

INTEGRATING AI-BASED FEEDBACK TOOLS INTO EFL WRITING INSTRUCTION

Sobirova Feruza

Teacher at Uzbekistan State World Languages University
Faculty of English Philology
fsobirova@uzswlu.uz

Iskandarova Bibixonim,

Student, Faculty of English Philology,
Uzbekistan State World Languages University,
bibixonimiskandarova@gmail.com

Abstract. This article examines the use of AI-based feedback tools in EFL writing classes. It discusses their pedagogical value, limitations, and classroom application, and proposes a practical model that combines machine support with teacher guidance and learner reflection.

Key words: artificial intelligence, EFL writing, feedback, digital pedagogy, revision

Introduction

Writing is one of the most difficult skills for EFL learners because it requires linguistic accuracy, logical organization, genre awareness, and the ability to revise one's own text. In many university classrooms, students can produce ideas, yet they struggle to shape those ideas into coherent paragraphs and academically appropriate compositions. For this reason, feedback becomes central in writing instruction. Traditional teacher feedback is valuable, but it is often delayed because one instructor works with many students at the same time. AI-based feedback tools have recently become a practical support mechanism in this area. They do not replace the teacher, but they can make revision faster, more visible, and more interactive.

The topicality of this topic is connected with the rapid digitalization of higher education and the growing interest in innovative language-teaching methods. The purpose of this article is to analyze the role of AI-based feedback tools in EFL writing instruction and to suggest practical ways of using them in university classrooms. The main tasks are to describe the pedagogical potential of such tools, identify possible risks, and propose a classroom model for guided implementation.

Literature Review and Methodology

Research in computer-assisted language learning has long shown that digital tools can support language development when they are used with clear pedagogical aims [1]. In writing instruction, feedback is especially important because revision is not a mechanical correction process; it is a stage where learners notice gaps, compare alternatives, and strengthen control over form and meaning [2]. The CEFR companion volume also emphasizes mediation, interaction, and purposeful language production, which means that writing lessons should develop both accuracy and communicative effectiveness [3].

From a cognitive perspective, digital tools are useful only when they reduce unnecessary mental overload and help students focus on meaningful revision [4]. Recent discussions on AI in education point out that large language models and automated feedback systems can support brainstorming, drafting, grammar checking, and idea

reformulation. At the same time, these tools may encourage dependency if teachers do not establish clear limits and reflective tasks [5].

The present article is based on analytical, descriptive, and methodological approaches. It compares theoretical views on feedback, digital pedagogy, and writing instruction, and then synthesizes them into a practical classroom model suitable for undergraduate EFL courses. The study does not claim large-scale experimental results; rather, it offers a pedagogically grounded framework for classroom use.

Discussion

AI-based feedback tools can support EFL writing in four major ways. First, they help students notice language problems immediately. A learner who writes a short paragraph can receive instant comments on grammar, punctuation, sentence boundaries, and lexical repetition. This quick response is useful because students often forget their communicative intention if feedback comes too late. Second, such tools can suggest more natural phrasing. This is especially helpful for learners who understand grammar rules but cannot produce fluent academic sentences on their own. Third, AI tools can assist with organization. Students may ask for help in arranging a topic sentence, supporting ideas, and a concluding sentence. Fourth, they can stimulate revision habits. Many learners submit the first version of a text because they do not know how to edit it; AI can make revision visible as a step-by-step activity.

Still, these advantages should not be exaggerated. AI-generated feedback is not always reliable. A system may mark a correct sentence as problematic or recommend a change that weakens the student's original meaning. In other cases, students may copy a machine-generated paragraph without understanding the vocabulary or structure. This creates only the appearance of progress. For that reason, the teacher's role remains essential. The teacher decides when AI may be used, which writing stage it can support, and what kind of reflection students must complete after receiving automated feedback.

A balanced model is more productive than either total acceptance or total rejection of AI. In classroom practice, AI should be treated as a revision assistant, not as an author. Students should first produce an original draft based on class discussion, reading tasks, or personal opinion. Only after that should they use an AI tool to check clarity, organization, and language errors. The next step must be reflection: learners should explain which suggestions they accepted, which they rejected, and why. This simple procedure protects authorship and develops critical language awareness.

Results

The analysis made it possible to design a practical four-stage model for EFL writing instruction.

At the first stage, the teacher introduces the task, explains the genre, and gives students a clear writing prompt. Learners prepare a short outline without digital support. At the second stage, they write the first draft independently. This is important because the classroom must preserve the student's own voice and level of competence. At the third stage, students use an AI-based feedback tool to identify errors, improve transitions, reduce repetition, and check paragraph structure. They are instructed not to replace the whole text, but to revise selected parts. At the fourth stage, they submit both versions of the text together with a short reflection note.

This model produces several pedagogical outcomes. It increases learner engagement because revision becomes active rather than passive. It improves self-editing skills because students compare alternatives instead of waiting for the teacher to

correct everything. It also helps the teacher save time on minor surface-level errors and focus on deeper issues such as argumentation, coherence, and genre control. Most importantly, it encourages responsible digital literacy. Students learn not only how to use a tool, but how to question it.

Conclusion and Practical Recommendations

AI-based feedback tools can strengthen EFL writing instruction when they are used within a clear pedagogical framework. Their greatest value lies in supporting revision, helping students notice errors, and making the writing process more interactive. Their main danger lies in overdependence and uncritical acceptance. As a result, the most effective approach is guided integration rather than uncontrolled use.

Several practical recommendations can be offered. Teachers should define which stage of writing allows AI support and which stage requires independent production. Short reflective tasks should accompany every AI-assisted revision activity. Classroom assessment should value process, not only the final text. Students should also be taught to distinguish between useful suggestions and inappropriate machine-generated reformulations. Finally, departments should include ethical guidelines for AI use in writing courses so that innovation develops together with academic responsibility.

REFERENCES

1. Chapelle, C. A. (2001). Computer applications in second language acquisition: Foundations for teaching, testing and research. Cambridge University Press.
2. Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (Eds.). (2006). Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues. Cambridge University Press.
3. Council of Europe. (2020). Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment—Companion volume. Council of Europe Publishing.
4. Mayer, R. E. (2009). Multimedia learning (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
5. Kasneci, E., Sessler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., Gasser, U., Groh, G., Günemann, S., Hüllermeier, E., Krusche, S., Kutyniok, G., Michaeli, T., Nerdel, C., Pfeiffer, F., Poquet, O., Sailer, M., Schmidt, A., Seidel, T., Stadler, M., & Kasneci, G. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 103, 102274.
6. Sobirova, F. I. (2025). Speech manipulation in electoral programs. *Philological Research: Language, Literature, Education*, 1(1.1).
7. Sobirova, F. I. (2025, February). Idrok va tilning o'zaro ta'siri: Tilni qayta ishlash va o'zlashtirishda psixolingvistik nuqtai nazar. *The Lingua Spectrum*, 2.
8. Sobirova, F. I. (2026). Ongga ta'sir qilish san'ati: Suhbatdan oldingi va keyingi manipulyatsiyalar. *Obrazovanie nauka i innovatsionnye idei v mire*, 91.
9. Sobirova, F. I. (2025, October). Saylovoldi nutqlarida manipulyativ strategiyalarning pragmatik tahlili. *Modern Education and Development*, 35(1).
10. Sobirova, F. I. (2025, March). Neyrolingvistikada nutqiy ta'sir. *Лучшие интеллектуальные исследования*, 41(2).