towards the two feedback types.

#### *4.2. Context and Participants*

The study aims to compare TF and AIF by EFL learners in the School of Foreign Languages in Ankara, Turkey, where the TF method is highly systematic in informing students about their mistakes and errors both at the micro-level (i.e., syntax, punctuation, and spelling) and macro-level (i.e., paragraph content and organisation) writing features. Teachers provide feedback to evaluate the midterm exam writings of EFL learners using a rubric developed by the Test and Evaluation Unit. After each midterm exam, feedback meetings are scheduled. One class session (50 minutes) is allocated to give feedback to learners on their midterm exams across four basic skills. During these 50-minute feedback sessions, lecturers deliver feedback to their students in both written and oral forms. The present study analysed the midterm exams of EFL learners from this perspective. Consequently, the learners received both AIF and TF for each midterm evaluation during the feedback session. Each midterm is evaluated by two EFL lecturers, with each class having two different raters, and the AI tool Gemini. Gemini is a generative AI (Gen AI) system developed by Google, featuring natural language processing that mimics human intelligence, enabling individuals to receive insightful and helpful feedback. Gemini thoroughly examines and understands individual

writing and continuously offers various alternatives, creating numerous expressions with its extensive linguistic competence (Tu & Ego-ugan, 2024); therefore, the researcher preferred this AI tool. Data was collected from sixty-five EFL preparatory students enrolled in B1-level writing classes at a higher education institution. They are studying in four different fields: architecture (n = 8), engineering (n = 15), medicine (n = 19), and English language teaching (n = 23). Each student participates in the same academic writing session and must complete the mandatory term(s) at the preparatory school before enrolling in their faculty courses. This diversity of educational backgrounds was regarded as an advantage, as it might reveal potential differences in how various subject areas interpret TF and AIF. These participants were included in the qualitative analysis to assess their perceptions of AIF versus TF. The convenient sampling used in this study is a form of non-randomised sampling where participants are selected based on their accessibility and willingness to contribute (Creswell & Creswell, 2023).

#### *4.3. Data Collection*

The primary data collection tool is an open-ended written questionnaire, allowing students to independently express their beliefs, experiences, and perceptions without being limited by predefined response categories. Open-ended questions are valuable in qualitative research because they enable researchers to explore participants' opinions more deeply (Patton, 2015). The questionnaire includes questions such as "How do you perceive AIF/TF?", "What are the benefits and drawbacks of each feedback type?", "How does AIF/TF influence your micro (i.e., grammar, vocabulary, spelling, and punctuation) and macro (i.e., paragraph content, organisation, coherence, and cohesion) writing skills?", and "Which feedback type do you prefer and why?" These questions aim to gather detailed, comprehensive responses that reveal EFL students' preferences and perceptions.

The researcher selected B1-level learners who received both AIF and TF feedback simultaneously for their midterm writing examinations. The students received both types of feedback after two

midterm exams; specifically, they were given two types of feedback for each midterm writing test. Following each delivery of AIF and TF, the students were required to respond to open-ended questions related to these feedback types. To gather rich, detailed data, the open-ended questions were repeated twice; that is, for students answered the same set of questions. This study has ethics approval from the university's ethics committee where the researchers carried out their work. Participants were informed about the committee's approval and the purpose of the study, and their consent forms were obtained prior to data collection. They were assured of confidentiality and anonymity. The open-ended questions were distributed in paper form because the procedure was conducted within the allotted time for the feedback session. After each midterm exam, the preparatory school where the study took place allocates one class period (50 minutes) for providing mandatory feedback to students. During this feedback session, students receive both AIF and TF simultaneously, then respond to open-ended questions. Participants are given one class period to complete the questionnaire, allowing for thoughtful and meaningful reflection.

#### 4.4. Data Analysis

Thematic analysis was conducted using the written expressions of EFL students, which were examined to understand their perceptions of AIF and TF types. The data were examined based on the standards of thematic analysis outlined by Braun and Clarke (2006). Thematic analysis began by collecting raw data from students' written

comments. The researcher carefully read all responses multiple times to gain a comprehensive understanding. Preliminary open coding was used to identify meaningful phrases and sentences related to students' perceptions. The identified codes were organised into broader categories, such as overall effectiveness, overall ineffectiveness, communicative ease, and affective affordances. Central themes were determined by exploring the connections between categories. Themes related to students' engagement, learning efficiency, or reliance on AIF or TF emerged. To ensure inter-rater reliability, two additional researchers reviewed the coding to verify data consistency. One of these researchers holds a PhD in EFL, while the other holds a PhD in measurement and assessment. Both analysed the data independently. After revising codes and themes separately, they conferred to reach a consensus and finalise the thematic analysis. The results were presented with illustrative quotes to clarify main themes and patterns, thus enhancing the credibility of the study (Krippendorff, 2019).

### 5. Results & Discussion

*RQ1. How do Turkish EFL students perceive the effectiveness of AI-generated and teacher feedback in enhancing their writing skills?*

Themes and codes are generated from the expressions of EFL students. The codes, percentages, and frequencies derived from students' perceptions of AIF and TF are shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1  
Code Schema

Codes	TF		AIF	
	%	f	%	f
1. Overall Efficiency of TF & AIF	13	9	20	13
2. Overall Inefficiency of TF & AIF	19	12	32	21
3. Communicative Ease	25	16	11	7
4. Feedback Customization	6	3	11	7
5. Reliability				
5.1. Reliability of TF & AIF	34	22	15	10
5.2. Unreliability of TF & AIF	21	14	32	21
6. Affective Affordances of TF & AIF	32	21	29	19
7. The impact of TF & AIF on Micro Skills	19	12	34	22
8. The impact of TF & AIF on Macro Skills	8	5	19	12

As shown in the table, there are eight distinct themes comparing TF and AIF. The most valued feature of TF is reliability (34%), and it offers affective affordances (32%) such as interactive feedback, human interaction, and empathic responses. Conversely, AI is preferred for its ability to develop students' micro skills (34%) and for providing affective affordances (29%) like motivating and enjoyable tools for receiving feedback from AI devices. TF was criticised for offering less personalised feedback (6%), while AI was criticised for being unreliable (32%).

#### *Theme 1: Overall Efficiency of TF and AIF*

Level-appropriate and context-sensitive TF is widely valued because teachers can offer more in-depth, comprehensive, and detailed suggestions to learners for editing their writing, thereby helping students gradually improve their ability to identify errors and revise their work (Hyland, 2022; Tran, 2025a). This perspective was shared by 13% of the students (9 students), highlighting the thoroughness and relevance of TF.

*"Teacher-based feedback made me more attentive while writing, and I think it will improve my performance." (P8)*

*"The teacher understands the topic better and explains the errors in the paragraph better." (P32)*

Recent research shows that many EFL students find AIF reasonable and clear, making it easier for them to engage with their written work (Ranalli, 2021; Steiss et al., 2024). Nearly 20% of participants (13 students) in this study highlighted the benefits of AIF, especially its quick and systematic error detection and the time it saves EFL teachers in providing feedback.

*"Artificial intelligence can detect mistakes that the teacher might miss." (P54)*

*"Since we live in a digital age, I think that AI-based feedback will contribute to improving my writing performance and the teacher's feedback skills." (P16)*

As a result, AIF is highly valued for its speed, clarity, and ability to provide accurate, real-time

revisions (Ranalli, 2021; Zhang et al., 2021). It is used to effectively detect even minor mistakes, saving EFL instructors and their students time, while reducing their workload and responsibilities (Zhang et al., 2021). The speed, immediacy, and accuracy of AIF were appreciated by EFL students (Steiss et al., 2024). Some EFL students viewed AIF's consistent categorisation according to rubric sections positively (Sysoyev et al., 2024). However, for more challenging writing activities, TF was preferred due to its detailed, valuable suggestions, pedagogical comprehensiveness, and contextual awareness (Hyland & Hyland, 2019; Hyland, 2022). Therefore, receiving feedback from teachers helps students become better at spotting errors over time and encourages them to be more cautious when producing and revising their written work (Luo et al., 2025).

#### *Theme 2: Overall Inefficiency of TF and AIF*

Considering the limitations of both AIF and TF, learners in EFL had various opinions. 19% of EFL learners (12 students) found TF confusing and superficial, as it frequently highlighted mistakes and offered limited explanations, resulting in feelings of disorientation and dissatisfaction when lecturers only pointed out incorrect sections without providing further clarifications.

*"Errors that are only underlined words are not understood, I could not understand which mistakes I made." (P21)*

*"I feel that the teacher's feedback tells me what is wrong, but not why it is wrong." (P2)*

When considering the perceived inefficiency of AIF by EFL students, 32% of participants (21 students) reported that the feedback provided by AI was too precise or beyond their level of competence, making it difficult to understand and apply.

*"AI-based feedback provided more perfectionist feedback than teacher-based feedback and expected me to write at a higher level than I was, which decreased my motivation to write." (P40)*

*"I do not find AI effective because it makes very general comments on the written paragraph." (P17)*

*“The AI-based feedback was extremely detailed and got stuck on things that did not matter.” (P22)*

Consequently, TF was described as superficial and confusing. Because teachers merely underlined errors without offering further explanations, students felt puzzled and frustrated. This aligns with previous studies indicating that this type of superficial feedback can hinder meaningful editing and comprehension skills in writing instruction (Ferris, 2018; Hyland, 2022). The students' complaint that their teachers only underlined mistakes and provided no explanations led to unclear reviews (Hyland, 2022). Conversely, although AI tools can identify mechanical errors, they often fall short in providing insightful feedback on more complex writing aspects such as style, cohesion, and coherence, resulting in very surface-level suggestions (Aldosemani et al., 2023; Yoon et al., 2023). EFL learners reported that AIF was less effective in promoting their writing development due to its tendency for perfectionism, lack of contextual awareness, and superficial feedback (Aldosemani et al., 2023; Yun, 2024).

### *Theme 3: Communicative Ease of TF and AIF*

EFL students preferred the engaging and face-to-face nature of TF, and this interactive approach helps students to write efficient texts (Zeevy-Solovey, 2024). Consistent with these findings, 25% of students (16 students) valued face-to-face, interactive TF.

*“When receiving face-to-face feedback from the teacher, we can talk in detail about what is right and wrong.” (P10)*

*“When we are confused by the teacher's feedback during the class, we can immediately ask questions on the floor.” (P61)*

Some students ignored AI suggestions due to the lack of human interaction or contact, highlighting the importance of one-on-one conversations in receiving and valuing AIF. Consequently, 11% of students (7 students) found it demotivating and frustrating.

*“I was not motivated enough because the nature of the AI feedback is that a machine gives it.” (P65)*

*“AI-based feedback does not offer an evaluation like teacher-based feedback because AI is a machine and cannot understand and evaluate us like a teacher.” (P7)*

To conclude, EFL learners valued TF's motivational aspects as well as direct communication during face-to-face feedback sessions (Lai, 2023). Notably, in-person and oral comments enable them to ask questions, clarify errors, and resolve misunderstandings (Lai, 2023). Interactions with their teachers allow learners to pose questions and receive explanations, which are absent in AIF. It is also believed that TF is more personalised, addressing individual needs and encouraging engagement (Zeevy-Solovey, 2024). Conversely, AIF may be seen as demotivating and mechanical due to its robotic and non-humanised nature (Stevenson & Phakiti, 2019). It was suggested that AIF might be too repetitive and robotic to adequately support the motivational and emotional aspects of writing development. Therefore, because AIF lacks real-time conversation and facial or emotional cues, it is often criticised for being impersonal, unnatural, and robotic (Mekheimer, 2025).

### *Theme 4: Feedback Customisation in TF and AIF*

Deeper awareness and improvement in composing skills may be limited due to the lack of tailored attention (Wang & Jiang, 2023). Only 6% of the students (3 students) in the present study appreciated the customised nature of feedback from their teachers, as they believe that their teachers do not provide personalised feedback on their writing.

*“In teacher-based feedback, the teacher knows the level of the student and can evaluate from a perspective appropriate to the student's language level.” (P30)*

*“Teacher-based feedback provided enough personalised feedback and taught me what to pay more attention to when writing paragraphs.” (P37)*

11% of EFL students (7 students) reported that they could recognise and understand various

linguistic errors, such as lexis, syntax, mechanics, and even content-related mistakes, thanks to a highly personalised approach of AIF.

*“With AI-based feedback, I received personalised feedback on my writing performance” (P16)*

*“After receiving AI-based feedback, I realised that I had more room for improvement than I thought” (P2)*

EFL teachers can personalise comments by considering each student's individual language skills, previous errors, and overall progress, unlike AI systems. This allows for more contextualised and sophisticated support that better meets each student's needs. Additionally, TF can be made more dynamic and responsive by adapting to each learner's proficiency (Lear et al., 2024; Yu & Yang, 2021). However, in a recent study on personalised feedback, a limited number of students reported that TF was customised and verbalised that their teachers provided personalised, contextualised, and sophisticated comments (Lear et al., 2024). Nonetheless, AI-generated remarks were valued for their customised, accurate, and immediate feedback. AI systems' ability to process data continuously, such as students' writing pieces, enables them to offer detailed, immediate, and highly individualised feedback on each sentence (Guo et al., 2024; Zhang, 2025). Consistent with these findings, AI was described as delivering more personalised feedback; it can also provide immediate and detailed comments that EFL students appreciated (Min, 2024; Ranalli, 2021).

#### *Theme 5: Reliability*

##### *Reliability of TF and AIF*

EFL students shared their opinions on the trustworthiness of these two types of feedback in the recent study. Since EFL teachers had a deeper understanding of their students' mistakes and offered more logical, practical, and contextually aware criticisms, 34% of students (22 students) believed that TF was more dependable.

*“The teacher provides more logical and reliable feedback.” (P24)*

*“Teacher-based feedback is always more reliable and more effective than AI” (P51)*

Conversely, 15% of students (10 students) stated that AIF was more reasonable and trustworthy because it can generally provide rational, suitable, and comprehensive suggestions for improving writing. They also noted that AI can be thorough, especially concerning rubric categories, including grammatical and linguistic accuracy.

*“Since AI has more information than the teacher, I think it provides more effective and efficient feedback when correcting the paragraph by using a rubric.” (P39)*

*“AI is more reliable since AI device objectively and meticulously analysed the paragraph I wrote and gave effective feedback accordingly.” (P45)*

TF was found to be more reliable than AIF because it provided relevant, consistent, and creative comments. This aligns with previous studies suggesting that TF is reliable, especially for complex and demanding composing tasks (Hyland & Hyland, 2019; Zou et al., 2025). When it comes to themes and the domain of creative writing, EFL learners are more likely to value their instructors' opinions and criticisms that are clear, consistent, and relevant (Wu et al., 2022). However, several EFL students found AI comments to be informative and credible. In certain circumstances, AI tools may even outperform what human assessors provide in terms of creative thinking, and syntax (Steiss et al., 2024). Additionally, some students found AIF more reliable due to rubric-based suggestions and comprehensive linguistic and contextual comments (Özdere, 2025; Song & Song, 2023; Tajik, 2025). Overall, the learners expressed that TF is more reliable because it is more rational, and the teacher has a deeper understanding when reviewing their writing pieces.

##### *Unreliability of TF and AIF*

According to 21% of participants (14 students), conditions involving cognitive load, tiredness, and lack of time during writing lessons or feedback sessions may cause TF to be uncertain and insecure,

which could lead to mistakes in comments and assessments.

*“When the teachers give feedback, it takes much time as they deals with everyone individually and not everyone can deal with it in detail.” (P27)*

*“In teacher-based feedback, there is a risk of making mistakes when the teacher gets tired.” (P12)*

32% of participants (21 students) regarded AIF as unreliable due to its systemic flaws, lack of human empathy and judgment, and tendency to exaggerate subtle errors.

*“AI-based feedback may not always give correct feedback and may create confusion.” (P3)*

*“The style and content of AI-based feedback can change because the data on the internet is constantly changing, and I think it is not reliable for this reason.” (P11)*

Reliability concerns affected both feedback types. TF was found unreliable due to limited class time, large class size, cognitive load, and fatigue (Kurnia, 2022). Yan et al. (2024) revealed similar findings, reporting that Chinese EFL student teachers were dissatisfied with grade-specific feedback mechanisms that offer less detailed and customised explanations because of their teachers' limited time, which may cause mistrust among these learners. The responses received from EFL students in the current research reflected these concerns. Additionally, AIF was found unreliable because of over-correction or lack of nuance (Alghannam, 2024). Tran (2025b) and Zhang et al. (2021) found that AI can reduce credibility by misinterpreting writing papers, making incorrect corrections, or missing or exaggerating minor errors. These issues align with the perspectives of EFL students in the current study.

#### *Theme 6: Affective Affordances of TF and AIF*

32% of the participants (21 students) underlined the significance of TF in supplying emotional support, comprising empathy, tolerance, and

encouragement, specifically due to the face-to-face and engaging nature of TF.

*“In teacher-based feedback, the teacher’s sincere and kind way of telling the students about their mistakes increased the students’ motivation.” (P32)*

*“I think that the help given to me by a human with teacher-based feedback contributes more to improving my writing performance than artificial intelligence.” (P5)*

In contrast, 29% of the learners (19 students) remarked that they genuinely felt more confident and enthusiastic after receiving a well-organised, comprehensible AIF, as it involves rubric-based critiques and more creative alternatives.

*“The AI feedback provided organised and better versions of my statements as alternatives in terms of sentences or words, and this motivated me.” (P14)*

*“The fact that the AI-based feedback gives individual feedback under rubric headings makes me very happy.” (P29)*

Several students appreciated both types of feedback for their emotional benefits. The findings from studies by Wang and Jiang (2023) and Hossain et al. (2024) support the view that TF was supportive, encouraging, tolerant, and empathetic. Teachers are better able to recognise the struggles faced by learners and respond with empathy because they are human. Additionally, during face-to-face interaction sessions, students felt more motivated to write. Han and Wang (2021) suggest that although AIF is usually quick and comprehensive, it lacks the emotional connection and personal bond that teacher assessment provides, making it essential for motivating students. Including empathy and mentorship in instructor remarks, as reported by Wang and Jiang (2023), creates a community-oriented environment that keeps students engaged and helps them write more effectively. Along these lines, the students described AIF as motivating, satisfying, pleasant, and less stressful. Ranalli (2021) found that EFL learners feel more at ease with AI feedback because

it provides a neutral and unbiased environment, allowing them to edit their assignments with ease. Additionally, AI-powered technologies enhance EFL learners' autonomy, self-discipline, and engagement, thereby making the writing process more productive and enjoyable (Tajik, 2025). Song and Song (2023) revealed that by promoting confidence and pleasure in writing, ChatGPT's AI-assisted guidance substantially boosted students' motivation. These results indicate that AI-based suggestions strengthen EFL students' confidence and enjoyment throughout the writing process. Meanwhile, students' autonomy, motivation, and pleasure are heightened with properly organised AIF (Song & Song, 2023; Tajik, 2025), suggesting that, when well balanced, both procedural AIF and emotional TF factors can improve learners' involvement in the writing process.

#### *Theme 7: The impact of TF and AIF on Micro Skills*

19% (12 students) of participants stated that the most effective way to improve mechanical writing skills, including vocabulary, syntax, punctuation, and spelling, was achieved through TF.

*"I improved my grammar, vocabulary usage, and spelling rules with teacher feedback." (P57)*

*"Teacher-based feedback is very descriptive in terms of grammar and spelling rules; it helps us to realise our mistakes." (P42)*

Respondents in this study valued AIF highly, particularly for its ability to further develop students' mechanical skills. 34% of participants (22 students) claimed that AIF improved their lexical, grammatical skills, and language mechanics such as spelling, punctuation, and capitalisation.

*"I found AI-based feedback instructive in terms of reinforcing grammar and spelling rules." (P50)*

*"AI-based feedback scans the vocabulary and grammatical patterns in my paragraph more thoroughly." (P13)*

Based on the reviews of the students above, EFL students' confidence increased, and their writing drafts became more polished and refined because of their writing instructor's concise, straightforward,

and comprehensive responses, which supported them in fixing mechanical errors (Luo et al., 2025). These findings seem to align with studies that indicate human-delivered feedback is essential for fostering syntactical growth and lexical development during the local-level feedback process (Çiçek & Kayaoğlu, 2024; Hossain et al., 2024; Wichanpricha, 2020). On the other hand, by providing tailored, immediate, and comprehensive guidance on lexical and linguistic issues, AI applications such as ChatGPT and Grammarly have been found to significantly boost EFL students' lexical use, grammatical proficiency, and overall fluency (Muftah et al., 2023; Sanosi, 2022). According to similar studies in the literature, EFL students who used AI devices showed notable improvements in their grammar, vocabulary, spelling, and punctuation skills compared to those who did not receive this type of assistance (Azenoud, 2024; Sanosi, 2022). As a result, AI tools have been valued more for improving mechanical accuracy, such as syntax, vocabulary, punctuation, and spelling, when compared with TF, which involved fewer mechanical reviews and comments (Azenoud, 2024; Cheong, 2024).

#### *Theme 8: The impact of TF and AIF on Macro Skills*

TF encourages EFL students to better utilise macro skills such as cohesive devices, helping them maintain paragraph unity and logical flow (Zhang et al., 2024). However, in this study, only 8% of the sample group (5 students) reported that their instructors' comments were beneficial for developing these globally based writing skills.

*"With the help of teacher feedback, I could see where I made mistakes so that I could reorganise my paragraph." (P10)*

*"Teacher feedback had a positive effect on my writing skills in terms of content and paragraph structure." (P46)*

19% of EFL students (12 students) in this study stated they preferred the macro-level suggestions of AI since AIF emphasises the benefits of coherence, cohesiveness, and paragraph unity, resulting in more focused and coherent content (Tajik, 2025).

*“Thanks to the AI feedback, I realised that I should focus on skills such as paragraph content and organisation while writing.” (P16)*

*“I found the AI-based feedback sufficient and explanatory in terms of correcting the paragraph content.” (P33)*

Both AIF and TF promoted improved content organisation, coherence, and cohesion. However, some students criticised TF for focusing on grammar and vocabulary rather than addressing macro-level issues, as they felt TF lacked macro skills. Nevertheless, to help EFL students enhance global writing skills such as paragraph structure, unity, content development, and cohesiveness, TF is essential. EFL students can enhance the organisation and clarity of their writing and create more cohesive and coherent drafts when teachers consistently provide feedback on macro-level components (Rastgou et al., 2020). Conversely, AIF helps EFL students produce deeper and more relevant writing by fostering context development, content creation, and reasoning skills (Tran, 2025a). EFL students who receive AIF report improved understanding of their expression and significantly higher writing scores (Sekewael & Anaktototy, 2024). Likewise, AI tools encourage organised and systematic writing processes that produce well-structured paragraphs and maintain a steady flow of ideas (Özdere, 2025). When considering all factors, AI is regarded as more effective for content creation, paragraph organisation, and text fluency (Dja’far & Hamidah, 2024).

*RQ2. What are Turkish EFL students’ preferences regarding AI-generated and teacher feedback?*

EFL students in this study were asked which feedback they preferred and to provide explanations for their choices. The percentages and frequencies of students’ preferences, based on their expressions, are shown in the following table.

Table 2  
Feedback Preferences of EFL Students

Feedback Type	%	f
TF	56,92	37
AIF	30,77	19
Both	13,85	9

Most of them (56.92%) preferred to receive feedback from their teachers. Many participants expressed a preference for TF because it provides reliable, face-to-face, and interactive feedback, making it the most effective and engaging way to enhance their writing skills. Nearly 31% of the students claimed that AIF is personalised and motivating, and therefore offers detailed feedback, so they wanted input from AI platforms. Lastly, some of them (13.85%) chose the hybrid model since both feedback types are equally important. When AIF and TF collaborate, students believe they can obtain more comprehensive and efficient reviews.

EFL students in this study believe that obtaining feedback from their teachers strengthens their overall writing capabilities; hence, they value it (Pertiwi & Ashadi, 2024). Delivering corrective, content-specific, and meaningful feedback is still critically important in the current AI-driven educational setting, and teachers’ intervention is vital to accelerating the development of EFL students’ written work (Fan et al., 2024). Because of teacher feedback’s perceived utility, comprehensive manner, validity, reliability and human touch, respondents strongly selected TF over AIF. According to Zeevy-Solovey (2024), teachers are more likely to figure out the intended meaning of EFL students’ writing than AIF, and they can deliver relevant, interactive evaluation. 56,92% of participants (37 students) in this study welcomed their teachers’ human-generated, targeted, and individualised suggestions, defining them as usually precise, relevant, reliable, and appropriate to their requirements.

*“I prefer teacher feedback because it is less likely to be misinterpreted.” (P37)*

*“I prefer teacher feedback because it is more effective for me to get feedback from a real person.” (P5)*

*“I prefer teacher feedback because I can get more accurate and precise feedback.” (P42)*

In EFL writing instruction, numerous studies have demonstrated the effectiveness and reliability of AIF (Merkviladze, 2024; Ranalli, 2021; Song & Song, 2023; Tajik, 2025). According to Huang and

Mizumoto (2024), these platforms are known for providing timely, accurate, and tailored feedback, helping EFL students become more engaged and confident in their writing tasks. However, EFL teachers may find it challenging to deliver prompt, comprehensive feedback, especially with large classes when time constraints hinder customised responses. Some significant gaps in traditional EFL writing instruction, such as offering local-based feedback while neglecting global input, known as imbalanced feedback, have been addressed through increased use of AI tools in writing classes (Rad et al., 2024). A wide range of writing aspects, including syntax, lexicon, mechanics, and the organisation and production of content, are thoroughly covered by AI-powered platforms (Sanosi, 2022; Steiss et al., 2024). These findings are supported by the current study, which shows that 30.77% of participants (19 students) found AIF to be highly accurate, informative, and well-suited to their specific writing needs.

*“I prefer to have AI feedback because it is more detailed and instructive.” (P12)*

*“I prefer artificial intelligence for feedback because I can get more qualified feedback, because there is no fatigue in artificial intelligence.” (P54)*

A hybrid approach involving both TF and AIF is increasingly valued by EFL students because each feedback type offers distinct benefits. While AI tools are appreciated for their speed, consistency, and ability to assist with syntax, vocabulary, and mechanics, TF is often seen as more contextually aware, empathetic, and supportive in guiding students in EFL writing instruction (Tang, 2024; Zeevy-Solovey, 2024). Several EFL learners noted that AIF allowed them to edit their documents quickly and independently, producing corrected drafts and suggestions for minor errors. Current studies suggest that this combined approach may improve students’ performance by merging the practicality and accessibility of AI platforms with the interpersonal and pedagogical skills of teachers (Nindya & Taufiqulloh, 2024; Yun, 2024). According to Min (2024), AI-powered tools also encourage autonomy among students by providing instant, personalised feedback that EFL students can review as needed. However, this may not be practical in

crowded classrooms. 13,85% of respondents (9 students) expressed a preference for receiving both types of feedback in this study.

*“I prefer both because the teacher is very effective in assessing writing skills, and AI is faster and more effective in grammar.” (P50)*

*“I prefer both teacher feedback and AI feedback because they both have their good points in terms of grammar, vocabulary and content generation”. (P41)*

Based on the research findings, most learners (56%) preferred receiving feedback from their teachers in EFL writing instruction. This aligns with previous studies, emphasising how important learners perceive customised, contextual, and personally constructive criticism from teachers (Yun, 2024). Conversely, 30% of participants valued AIF for its effectiveness in identifying linguistic and lexical errors and its immediacy. Consistent with these findings, one study suggested that AI platforms are increasingly accepted as supplementary guidance tools, particularly for surface-level corrections (Zhai & Ma, 2023). Nearly 14% of students opted for a hybrid approach combining AIF and TF. These learners appreciated the integration of current ideas for mixed feedback methods in the EFL writing classroom, as they valued the combination of human understanding with AI’s immediacy and efficiency (Tang, 2024). Ultimately, the results highlight the need for writing pedagogies that strike a balance between human-centred and technology-assisted guidance.

## 6. Conclusion

The current study indicates that, when teaching EFL writing, both TF and AIF have distinct, complementary benefits. While AIF is valued for its speed, organised clarity, and consistency—especially in mechanical aspects—TF is respected for its reliability, empathy, and interactive qualities. Additionally, several learners mentioned preferring a hybrid approach that combines the human touch of TF, which is level-appropriate and empathetic, with the instant and comprehensive guidance of AIF. Effective EFL writing instruction still heavily depends on TF. However, AI tools can serve as

helpful supplemental intermediaries, particularly in large classrooms where individual teacher attention may be limited. The perceptions of EFL students show that to address different emotional and cognitive needs, feedback processes must be student-centred, context-specific, reliable, interactive, empathetic, adaptable, and varied.

This study acknowledges some limitations. Firstly, the small sample size (n=65) may limit the generalisability of the findings to other settings, and secondly, the study took place within a specific EFL syllabus in Turkey, further narrowing generalisability. Additionally, since only qualitative data analysis was conducted, there may be constraints on broader empirical validation.

Future studies could benefit from mixed methods that include both generalisation and in-depth investigation. This might involve larger, more diverse samples and incorporating peer feedback in addition to teacher and AI feedback. Moreover, longitudinal studies could explore the long-term impact of various feedback types on students' writing skills, providing more robust evidence to enhance EFL writing instruction.

## **7. Pedagogical Implications**

Teachers are invited to utilise a hybrid feedback model that combines AIF and TF to enhance EFL writing instruction: While AI tools effectively promote mechanical accuracy and macro-level editing, teachers can provide personalised, empathetic, and interactive feedback environments (Tang, 2024; Yun, 2024). Establishing students' technological literacy is essential to prevent misunderstandings and over-reliance on artificial intelligence tools by supporting them in responsibly understanding and using both AI and human responses (Boud & Dawson, 2023; Zhang et al., 2021). Instead of replacing human instruction, AI

should be used to complement it, helping with writing tasks that involve emotional nuance and creative thinking. Instructors must carefully consider AI's role to maintain a human-centred environment for writing education (Nindya & Taufiqulloh, 2024). It is also important to consider time constraints and class size. To ensure EFL students receive more comprehensive and personalised feedback, higher education institutions should aim to reduce teachers' workloads and daily responsibilities. At this point, AI-powered platforms can serve as valuable tools for providing feedback and assessing writing tasks (Wang & Jiang, 2023). In conclusion, reflective and recurrent writing phases should include feedback, both from teachers and from AI devices. A longer-term advancement in writing can be maintained via practices like revision journals or memos, resulting in strengthening student autonomy and self-regulation (Huang & Mizumoto, 2024; Zhai & Ma, 2023).

## **Ethics Statements**

This article is based on a PhD thesis currently in progress.

This study has ethics committee approval from the Gazi University Ethics Committee, Turkey.

## **Declaration of Competing Interests**

The authors declare none.

## **Funding**

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

## **Data Availability**

The authors do not have permission to share data.

## References

- Aldosemani, T. I., Assalahi, H., Lhothali, A., & Albsisi, M. (2023). Automated writing evaluation in EFL contexts: A review of effectiveness, impact, and pedagogical implications. *International Journal of Computer-Assisted Language Learning and Teaching (IJCALLT)*, 13(1), 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.4018/IJCALLT.329962>
- Alghannam, M. S. M. (2024). Artificial Intelligence as a provider of feedback on EFL student compositions. *World Journal of English Language*, 15(2), 161. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v15n2p161>
- Azenoud, A. (2024). Enhancing writing accuracy and complexity through AI-assisted tools among Moroccan EFL university learners. *International Journal of Linguistics and Translation Studies*, 5(4), 211–226. <https://doi.org/10.36892/ijlts.v5i4.529>
- 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>
- Bibi, Z., & Atta, A. (2024). The role of ChatGPT as an AI English writing assistant: A study of students' perceptions, experiences, and satisfaction. *Annals of Human and Social Sciences*, 5(1), 433-443. [https://doi.org/10.35484/ahss.2024\(5-1\)39](https://doi.org/10.35484/ahss.2024(5-1)39)
- Boud, D., & Dawson, P. (2023). What feedback literate teachers do: An empirically derived competency framework. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 48(2), 158–171. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.1910928>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp0630a>
- Butler, D. L., & Winne, P. H. (1995). Feedback and self-regulated learning: A theoretical synthesis. *Review of Educational Research*, 65(3), 245–281. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543065003245>
- Cheng, X., Zhang, L. J., & Yan, Q. (2021). Exploring teacher-written feedback in EFL writing classrooms: Beliefs and practices in interaction. *Language Teaching Research*, 1–31. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688211057665>
- Cheong, Y. (2024). A study of the effectiveness of student perception-based AI feedback in college writing classes. *Korean Journal of General Education*, 18(5), 159–173. <https://doi.org/10.46392/kjge.2024.18.5.159>
- Chiu, T. K., Xia, Q., Zhou, X., Chai, C. S., & Cheng, M. (2023). Systematic literature review on opportunities, challenges, and future research recommendations of Artificial Intelligence in education. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 4, 100118 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2022.100118>
- Creswell, J.W. & Creswell, J.D. (2023). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). Sage.
- Çiçek, M., & Kayaoglu, M. N. (2024). Exploring the impact of form and content feedback on EFL writing proficiency: A quasi-experimental study. *Studies in Linguistics, Culture and FLT*, 12(3), 31–56. <https://doi.org/10.46687/plyn8876>
- Davis, F. D. (1989). Technology acceptance model: TAM. *Al-Suqri, MN, Al-Aufi, AS: Information Seeking Behavior and Technology Adoption*, 205(219), 5. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-4666-8156-9.ch013>
- Dja'far, V. H., & Hamidah, F. N. (2024). The effectiveness of AI technology in improving academic English writing skills in higher education. *Journal of Language and Literature Studies*, 4(3), 579–593. <https://doi.org/10.36312/jolls.v4i3.2031>
- Du, Y., & Gao, H. (2022). Determinants affecting teachers' adoption of AI-based applications in EFL context: An analysis of analytic hierarchy process. *Education and Information Technologies*, 27(7), 9357–9384. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-022-11001-y>
- Escalante, J., Pack, A., & Barrett, A. (2023). AI-generated feedback on writing: Insights into efficacy and ENL student preference. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 20(1), 57. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00425-2>
- Fan, Y.-X., Sheng, T. T., & Lim, G. (2024). EAP teacher feedback in the age of AI: Supporting first-year students in EFL disciplinary writing. *Australian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7(3), 1943. <https://doi.org/10.29140/ajal.v7n3.1943>
- Ferris, D. (2018). "They said I have a lot to learn": How teacher feedback influences advanced university students' views of writing. *Journal of Response to Writing*, 4(2), 2. <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/journalrw/vol4/iss2/2>
- Guo, K., Pan, M., Li, Y., & Lai, C. (2024). Effects of an AI-supported approach to peer feedback on university EFL students' feedback quality and writing ability. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 63, 100962. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2024.100962>

- Han, F., & Wang, Z. (2021). Comparison of English teacher feedback and automated writing feedback on the quality of English language learners' essay revision. *OTESSA Conference Proceedings*, 1(1), 1-5. <https://doi.org/10.18357/otessac.2021.1.1.44>
- Han, J. L. (2020). Effects of the comparative continuation on L2 writing performance. *English Language Teaching*, 13(8), 27-34. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v13n8p27>.
- Hossain, K. I., Ahmed, Md. K., & Mahmud, M. S. (2024). A comprehensive review on the impact of teacher feedback in language development for ESL/EFL learners. *IUBAT Review*, 7(1), 218–229. <https://doi.org/10.3329/iubatr.v7i1.74421>
- Huang, J., & Mizumoto, A. (2024). Examining the effect of generative AI on students' motivation and writing self-efficacy. *Digital Applied Linguistics*, 1, 102324–102324. <https://doi.org/10.29140/dal.v1.102324>
- Hyland, K. (2019). *Second language writing*. Cambridge University Press. <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/journalrw/vol4/iss2/2>
- Hyland, K. (2022). English for specific purposes: What is it and where is it taking us? *ESP Today-Journal of English for Specific Purposes at Tertiary Level*, 10(2), 202–220. <https://doi.org/10.18485/esptoday.2022.10.2.1>
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (Eds.). (2019). *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kim, S. (2024). *Harnessing AI for writing development: Exploring emerging multilinguals' ChatGPT usage patterns* (Publication No. 31837236) [Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. <https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/harnessing-ai-writing-development-exploring/docview/3150095897/se-2?accountid=11054>
- Krippendorff, K. (2019). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (4th ed.). Sage.
- Kurnia, A. (2022). EFL students' problems in dealing with teacher written feedback. *Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia*, 3(9), 812–819. <https://doi.org/10.36418/japendi.v3i9.1143>
- Lai, C. J. (2023). Teacher-student interaction for English-medium instruction (EMI) content and language learning and the effects of implementing multimodal input of classroom interaction: University students' perceptions. *English Language Teaching*, 16(1), 52-69. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v16n1p52>
- Lear, C., Xu, Z., & Yang, L. F. (2024). Relationships between teacher feedback and English writing proficiency in Chinese students: The mediating effect of writing self-regulated learning strategies. *System*, 123, 103338. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2024.103338>
- Lim, M. H., & Aryadoust, V. (2022). A scientometric review of research trends in computer-assisted language learning (1977–2020). *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 35(9), 2675-2700. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2021.1892768>
- Linuwih, E. R., Setiawan, S., & Munir, A. (2024). Student engagement with teacher written feedback in online EFL writing context. *Theory & Practice in Language Studies (TPLS)*, 14(7). <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1407.26>
- Loncar, M., Schams, W., & Liang, J. S. (2023). Multiple technologies, multiple sources: Trends and analyses of the literature on technology-mediated feedback for L2 English writing published from 2015-2019. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 36(4), 722-784. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2021.1943452>
- Luo, M., Hu, X., & Zhong, C. (2025). The collaboration of AI and teacher in feedback provision and its impact on EFL learner's argumentative writing. *Education and Information Technologies*, 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-025-13488-7>
- Min, C. J. (2024). The use of AI and ChatGPT in teaching synonyms to EFL students. *Research Studies in English Language Teaching and Learning*, 2(4), 187-207. <https://doi.org/10.62583/rseltl.v2i4.53>
- Masoudi, H. (2024). Effectiveness of ChatGPT in improving English writing proficiency among Non-native English speakers. *International Journal of Educational Sciences and Arts*, 3(4), 62-84. <http://dx.doi.org/10.59992/IJESA.2023.v3n4p2>
- Mekheimer, M. (2025). Generative AI-assisted feedback and EFL writing: A study on proficiency, revision frequency and writing quality. *Discover Education*, 4(1), 170. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-025-00602-7>
- Merkviladze, M. (2024). Integration of automated feedback tools in EFL academic writing classes: Teachers' perspective. *Journal of Education in Black Sea Region*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.31578/jebs.v10i1.323>
- Muftah, M., Al-Inbari, F. A. Y., Al-Wasy, B. Q., & Mahdi, H. S. (2023). The Role of automated corrective feedback in improving EFL learners' mastery of the writing aspects. *Psycholinguistics*, 34(2), 82-109. <https://doi.org/10.31470/2309-1797-2023-34-2-82-109>

- Muliyah, P., Rekha, A., & Aminatun, D. (2020). Learning from mistakes: Students' perception towards teacher's attitude in writing correction. *Lexeme: Journal of Linguistics and Applied Linguistics*, 2(1), 44. <https://doi.org/10.32493/ljal.v2i1.6995>
- Nindya, M. A., & Taufiqulloh, T. (2024). EFL learners' perceived grammar accuracy: AI feedback tools assessment in focus. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 12(3), 993-1002. <https://doi.org/10.25134/erjee.v12i3.10672>
- Özdere, M. (2025). AI in academic writing: Assessing the effectiveness, grading consistency, and student perspectives of ChatGPT and You.com for EFL students. *International Journal of Technology in Education*, 8(1), 123–154. <https://doi.org/10.46328/ijte.1001>
- Pace-Sigge, M., & Sumakul, D. T. (2021). What teaching an algorithm teaches when teaching students how to write academic texts. *Proceedings of the Digital Research Data and Human Sciences*, 230-251. <http://dx.doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.29658.26567>
- Patton M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pertiwi, O. P., & Ashadi, A. (2024). Exploring EFL students' preferences on teachers' written corrective feedback in encouraging students' writing skills. *Enrichment*, 2(8). <https://doi.org/10.55324/enrichment.v2i8.188>
- Phan, T. T. Q. (2023). EFL students' perceptions towards cooperative learning in writing skills at a university in the Mekong Delta. *International Journal of Language Instruction*, 2(3), 48–62. <https://doi.org/10.54855/ijli.23232>
- Rad, H. S., Alipour, R., & Jafarpour, A. (2024). Using Artificial Intelligence to foster students' writing feedback literacy, engagement, and outcome: A case of Wordtune application. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 32(9), 5020-5040. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2023.2208170>
- Ranalli, J. (2021). L2 student engagement with automated feedback on writing: Potential for learning and issues of trust. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 52, 100816. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2021.100816>
- Rastgou, A., Storch, N., & Knoch, U. (2020). The effect of sustained teacher feedback on CAF, content and organization in EFL writing. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 8(2), 41-61. <https://doi.org/10.30466/IJLTR.2020.120888>
- Sanosi, A. B. (2022). The impact of automated written corrective feedback on EFL learners' academic writing accuracy. *Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes*, 10(2), 301-317. <https://doi.org/10.22190/jtesap2202301s>
- Sekewael, M., & Anaktototy, K. (2024). Chat-GPT feedback: Fostering growth in English writing abilities among students. In Xiaoming Jiang and Muhammad Azeem Ashraf] (Eds.), *Interdisciplinary Themes of Sociolinguistic Studies - Language Learning, Technology, and Identity in the Age of AI and Globalization*. IntechOpen. <https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.1007287>
- Song, C., & Song, Y. (2023). Enhancing academic writing skills and motivation: assessing the efficacy of ChatGPT in AI-assisted language learning for EFL students. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14,1260843 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1260843>
- Steiss, J., Tate, T., Graham, S., Cruz, J., Hebert, M., Wang, J., Moon, Y., Tseng, W., Warschauer, M., & Olson, C. B. (2024). Comparing the quality of human and ChatGPT feedback of students' writing. *Learning and Instruction*, 91, 101894. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2024.101894>
- Stevenson, M., & Phakiti, A. (2019). Automated feedback and second language writing. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in Second Language Writing* (pp. 125-142). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108635547.009>
- Sulis, G. (2022). Engagement in the foreign language classroom: Micro and macro perspectives. *System*, 110, 102902. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102902>
- Sysoyev, P. V., Filatov, E. M., Khmarenko, N. I., & Murunov, S. S. (2024). Teacher vs Artificial Intelligence: A comparison of the quality of feedback provided by a teacher and generative artificial intelligence in assessing students' creative writing. *Perspektivy Naukii Obrazovaniâ*, 71(5), 694–712. <https://doi.org/10.32744/pse.2024.5.41>
- Tajik, A. (2025). Exploring the role of AI-driven dynamic writing platforms in improving EFL learners' writing skills and fostering their motivation. *Research Square*,1. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-5788599/v1>
- Tang, Z. (2024). An investigation into the feedback of automated writing evaluation system on EFL learners' writing. *Study in English Language Teaching*, 12(4), 1. <https://doi.org/10.22158/selt.v12n4p1>

- Tran, T. T. (2025b). The differential impact of AI tools among EFL university learners: A process writing approach. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 24(5), 452-471. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.24.5.24>
- Tran, T. T. T. (2025a). Enhancing EFL writing revision practices: The impact of AI-and teacher-generated feedback and their sequences. *Education Sciences*, 15(2), 232. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15020232>
- Tu, S. P., & Ego-ugan, G. B. (2024). Teacher feedback shaping emotions and motivation in EFL writing. In B. Lacy, P. Lege, & P. Ferguson (Eds.), *Growth Mindset in Language Education*. JALT. <https://doi.org/10.37546/JALTPCP2023-32>
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Interaction between learning and development. In M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman (Eds.), *Mind and Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes* (pp.79-91). Harvard University Press.
- Wahyudi, A., Sari, F., Pamuji, A., & Dharmawan, Y. Y. (2024). From critique to insight: Student voices on English writing feedback. *Voices of English Language Education Society*, 8(1), 282-292 <https://doi.org/10.29408/veles.v8i1.25659>
- Wang, Z. (2022). Computer-assisted EFL writing, and evaluations based on Artificial Intelligence: A case from a college reading and writing course. *Library Hi Tech*, 40(1), 80–97. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LHT-05-2020-0113>
- Wang, W., & Jiang, L. (2023). Writing on WeChat moments: Impact on writing performance and learner autonomy. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 36(7), 1236-1264. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2021.1976799>
- Wichanpricha, T. (2020). Roles of feedback to English writing improvement: Thai EFL novice writers in higher education. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 10(6), 133. <https://doi.org/10.36941/JESR-2020-0115>
- Wu, W., Huang, J., Han, C., & Zhang, J. (2022). Evaluating peer feedback as a reliable and valid complementary aid to teacher feedback in EFL writing classrooms: A feedback giver perspective. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 73, 101140. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2022.101140>
- Yan, C., He, C., & Sheng, H. (2024). ‘Grades alone are insufficient!’ Chinese EFL student teachers’ perspectives on teacher written feedback on course essays. *Innovations In Education and Teaching International*, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2024.2437116>
- Yildiz, H., & Gonen, S. I. K. (2024). Automated writing evaluation system for feedback in the digital world: An online learning opportunity for English as a foreign language student. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, 25(3), 183-206. <https://doi.org/10.17718/tojde.1169727>
- Yoon, S. Y., Miszoglad, E., & Pierce, L. R. (2023). Evaluation of ChatGPT feedback on ELL writers' coherence and cohesion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06505*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2310.06505>
- Yu, R., & Yang, L. (2021). ESL/EFL learners' responses to teacher written feedback: Reviewing a recent decade of empirical studies. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 735101. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.735101>
- Yun, C. S. (2024). Exploring learners’ perceptions on efficacy of Artificial Intelligence in enhancing EFL conversation classes. *영어교육연구*, 117–143. <https://doi.org/10.69822/kdps.2024.54.117>
- Zeevy-Solovey, O. (2024). Comparing peer, ChatGPT, and teacher corrective feedback in EFL writing: Students’ perceptions and preferences. *Technology in Language Teaching & Learning*, 6(3), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.29140/tlil.v6n3.1482>
- Zhai, N., & Ma, X. (2023). The effectiveness of automated writing evaluation on writing quality: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 61(4), 875-900. <https://doi.org/10.1177/07356331221127300>
- Zhang, B., Razali, A. B., & Ismail, L. (2024). The effect of teacher-guided peer feedback on English writing performance of Chinese EFL high school students. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, 13(4). <https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarped/v13-i4/23034>
- Zhang, K. (2025). Enhancing critical writing through AI feedback: A randomized control study. *Behavioral Sciences*, 15(5), 600. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs15050600>
- Zhang, T., Chen, X., Hu, J. and Ketwan, P. (2021). EFL students’ preferences for written corrective feedback: Do error types, language proficiency, and foreign language enjoyment matter? *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 660564. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.660564>
- Zou, S., Guo, K., Wang, J., & Liu, Y. (2025). Investigating students’ uptake of teacher- and ChatGPT-generated feedback in EFL writing: A comparison study. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2024.2447279>