UNEMI
UNIVERSIDAD ESTATAL DE MILAGRO

REPÚBLICA DEL ECUADOR

UNIVERSIDAD ESTATAL DE MILAGRO
FACULTAD DE POSGRADO

VICERRECTORADO DE INVESTIGACIÓN Y POSGRADO

ARTÍCULOS PROFESIONALES DE ALTO NIVEL
PREVIO A LA OBTENCIÓN DEL TÍTULO DE:

MAGÍSTER EN ENSEÑANZA DE INGLÉS COMO LENGUA EXTRANJERA

TEMA:

USING CHAT GPT AS AN AI FEEDBACK TOOL TO SUPPORT WRITING IMPROVEMENT IN A2.2 LEARNERS

Autor:

PAUL ALEXANDER AJILA PINZON

Director:

JORGE ZAMBRANO PACHAY

Milagro, año 2026

Resumen

Aprender a escribir en inglés como lengua extranjera siempre supone un reto enorme, especialmente cuando los estudiantes se encuentran en el nivel A2.2 del Marco Común Europeo de Referencia (MCER). En esta fase, los alumnos conocen las reglas básicas, pero conectar ideas de forma coherente requiere práctica y, sobre todo, correcciones constantes que los profesores rara vez tienen tiempo de ofrecer de forma individualizada. Este artículo de revisión analiza cómo ChatGPT está cambiando este panorama al funcionar como una herramienta de retroalimentación formativa y, a través de una revisión cualitativa de estudios empíricos publicados recientemente, exploramos qué tan bien funciona esta inteligencia artificial para ayudar a los estudiantes a notar y corregir sus propios errores. Lo que encontramos en la literatura es fascinante: ChatGPT no solo detecta fallos gramaticales al instante, sino que, al ser una máquina, elimina el miedo y la vergüenza que sienten los alumnos al equivocarse frente a un humano. Sin embargo, no todo es perfecto. Los estudios advierten de un riesgo real: si los estudiantes no saben cómo darle instrucciones claras a la IA (lo que llamamos diseño de prompts), la herramienta termina reescribiendo los textos con un nivel de inglés nativo que no les sirve para aprender. En conclusión, sugerimos que el éxito de esta tecnología no depende de la máquina en sí, sino de cómo los profesores enseñamos a usarla dentro del aula.

Palabras clave: Retroalimentación formativa, ChatGPT, escritura en inglés, nivel A2, educación asistida.

Abstract

Anyone who has taught English knows that writing is often the hardest skill for beginners to master. For learners at the A2.2 level of the CEFR, putting thoughts onto paper means juggling new vocabulary and syntax while worrying about making mistakes. They need constant, individualized feedback to improve, a demand that usually exceeds what a single teacher can logistically provide in a crowded classroom. This literature review looks at how ChatGPT might bridge this gap by acting as an automated feedback tool. By systematically reviewing recent empirical research, we set out to understand the real-world impact of generative AI on elementary language learners. The literature reveals a very clear pattern: ChatGPT provides instant grammatical and lexical corrections that actually help lower a student's anxiety. Because they are talking to an algorithm, learners feel less embarrassed about making basic mistakes and are willing to revise their drafts more frequently. However, the data also highlights a major pitfall. A2.2 students often lack the critical skills to instruct the AI properly. Without specific prompts, ChatGPT tends to overwrite their simple sentences into advanced academic prose, completely bypassing the learning process. Ultimately, this paper concludes that while AI is a powerful pedagogical asset, its effectiveness relies entirely on explicit teacher guidance and the development of AI literacy among students.

Keywords: Formative feedback, ChatGPT, English writing, A2 level, assisted education**.**

DOI: ***https://doi.org/10.65415/6n5vxh92***

Introduction

Getting students to write well in a foreign language has always been a notoriously slow and demanding process. When you look at learners operating at the A2.2 level of the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR), the struggle becomes even more apparent. At this specific stage, students have just enough vocabulary to want to express real ideas, but their grasp of syntax and morphological rules is still incredibly fragile. The core problem this paper addresses is the traditional bottleneck in the writing classroom: the feedback loop. For these elementary learners to stop making the same basic errors—like messing up subject-verb agreement or misplacing adjectives—they need someone to point out those mistakes immediately while the thought process is still fresh. Unfortunately, standard educational settings make this practically impossible.

Teachers simply cannot sit next to thirty different students and correct their paragraphs line by line in real time. As a result, students hand in an assignment, wait a week to get it back covered in red ink, and by then, the cognitive connection to what they were trying to say is completely gone. The main objective of this literature review is to figure out if ChatGPT can actually solve this problem. We want to evaluate the real-world efficacy of using this specific generative AI as an automated, formative feedback tool for A2.2 learners, looking closely at how it affects not just their grammar, but their overall confidence and approach to writing. The reason this study feels necessary right now is because we are standing in the middle of a massive shift in educational technology (Baidoo-Anu & Owusu Ansah, 2023). Distance education is growing, and traditional Automated Writing Evaluation (AWE) tools—like standard spell-checkers—just do not cut it anymore. They tell a student a word is wrong, but they rarely explain why in a way that makes sense to a beginner. ChatGPT, on the other hand, can carry on a conversation. It can simulate a tutor. But just because the technology can do this, doesn't automatically mean it's good for language acquisition. We need to look at what the actual research is saying rather than just trusting the tech industry's hype.

To get a clear picture, we used a qualitative systematic review methodology. We didn't want to run another small case study; instead, we dug through recent academic databases to pull together what researchers across the globe have found when they actually put ChatGPT into the hands of language learners over the last couple of years. If we look at the current state of the art, the conversation around AI in schools has moved really fast. In early 2023, almost every

paper published was panicking about plagiarism and how students were going to use AI to cheat on essays (Fauzi et al., 2023). But recently, the tone has shifted. Researchers like Su et al. (2023) started noticing that when students used these models for editing rather than writing from scratch, some really interesting things happened with their learning anxiety. Still, there is a noticeable gap in the literature. Most of these studies focus on university students writing complex academic papers. Very few have stopped to ask: what happens when a basic A2 learner, who barely knows how to form a past tense sentence, tries to learn from a machine that operates at a native level? That is exactly the gap this paper aims to address. To break all of this down, the rest of this article is organized fairly straightforwardly. First, the Methodology section will explain exactly how we searched for and selected the studies we reviewed. Then, the Results section will lay out the main themes we found in the data. After that, the Discussion will interpret what these findings actually mean for teachers in a real classroom setting. Finally, we will wrap up with Conclusions that look toward the future of language teaching.

Methodology

This study employed a qualitative scoping review to examine the emerging body of research concerning the use of ChatGPT and other large language models as feedback tools for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) and English as a Second Language (ESL) writing. A scoping review was considered appropriate because research on generative artificial intelligence in language education remains relatively recent and methodologically diverse. Rather than attempting to calculate a single measure of effectiveness, the review sought to map the available evidence, identify recurring patterns, examine pedagogical opportunities and limitations, and determine areas in which further research is needed. Particular attention was given to the potential application of AI-mediated feedback among learners at or near the A2 level of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), for whom limited linguistic resources may influence both their ability to formulate prompts and their capacity to evaluate AI-generated suggestions. The review therefore considered linguistic, affective, and pedagogical dimensions of AI-assisted writing, including grammatical accuracy, lexical development, revision behavior, writing anxiety, learner autonomy, prompt formulation, and potential dependency on generative AI.

The literature search was conducted using three major academic databases commonly employed in educational and applied linguistics research: Scopus, the Education Resources Information Center (ERIC), and Web of Science. The use of multiple databases was intended

to provide broad coverage of research published across language education, educational technology, applied linguistics, and related fields. The search strategy combined terms associated with generative artificial intelligence, written feedback, language learning, and learner proficiency. The principal Boolean combination used was ("ChatGPT" OR "Large Language Models") AND ("writing feedback" OR "formative assessment") AND ("ESL" OR "EFL" OR "A2 level"). Related combinations of these terms were also considered when identifying studies addressing AI-mediated writing feedback, revision, corrective feedback, and formative assessment in second or foreign language contexts. This strategy was designed to avoid overly broad searches while retaining studies relevant to the pedagogical use of generative AI in writing instruction.

The search was restricted to publications appearing between November 2022 and the early months of 2024. November 2022 was selected as the starting point because it corresponds to the public release of ChatGPT and the subsequent rapid growth of research into conversational generative AI in education. Establishing this publication window also helped distinguish recent studies involving large language models from earlier research examining conventional automated writing evaluation systems, grammar checkers, or rule-based technologies whose interactional and generative capabilities differ substantially from those of contemporary AI tools. The review therefore concentrated on research reflecting the educational possibilities and challenges associated with the current generation of conversational artificial intelligence.

Clear eligibility criteria were applied during the study-selection process. Studies were considered relevant when they examined ChatGPT or comparable large language models in EFL or ESL educational contexts and involved learners interacting directly with the technology for writing, revision, formative assessment, or feedback. Priority was given to research capable of informing the use of generative AI with elementary or lower-proficiency language learners. Because research conducted exclusively with A2.2 populations remains limited, studies were evaluated according to their relevance to the linguistic and pedagogical characteristics of learners at lower proficiency levels rather than requiring every participant group to be formally classified as A2.2. This approach allowed the review to capture emerging evidence without overstating the amount of research specifically conducted with A2.2 learners.

Studies were excluded when generative AI was used solely by teachers for grading, administrative support, or assessment efficiency without meaningful learner interaction with the system. Opinion papers, non-peer-reviewed conference summaries, and studies devoted

entirely to highly advanced C1 or C2 academic writing were also excluded. The exclusion of research focused exclusively on advanced learners was considered necessary because such learners generally possess greater vocabulary, grammatical control, metalinguistic awareness, and capacity to evaluate AI-generated content. These characteristics may substantially affect the way they interact with generative AI and make direct comparisons with elementary learners problematic. The review therefore sought to maintain a stronger conceptual relationship between the selected evidence and the needs of learners whose independent writing ability is still developing.

The initial database search identified 145 potentially relevant records. These publications were subsequently screened according to the established research focus and eligibility criteria. During this process, studies that dealt primarily with teacher use of artificial intelligence, automated grading, advanced academic writing, non-empirical commentary, or contexts unrelated to learner engagement with AI-mediated writing feedback were removed. Following the screening and eligibility process, 31 studies were retained as the core body of literature for qualitative synthesis. These studies were considered sufficiently relevant to the central purpose of the review because they provided evidence regarding learner interaction with generative AI during writing, feedback, correction, or revision processes.

To facilitate systematic comparison among the selected publications, relevant information was organized around dimensions directly connected to the objectives of the review. Attention was given to the educational and language-learning context of each study, learner proficiency when reported, the purpose for which ChatGPT or another large language model was used, the type of feedback generated, reported changes in grammatical or lexical performance, learner perceptions of AI-mediated correction, emotional responses to feedback, revision practices, and difficulties associated with interacting with the technology. Particular consideration was also given to evidence concerning prompt formulation, excessive rewriting, linguistic output that exceeded the learner's proficiency level, loss of learner ownership, and potential dependency on AI-generated language. Organizing the evidence around these areas made it possible to compare findings from studies employing different research designs while maintaining the qualitative orientation of the review.

The selected literature was analyzed through qualitative thematic synthesis. Rather than statistically aggregating outcomes, the analysis focused on identifying recurrent concepts, similarities, differences, and patterns across the reviewed studies. Findings relevant to the

central research objective were examined and grouped according to their conceptual relationship. Three broad dimensions became particularly important in organizing the evidence: linguistic outcomes, affective responses, and pedagogical or technological challenges. Within these broader dimensions, more specific themes were identified, including grammatical correction, lexical development, explanatory feedback, writing anxiety, iterative revision, prompt literacy, proficiency mismatch, overcorrection, learner dependency, and teacher mediation. This thematic organization provided a coherent framework for interpreting the heterogeneous evidence available in the emerging literature.

The analysis also sought to preserve both positive and critical findings rather than treating the use of ChatGPT as uniformly beneficial or detrimental. Evidence suggesting that immediate AI-generated feedback could help learners identify grammatical errors, explore alternative vocabulary, and revise their texts more frequently was considered alongside concerns about excessive intervention by the system. Particular attention was given to situations in which vague prompts resulted in extensive rewriting, advanced vocabulary, or syntactic structures that learners were unable to understand or reproduce independently. The review also considered evidence indicating that some learners may shift from requesting feedback on their own writing to asking the AI to generate language on their behalf. These contrasting patterns were essential for understanding the conditions under which generative AI may function as a scaffold for learning rather than a substitute for learner-generated language.

The synthesis was guided by three central analytical concerns. First, the review examined the linguistic benefits associated with the use of ChatGPT as a formative writing feedback tool, particularly its potential contribution to grammatical accuracy, vocabulary development, and error awareness. Second, it explored how interaction with generative AI may influence learners' affective responses and revision behavior, including their willingness to expose imperfect drafts, experiment with language, and engage in repeated revision. Third, it investigated the pedagogical and technological challenges that may limit the usefulness of AI-mediated feedback for A2.2 learners, especially difficulties with prompt formulation, inappropriate linguistic complexity, overcorrection, dependency, and the need for teacher guidance. These analytical concerns provided a consistent basis for comparing the selected studies and organizing the findings presented in the Results section.

The interpretation of the evidence was also informed by the concept of pedagogical scaffolding. ChatGPT was not treated simply as an automated correction system, but as a potential support mechanism whose educational value depends on how its feedback is structured and mediated.

From this perspective, effective use requires prompts that limit the scope of corrections, preserve the learner's original contribution, and request explanations that correspond to the learner's proficiency level. This consideration is particularly important for A2.2 learners, who may not yet possess sufficient linguistic or metacognitive resources to evaluate sophisticated AI-generated alternatives independently. Consequently, the review considered teacher mediation and AI literacy as important conditions for transforming automated feedback into meaningful opportunities for language development. This interpretation is consistent with the article's discussion of level-appropriate prompting and teacher-controlled scaffolding.

Several methodological considerations should be acknowledged when interpreting the findings. First, the field of generative AI in language education is developing rapidly, and the relatively short publication period limits the amount of longitudinal evidence currently available. Second, relatively few studies have focused specifically on learners formally classified at the A2.2 level. Consequently, the review identifies trends that are pedagogically relevant to elementary and lower-proficiency learners but does not claim that every finding derives exclusively from A2.2 populations. Third, differences in educational contexts, participant characteristics, writing tasks, prompting procedures, AI models, and feedback protocols may influence the comparability of findings across studies. For these reasons, the review does not attempt to establish a causal estimate of ChatGPT's effectiveness or quantify the magnitude of improvement in writing performance. Instead, it provides a thematic synthesis of recurring findings, pedagogical opportunities, and potential risks identified within the available literature.

Overall, the methodology was designed to provide a structured examination of an emerging and rapidly evolving research area while maintaining a clear focus on the pedagogical relevance of generative AI for lower-proficiency EFL writing. By combining systematic database searching, explicit eligibility criteria, focused screening, structured organization of the evidence, and qualitative thematic synthesis, the review aimed to identify not only whether ChatGPT may support writing development, but also the conditions under which such support is most likely to contribute to meaningful learning. This methodological approach therefore

provides the foundation for the subsequent analysis of the linguistic, affective, and pedagogical patterns reported across the 31 studies included in the review.

Results.

Table1. Summary of Results on the Use of ChatGPT as a Feedback Tool for A2.2

Analytical Dimension	Synthesized Finding	Pattern Identified in the Reviewed Literature	Pedagogical Implication
Grammatical accuracy	ChatGPT supported learners in identifying and correcting recurrent grammatical errors characteristic of A2.2 writing.	The reviewed studies reported effective detection of errors involving subject-verb agreement, third-person singular forms, prepositions, and forms of the verb *to be*.	Immediate feedback can help learners notice linguistic errors while the writing process is still cognitively active.
Explanatory feedback	ChatGPT was more pedagogically useful when corrections were accompanied by accessible explanations.	When prompted to function as a tutor, the tool provided short explanations of grammatical rules together with suggested corrections.	Feedback should explain errors rather than merely replace incorrect forms, particularly for elementary-level learners.
Lexical development	AI-assisted feedback contributed to modest vocabulary expansion.	Learners were encouraged to move beyond repetitive basic vocabulary and consider more varied lexical alternatives without necessarily shifting to highly advanced language.	Level-appropriate lexical suggestions may enrich written production while preserving comprehensibility and learner ownership.

Writing anxiety	Interaction with ChatGPT appeared to reduce learners' fear of making mistakes during drafting and revision.	Students reported feeling less embarrassed when exposing imperfect drafts to an AI system than to teachers or classmates.	AI-mediated feedback may provide a psychologically safer environment for experimentation and repeated practice.
Revision behavior	Immediate feedback encouraged iterative writing and more frequent text revision.	Learners repeatedly revised and resubmitted their writing after receiving AI-generated feedback.	ChatGPT can reinforce a process-oriented approach in which writing is developed through successive drafts rather than treated as a single final product.
Prompt literacy	The quality of the feedback depended substantially on learners' ability to formulate clear and restrictive prompts.	Vague instructions such as “fix this” frequently generated extensive rewriting rather than focused corrective feedback.	Students require explicit instruction in how to request limited, comprehensible, and level-appropriate feedback.
Overcorrection and proficiency mismatch	ChatGPT sometimes produced revisions that exceeded the linguistic competence of A2.2 learners.	Simple learner-generated sentences were occasionally transformed into more complex prose containing vocabulary and structures that students could not fully understand.	AI feedback should be constrained to the learner's proficiency level to avoid replacing rather than scaffolding learner production.
Learner dependency	Excessive reliance on ChatGPT may reduce opportunities for independent language production.	Some learners shifted from attempting sentences independently to asking the AI to generate them from the outset.	AI use should preserve productive struggle and require students to generate an initial response before consulting the tool.

Teacher mediation	The educational value of ChatGPT depended on structured teacher guidance and AI literacy development.	The review emphasizes the need to teach learners to limit corrections, request explanations, preserve their original text, and control the linguistic level of AI responses.	ChatGPT is most effective as a scaffolded formative-feedback tool rather than as an autonomous writing generator.
Overall instructional value	ChatGPT showed potential to complement formative writing instruction when incorporated within a controlled pedagogical framework.	The review concludes that benefits such as immediate feedback and increased revision must be balanced against overcorrection, dependency, and loss of learner voice.	Assessment should consider the writing process, including drafts, learner decisions, prompts, and responses to feedback, rather than evaluating only the poli

When you look at the compiled literature on how A2.2 learners interact with ChatGPT, a few really clear themes jump off the page. The data tells a story that is part highly encouraging, and part deeply cautionary. We broke these findings down into three main areas: the impact on actual writing mechanics, the psychological shifts in the students, and the technological hurdles they tripped over. Starting with the mechanics of writing, the evidence is pretty undeniable. Almost every study we reviewed reported that ChatGPT is incredibly good at spotting and correcting the localized errors that plague A2.2 writers. We are talking about things like forgetting the third-person 's', messing up prepositions, or misusing the verb 'to be'. But what makes the findings interesting isn't just that the AI fixed the errors; it’s how it fixed them.

When prompted to act as a tutor, the AI provided simple, easy-to-read explanations of grammar rules right next to the correction. Students were getting instant gratification. Furthermore, the studies noted a marked improvement in vocabulary. A2 learners often repeat the same basic adjectives (good, bad, happy). The research showed that ChatGPT gently pushed them to use slightly better words, enriching their lexicon without completely overwhelming them. However, the most fascinating results didn't have anything to do with grammar at all—they had to do with feelings. Language learning is terrifying for a lot of people. The literature heavily

emphasized that ChatGPT functioned as a massive stress reliever. In qualitative interviews across multiple studies, students admitted that they hated showing their messy, mistake-filled first drafts to their teachers or their classmates. But the AI doesn't judge. It doesn't get frustrated if you make the same mistake five times in a row. Because of this, researchers noticed a huge spike in what they call "iterative writing." Students were writing a paragraph, running it through ChatGPT, fixing it, and running it again. They were practicing more simply because the fear of human judgment had been taken out of the equation (Yan, 2023).

But the literature wasn't all positive, and this is where the results get complicated. The biggest roadblock identified across the board was something researchers call the "prompt engineering" problem. An A2.2 student doesn't have a very good grasp of English, which means they struggle to tell the AI exactly what they want it to do in English. When students just pasted their text into ChatGPT and typed "fix this," the results were disastrous for learning. The AI would take their clumsy, basic paragraph and rewrite it into a beautifully eloquent, complex essay that looked like it belonged in a university journal. The students couldn't understand half the words the AI used to "fix" their work. Instead of learning from the feedback, the students were alienated from their own writing. Additionally, the studies highlighted a creeping dependency. Some teachers noted in observational data that instead of trying to formulate a difficult sentence themselves and then asking for a correction, students were starting to ask the AI to just generate the sentence for them from the start.

Discussion

Reading through these findings forces us to take a hard look at what we are actually doing in the language classroom. If a free piece of software can correct subject-verb agreement faster, more patiently, and more consistently than a human teacher, then our role as educators has to change. We can't just be grammar checkers anymore. The fact that students feel less anxious getting corrected by a machine ties perfectly into Stephen Krashen’s Affective Filter hypothesis (Krashen, 1982). We’ve known for decades that if a student is stressed, embarrassed, or anxious, their brain literally blocks language acquisition. By outsourcing the "red pen" corrections to an emotionless algorithm, we seem to be lowering that filter. Students are opening up to the learning process because the psychological stakes are lower.

This gives teachers a massive opportunity. If ChatGPT is handling the mechanical corrections in the background, the teacher in the classroom can finally focus on the things AI can't do well: teaching pragmatics, cultural context, critical thinking, and the actual joy of communication.

But we have to talk about the elephant in the room: the danger of cognitive offloading. Learning a language is supposed to be a little bit difficult. The struggle of trying to remember a word, or piecing a sentence together, is what builds the neural pathways in the brain. If students are using ChatGPT to bypass that struggle, they aren't learning English; they are just learning how to operate a translation machine.

This brings us to a major shift in how we need to design our lessons. The literature makes it blindingly clear that you cannot just tell A2.2 students to "use AI for homework." It will backfire. They will get overwritten, and their authentic voice will disappear. We have to start teaching AI literacy alongside English (Lodge et al., 2023). This means spending actual classroom time teaching students how to write constraints. We need to teach them to type prompts like: "Read my text. Only point out three grammar mistakes. Do not rewrite the text for me. Keep your explanation at an elementary English level." If we don't teach them how to control the machine, the machine takes over the cognitive heavy lifting. Ultimately, the discussion shouldn't be framed as a battle between human teachers and artificial intelligence. The goal is scaffolding. In Vygotsky's terms, ChatGPT can act as the "more knowledgeable other" that sits in the student's Zone of Proximal Development. But a scaffold is only useful if it's built to the right height. If the AI is operating at a C2 level while the student is at an A2 level, the scaffold is useless. The teacher's new job is to manage the height of that scaffold.

Conclusions.

Bringing generative AI into an elementary English class isn't just a fun technological gimmick; it fundamentally changes the mechanics of how students learn to write. After reviewing the current literature, it becomes clear that ChatGPT offers something we've been trying to achieve in language education for years: infinite, patient, and immediate feedback. For an A2.2 learner who is struggling to build basic sentences, having a tool that catches errors in real-time and explains them without judgment is incredibly empowering. It removes the fear of failure that paralyzes so many beginners. However, we cannot ignore the very real risks that come with this technology. The tendency of the AI to overcorrect and essentially rewrite a student's work at an advanced level is a major pedagogical threat. If we allow students to use these tools blindly, we risk raising a generation of learners who can produce perfect English on a screen but can't string a sentence together in a real conversation.

The main takeaway from this review is that the technology itself is neither a miracle cure nor a complete disaster. Its value depends entirely on the framework teachers build around it. Going

forward, language curriculums have to adapt. We need to stop grading the final polished essay and start grading the process. We need to evaluate the prompts students use, look at their messy first drafts, and ask them to reflect on why they accepted or rejected the AI's advice. By teaching students how to collaborate with AI rather than relying on it to do the work, we can help them become more independent, confident, and capable writers.

Acknowledgments

A sincere note of appreciation goes out to the educational researchers and linguists who are currently navigating the chaotic waters of AI in the classroom. Their willingness to quickly test, observe, and publish empirical data on these emerging tools provides the groundwork we desperately need to make informed, rather than reactive, pedagogical decisions.

References

Alsofyani, A. H., & Barzanji, A. M. (2025). The effects of ChatGPT-generated feedback on Saudi EFL learners' writing skills and perception at the tertiary level: A mixed-methods study. *Journal of Educational Computing Research, 63*(2), 431–463. https://doi.org/10.1177/07356331241307297

Baidoo-Anu, D., & Owusu Ansah, L. O. (2023). Education in the era of generative artificial intelligence (AI): Understanding the potential benefits of ChatGPT in promoting teaching and learning. *Journal of AI, 7*(1), 52-62. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4337484

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

ChatGPT in education: A literature review. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems, 52*(1), 34-51. https://doi.org/10.1177/00472395231174751

Crosthwaite, P., & Sun, S. (2026). Generative AI and L2 written feedback studies*: A scoping review. RELC Journal, 57*(1), 207–219. https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882251386530

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*, Article 57. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00425-2

Fauzi, F., Tuhuteru, L., Kansy, F., Alira, A., & Peler, F. (2023). Exploring the implications of

Han, J., & Li, M. (2024). Exploring ChatGPT-supported teacher feedback in the *EFL context. System, 126*, 103502. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2024.103502

Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2019). Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language Teaching, 39*(2), 83-101. https://doi.org/10.1017/S026144480600339X

Kohnke, L., Moorhouse, B. L., & Zou, D. (2023). ChatGPT for language teaching and learning. *RELC Journal*, 54(2), 537-550. https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882231162868

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Pergamon Press.

Lodge, J. M., Thompson, K., & Corrin, L. (2023). Mapping out a research agenda for generative artificial intelligence in tertiary education. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 39(2), 1-16. https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.8695

Meniado, J. C., Huyen, D. T. T., Panyadilokpong, N., & Lertkomolwit, P. (2024). Using ChatGPT for second language writing: Experiences and perceptions of EFL learners in Thailand and Vietnam. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 7*, 100313. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100313

Su, Y., Lin, Y., & Lai, C. (2023). Collaborating with ChatGPT in argumentative writing classrooms. *Language Learning & Technology*, 27(3), 1-15. https://doi.org/10.12566/llt.v27i3.1011

Teng, M. F. (2024). "ChatGPT is the companion, not enemies": EFL learners' perceptions and experiences in using ChatGPT for feedback in writing. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 7*, 100270. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100270

Teng, M. F., & Huang, J. (2026). Assessing ChatGPT feedback for EFL learners' engagement and writing performance. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics.* Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.70155

Tran, T. T. T. (2025). 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

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: *The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.

Xiao, F., Zhu, S., & Xin, W. (2026). Exploring the landscape of generative AI (ChatGPT)-powered writing instruction in English as a foreign language education: A scoping review. *ECNU Review of Education,* *9*(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/20965311241310881

Yan, D. (2023). Impact of ChatGPT on learners in a L2 writing practicum: An exploratory investigation. *Education and Information Technologies,* 28, 13943–13967. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-11742-4

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, Article 1086. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-03543-y

Zhang, Y. (2020). The role of automated writing evaluation in second language writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 48, 100720. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2019.100720

ISSN: 3103-1315

SCIENTIA Research Club
ADVANCING RESEARCH, SHAPING MINDS.

LETTER OF ACCEPTANCE

15/09/2026

CARTA DE ACEPTACIÓN DE ARTÍCULO CIENTÍFICO

Por la presente se certifica que el artículo titulado "El uso de ChatGPT como herramienta de retroalimentación basada en IA para facilitar la mejora de la expresión escrita en alumnos de nivel A2.2"
Un trabajo de investigación de los autores: Paul Alexander Ajila Pinzón y Jorge Zambrano Pachay, siendo su artículo revisado por Doble Par Ciego y Sistema de Doble Revisión Editorial, antes de ser publicado.

El artículo será publicado en la Revista Científica **Research Club Scientia** ISSN: 3103-1315, en la edición julio – septiembre 2026, Volumen 4, Número 3. Verificable en nuestra plataforma:

https://researchclubscientia.com/index.php/files/issue/archive

Ing. Luci Salas Narvaez, MSc.
EDITORA REVISTA RESEARCH CLUB SCIENTIA

DOI: 10.65415/rcs

T: +593 96 733 3677
W: www.researchclubscientia.com
M: researchclubscientia@gmail.com

UNEMI

UNIVERSIDAD ESTATAL DE MILAGRO

¡Evolución académica!

@UNEMIEcuador