


The Role of ChatGPT in Providing Written Corrective Feedback for EFL Academic Writing: A Literature Review

Nguyen Duong Minh Quyen^{1*}

¹ Ho Chi Minh City Open University, Vietnam

*Corresponding author's email: nguyenduongminhquyen@gmail.com

*  <https://orcid.org/0009-0001-9211-3533>

*  <https://doi.org/10.54855/ijaile.26313>

® Copyright (c) 2026 Nguyen Duong Minh Quyen

Received: 01/10/2025

Revision: 21/03/2026

Accepted: 25/03/2026

Online: 29/04/2026

ABSTRACT

This literature review investigates the effect of ChatGPT in delivering written corrective feedback (WCF) for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) academic writing, using studies published from 2022 to 2025. Research indicates that ChatGPT feedback offers considerable benefits in formative contexts, including immediacy, personalization, and clarity that improve learners' revisions and confidence. Unlike other automated writing evaluation tools, ChatGPT offers more contextually informed and interactive feedback, making it a valuable asset in the writing process. However, limitations arise in feedback concerning advanced writing abilities, rhetorical components, and cultural nuances, underscoring the need for teacher feedback. Equity and ethical issues, such as learner dependency and disparate access, underscore the imperative for careful integration. The review asserts that ChatGPT ought to be integrated into educational frameworks to enhance instructor and peer feedback, facilitating effective assessment and genuine skill development.

Keywords: ChatGPT, Written Corrective Feedback, EFL Academic Writing

Introduction

Academic writing is a cornerstone of higher education and professional communication, as it enables students and practitioners to convey complex ideas effectively while engaging in knowledge construction, documentation, and critical evaluation (Lloyd-Jones & Masterton, 2010). Among academic genres, argumentative writing is particularly significant since it requires learners to integrate linguistic competence with critical skills such as analysis, evaluation, and problem-solving (Ferretti et al., 2007; Widyastuti, 2018). As Chance (1986) observes, writing represents the linguistic manifestation of critical thinking, fostering idea generation, organization, and intellectual growth. Consequently, academic writing serves as both a linguistic endeavor and an essential avenue for intellectual engagement and professional advancement (Chance, 1986).

Given its complexity and central role in higher education, developing proficiency in academic writing remains a continuous difficulty for many EFL learners (Chen et al., 2024). Written corrective feedback (WCF) has long been recognized as a key pedagogical strategy to address

these challenges by providing targeted guidance on errors and promoting sustained improvement in students' writing skills (Cao & Zhong, 2023; Su, Lin, & Lai, 2023). However, conventional teacher feedback often falls short of offering the individualized, timely support that many learners require (Scheeler, 2004).

Technological advances in education have introduced new opportunities to enhance WCF practices (Hyland & Hyland, 2006; Godwin-Jones, 2024). Automated Writing Evaluation (AWE) systems, for example, offer prompt and data-informed feedback on grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics, demonstrating clear benefits for EFL writing instruction (Li, 2021). Nonetheless, such tools have been limited to surface-level corrections and lack the capacity to provide contextualized, personalized feedback necessary for complex academic writing tasks. As an advanced large language model, ChatGPT offers dynamic, context-sensitive, and conversational feedback that extends beyond the capabilities of traditional AWE systems (Jiao & Yu, 2023). In this environment, WCF is crucial for enhancing accuracy, fostering self-awareness, and facilitating sustained writing progress; however, its effectiveness depends on the nature of the feedback, the cultural context, and the learner's perspectives (Kluger & DeNisi, 1996).

Meanwhile, there are several benefits to applying ChatGPT-generated corrective feedback in academic writing, but the effectiveness of ChatGPT compared with traditional feedback tools such as teacher and peer feedback remains unclear. Various language learners tend to use traditional feedback, such as teacher or peer feedback, while others choose ChatGPT feedback for its immediacy, accessibility, and impartiality (Dwivedi et al., 2023; Firat, 2023). This scenario calls for a systematic literature review to evaluate ChatGPT's implementation in EFL academic writing settings, focusing on its effectiveness, accuracy, and educational consequences.

Purpose of the study

This literature review examines the role of ChatGPT in providing written corrective feedback for academic writing in EFL classes, drawing on empirical papers published between 2022 and 2025. Moreover, this study will present and categorize previous research on the effects of ChatGPT's feedback on learners' academic writing across grammar, vocabulary, sentence structure, coherence, punctuation, and spelling, among other important linguistic domains. Besides, this study compares and contrasts the strengths and weaknesses of ChatGPT with teacher and student feedback to examine the pedagogical implications of ChatGPT for using AI to teach English as a foreign language writing. Dwivedi et al. (2023) and Firat (2023) persisted that some learners preferred the immediacy and perceived impartiality of artificial intelligence, whereas others highlighted the knowledge of instructors or the collaborative nature of peer contributions more (Dwivedi et al., 2023; Firat, 2023). To clarify the objectives above and establish the theoretical and empirical foundation for this study, the following section will review the literature on written corrective feedback, particularly ChatGPT, teachers', and peers' feedback in EFL academic writing contexts.

Literature Review

ChatGPT as an AI-based Feedback Tool

Despite ChatGPT having been introduced as a revolutionary tool for transforming education since 2022, especially in writing (Kohnke et al., 2023), the effectiveness of ChatGPT in

delivering written corrective feedback has not been specifically examined in existing studies. In fact, ChatGPT has strong natural language processing (NLP) capabilities, including contextual comprehension, coherent and human-like text generation, and prompt-based feedback. As a result, these functions could help learners improve their language skills and become more proficient in the targeted language.

There are three main types of written corrective feedback in many EFL classrooms: peer, ChatGPT, and teacher feedback. According to Ferris and Roberts (2001), the most typical and conventional kind of feedback is teacher feedback in students' writing, such as pointing out mistakes and then offering suggestions for improvement (Ferris and Roberts 2001). Most learners depend significantly on teacher feedback for their revised writing tasks (Sheen et al., 2009). Many studies have shown that EFL learners can improve their grammatical structure, including punctuation, tense, clauses, and sentences (Bitchener and Ferris 2012). Overall, teacher feedback is necessary to provide experienced guidance and instruction to address the specific demands of individual learners, as it is considered an authentic and accurate feedback tool for EFL learners, though it is time-consuming and can be heavy on the workload (Lyster, 1998).

Secondly, peer feedback plays a crucial part in language learning, which is a development in education. This is because peer feedback not only provides comments on another's writing, but it also strengthens a collaborative learning environment. Previous literature review has increasingly examined peer feedback (Hewett, 2000; Liu & Hansen, 2002), showing numerous benefits. Numerous studies (Connor & Asenavage, 1994; Cho & MacArthur, 2010; Storch, 2005; Topping, 1998) indicate that peer feedback improves students' writing skills in critical thinking, social interaction, and linguistic dimensions. Sato (2013), Sato and Lyster (2012), and Sippel and Jackson (2015) asserted that students can proactively engage in class through peer feedback to enhance second-language acquisition. Peer feedback facilitates active analysis of peers' writing, leading to a deeper understanding of one's own writing deficiencies (Storch, 2005). Peterson and Portier (2014) noted that peer feedback is advantageous for both students and those providing feedback. This approach helps students cultivate critical thinking and language analysis skills (Ferris & Roberts, 2001). As students acquire experience in applying the specified criteria for writing evaluation, their self-assessment skills advance (Lundstrom & Baker, 2009). In brief, peer feedback is considered a beneficial practice for students' academic writing (Xiao & Lucking, 2008). In general, peer feedback is an alternative feedback tool for EFL learners to improve their collaboration, engagement, and critical reflection; however, it still has some drawbacks, such as differences in learners' levels and feedback quality.

AI feedback has recently made a substantial contribution to written corrective feedback. Steiss et al. (2024) argue that AI can serve as automated corrective feedback for writing, enhancing learners' writing skills, provided by ChatGPT, while reducing teachers' workload, which they frequently carry across many classes. Wu (2024) indicates that tools have advanced notably in lexical resources, grammatical accuracy, and discourse generation. AI technology analyzes grammar and spelling, providing significant assistance in identifying writing issues and recommending enhancements (Alharbi, 2023). ChatGPT (Chat Generative Pre-trained Transformer) is an AI tool that engages users in conversation, providing responses to inquiries and requests in a dialogic format (OpenAI, 2023). ChatGPT uses a large language model to comprehend and generate responses like a human across various topics, employing computational techniques and extensive data to connect ideas and interpret prompts in context (Barrot, 2023). Wenzlaff and Spaeth (2022) assert that ChatGPT's explanations are almost indistinguishable from those of humans.

Barrot (2023) observed that ChatGPT can assess a text's concentration, clarity, and organization. However, many studies regarding ChatGPT as a feedback tool have yielded inconclusive outcomes (Steiss et al., 2024; Wu, 2024). In contrast, Dai et al. (2023) found that ChatGPT's feedback is unambiguous and comprehensible, helping learners understand their errors and improve their writing skills. In contrast, some research claims that ChatGPT is less reliable than teacher feedback. Besides, other findings showed that ChatGPT frequently offers process-oriented feedback (instructing on task approaches), which significantly decreases students' strategies more than task corrections. Therefore, these results indicate that ChatGPT illustrates significant potential to assist learners in enhancing their skills and fostering greater autonomy in learning. These mixed findings suggest that the effectiveness of written corrective feedback from ChatGPT depends on various factors, including learners' requirements, the suitability of the feedback type, and so on.

Research has shown that ChatGPT can provide timely, tailored, and situational written corrective feedback as an assistant tool for language learners (Dwivedi et al., 2023). In fact, learners correct their grammar and vocabulary mistakes and enhance their writing in real time with the help of ChatGPT (Tran et al., 2025), rather than conventional forms of feedback such as teacher or peer feedback. Thanks to several interactive explanations and various feedback options, this feature helps learners self-regulate their learning and produce language more actively, according to Kuhail et al. (2023). With the increasing demand for written feedback, many experts raise awareness about the trustworthiness of AI's feedback (Kim et al., 2025). Previous literature reviews have shown that ChatGPT performs effectively when combined with other traditional methods in the context of written corrective feedback for EFL writing.

ChatGPT in Providing Corrective Feedback

Recent research has shown that ChatGPT has had a significant impact on EFL academic writing, especially by offering corrective feedback, fostering student autonomy, and providing diverse linguistic assistance. However, there are many factors, including reliance on AI-generated suggestions, their reliability, and how learners genuinely respond to the feedback. Therefore, the effect of ChatGPT feedback should be analyzed to solve these relevant problems. The objective is to collect findings, including the effect of ChatGPT feedback on EFL learners' academic writing in terms of positivity and negativity.

Overview of Empirical Studies (2022–2025)

Numerous empirical studies and systematic reviews have investigated whether ChatGPT feedback positively affects students' academic writing and helps learners enhance their writing. Teng et al. (2024) found that ChatGPT can analyze input quickly and consistently, and customize it better than conventional peer or teacher feedback, in both timeliness and scope. Imran et al. (2024) emphasized that ChatGPT fosters learner autonomy in learning by allowing learners to continuously revise and reflect on their writing tasks.

Rahman et al. (2022) agreed that learners using ChatGPT for academic writing tasks performed better in grammatical and lexical accuracy compared to those who received peer feedback solely (Rahman et al., 2022). Similarly, Su et al. (2023) demonstrated that feedback from ChatGPT improved language accuracy, idea generation, and logical coherence. However, many researchers have raised concerns about potential drawbacks, such as general or inaccurate feedback (Mun, 2024), including plagiarism and authenticity, which are significant threats (Muñoz, 2025).

ChatGPT is considered an ideal tool for EFL learners and educators, especially in academic writing. There are several benefits of applying ChatGPT feedback in developing writing skills.

because it can provide immediate written corrective feedback and enhance autonomous learning. In contrast, depending too much on ChatGPT would hinder critical thinking and an active learning environment, as learners would focus solely on ChatGPT's feedback. It is necessary to conduct a literature review to analyze the impact of ChatGPT-generated feedback on the delivery of written corrective feedback. Overall, previous studies have shown that written corrective feedback from ChatGPT helps EFL learners improve their linguistic accuracy, autonomy, coherence, and cohesion, while others raise awareness of the overreliance on AI tools and of vague or overly general feedback from AI.

Thematic Analysis by Linguistic Features Grammar and Vocabulary

Research indicates that ChatGPT consistently enhances grammar for language learners. Rahman et al. (2022) demonstrated that postgraduate EFL learners improved their grammatical accuracy through the utilization of ChatGPT feedback in writing tasks (Rahman et al., 2022). Mun (2024) asserted that ChatGPT demonstrates a significantly more advanced lexical capability than tools such as Grammarly, which primarily enhance learners' vocabulary. Huang and Wang (2023) similarly highlighted its efficacy in detecting collocational errors and the application of academic language in writing tasks.

Sentence Structure

Multiple studies indicate that when learners use ChatGPT to assist with writing tasks, their sentences exhibit greater complexity, reflecting a wider range of syntactic structures. Su et al. (2023) found that learners improved their revision of run-on sentences and fragmented structures more effectively with ChatGPT feedback. Muñoz (2025) observed that writing tasks revised with ChatGPT feedback exhibited improved clause-level structure, particularly in academic contexts (Muñoz, 2025).

Cohesion and Coherence

A number of studies indicate that ChatGPT offers valuable insights into coherence and structure in writing skills. Pariyanto et al. (2023) demonstrated that Indonesian EFL learners enhanced the coherence of their writing paragraphs through AI-generated feedback. Su et al. (2023) highlighted ChatGPT's contribution to improving coherence by helping students restructure their ideas for greater clarity and effectiveness.

Punctuation and Spelling

ChatGPT excels in recognizing punctuation errors and spelling mistakes. Muñoz (2025) observed a notable reduction in typographical errors in students' final compositions (Muñoz, 2025).

Masoud Rahimi employed a sequential explanatory mixed-methods approach to evaluate the effect of written corrective feedback on the academic writing of EFL learners (Rahimi, 2025). As a result, two classrooms were randomly selected: one with 30 EFL learners receiving AWCF electronically and another with 26 EFL learners receiving WCF in a non-electronic format. The data were collected via IELTS Writing Tasks 1 and 2 and an individual semi-structured interview. Findings indicated that electronic learners performed better than their non-electronic peers in task achievement, grammatical range, and correctness. However, this study fails to find any differences in coherence, cohesion, and lexicon between the two groups. The individual semi-structured interview with the electronic learners revealed both positive and negative attitudes and perceptions towards the AWCF. This study analyses the pedagogical implications

of an activity to illustrate how instructional methods and academic learning classrooms support EFL learners in interaction activities and writing skills.

The recent emergence of technologies based on ChatGPT signals transformative shifts in the theory and practice of written corrective feedback in L2 instruction. Da Yan seeks to examine L2 authors' behavior, awareness, and affective factors using ChatGPT as a writing-correction feedback tool for academic writing. This research examined prompt-writing methods, revised processes, and the application of metacognitive and cognitive strategies to feedback. The findings revealed that behavioral engagement correlated with individual variations in language proficiency, and participants inadequately regulated their learning processes metacognitively. ChatGPT produced an effective learning environment but required a lot of time and effort. The study provides various concepts and recommendations for education for educators and researchers to apply ChatGPT in language teaching (Yan, 2024)

A recent study by Özdere (2025) discussed the integration of AI-based feedback in academic writing, focusing on 16 undergraduate students majoring in English Language and Literature and English Language Teaching at Niğde Ömer Halisdemir University during the 2023–2024 spring term (Özdere, 2025). The researchers employed ChatGPT and You.com to evaluate students' drafts across various paragraph types and combined this feedback with targeted training sessions. Their findings revealed notable improvements in writing performance, as reflected in significant score increases between first and final tasks, with You.com generally assigning higher scores than ChatGPT. Moreover, qualitative data from focus group interviews indicated that students perceived AI feedback as timely and effective in identifying weaknesses, particularly when reinforced by supplementary training.

Shao et al. (2025) conducted a systematic literature review of 26 research papers published from 2022 to 2025 regarding the application of ChatGPT in EFL writing assessment. Research indicates that although ChatGPT is effective for formative assessment, it is unreliable for summative assessment and advanced writing skills, including argument, coherence maintenance, and adherence to academic standards. These results are important for this study because they show how important it is to compare ChatGPT's minor changes with peer feedback, which may help with idea development, logical progression, and overall coherence. Shao et al. (2025) have raised concerns about the reliability, fairness, and morality of ChatGPT's feedback. They amplified the importance of combining ChatGPT with human efforts in educational settings.

Üstünbaş (2024) investigated EFL learners' perceptions of the effects of ChatGPT feedback on their academic writing (Üstünbaş, 2024). The study collected data through semi-structured interviews and video recordings of students' interactions with ChatGPT over five weeks. The findings show both advantages and disadvantages of using AI corrective feedback, shaped by learner characteristics, preferences, and ChatGPT's efficacy in writing training. The study provided useful insights into students' experiences, primarily focusing on their thoughts instead of contrasting ChatGPT's feedback with alternative sources. This gap underscores the need for the field to directly compare ChatGPT with peer feedback for postgraduate English majors to improve their academic writing.

Discussion

Strengths Highlighted in Literature

Collectively, previous studies have highlighted that ChatGPT is a combination of earlier automated writing evaluation tools rather than an isolated one, as it can incorporate additional

features to produce effective written feedback for EFL learners. There are several benefits of ChatGPT feedback in EFL academic writing, such as quick, personalization, and clear instructions. One benefit is timeliness: ChatGPT provides fast feedback, allowing learners to receive suggestions and explanations immediately (Steiss et al., 2024; Yan, 2024), compared to other automated writing evaluation tools, which often require more time than ChatGPT. This is a better solution for learners than traditional teacher or peer feedback, which typically takes a long time.

The second advantage is customization: ChatGPT not only produces tailored written feedback but also integrates other factors from learners, such as their learning objectives, needs, and stages. Because ChatGPT may change its feedback based on learners' requirements, questions, and revisions, unlike static grammar checkers like Grammarly (Thai et al., 2025). The interactive and conversational elements let users ask follow-up questions and receive tailored answers, encouraging more personalized learning (Wu & Yu, 2024; Jiao et al., 2023; Mizumoto et al., 2024; Eguchi, 2023). Moreover, different studies show that ChatGPT's feedback is clear and easy to understand. The findings showed that students reported that ChatGPT provides clear explanations of grammar and structure problems to help them fix their mistakes (Huang et al., 2023). Specifically, ChatGPT's feedback helps EFL learners comprehend more easily, depending on their language proficiency level, making it suitable for some EFL learners compared to other tools. Besides, ChatGPT feedback could assist learners who are not good at grammar and sentence structure, thanks to its potential for providing accurate, immediate feedback on writing tasks (Wu, 2024). In short, ChatGPT feedback improves EFL learners' academic writing and increases their confidence in learning and correcting their mistakes by extending the benefits of earlier automated writing evaluations to better adapt to each learner's goals.

Limitations Reported

Firstly, the primary limitation is the generation of inaccurate information, commonly known as "AI hallucinations". Tonmoy et al. (2024) stated that when ChatGPT is provided with complex language input or ambiguous instructions from users, it would generate irrelevant results even though they are significantly grammatically correct. Another noticeable limitation is that ChatGPT often provides overly common responses. Specifically, Yan (2024) clarified that ChatGPT could identify simple mistakes; however, it rarely correctly recognizes grammatical mistakes in complex sentences, including connections, logic, and tone. As a result, this disadvantage reduces ChatGPT's impact on more experienced users.

Moreover, the more reliance on ChatGPT, the more prevention of critical thinking and autonomous learning habits. Aziz et al. (2026) and subsequent studies have highlighted that the drawback of overreliance on ChatGPT feedback could hinder learners' ability to correct their own writing and lower their critical thinking and problem-solving skills (Aziz et al., 2026). Mun (2024) stated that learners who depend on ChatGPT would increasingly lose their ability to write independently. Akgün and Greenhow (2021), emphasized concerns about misuse leading to plagiarism or the dissemination of illegal information, especially in the learning environment without clear teacher instructions (Akgün and Greenhow 2021). Yan (2024) recommended that learners be given sufficient training materials on AI, specifically ChatGPT, to ensure they have a full understanding of ChatGPT's use and can learn effectively and responsibly (Yan, 2024). To make the most of its benefits and avoid its hazards, it should be used with pedagogical precautions and clear directions.

Pedagogical Implications

There are several strategies that can make ChatGPT more effective as a teaching tool. However, it should be used as a supporting tool instead of replacing teachers' roles. Human involvement involves helping students think critically, addressing problems at the discourse level, and guiding their growth through personalized, nuanced support. When ChatGPT is used to teach academic writing, it needs to be well-planned and grounded in effective teaching methods. Teaching models built on the TPACK framework (Gonscherowski & Rott, 2025) can make it much easier to use generative AI technologies in ways that align with current technology and good teaching practices. Teachers can assign tasks that ask students to contrast information generated by AI with that of peers or teachers, rate its usefulness, or edit texts again.

Furthermore, plagiarism, excessive reliance, and cheating in school are concerns when students use ChatGPT for academic writing. Akgün and Greenhow (2021) and Yan (2024) emphasized the importance of teaching students AI literacy so they can understand the advantages and disadvantages of ChatGPT. Teachers need to set clear rules and provide ongoing support to ensure learners use AI in schools in a moral and responsible way. Ultimately, the standardization of rubrics is essential for the equitable evaluation of AI-influenced writing, notably via assessment frameworks attuned to AI that gauge not only linguistic precision but also advanced competencies such as argumentation, coherence, and creativity (Hmoud et al., 2024). Longitudinal studies must examine the effects of prolonged exposure to AI feedback on learners' competency, engagement, and independent thinking over time.

Gaps and Directions for Future Research

Despite the growing literature validating ChatGPT's potential to facilitate EFL writing classes, significant research gaps persist. There is an urgent need for additional empirical research, especially studies utilizing quasi-experimental and longitudinal methodologies, to better understand the enduring impacts of AI-assisted writing support. Although current research frequently highlights immediate improvements in grammar and organization, there is a paucity of studies investigating the long-term effects of AI tools on writing, learner motivation, and retention. Secondly, subsequent studies should evaluate the efficacy of ChatGPT-generated feedback relative to conventional feedback sources, including instructor and peer assessments. Although AI delivers speed and scalability, human input provides contextual and emotional support that may be essential for advanced writing skills. Comprehending the relative significance of different feedback sources can guide more equitable and pedagogically sound integration tactics (Sheen, 2010a).

The perceptions of learners and teachers regarding ChatGPT are still inadequately examined. Despite students typically expressing favorable initial perceptions of AI tools, qualitative research regarding user experiences, emotional reactions, and confidence levels remains scarce. Instructors' perspectives on the pedagogical benefits and challenges of AI integration warrant further investigation, particularly in culturally unique EFL contexts such as Vietnam. Additionally, future studies should focus more on Asian EFL contexts, especially Vietnam, where cultural learning norms, teacher-centered classrooms, and exam-oriented systems may affect learners' interpretation and application of ChatGPT feedback. Vietnamese EFL learners may demonstrate different levels of trust, dependency, or critical engagement with AI compared to learners in Western educational environments. Subsequently, future research should examine the enduring effects of ChatGPT on learners' autonomy and writing proficiency. Because, depending on AI feedback, it could prevent the development of self-correction skills and critical analysis. Therefore, it is essential to measure the role of extended ChatGPT usage on students' proficiency for self-learning writing, strategic revision, and skill transfer across tasks to

comprehensively assess its genuine educational value.

Conclusion

Although this systematic study identifies serious shortcomings, it shows that ChatGPT has potential for EFL academic writing assessment. There are 26 empirical studies showing that ChatGPT is suitable for providing feedback and assessing writing in formative contexts, offering grammatical and organizational feedback comparable to that of humans. However, the reliability of ChatGPT diminishes in summative assessment contexts and when evaluating advanced writing skills, underscoring the indispensability of human correction in complex contexts. In practical classroom implementation, ChatGPT can be integrated as an initial feedback layer before human feedback. For instance, students can first submit their drafts to ChatGPT to receive immediate feedback on grammar, vocabulary, and structural clarity. After revising based on AI feedback, peers can provide feedback on groups to encourage collaborative reflection and audience awareness. Lastly, teachers can provide higher-level feedback focusing on argumentation, coherence, and critical thinking. This staged integration allows ChatGPT to support lower-level language correction while human feedback addresses deeper pedagogical and contextual aspects of academic writing. In terms of findings, there are three essential components for effective implementation. ChatGPT is intentionally integrated into existing teaching frameworks to support, rather than replace, the role of instructor abilities. The tool's existing shortcomings in cultural sensitivity and linguistic complexity require meticulous rubric building and ongoing improvement of grading standards. Moreover, ethical issues should be taken into consideration to ensure equal accessibility, and educational institutions should impose rules for both educators and learners. Future research should focus on long-term studies to assess ChatGPT's feedback on academic writing and explore different responses from EFL learners to adopting written corrective feedback from ChatGPT. By doing this, more training programs will be developed for language educators. Given ChatGPT's substantial growth, it is important to maintain a balanced approach that uses ChatGPT as a tool for EFL learners, alongside teacher feedback as a crucial part of instruction and evaluation. The collaboration between ChatGPT and language educators in EFL classrooms depends on the assessment of AI efficiency and pedagogical competence to maintain the quality of learning assessments and improve writing skills.

References

- Alharbi, W. (2023). AI in the Foreign Language Classroom: A Pedagogical Overview of Automated Writing Assistance Tools. *Education Research International*. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2023/4253331>
- Aziz, B., Zehra, S. L., & Shafiq, M. H. (2026). Over-Reliance on ChatGPT and Its Psychological Impact on Critical Thinking and Writing Skills among University Students. *ACADEMIA International Journal for Social Sciences*, 5(2), 31-44. <https://doi.org/10.63056/academia.5.2.2026.1508>
- Barrot, J.S. (2023). Using ChatGPT for second language writing: Pitfalls and potentials. *Assessing Writing*, 57, Article 100745. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2023.100745>
- Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. (2012). Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203832400>

- Cao, S., & Zhong, L. (2023). Exploring the effectiveness of ChatGPT-based feedback compared with teacher feedback and self-feedback: *Evidence from Chinese to English translation*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2309.01645>
- Chance, P. (1986). Teaching thinking. *Curriculum Report*, 15(5), 1-8.
- Cho, K., & MacArthur, C. (2010). Student revision with peer and expert reviewing. *Learning and Instruction*, 20(4), 328–338. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2009.08.006>
- Chen, B., Bao, L., Zhang, R., Zhang, J., Liu, F., Wang, S., & Li, M. (2024). A multi-strategy computer-assisted EFL writing learning system with deep learning incorporated and its effects on learning: A writing feedback perspective. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 61(8), 1596–1638. <https://doi.org/10.1177/07356331231189294>
- Connor, U., & Asenavage, K. (1994). Peer response groups in ESL writing classes: How much impact on revision? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 3(3), 257–276. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1060-3743\(94\)90019-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/1060-3743(94)90019-1)
- Dai, W., Lin, J., Jin, H., Li, T., Tsai, Y. S., Gašević, D., & Chen, G. (2023). Can large language Models provide feedback to students? *A case study on ChatGPT*. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Advanced Learning Technologies (ICALT)* (pp. 323–325), Orem, UT, USA. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICALT58122.2023.00100>.
- Dwivedi, Y. K., Hughes, L., Ismagilova, E., Aarts, G., Coombs, C., Crick, T., ... & Williams, M. D. (2023). “So what if ChatGPT wrote it?” Multidisciplinary perspectives on opportunities, challenges, and implications of generative conversational AI for research, practice, and policy. *International Journal of Information Management*, 71, Article 102642. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2023.102642>
- Ferretti, R. P., Andrews-Weckerly, S., & Lewis, W. E. (2007). Improving the argumentative writing of students with learning disabilities: *Descriptive and normative considerations*. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 23, 267-285. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-019-09950-x>
- Ferris, D. R., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10(3), 161–184, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(01\)00039-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(01)00039-X).
- Firat, M. (2023). What ChatGPT means for universities: Perceptions of scholars and students. *Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching*, 6(1). Article 22 <https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2023.6.1.22>
- Godwin-Jones, R. (2024). Distributed agency in second language learning and teaching through generative AI. *Language Learning & Technology*, 28 (2), 5–30. <https://doi.org/10125/73570>
- Gonscherowski, P., & Rott, B. (2025). A systematic review of the literature on TPACK instruments used with pre-service teachers from 2017 to 2023 focused on selecting digital resources. *Journal of Computers in Education*, 12, 973–1018. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40692-025-00379-6>
- Hewett, B. L. (2000). Characteristics of interactive oral and computer-mediated peer group talk and its influence on revision. *Computers and Composition*, 17(3), 265–288. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S8755-4615\(00\)00035-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S8755-4615(00)00035-9)
- Hmoud, M. et al. 2024. “Rubric Development and Validation for Assessing Tasks' Solving via

- AI Chatbots”, *Electronic Journal of e-Learning*, 22(6), (1-17), <https://doi.org/10.34190/ejel.22.6.3292>
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on second language students’ writing: State of the art. *Language Teaching*, 39(2), 83-101. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444806003399>
- Jiao W, Wang W, Huang J et al. (2023) Is ChatGPT a good translator? Yes with GPT-4 as the engine. arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2301.08745>
- Kim, J., Yu, S., Detrick, R. et al. Exploring students’ perspectives on Generative AI-assisted academic writing. *Educational Information Technology* 30, 1265–1300 (2025). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-12878-7>
- Kluger, A. N., & DeNisi, A. (1996). The effects of feedback interventions on performance: A historical review, a meta-analysis, and a preliminary feedback intervention theory. *Psychological Bulletin*, 119(2), 254–284. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.119.2.254>
- Kohnke, L., Moorhouse, B. L., & Zou, D. (2023). ChatGPT for language teaching and learning. *RELC Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882231162868>
- Kuhail, M. A., Alturki, N., Alramlawi, S., et al. (2023). Interacting with educational chatbots: A systematic review. *Educational Information Technology*, 28, 973–1018. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-022-11177-3>
- Lundstrom, K., & Baker, W. (2009). To give is better than to receive: The benefits of peer review to the reviewer’s own writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 18(1), 30–43. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2008.06.002>
- Liu, J., & Hansen, J. G. (2002). Peer response in a second language classroom. University of Michigan Press. <https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.9361097>
- Li, Z. (2021). Teachers in automated writing evaluation (AWE) system-supported ESL writing classes: Perception, implementation, and influence. *System*, 99, Article 102505. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102505>
- Lloyd-Jones, N., & Masterton, A. (2010). Writing skills and developing an argument. In Bailliere's study skills for nurses and midwives. *Edinburgh Bailliere Tindall*.
- Lyster, R. (1998). Recasts, repetition, and ambiguity in L2 classroom discourse. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 20(1), 51–81. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S027226319800103X>
- Mizumoto, A., Shintani, N., Sasaki, M., & Teng, M. F. (2024). Testing the viability of ChatGPT as a companion in L2 writing accuracy assessment. *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*, 3(2), Article 100116. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rmal.2024.100116>
- Mun, C. Y. (2024). EFL learners’ English writing feedback and their perception of using ChatGPT. *Journal of English Teaching through Movies and Media*, 25(2), 26-39. <https://doi.org/10.16875/stem.2024.25.2.26>
- Muñoz Muñoz, B. C., Nassaji, H., & Bello Carrillo, F. I. (2025). ChatGPT-generated versus human direct corrective feedback on L2 writing. *System*, 126, Article 103359. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2025.103805>
- OpenAI. (2023). ChatGPT: Optimizing language models for dialogue. <https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt/>
- 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), 45-62. <https://doi.org/10.46328/ijte.1001>
- Peterson, S. S., & Portier, C. (2014). Grade one peer and teacher feedback on student writing. *Education 3–13*, 42(3), 237–257, <https://doi.org/10.1080/03004279.2012.670256>.
- Rahman, N. A. A., Zulkornain, L. H., & Hamzah, N. H. (2022). Exploring artificial intelligence using automated writing evaluation for writing skills. *Environment - Behaviour Proceedings Journal*, 7 (SI9), 547-553. <https://doi.org/10.21834/ebpj.v7iSI9.4304>
- Rahimi, M., Fathi, J. & Zou, D. (2025). Exploring the impact of automated written corrective feedback on the academic writing skills of EFL learners: An activity theory perspective. *Educ Inf Technol* 30, 2691–2735. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-12896-5>
- Sato, M. (2013). Beliefs about peer interaction and peer corrective feedback: Efficacy of classroom intervention. *Modern Language Journal*, 97(3), 611–633. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2013.12035.x>
- Sato, M., & Lyster, R. (2012). Peer interaction and corrective feedback for accuracy and fluency development: Monitoring, practice, and proceduralization. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 34(4), 591–626. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263112000356>
- Scheeler, M. C., Ruhl, K. L., & McAfee, J. K. (2004). Providing Performance Feedback to Teachers: A Review. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 27(4), 396-407. <https://doi.org/10.1177/088840640402700407> (Original work published 2004)
- Sheen, Y. (2010a). Differential effects of oral and written corrective feedback in the ESL classroom. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32(2), 203–234. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990507>
- Sheen, Y., Wright, D., & Moldawa, A. (2009). Differential effects of focused and unfocused written correction on the accurate use of grammatical forms by adult ESL learners. *System*, 37(4), 556–569. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2009.09.002>
- Sippel, L., & Jackson, C. N. (2015). Teacher vs. peer oral corrective feedback in the German language classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, 48(4), 688–705. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12164>
- 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, Article 101894. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2024.101894>
- Storch, N. (2005). Collaborative writing: Product, process, and students' reflections. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 14(3), 153–173. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2005.05.002>
- Su, Y., Lin, Y., & Lai, C. (2023). Collaborating with ChatGPT in argumentative writing classrooms. *Assessing Writing*, 57, Article 100752. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2023.100752>
- Thai, T. T. A., Nguyen, H. H. G., & Nguyen, N. C. (2025). English-major of Using Grammarly for Thesis Writing at Seniors' Perceptions IUH. *International Journal of AI in Language Education*, 2(2), 55-78. <https://doi.org/10.54855/ijaile.25224>
- Topping, K. (1998). Peer assessment between students in colleges and universities. *Review of Educational Research*, 68(3), 249–276. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1170598>

- Tran, T. T. P., Dang, T. N., & Nguyen, V. L. P.(2025). Master Students' Perceptions of How ChatGPT Influenced Critical Thinking in Academic Writing at The Industrial University of Ho Chi Minh City. *International Journal of AI in Language Education*, 2(2), 20-39. <https://doi.org/10.54855/ijaile.25222>
- Wenzlaff, K., & Spaeth, S. (2022). Smarter than Humans? *Validating how OpenAI's ChatGPT model explains Crowdfunding, Alternative Finance and Community Finance*. SSRN Scholarly Paper. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4302443>
- Widyastuti, S. (2018). Fostering critical thinking skills through argumentative writing. Yogyakarta State University. <https://doi.org/10.21831/cp.v37i2.20157>
- Wu, Y. (2024). Study on the impact of utilizing ChatGPT and other AI tools for feedback in EAP writing classrooms on the discursive writing performance of English major students. *Transactions on Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 4, 143–150. <https://doi.org/10.62051/4se95x52>
- Üstünbaş, Ü. (2024). EFL learners' views about the use of artificial intelligence in giving corrective feedback on writing: A case study. In Z. Ç. Köroğlu & A. Çakır (Eds.), *Fostering Foreign Language Teaching and Learning Environments with Contemporary Technologies* (pp. 115–133). *IGI Global*. <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-0353-5.ch006>
- Xiao, Y., & Lucking, R. (2008). The impact of two types of peer assessment on students' performance and satisfaction within a Wiki environment. *Internet and Higher Education*, 11(3–4), 186–193. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2008.06.005>
- Yan, D., & Zhang, S. (2024). L2 writer engagement with automated written corrective feedback provided by ChatGPT: A mixed-method multiple case study. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 11(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-03543-y>

Biodata

Nguyen Duong Minh Quyen, the author, is currently a PhD student at HCMC Open University and holds a Master of Arts in English Language Studies from Van Lang University. He is dedicated to improving learners' academic writing through innovative teaching approaches, motivated by a deep passion for education and research. His current interests center on integrating technology and artificial intelligence into language education to enhance instructional effectiveness and student independence.