



AN INTERNATIONAL HYBRID CONFERENCE

12th COTEF

Conference on Teaching
English as A Foreign
Language

*Paths to Maximize the AI's Roles in
Shaping Future Language Education
and Literacy Studies*

5th CELTI

Conference on English
Language Teaching

Empowering Students: Utilizing Cambridge's Write and Improve for Personalized Writing Development

Author's:

Meida Rabia Sihite^{1*}; Rini Ekayati²; Irene
Adriyani Nababan³; Sri Minda Murni⁴

Affiliation:

¹English Education Study Program,
Universitas Alwashliyah Medan, Indonesia

²English Education Study Program,
Universitas Muhammadiyah Sumatera
Utara, Indonesia

³English Education Study Program,
Universitas HKBP Nommensen
Pematangsiantar, Indonesia

⁴English Education Study Program,
Universitas Negeri Medan, Indonesia

Abstract: This study investigated the role of artificial intelligence in enhancing students' writing skills through the use of Cambridge's Write & Improve tool. The research aimed to examine two main objectives: first, to analyze how the tool provided personalized feedback that supported students in improving their writing performance; and second, to explore its impact on students' motivation and confidence in fostering independent writing. The analysis focused on key features such as grammar correction, vocabulary enhancement, sentence structure simplification, and coherence support. These features were found to contribute significantly to the development of students' writing by offering iterative learning opportunities, promoting self-correction, and reinforcing confidence through positive feedback. Although the tool demonstrated considerable benefits, the study also identified limitations, including the potential for overdependence on the technology and its limited capacity to interpret complex contexts. The findings concluded that while Write & Improve effectively supports writing development and autonomy, it achieves optimal outcomes when used alongside traditional instructional methods. Recommendations are provided for educators to integrate the tool as a supplementary resource that encourages reflection and active engagement in the writing process.

Corresponding email:

meidarabia55@gmail.com

Keywords: write & improve, artificial intelligence, personalized feedback, writing development, learner autonomy

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.24090/celti.2025.1422>

Pages:

405-416

Copyright © 2025 by Author/s. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Introduction

In recent years, the integration of technology into writing instruction has expanded opportunities for language learners to develop their writing skills through personalized and sustained engagement. Among various innovations, digital writing platforms that provide formative feedback have gained considerable attention in pedagogical practice. While these tools are designed to support writing improvement, their role in fostering learner motivation, self-confidence, and autonomy has received limited empirical attention. Most existing studies have prioritized surface-level error correction, scoring

validity, or tool functionality, leaving a conceptual and practical gap regarding how these platforms contribute to meaningful learning and ethical development in the writing process.

This study seeks to address that gap by investigating how a widely used digital platform, Write & Improve, facilitates writing development among learners through iterative feedback. The research is grounded in the assumption that writing is not merely a mechanical skill, but a process that involves reflection, revision, and critical engagement. Accordingly, the study explores how ongoing feedback delivered in accessible and individualized forms can influence not only the quality of student writing but also the learner's sense of ownership and responsibility in the learning process. By doing so, this research contributes to the broader discourse on writing pedagogy, highlighting how digital tools can support educational goals beyond accuracy, such as learner agency and academic integrity.

Traditional models of feedback in writing instruction often depend on teacher-generated comments, which may be delayed, generalized, or limited by time and class size constraints. As noted by Winiewski et al. (2020), such conditions can restrict the frequency and depth of feedback students receive, especially in contexts where writing instruction must serve large cohorts. Compounding this challenge, writing continues to be one of the most demanding language skills to master. Learners frequently experience difficulties in syntactic control, lexical variety, textual cohesion, and rhetorical organization (Bitchener & Knipe, 2020). These challenges point to the necessity of consistent, targeted support that enables students to identify their weaknesses and revise meaningfully over time.

A growing body of research affirms the value of formative, personalized feedback in enhancing writing skills. Feedback that is specific and learner-centered has been found to promote higher engagement with revision and greater awareness of writing strategies (Nazim, 2024; Alharbi, 2023). Unlike summative evaluations, formative feedback enables learners to approach writing as a process of development rather than a product for judgment. Repeated exposure to feedback and the opportunity to submit multiple drafts contribute to a growth-oriented mindset and foster self-regulated learning (Zhang, 2021). As Rahman et al. (2022) emphasize, such engagement cultivates not only technical improvement but also emotional resilience and motivation in writing tasks.

Importantly, the way learners respond to feedback is also linked to broader issues of ethical learning and academic responsibility. Effective feedback mechanisms do not merely point out errors but guide learners toward understanding their own writing decisions. This encourages critical reflection and supports the development of independent judgment. Nazari et al. (2021) argue that fostering such reflection is central to the cultivation of academic integrity. Likewise, Pokrivčáková (2019) highlights the importance of promoting original expression and personal voice in writing pedagogy outcomes that are more likely to emerge when learners are engaged in iterative revision based on formative input.

Another pedagogical advantage of digital writing platforms is their potential to enhance accessibility and inclusivity. Flexible access allows learners from diverse linguistic and educational backgrounds to engage with feedback at their own pace and outside the constraints of class time. Kukulska-Hulme (2021) notes that such affordances are especially valuable in promoting equity, enabling differentiated learning in line with the principles of Universal Design for Learning (Moore, 2007). When consistently implemented, such systems can reduce dependence on teacher availability while maintaining the integrity of feedback delivery across learner populations.

However, the use of digital platforms in writing instruction is not without critique. Concerns have been raised about the limitations of feedback systems in capturing rhetorical nuance, cultural appropriateness, or the overall coherence of arguments dimensions often best addressed through

teacher-student interaction (Kukulska-Hulme, 2021). Moreover, there is ongoing debate about the risk of overreliance on external tools for editing and revising, which could hinder the long-term development of learners' independent writing strategies (Selim, 2024; William, 2024). To address this, it is essential that writing technologies be integrated into instruction with pedagogical guidance, ensuring that they serve as developmental aids rather than crutches.

Given these considerations, this study investigates how Write & Improve contributes to learners' writing development through its feedback mechanisms and revision process. By focusing on writing quality, learner motivation, and reflective engagement, this research aims to provide insights into the pedagogical value of feedback-oriented platforms in second language writing instruction. The findings are expected to inform both classroom practice and curriculum design, offering a framework for integrating writing technologies in ways that are ethically grounded, learner-responsive, and educationally effective.

Research Method

1. Research Design

A qualitative observational design was employed to enable a detailed analysis of the tool's interface and its key components. The exploration focused on identifying how the platform provides corrective and formative feedback on grammar, vocabulary, sentence structure, and overall writing coherence. This approach allowed for an in-depth understanding of the tool's pedagogical potential without involving participants or classroom interventions.

2. Data Collection

Data were collected through systematic observation and documentation of the tool's feedback process. A series of writing samples were submitted to the platform to generate feedback, which was then recorded and organized for analysis. The data collection process consisted of two main stages:

a. Observation of Tool Features

The interface and functions of Write & Improve were examined in detail. Specific attention was given to how the platform responds to user input, the types of feedback it generates, and the areas of writing it targets—such as grammar correction, vocabulary enhancement, and sentence structure improvement.

b. Documentation of Feedback Process

Multiple versions of writing texts were submitted to the tool in order to observe how feedback changed over successive drafts. Feedback outputs were documented, categorized, and compared to assess the types of errors addressed, the specificity of suggestions, and the consistency of revision prompts across submissions.

3. Data Analysis Technique

A descriptive analysis was carried out to interpret the data and identify patterns related to the tool's instructional support. The analysis followed three main steps:

a. Feature Analysis

Each observed feature was analyzed in terms of its usability, clarity, and relevance to common writing challenges encountered by English language learners. The effectiveness of each function was considered based on its potential to guide learners through independent revision.

b. Feedback Evaluation

The feedback was assessed for its instructional quality, focusing on the clarity, depth, and pedagogical value of the suggestions provided. Emphasis was placed on whether the feedback was actionable and could facilitate learner improvement over time.

c. Synthesis of Findings

The results from the observation and evaluation stages were synthesized to form a comprehensive view of the platform's potential role in writing instruction. The synthesis highlighted how the tool supports autonomous learning, promotes writing revision, and contributes to learner confidence in writing

Results & Discussion

1. Results

This section presents the results derived from qualitative observation of the Cambridge Write & Improve tool, structured according to emerging themes aligned with the research objectives. The findings emphasize the tool's role in enhancing students' writing development, motivation, confidence, and autonomy.

a. Empowerment through Personalized Feedback

The Write & Improve tool's personalized feedback mechanism emerged as a critical factor in empowering students to enhance their writing skills. The observations revealed that the tool offers various features and processes designed to address individual writing challenges effectively.

1) Detailed Feedback on Writing Elements

The tool provides specific, actionable suggestions on critical elements of writing, including grammar, vocabulary, sentence structure, and coherence. During the observations, the following insights were noted:

- a) Grammar Correction: For example, when a sentence like "She go to the market yesterday" was input, the tool identified the verb "go" and suggested "went" to correct the tense error. Alongside the correction, the tool offered a concise explanation of why past tense was necessary.
- b) Vocabulary Suggestions: In a sample sentence like "The food was very good," the tool recommended replacing "very good" with "delicious" to encourage more precise word choices. This type of enhancement supports students in expanding their vocabulary repertoire.
- c) Sentence Structure: When students input overly complex sentences, such as "The boy, who was running fast because he was late, tripped and fell," the tool provided a simplified version, such as "The boy was running fast because he was late and tripped." This process helps students understand the importance of clarity in writing.
- d) Coherence and Organization: The tool highlighted logical flow issues in longer texts by suggesting transitions or restructuring paragraphs. For example, if a paragraph lacked a clear topic sentence, the feedback emphasized its necessity and provided examples.

2) Iterative Learning Support

The iterative process of feedback and resubmission fosters active engagement with writing. Observations of multiple iterations revealed how the tool supported gradual improvements:

- a) **Progress Tracking:** When students revised their submissions, the tool highlighted improvements visually, such as an increasing score or a message like "Great job! You've improved in grammar by 20%." These metrics motivated students to continue refining their work.
- b) **Encouragement of Experimentation:** By allowing multiple revisions, the tool encouraged students to test different sentence structures or vocabulary without the fear of penalties. For instance, the transformation of passive voice sentences "The cake was eaten by the boy" into active voice "The boy ate the cake" was experimented with, and the improvement in clarity and brevity was recognized by the tool.

3) Encouragement for Self-Correction

One of the tool's strengths is its ability to guide students toward independent learning. Feedback was designed to prompt students to think critically about their errors rather than merely providing answers:

- a) **Prompting Reflection:** Instead of simply correcting "He don't like apples," the tool displayed a message like "Check the subject-verb agreement. Should it be 'don't' or 'doesn't'? Why?" This type of guidance encouraged the user to identify and understand the mistake before applying the correction.
- b) **Positive Reinforcement:** The tool used motivational messages such as "Well done! You've mastered this skill," when users successfully implemented feedback. These messages helped build confidence and reinforce learning outcomes.

2. Empowering Students to Enhance Motivation and Confidence in Writing Independently

The Cambridge Write & Improve tool displayed numerous features that encouraged students to build motivation and confidence in writing independently. Through descriptive analysis of its functionalities and feedback mechanisms, the study identified specific ways the tool supported learners in becoming self-directed and motivated writers.

a. Motivational Aspects

1) Progress Tracking and Visual Indicators of Improvement

The tool offered real-time feedback through progress scores and improvement graphs, which motivated users by showing tangible growth. For example, a user's initial submission might receive a CEFR level of A2, accompanied by a progress bar indicating areas for improvement. Subsequent submissions that incorporated the feedback could achieve B1, and the improvement was visually displayed as a "growth bar".

2) Achievement Badges and Positive Reinforcement

Students received digital rewards, such as badges, for reaching milestones like submitting five drafts or reducing errors in key areas like grammar or vocabulary. This gamification element created an engaging experience. One example included a message displayed after significant progress: "Congratulations! You've earned the 'Grammar Guru' badge for reducing grammar mistakes in three consecutive drafts!" Observational data indicated that students often expressed satisfaction with these rewards, fostering a sense of achievement and engagement.

3) Goal Setting through Gradual Feedback

By breaking the writing process into smaller goals, the tool reduced cognitive load and helped students focus on manageable tasks. For instance, one feature suggested "Focus on improving verb usage in this draft" instead of addressing all errors simultaneously. Observations showed that users who followed this advice demonstrated gradual but consistent improvement. In one case, a user corrected verb tenses in successive drafts, moving from "He go to school yesterday" to "He went to school yesterday," reinforcing a sense of accomplishment with each corrected error.

b. Confidence-Building Mechanisms

1) Clarity and Actionability of Feedback

Feedback was tailored to be constructive and actionable, ensuring students understood their errors and how to address them. For example, when a sentence like "She don't likes apples" was identified, the tool provided detailed guidance: "Subject-verb agreement issue. The correct form is: She doesn't like apples." Observation showed that user appreciated the tool's ability to clarify concepts, with many revisiting similar corrections in subsequent drafts. This iterative process reinforced their understanding and built confidence in applying the rules independently.

2) Support for Independent Problem-Solving

The tool encouraged users to analyze their errors and implement corrections without external assistance. For instance, after highlighting redundancy in the phrase "free gift," the tool suggested eliminating the unnecessary word, stating: "'Gift' implies free. Consider revising to: gift." Observations indicated that users often began self-identifying similar redundancies in future drafts, such as avoiding phrases like "basic fundamentals" or "unexpected surprise," showcasing their growing confidence in editing their work.

3) Reduction of Fear of Making Mistakes

The tool created a low-pressure environment where students could practice without judgment, reducing anxiety associated with writing. Unlike traditional teacher feedback, which could feel intimidating, the tool's neutral and constructive tone encouraged experimentation. For instance, a student hesitated to use advanced vocabulary in their initial drafts but later incorporated phrases like "mitigate challenges" instead of "solve problems" after receiving supportive feedback. The absence of punishing language, combined with phrases like "Good attempt! Here's a

suggestion to enhance clarity,” helped students build confidence to try more complex writing styles.

c. Encouragement for Self-Directed Writing

1) Autonomy in the Writing Process

The tool’s 24/7 accessibility enabled students to practice writing at their convenience, fostering self-directed learning. For example, a user could upload a draft multiple times in a single session, observing improvements with each revision.

2) Support for Independent Reflection and Revision

The tool encouraged students to reflect on their progress by comparing feedback across drafts. For instance, after multiple revisions of an essay introduction, one student expressed, “I now see how a stronger opening makes my writing more engaging,” indicating deeper self-awareness of writing quality.

3. Discussion

The findings from this study tool reveal several key insights into its impact on student writing development. The tool’s ability to provide fast, personalized feedback plays a significant role in enhancing students’ writing skills and motivation. By offering constructive and actionable feedback, the tool helps students understand their errors and learn how to correct them independently, thereby building their confidence. This feedback mechanism aligns with previous research, which highlights the positive effects of personalized feedback on skill development and student motivation.

One of the notable strengths of the tool is its iterative learning support, which encourages students to engage actively with their writing. The process of receiving feedback and making revisions fosters gradual improvement, as evidenced by progress tracking features that visually highlight improvements. These features offer tangible evidence of progress, which motivates students to continue improving their work. This iterative approach not only motivates students but also reinforces their understanding of writing rules, enabling them to apply these concepts independently in future tasks. Such an approach is consistent with research showing that iterative feedback can promote deeper learning and skill retention.

Moreover, the tool’s focus on coherence and organization aids students in developing a logical flow in their writing. By suggesting transitions or restructuring paragraphs, it helps students create more cohesive texts. This aspect of the tool is particularly valuable for students who struggle with organizing their thoughts and ensuring clarity in their writing. Providing specific feedback on organization allows students to address one of the most common challenges in writing, creating clear and structured arguments or narratives thereby contributing to the overall quality of their written work.

However, the study also highlights some limitations. While the tool provides valuable support, there is a risk that students may become overly reliant on it, potentially hindering their ability to develop writing skills independently. This dependency could lead to a situation where students might expect immediate fixes rather than engaging in the critical thinking required for self-correction. Such a concern underscores the importance of using the tool as a complementary resource rather than a replacement for traditional teaching methods. Educators are encouraged to incorporate the tool into a balanced learning strategy, ensuring that students continue to develop their writing skills autonomously. Research

on tool overreliance suggests that students benefit most when such resources are used to supplement, rather than replace, traditional learning environments.

In conclusion, Cambridge's Write & Improve tool offers significant benefits in supporting writing development through personalized feedback and iterative learning. These features enhance student motivation and confidence by providing clear, actionable insights into their writing. However, careful integration into educational settings is necessary to maximize its potential while mitigating the risk of overreliance. Future research could explore how AI tools like Write & Improve can be adapted to different learning environments, such as classrooms with diverse proficiency levels, to further enhance writing instruction and ensure that students develop long-term independent writing skills.

Conclusion

This study set out to explore how Cambridge's Write & Improve tool supports students' writing development through personalized feedback and its impact on learner motivation and confidence. The findings show that the tool not only provides actionable, individualized feedback but also encourages iterative learning and self-revision, fostering greater autonomy in student writing practices. By offering clear suggestions and visual indicators of progress, the tool reinforces student engagement and builds a sense of achievement that contributes to writing improvement.

Importantly, this study highlights the value of digital tools in enhancing the writing process, especially when used to supplement teacher guidance. The feedback-driven interaction between learner and tool promotes deeper understanding of writing mechanics rather than surface-level correction. At the same time, the research draws attention to the potential risks of overreliance on automated systems, suggesting the need for thoughtful integration into pedagogical settings.

In sum, the study contributes to a growing body of knowledge on AI-assisted learning environments and emphasizes the importance of balancing technological support with instructional scaffolding. Future research may consider how such tools can be further adapted to suit diverse learner profiles and how they perform in varied instructional contexts.

References

- Abdul Rahman, N. 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>
- AbuSahyon, A. S. E., Alzyoud, A., Alshorman, O., & Al-Absi, B. (2023). AI-driven Technology and Chatbots as Tools for Enhancing English Language Learning in the Context of Second Language Acquisition: A Review Study. *International Journal of Membrane Science and Technology*, 10(1), 1209–1223. <https://doi.org/10.15379/ijmst.v10i1.2829>
- Akavova, A., Temirkhanova, Z., & Lorsanova, Z. (2023). Adaptive learning and artificial intelligence in the educational space. *E3S Web of Conferences*, 451, 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202345106011>
- Alharbi, W. (2023). AI in the Foreign Language Classroom: A Pedagogical Overview of Automated Writing Assistance Tools. *Education Research International*, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2023/4253331>

- Aljuaid, H. (2024). The Impact of Artificial Intelligence Tools on Academic Writing Instruction in Higher Education: A Systematic Review. *Arab World English Journal*, 1(1), 26–55. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/chatgpt.2>
- Almasi, M., Zhu, C., & Machumu, H. (2018). Students' Perceptions of Social Presence in Blended Learning Courses in a Tanzanian Medical College. *INTED2018 Proceedings*, 1(9), 3404–3414. <https://doi.org/10.21125/inted.2018.0655>
- Biermann, O. C., Ma, N. F., & Yoon, D. (2022). From Tool to Companion: Storywriters Want AI Writers to Respect Their Personal Values and Writing Strategies. *Designing Interactive Systems Conference*, 1209–1227. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3532106.3533506>
- Bodaubekov, A., Agaidarova, S., Zhussipbek, T., Gaipov, D., & Balta, N. (2025). Leveraging AI to enhance writing skills of senior TFL students in Kazakhstan: A case study using “Write & Improve.” *Contemporary Educational Technology*, 17(1), ep548. <https://doi.org/10.30935/cedtech/15687>
- Escalante, J., Pack, A., & Barrett, A. (2023). AI-generated feedback on writing: insights into efficacy and ENL student preference. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 20(1), 57. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00425-2>
- Frinsel, F. F., Trecca, F., & Christiansen, M. H. (2024). The Role of Feedback in the Statistical Learning of Language-Like Regularities. *Cognitive Science*, 48(3). <https://doi.org/10.1111/cogs.13419>
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81–112. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654302984>
- Hibbi, F.-Z., Abdoun, O., & Haimoudi, E. K. (2021). Smart Tutoring System: A Predictive Personalized Feedback in a Pedagogical Sequence. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (IJET)*, 16(20), 263. <https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v16i20.24783>
- Kochmar, E., Vu, D. Do, Belfer, R., Gupta, V., Serban, I. V., & Pineau, J. (2020). Automated Personalized Feedback Improves Learning Gains in An Intelligent Tutoring System (pp. 140–146). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-52240-7_26
- Konyrova, L. (2024). The Evolution of Language Learning: Exploring AI's Impact on Teaching English as a Second Language. *Eurasian Science Review An International Peer-Reviewed Multidisciplinary Journal*, 2(2), 133–138. <https://doi.org/10.63034/esr-42>
- Kouam Arthur William, F. (2024). AI in Academic Writing: Ally or Foe? *International Journal of Research Publications*, 148(1). <https://doi.org/10.47119/IJRP1001481520246427>
- Kwak, S. (2017). Approaches Reflected in Academic Writing MOOCs. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 18(3). <https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v18i3.2845>
- Liu, M. (2023). Exploring the Application of Artificial Intelligence in Foreign Language Teaching: Challenges and Future Development. *SHS Web of Conferences*, 168, 03025. <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/202316803025>
- Ma, Y., Huang, Y., & Wang, Q. (2023). Exploring ChatGPT in Language Teaching for Higher Education in China. *Lecture Notes in Education Psychology and Public Media*, 18(1), 265–271. <https://doi.org/10.54254/2753-7048/18/20231337>

- Maawa, P. K. L., & Ortega-Dela Cruz, R. (2019). REMEDIAL AND CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK STRATEGIES FOR IMPROVING STUDENTS' ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY. *International Journal of Language Education*, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v1i1.7794>
- Makwana, V. (2025). A Comparative Analysis of AI-Powered and Teacher-Led Feedback : Investigating Student Perceptions and Writing Performance. 67(1).
- Martin, S., Alvarez, I. M., & Espasa, A. (2022). Video feedback and Foreign Language Anxiety in online pronunciation tasks. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 19(1), 19. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-022-00324-y>
- Monaghan, P., Ruiz, S., & Rebuschat, P. (2021). The role of feedback and instruction on the cross-situational learning of vocabulary and morphosyntax: Mixed effects models reveal local and global effects on acquisition. *Second Language Research*, 37(2), 261–289. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0267658320927741>
- Moore, S. L. (2007). David H. Rose, Anne Meyer, *Teaching Every Student in the Digital Age: Universal Design for Learning*. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 55(5), 521–525. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-007-9056-3>
- Nazari, N., Shabbir, M. S., & Setiawan, R. (2021). Application of Artificial Intelligence powered digital writing assistant in higher education: randomized controlled trial. *Heliyon*, 7(5), e07014. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e07014>
- Nazim, M. (2024). Exploring EFL Teachers' Insights Regarding Artificial Intelligence Driven Tools in Student-Centered Writing Instructions. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 14(3), 93. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v14n3p93>
- Nguyen Minh, A. (2024). Leveraging ChatGPT for Enhancing English Writing Skills and Critical Thinking in University Freshmen. *Journal of Knowledge Learning and Science Technology* ISSN: 2959-6386 (Online), 3(2), 51–62. <https://doi.org/10.60087/jklst.vol3.n2.p62>
- Nisa, I. C., Asib, A., & Ngadiso, N. (2017). The Correlation Between Creativity, Cohesive Devices Mastery, and Writing Skill. *English Education*, 5(3). <https://doi.org/10.20961/eed.v5i3.35879>
- Noviyanti, S. D. (2020). Artificial Intelligence (AI)-Based Pronunciation Checker: An Alternative for Independent Learning in Pandemic Situation. *ELT Echo : The Journal of English Language Teaching in Foreign Language Context*, 5(2), 162. <https://doi.org/10.24235/eltecho.v5i2.7246>
- Pokrivcakova, S. (2019). Preparing teachers for the application of AI-powered technologies in foreign language education. *Journal of Language and Cultural Education*, 7(3), 135–153. <https://doi.org/10.2478/jolace-2019-0025>
- Prasetya, R. E., & Syarif, A. (2023). ChatGPT as a Tool for Language Development: Investigating Its Impact on Proficiency and Self-Evaluation Accuracy in Indonesian Higher Education. *VELES (Voices of English Language Education Society)*, 7(3), 402–415. <https://doi.org/10.29408/veles.v7i3.19303>
- Rahimi, S., & Shute, V. (n.d.). *Personalized Learning in Educational Games Using Stealth Assessment*. 1–24.

- Remache Carrillo, N. M., Yáñez Valle, V. V., & Pilco Labre, M. G. (2019). Storytelling strategy to improve coherence in writing skills development. *Explorador Digital*, 3(3.1), 123–142. <https://doi.org/10.33262/exploradordigital.v3i3.1.873>
- Rummel, S., & Bitchener, J. (2015). The effectiveness of written corrective feedback and the impact LAO learners' beliefs have on uptake. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 38(1), 64–82. <https://doi.org/10.1075/aral.38.1.04rum>
- Selim, A. S. M. (2024). The Transformative Impact of AI-Powered Tools on Academic Writing: Perspectives of EFL University Students. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 14(1), 14. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v14n1p14>
- Wisniewski, B., Zierer, K., & Hattie, J. (2020). The Power of Feedback Revisited: A Meta-Analysis of Educational Feedback Research. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.03087>
- Zhang, Y. (2021). Enhancing writing through AI-powered feedback: A case study on Cambridge Write & Improve. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 34(5), 673–695. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2020.1790462>

This page has been intentionally left blank.