Austronesian: Journal of Language Science & Literature

P-ISSN: 2963-1548 E-ISSN 2961-9947

Journal Homepage:

https://www.ojs.wahanapublikasi.com/index.php/austronesian



Students' Perception on AI-Based Feedback in Writing Descriptive Text

Kezia Tatipata[1*], Ignatius Javier Couturier Tuerah[2], Herminus Efrando Pabur[3]

[1-3] English Education Department, Univeritas Negeri Manado, Tondano, Sulawesi Utara 95618, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Received:
29 August 2026

Accepted:
16 October 2026

Published:
01 December 2026

Keywords:

Students' Perception, AI-Based Feedback, Writing, Descriptive Text

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to explore students' perceptions of AI-based feedback, its usefulness in writing descriptive texts, their intentions to continue using it, and its positive and negative impacts on writing development. A qualitative case study design was employed to collect data through semi-structured interviews with sixteen students in class 10-4. The study employed a qualitative approach, with interview data collected from 16 students at SMA Negeri 1 Tondano who used ChatGPT as an AI-based feedback tool. The findings revealed that students generally perceived ChatGPT positively, with 14 students (87.5%) describing it as easy, practical, and accessible. Regarding writing development, grammar improvement was the most frequently reported benefit (62.5%), followed by vocabulary enrichment (37.5%), while improvements in text structure were less consistently reported. Students also experienced increased writing confidence, motivation, and opportunities for independent learning. Furthermore, 15 students (93.75%) expressed affirmative or conditional intentions to continue using AI-based feedback. Despite these benefits, over-reliance emerged as the most frequently reported negative impact, identified by eight students (50%). Other concerns included passive acceptance of AI-generated corrections without understanding their underlying linguistic principles, inappropriate use of advanced vocabulary, and reduced engagement in independent writing processes. The study concludes that ChatGPT offers pedagogical potential for improving grammatical accuracy, vocabulary development, and students' affective engagement in descriptive text writing. Nevertheless, its effectiveness depends on critical student engagement and appropriate pedagogical guidance. Therefore, AI-based feedback should be integrated as a supplementary tool within a teacher-mediated instructional framework rather than used as a substitute for teacher guidance and independent learning.

Copyright © 2026 The Author(s)
Published by CV Wahana Publikasi.
This article is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 License

* Corresponding Author: keziatatipata16@gmail.com
DOI: https://doi.org/10.59011/austronesian.5.3.2026.822-836

1. Introduction

One of the most revolutionary developments in education is the integration of artificial intelligence (AI) in education process, especially in the form of intelligent tutors that customize materials to each student's needs and adaptive learning systems (Cai et al., 2023; Malik et al., 2023; Suryanarayana et al., 2024; Ukwandu et al., 2025; Zhang & Wang, 2026). In addition to increasing education's efficacy and efficiency, including AI into the learning process makes it possible for previously unattainable customization and immediate feedback (Alreshidi et al., 2026; Berisha Qehaja, 2025; Birgün, 2026; Chakraborty, 2026; Dissanayake et al., 2025). However, there are a number of obstacles to implementing AI in educational institutions, including concerns about algorithm dependability, equal access, and ethics (Al Yakin et al., 2026; Ali et al., 2024; Thomas et al., 2026). AI has the potential to be a supplementary tool that enhances rather than replaces the function of teachers and students' educational experiences.

Through a variety of applications, including chatbots, automated writing assessments, and intelligent tutoring systems that may provide students immediate feedback, artificial intelligence (AI) has significantly changed the field of teaching English (Al-selwi, 2025; Ekizer, 2025; Sayfiddinova, 2025; Torres & Kahveci, 2025). More individualized learning is made possible by this technology, which allows language exercises and resources to be customized to meet the needs and skill levels of each individual. By simulating conversations and providing precise auto-correction, AI also helps students become more proficient speakers and writers. However, issues with algorithm quality, technological accessibility, and ethics continue to hinder the application of AI in English language instruction, especially in English writing activity.

One of the most important language skills that students need to master to thrive in both academic and professional settings is writing. Writing acts as the main channel of communication, enabling people to share information, communica6te concepts, and engage in intellectual dialogue with others (Yang et al., 2025). Because it necessitates the combination of linguistic, cognitive, and social competencies, writing is still a difficult ability for many students, despite its significance. Effective writing needs not only a command of syntax and vocabulary but also the capacity to arrange ideas rationally and clearly. Therefore, enhancing students' writing abilities and increasing the efficacy of instruction requires a grasp of the concept and nature of writing (Abdeta et al., 2026).

Writing and multimodal communication of ideas and experiences in a variety of fiction and nonfiction texts are expected of students. In line with the communication objectives, students must show that they can employ suitable text structures and linguistic components to communicate ideas in an understandable and efficient manner. Additionally, students must be able to use a variety of presentation media, both digital and print, in a creative and responsible manner in order to defend their positions and voice their opinions on common subjects or contemporary issues. Writing exercises promote critical and creative thinking abilities in the communication of ideas in addition to producing grammatically sound writings. Additionally, high school writing instruction is essential for fostering students' academic literacy and equipping them with the written communication skills needed for both the workplace and higher education (Apridayani & Waluyo, 2025). Nonetheless, a number of studies demonstrate that students continue to struggle with writing, including poor comprehension, trouble structuring ideas, and a lack of consistent writing practice. To improve their communication skills, students are encouraged to use a range of text types, including descriptive texts.

One kind of texts that are taught to the students in Phase E level is descriptive text. Based

on the Learning Outcome Progression in syllabus of SMA Negeri 1 Tondano, descriptive text is one of the materials that is taught to the students. However, as initially observed by the researcher, students frequently struggle with a variety of issues when writing descriptive texts, including a lack of vocabulary, poor grammar, and trouble putting ideas in a logical order. Students tend to make the same errors and find it difficult to write descriptive text. Students' low vocabulary and inadequate comprehension of text structure are the primary causes of their difficulty with writing descriptive text (Maharani et al., 2024). Similarly, Nurfidoh and Kareviati (2021) discovered that students' capacity to generate coherent descriptive writings is greatly impacted by both a lack of writing practice and insufficient teacher feedback. From teacher's perspectives, teachers rarely provide adequate feedback, which worsens these problems due to time limits while evaluating students' writing work. Matsumur et al. (2002) highlighted that a major obstacle teachers encounter is the lack of time to grade assignments and offer thorough feedback, which keeps students from getting helpful advice to improve their writing.

AI-based feedback has emerged as an option for teachers that struggle for time when giving students feedback on their writing. Students can get more regular and timely feedback because to this technology's ability to automatically correct grammar, comprehension, and sentence structure errors quickly and correctly. An AI-based written feedback system can help teachers save time and improve the accuracy of analyzing student writing (Shi & Aryadoust, 2024). Furthermore, by offering prompt and understandable suggestions for improvement, ChatGPT, an automated feedback tool, can enhance student motivation and writing quality (Kurt & Kurt, 2024). The use of AI-based feedback has, still created significant discussion in spite of its obvious advantages. According to Qiao et al. (2025), AI systems are currently unable to fully comprehend context, creativity, and the nuances of human language, which leads to feedback that is often basic and automated. Additionally, certain academics contend that an excessive dependence on AI may diminish students' capacity for reflection and erode the teacher's function as the main mentor in the writing process. Thus, to ensure efficient and significant writing learning, the use of AI-based feedback should be compatible with human direction.

Since students are the ones who immediately receive feedback during the learning process, it is crucial to take their opinions to consideration. However, the frequency and impact of instructor input may decline with the introduction of AI-based feedback (Hyland, 2026). Additionally, the application of AI-based feedback in writing classes is still in early stages and is still not commonly used in educational settings, especially as it involves descriptive texts (Atikah, 2026; Chakraborty, 2026; Yang et al., 2025). AI-based feedback system for writing assignments has never been used by teachers at SMA Negeri 1 Tondano. Accordingly, the researcher wanted to find out how students perceive the use of AI-based feedback in writing descriptive texts to ascertain their opinions on the technology's value, advantages, and difficulties. How do the 10th-grade students at SMA Negeri 1 Tondano perceive the use of AI-based feedback in writing descriptive texts."

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1 The Concept of Feedback

Feedback in an educational context is understood as information provided to students regarding the quality of their performance with the aim of helping them improve their learning outcomes on subsequent assignments. This information can come from teachers, peers, or learning evaluation instruments, and serves as corrective guidance for the academic

process and outcomes. Wisniewski et al. (2020) state that feedback is an integral part of learning because it provides information that can guide students toward a better understanding of the discrepancy between actual performance and expected competencies. In modern pedagogy, feedback not only validates success but also identifies areas of weakness that need constructive improvement. Thus, feedback plays a role as a mechanism to help students regulate their learning process and develop readiness for continuous academic improvement.

Feedback is viewed as a dialogic process involving reflective interaction between educators and students, rather than a simple one-way delivery of information. Sankaran and Fin (2025) emphasize that ideal feedback should be specific, clear, relevant, and timely to be optimally utilized to improve academic performance. Furthermore, effective feedback fosters metacognitive skills, fosters active engagement, and facilitates self-regulation in the learning process (Nedrehagen et al., 2025). By receiving explanations of errors and strategies for improvement, students can understand the underlying reasons for their performance and address competency gaps in subsequent assignments. In addition, constructive feedback guides students to participate as managers of their own learning, rather than simply recipients of information (Gan et al., 2023; Pham et al., 2026). Therefore, feedback provides a conceptual and practical foundation for enhancing motivation, self-confidence, and persistence in facing academic challenges.

2.2 AI-based Feedback

AI-based feedback refers to a learning feedback system generated by artificial intelligence to automatically and structurally analyze students' academic performance (Mujeeb et al., 2026). In the context of language learning, AI-based feedback works by leveraging machine learning and natural language processing to detect linguistic errors, providing revision recommendations, and suggest improvement strategies tailored to individual needs. This technology allows students to receive instant, accurate, and consistent evaluations without relying on teacher availability. This aligns with Tang and Zhang's (2026) findings, which state that automated written feedback based on artificial intelligence is increasingly effective in supporting language teaching and learning, particularly in improving academic writing skills. Recent research shows that students who receive AI-assisted feedback experience significant improvements in writing skills, particularly in grammar, vocabulary, and discourse coherence (Ekizoğlu & Demir, 2025). Furthermore, automated writing evaluation systems have also been shown to improve writing accuracy and accelerate the revision process, thus supporting self-directed learning. With its high evaluation speed and ability to map error patterns, AI-based feedback helps students identify areas for improvement and reduces learning misconceptions. The use of artificial intelligence is increasingly recognized as an important approach in modern learning design.

While the emergence of AI-based feedback represents a significant innovation, its implementation still requires pedagogical oversight from teachers to avoid mechanical learning. AI systems are not yet fully capable of capturing the emotional context, cultural nuances, or originality of students' ideas, so teacher interpretation is still needed to facilitate meaningful understanding. The best approach is to combine the power of AI-generated feedback with human feedback to achieve more effective and meaningful learning. Research shows that the use of AI is most effective when combined with humanized feedback that is empathetic, interpersonal, and motivational. Therefore, AI is not intended to replace the role of teachers, but rather to support the learning process in a complementary manner Teachers can leverage AI-based diagnostic analysis to design individualized and differentiated learning

interventions tailored to student needs. This integrated approach enables a more adaptive, personalized, and sustainable learning process. The artificial intelligence algorithms in e-learning can create adaptive and personalized learning paths tailored to each student's performance, preferences, and development. Therefore, optimizing AI-based feedback must center on a balanced integration of technological accuracy and a human touch to ensure students' academic, emotional, and social development can flourish harmoniously.

2.3 Advantages and Disadvantages

AI-based feedback has several pedagogical advantages that significantly impact the quality of learning. Its main advantages lie in the speed and consistency of evaluation, allowing students to immediately correct errors during the learning process. AI is also capable of providing personalized assessments based on learning error patterns, so each student receives feedback tailored to their needs. AI-based feedback systems offer speed, consistency, and personalized assessments, allowing students to make corrections directly during the learning process. This aligns with research findings that conclude that the use of AI platforms increases motivation, learning independence, and the efficiency of academic revision strategies (Birgün, 2026). Furthermore, the use of real-time feedback helps teachers save time grading large volumes of assignments, allowing them to focus more on direct interaction and fostering emotional well-being for students. In language learning, AI technology supports the detection of complex errors such as discourse inconsistency, paragraph cohesiveness, and academic vocabulary choice, which typically require more time to analyze manually. An automated writing evaluation system can improve EFL learners' writing skills in terms of coherence, cohesion, lexicon, and grammatical accuracy, including detecting discourse-level problems that are not limited to sentence-level errors. Therefore, AI-based feedback is a strategic tool to support continuous learning in modern education.

Despite its many benefits, AI-based feedback has several limitations that require consideration. AI does not fully understand the emotional context, linguistic aesthetics, creativity, humor, or unique writing style of students, which can lead to interpretations of corrections that are not entirely relevant. Over-reliance on AI can also decrease reflective skills because students tend to follow recommendations without analyzing the conceptual rationale behind the corrections. Furthermore, there is a risk of bias in the training dataset, which can affect the quality of the corrections provided. Automated feedback tools still have limitations in evaluating high-level writing constructs such as rhetorical quality, creativity, and authenticity of author voice, due to their focus on surface features. Research shows that AI cannot replace the humanistic touch of teachers and must be combined with human judgment for long-term learning effectiveness. From an ethical perspective, concerns about data privacy, information security, and disparities in technology access also pose implementation challenges. Therefore, the use of AI-based feedback must be carried out proportionally within a technology-based learning framework that prioritizes pedagogical aspects, empathy, and educational equity

3. Method

This research used a qualitative research method with a case study design to explore students' perceptions of AI-based feedback in writing descriptive texts. A qualitative research focuses on exploring real-life contexts by examining participants' experiences, perceptions, and meanings in depth (Ritchie & Lewis, 2003; Schreier, 2024). This approach emphasizes the use of multiple sources of evidence, such as interviews, observations, and documents, to obtain

rich and comprehensive data. Qualitative research emphasizes exploring the meaning contained in the experiences of research subjects, thus enabling researchers to gain a comprehensive understanding of the phenomena studied from the participants' perspectives. In the context of this study, a qualitative approach is used to interpret how students interpret the practicality, usefulness, and impact of using AI-based feedback on their writing learning process and outcomes (Yin, 2017). This approach does not aim to test hypotheses or measure relationships between variables statistically, but rather to describe and interpret the empirical reality experienced by students in a deep, contextual, and holistic manner.

4. Results and Discussion

In the results section contain the results of the analysis and research findings. In the discussion section, interpretations of research results are provided to give meaning to the reader or provide guidance for further research.

4.1 Students' Perception on AI-based Feedback

The findings from the interview align strongly with the perceived ease of use in technology acceptance model (TAM). The favourable ease of use perception documented by Wahyuni et al. (2026) who reported a high positive perception attributed to accessibility and immediacy of automatic responses provided by AI-Based feedback. It is directly supported by the interview data in the present study. 14 out of 16 students (87.5%) described ChatGPT as easy, practical, or simple to use. Students in this study consistently pointed to the same qualities that Wahyuni et al. (2026) identified: accessibility and immediacy. They are the primary drivers of their positive ease of use perceptions. Student 5, for instance, described the workflow as simply copying text and asking the AI to correct it. Student 14 noted that corrections were received immediately and the display was clear enough to spot errors quickly. The findings in the present study suggests that high ease of use perception is a robust and replicable finding across different AI-based feedback tools and student populations. It reflects a fundamental characteristic of conversational AI interfaces rather than a context-specific result. Furthermore, the present study extends finding by identifying prompt literacy as a mediating variable in ease-of-use perception. Students struggled to formulate clear prompts, such as Students 1 and 8, experienced a measurable reduction in ease of use.

The interview result in the current study also demonstrates the efficacy of AI-based feedback in enhancing the quality of descriptive text writing. These findings are in line with the previous studies conducted by Kristianto et al. (2025), who found an improvement in descriptive writing, are consistent with the qualitative pattern in the current data, where students reported definite gains in vocabulary and grammar but less gains in the structural dimension. Students 2, 7, 11, and 12 reported improvements in both grammar and structural organization, which is consistent with Laila and Daulay's (2024) finding that students using Quillbot demonstrated improvements in idea expression, grammatical quality, and logical structure. However, a crucial qualification is revealed by the qualitative data of this study. It is found that students' underlying linguistic competence did not always improve in tandem with improvements in written text quality. Student 1 admitted of copying corrections without understanding them. Student 14 acknowledge to follow suggestions without engaging with the reasoning. This distinction can be clearly seen in qualitative interview data but not in quantitative pre-post score comparisons.

The results of the interviews conducted for this study also reflect the risks and limitations of AI-based feedback noted in the literature. Student 1 observes that AI feedback did not

sufficiently address the genre-specific structural conventions of descriptive text. It is directly related to Wahyuni et al. (2026) finding that reliability received a lower mean rating. In the context of descriptive text writing, where structural conventions the identification and description paragraphs are a key evaluation criterion, this reliability limitation is particularly important. The present study's finding that over-reliance was the single most frequently cited negative impact, reported by 8 out of 16 students (50%), caution against over-reliance on AI feedback as a threat to critical thinking development. The qualitative results of this study and the empirical literature show that AI-based feedback is a pedagogically promising but double-edged tool with real and significant improvements in writing accuracy and ease of use. However, the risks of over-reliance, passive engagement, and structural feedback inadequacy necessitate careful pedagogical management in order to support the long-term objectives of writing competence development.

4.2 The Usefulness of AI-Based Feedback in Writing Descriptive Texts

a. Grammar

The qualitative from the interview data show that the use of AI-Based feedback demonstrate its efficacy in improving the grammar aspect in writing descriptive text. These overall improvements are particularly evident in the interview data from the current study, where 10 out of 16 students (62.5%) specifically mentioned grammar improvement as the main advantage of using ChatGPT. The grammatical elements identified in the previous studies as being most frequently revised were consistently recognized by students, especially verb tense accuracy. Student 1 noted particular improvements in verb tense and the use of "to be", Student 5 reported that ChatGPT assisted in correcting the misuse of the simple present tense, and Student 9 confirmed that tense errors were promptly identified and corrected. AI-based grammar feedback, as reported in the interview result, is the most reliably and consistently advantageous aspect of AI-assisted descriptive text writing.

Besides grammar correction, students' responses shed light on the condition that can lead grammar improvement. Although Hu et al. (2026) reported a strong positive correlation between AI-Based feedback and grammar improvement, students responses indicate that the quality of students cognitive engagement with the feedback they receive mediates this relationship. The grammar improvement matches to a real development of metalinguistic awareness that is likely to result in long-lasting competence gains for students. Student 14 reported becoming "more aware of grammatical errors" with sentences that became "more coherent," and Student 9, who described gaining a better understanding of tense usage through repeated AI correction. However, several students show that AI-Based feedback only provide surface-level accuracy gains. They do not translate into comparable gains in internalized grammatical competence. Student 1 acknowledged copying corrections *"without really understanding"* them, and Student 14, who acknowledged following suggestions *"without understanding the reasoning."* As the previous studies are unable to capture this distinction between surface accuracy improvement and deep competence development, the interview result of this study highlights it as a crucial pedagogical concern.

The interview data from this study are also in line with the findings of the previous studies conducted by Fathimatuzahro and Rizkiyah (2025). They found that AI feedback functions best when combined with traditional instruction rather than used alone. Students 9 and 11 stated that they intended to use AI "*wisely"* and as *"supplementary assistance"* while keeping teacher guidance as an essential complement. They understood AI feedback as one resource within a larger, teacher-mediated learning ecosystem rather than as a substitute for human

instruction. The best way to incorporate AI-based grammar feedback in descriptive text writing instruction may depend more on how to structure its use within a framework. The framework must maintain and enhance students' ability for independent grammatical reasoning, critical engagement with feedback, and autonomous writing competence than on whether or not to use it.

b. Vocabulary

Based on the findings of the study, students at SMA Negeri 1 Tondano consistently supports the efficacy of AI-based feedback in enhancing vocabulary in descriptive text writing. In the previous study, it showed that students who received AI-assisted feedback significantly outperformed peers who received teacher-only feedback in terms of grammar, vocabulary, and coherence (Ekizoğlu & Demir, 2025). AI-driven feedback models can improve vocabulary learning and retention when successfully integrated into writing instruction (Mujeeb et al., 2026). The interview data from the current study clearly supports these conclusions, as six out of sixteen students (37.5%) specifically mentioned vocabulary enrichment as the main advantage of utilizing ChatGPT. Student 15 admitted their vocabulary becoming richer and less repetitive, with more engaging and varied descriptions as a result of AI-generated word choices. Student 3 stated that their writing became more intriguing and varied in terms of vocabulary. Student 9 listed AI-suggested vocabulary as one of the most useful features, and Student 8 gave a specific example of how ChatGPT enabled vocabulary substitution. AI-based vocabulary feedback, as reported in the interview result, is established as a truly effective and consistently beneficial aspect of AI-assisted descriptive text writing improvement.

The interview result demonstrated the processes by which AI-based feedback results in vocabulary gains in descriptive text writing. By identifying the aspects vocabulary enrichment, the qualitative data from this study contribute to the previous studies. The present studys interview noted that vocabulary improvement was consistently described not only as an increase in word quantity but also as an enhancement of descriptive quality and communicative effectiveness. These findings are consistent with Ekizoğlu and Demirs (2025) finding that AI-assisted feedback produced notable gains in coherence alongside vocabulary. Student 15 report that AI suggestions made descriptions *"sound more interesting and varied"* and Student 3 reported that their writing *became "more interesting."* Students are not stuck in repeating the same words point to a particular and genre-relevant form of vocabulary development. Mujeeb et al. (2026) discover that AI-driven feedback improves vocabulary learning most effectively when integrated into contextualized writing tasks is consistent with this genre-specific vocabulary improvement mechanism. Student 3 reported that vocabulary enrichment makes their writing *"more creative"* as a result of AI-suggested word choices indicates. The benefits go beyond the quantifiable dimension of lexical variety to encompass a broader enhancement of students expressive and creative engagement with descriptive writing.

The findings of the current study add a significant contribution to the previous studies that mainly focuses on the quantitative results. Alongside the positive impacts of AI-based feedback on vocabulary improvement, Students 3 and 15 acknowledged a common and significant limitation: the danger of using AI-suggested words without fully comprehending their meaning or contextual appropriateness. Student 15 acknowledged that *"sometimes I use words that are too difficult without really understanding their meaning,"* and Student 3 emphasized the importance of *"ensuring the meaning of the words is correct."* These reports highlight lexical

overcorrection, a particular failure mode in AI-assisted vocabulary development. Students tends accept complex vocabulary recommendations from ChatGPT without having the semantic proficiency to assess whether those words are correctly or contextually appropriate. As a result, the text may seem to be lexically advanced on the surface, but at the level of precise word meaning, it may be semantically compromised. When properly integrated, AI-driven feedback improves vocabulary learning, a qualification that suggests the need for pedagogical scaffolding beyond simple tool access. Students must receive explicit instruction in critical vocabulary evaluation in addition to vocabulary feedback from ChatGPT. This means that students must be taught not only to accept AI-suggested words but also to confirm their meanings, evaluate their contextual appropriateness, and incorporate them into their active vocabulary through intentional, reflective engagement

4.3 Students Intention to continue use AI-Based feedback

As noted from the interview result, students at SMA Negeri 1 Tondano show a strong and consistent pattern of continued use intention. The results of the current study showed that 15 out of 16 students (93.75%) expressed affirmative or conditionally affirmative future use intentions Wong et al. (2025), in their study, reported that about 90% of students expressed willingness to use AI feedback again, with Technology Acceptance Model metrics scoring 80% and above. It means that strong continued use intention is not context-specific but rather represents a more general and repeatable pattern of positive orientation toward AI-based feedback among students who have benefited practically from the tool. However, several studies show modest to low intention to continue to use AI-Based in writing (Bongsu et al., 2025; Dawes & Melnikova, 2025). This finding suggests that the high continued use intention in the current study is significantly grounded in the generally positive usefulness perceptions documented throughout the interview data. Students consistently reported concrete grammar improvements, vocabulary enrichment, increased confidence, and enhanced writing efficiency as direct outcomes of ChatGPT use.

The findings of this study are in line with the emotional and motivational aspects of continued use intention. It is found that perceived enjoyment and technological optimism significantly influence continued use intention alongside cognitive factors. It also identifies emotional factors as significant drivers of continued use intention as it acknowledges that students' relationship with AI tools is shaped by affective experiences. As reported by Students 2, 4, 5, 13, and 14, the most commonly mentioned positive impact is essentially an affective rather than a purely cognitive outcome. This emotional dimension is evident in the interview data of the current study. The kind of positive affective engagement to be a significant predictor of continued use intention is reflected in Student 13 report of increased motivation as a positive impact of AI feedback.

4.4 The Positive and Negative Impacts

a. Positive Impacts

As shown in the findings, the use of AI-Based feedback clearly impacts students writing positively. Those studies reported that AI-Based feedback can improve students writing and have a strong correlation with students gains in writing. Ekizoğlu and Demir (2025) noted improvements in grammar, vocabulary, and coherence among students compared to those who only received traditional feedback. The result of the previous study is directly reflected in the interview result of the current study. 10 of 16 students (62.5%) said their grammar has improved. Student 2 reported that their grammar was *"more correct"* and their sentences were

"clearer," Student 9 reported that basic present tense mistakes were immediately fixed, and Student 14 reported that their sentence coherence and grammatical awareness had improved. Student 15 described richer and less repetitive word choices, while Student 3 attributed more creative and fascinating descriptions to AI-generated lexical options. 6 of 16 students (37.5%) claimed vocabulary enrichment. Although they were less common, students 7, 10, 11, and 12 reported structural improvements.

The findings of Urzúa et al. (2025) demonstrate equally compelling resonance with the larger affective, motivational, and self-efficacy outcomes. Increased self-efficacy, motivation, and decreased anxiety were found to be consistent affective outcomes of AI-based writing feedback across 12 research. The interview accounts in the current study strongly support this finding. Students 2, 4, 5, 13, and 14 reported increased writing confidences as the most frequently mentioned positive impact in the current data. It means that having access to immediate corrective feedback allows students to take on more challenging writing assignments with less fear of failing. The use of AI-Based feedback, as shown by Student 5 and Student 13, increased motivation caused by writing improvement.

b. Negative Impacts

The findings of the study show negative impacts posed by AI-Based feedback on students writing. It proved that over-reliance as the most frequently reported negative impact in writing. Their findings are strongly supported by the interview data from the current study, where 8 out of 16 students (50%) reported over-reliance. Students in the current study recognized over-reliance as an active and lived pattern in their own writing behavior rather than just acknowledging it as an abstract problem. Students 6, 7, 10, and 12 all recognized the need to *"maintain control,"* Student 5 stated that they occasionally relied "too much on AI," and Student 4 noted that they needed to *"learn to be less dependent"* control their usage as a prerequisite for responsible ongoing participation. A further important quantitative dimension to this issue is added by Chong (2019), who stated that the teacher feedback group outperformed the AI feedback group in fluency and functional adequacy among 41 students: even when AI feedback results in quantifiable gains in grammar and vocabulary, it may also cause deficits in fluency and functional writing adequacy that are hidden by aggregate writing scores.

Passive acceptance of AI corrections without true understanding emerged as a recurrent and pedagogically serious pattern. Student 14 admission of following recommendations *"without understanding the reasoning"* and Student 1 admission that *"sometimes I just copy the corrections without really understanding... because I want to get it done quickly."* One of the main drawbacks of utilizing AI feedback is that students delegate the cognitive tasks of lexical evaluation and grammatical reasoning to the AI. AI-Based feedback makes students avoid the laborious mental processes that lead to the development and internalization of true writing skill. In descriptive writing, which requires not only grammatical precision but also creative, expressive, and individualized language use, this passive correcting tendency is especially problematic. This finding it relates to the detrimental effects of AI feedback on the voice of individual writers. In other words, students routinely replace their own choices with AI-generated vocabulary and sentence structures. This is in line with what the students 3 and 15 admitted doing when adopting words "too difficult without really understanding their meaning." In this case, students regularly accept and apply AI corrections without question, instead of using them as reflection prompts, occupy an ambiguous position on the boundary between AI-generated writing and AI-assisted improvement.

The negative effects of AI-based feedback are not intrinsic and inevitable characteristics of the technology itself. It can be mitigated through intentional pedagogical integration with human instruction as supported by the findings of the current study. The findings of the current study turn the negative impact findings into a useful design challenge for writing instructors and curriculum developers. The interview by students 9 and 11 favor hybrid frameworks for AI use that kept teacher assistance as a crucial supplement. Student 11 pledged to use AI *"wisely,"* Student 9 made it clear that they needed teacher explanations *"so I really understand and dont just rely on AI alone."* These statements indicate that the type of critically mediated, teacher-complemented AI integration that the literature suggests as a remedy for over-reliance, erosion of critical thinking, and creative displacement. However, as noted by Student 1 interview result, instructor feedback is still more preferred since it is more responsive, personal and reliable. Thus, AI-based feedback needs to be integrated into a structured pedagogical framework that includes regular teacher-mediated discussion of feedback content.

5. Conclusion

The findings reveal a consistently positive overall perception across all four dimensions. The majority of students found ChatGPT easy and practical to use, attributing this to its conversational interface, simple copy-paste workflow, and the immediacy of feedback delivery. In terms of writing quality, grammar and vocabulary emerged as the dimensions most meaningfully improved through AI-based feedback. Structural improvement, while present in some accounts, was less consistently reported, reflecting a partial alignment between ChatGPT general-purpose feedback capabilities and the genre-specific structural conventions of descriptive text. Students reported meaningful affective gains including increased writing confidence, greater motivation, and expanded opportunities for independent learning.

The study also identifies significant concerns that qualify and complicate the broadly positive perception findings, most prominently the risk of over-reliance. Students described patterns of passive correction acceptance copying AI suggestions without genuinely understanding the underlying linguistic reasoning alongside reduced confidence in independent writing. It also diminished peer and teacher collaboration, and made the students adopt sophisticated vocabulary without sufficient semantic understanding to deploy it accurately. These findings of this study suggest that AI-based feedback is most effectively deployed not as a standalone writing improvement tool but as a carefully scaffolded component of a broader, teacher-mediated instructional framework. It harnesses its genuine strengths in grammar correction, vocabulary enrichment, and confidence building while actively cultivating students' capacity for independent reasoning, critical engagement with feedback, and autonomous writing competence.

Funding
The authors declare that they did not receive grant/funding in this research.

Conflict of interest
The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

Authors contribution
Kezia Tatipata: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Methodology, Writing –

original draft, Writing – review & editing.
Ignatius Javier Couturier Tuerah: Investigation, Methodology, Supervision, Validation, Writing – review & editing.
Herminus Efrando Pabur: Investigation, Methodology, Supervision, Validation, Writing – review & editing.

Statement of the use of AI
The authors declare that, during the process of writing this paper, they used generative AI to refine the grammar, readability, and language; however, all research outputs and content were reviewed and verified by the authors.

References
Abdeta, M. T., Olamo, T. G., & Woldeyes, K. M. (2026). Enhancing learners social skills in EFL classrooms: The role of collaborative writing instruction. *Acta Psychologica*, *263*, 106307. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2026.106307

Al-selwi, A. S. T. (2025). Artificial Intelligence: Implications for English Language Teaching. *Sakaguru: Journal of Pedagogical and Creative Teacher*, *2*(2), 81–90. https://doi.org/10.70211/sakaguru.v2i2.282

Al Yakin, A., Muthmainnah, M., Asad, M. M., & Almusharraf, N. M. (2026). Rethinking sociology education in human–robot social interaction learning ecosystems: a mixed method study. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSSP-08-2025-0566

Ali, O., Murray, P. A., Momin, M., Dwivedi, Y. K., & Malik, T. (2024). The effects of artificial intelligence applications in educational settings: Challenges and strategies. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *199*, 123076. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2023.123076

Alreshidi, S. M., Almutairi, A. A., El Malti, W., Jomaa, L., Dankar, M., & Fawaz, M. (2026). Perceptions of Lebanese students regarding Integration of Artificial Intelligence in English University courses. *Acta Psychologica*, *265*, 106629. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2026.106629

Apridayani, A., & Waluyo, B. (2025). Valuing students mindsets in essay compositions: Active learning and feedback approaches. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, *11*, 101273. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2024.101273

Atikah. (2026). The Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Teaching English Writing. *Jurnal Alwatzikhoebillah: Kajian Islam, Pendidikan, Ekonomi, Humaniora*, *12*(1), 653–660. https://doi.org/10.37567/alwatzikhoebillah.v12i1.5212

Berisha Qehaja, A. (2025). Strategic integration of artificial intelligence solutions to transform teaching practices in higher education. *Foresight*, *27*(5), 970–991. https://doi.org/10.1108/FS-04-2024-0079

Birgün, M. (2026). Integrating AI into Quran learning: Technical advances and pedagogical gaps. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, *13*, 102499. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2026.102499

Bongsu, S., Mohamed, W. N. M. N., & Mohamed, W. N. W. (2025). Determinants of Students Intention to Use AI-Powered Writing Tools in Academic Writing. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science (IJRISS)*, *IX*(III), 5616–5630. https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.903SEDU0411

Cai, Z., Gui, Y., Mao, P., Wang, Z., Hao, X., Fan, X., & Tai, R. H. (2023). The effect of feedback on academic achievement in technology-rich learning environments (TREs): A meta-

analytic review. *Educational Research Review*, *39*, 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2023.100521

Chakraborty, S. (2026). Generative artificial intelligence in fifth-generation education systems: A systematic review. *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence*, *173*, 114463. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engappai.2026.114463

Chong, S. W. (2019). A Systematic Review of Written Corrective Feedback Research in ESL/EFL Contexts. *Language Education & Assessment*, *2*(2), 70–95. https://doi.org/10.29140/lea.v2n2.138

Dawes, A. E., & Melnikova, M. (2025). AI as a writing feedback companion: Student beliefs. *JALTCALL Trends*, *1*(1), 2155. https://doi.org/10.29140/jct.v1n1.2155

Dissanayake, H., Manta, O., Iddagoda, A., & Palazzo, M. (2025). Artificial intelligence and management Education: Bibliometric analysis. *The International Journal of Management Education*, *23*(3), 101222. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2025.101222

Ekizer, F. N. (2025). Exploring the impact of artificial intelligence on English language teaching: A meta-analysis. *Acta Psychologica*, *260*, 105649. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2025.105649

Ekizoğlu, M., & Demir, A. N. (2025). The role of AI assisted writing feedback in developing secondary students writing skills. *Discover Education*, *4:454*, 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-025-00919-3

Fathimatuzahro, M., & Rizkiyah, F. (2025). AI-driven feedback in EFL students writing: Does it enhance their skills? *Celtic : A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching, Literature and Linguistics*, *12*(1), 637–657. https://doi.org/10.22219/celtic.v12i1.40594

Gan, Z., He, J., Zhang, L. J., & Schumacker, R. (2023). Examining the Relationships between Feedback Practices and Learning Motivation Examining the Relationships between Feedback Practices and. *Measurement: Interdisciplinary Research and Perspectives*, *21*(1), 38–50. https://doi.org/10.1080/15366367.2022.2061236

Hu, H., Gong, Q., & Harwati, H. (2026). The Impact of ChatGPT-Generated Feedback on English Academic Writing Proficiency and Engagement: A Mixed-Methods Study. *SAGE Open*, *16*(3), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440261480859

Hyland, K. (2026). EFL teachers and feedback fatigue: AI to the rescue? *Language Teaching*, *59*(3), 310–326. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444825101018

Kristianto, V. A., Sucipto, Handayani, S., & Yuhanafia, N. (2025). Evaluation of the Feedback Impact Generated by Generative Artificial Intelligence on Writing Ability in Descriptive Texts. *Language Circle: Journal of Language and Literature*, *20*(1), 428–439. https://doi.org/10.15294/lc.v19i2.21540

Kurt, G., & Kurt, Y. (2024). Enhancing L2 Writing Skills: ChatGpt as an Automated Feedback Tool. *Journal of Information Technology Education: Research*, *23*. https://doi.org/10.28945/5370

Laila, N., & Daulay, E. (2024). Students Perception of Using Quillbot to Improve Students Writing Skills. *Indonesian EFL Journal*, *10*(2), 223–232. https://doi.org/10.25134/ieflj.v10i2.10083

Maharani, M. M., Nugroho, A. A., Widiyati, E., & Hidayati, N. (2024). Descriptive Text Writing in the Perspective of Surface Strategy Taxonomy. *Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research*, *5*(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.30659/JAMR.4.2.1-12

Malik, A. R., Pratiwi, Y., Andajani, K., Numertayasa, I. W., Suharti, S., Darwis, A., & Marzuki. (2023). Exploring Artificial Intelligence in Academic Essay: Higher Education Students Perspective. *International Journal of Educational Research Open*, *5*, 100296.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2023.100296

Matsumur, L. C., Patthey-Chave, G. G., Valdes, R., & Garnier, H. (2002). Teacher Feedback, Writing Assignment Quality, and Third- Grade Students Revision in Lower-and Higher-Achieving Urban Schools. *The Elementary School Journal*, *103*(1), 3–25. http://www.jstor.org/stable/1002306

Mujeeb, N., Lodhi, M. A., Ali, A., Mashwani, W. K., Mostafa, S. M., & Ahmadini, A. A. H. (2026). Beyond red ink: AI feedback and ESL academic writing development in higher education. *Language Testing in Asia*, *16*(24), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-026-00442-8

Nedrehagen, E., Vee, T. S., Stokstad, J. M., & Orm, S. (2025). A scoping review of dialogic formative feedback practices in higher education. *Frontiers in Education*, *10*. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1696703

Nurfidoh, S., & Kareviati, E. (2021). An Analysis of Students Difficulties in Writing Descriptive Texts. *PROJECT (Professional Journal of English Education)*, *4*(1), 16–22. https://doi.org/10.22460/project.v4i1.p16-22

Pham, A. N. M., Doan, A. N., Tran, T. T., Truong, H. N., & Nguyen, T. P. (2026). The impact of student engagement on student satisfaction in an English as the medium of instruction environment at a private university in Vietnam. *Acta Psychologica*, *263*, 106315. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2026.106315

Qiao, S., Gu, M. M., & Lu, C. (2025). Artificial Intelligence for Language Learning: A Systematic Review of its Design, Theoretical Foundations, Implementation, and Impact. *International Journal OfApplied Linguistics*, *36*(1), 3183–3202. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.70034

Ritchie, J., & Lewis, J. (2003). Qualitative Research Practice: A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers. In *Journal of Social Intervention: Theory and Practice*. Sage Publication Ltd. https://doi.org/10.18352/jsi.39

Sankaran, S., & Fin, L. S. (2025). Effectiveness of Feedback on Continuous Assessment: Students Views. *Asian Journal of Assessment in Teaching and Learning*, *15*(1), 49–62. https://doi.org/10.37134/ajatel.vol15.1.4.2025

Sayfiddinova, N. (2025). The Role of Artificial Intelligence in Enhancing English Language Teachers Professional Competence. *Pubmedia Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris*, *3*(1), 1–6. https://doi.org/10.47134/jpbi.v3i1.2345

Schreier, M. (2024). *Qualitative Content Analysis in Practice* (1st ed.). Sage Publication Ltd. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781529682571

Shi, H., & Aryadoust, V. (2024). A systematic review of AI-based automated written feedback research. *ReCall*, 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0958344023000265

Suryanarayana, K. S., Kandi, V. S. P., Pavani, G., Rao, A. S., Rout, S., & Siva Rama Krishna, T. (2024). Artificial Intelligence Enhanced Digital Learning for the Sustainability of Education Management System. *The Journal of High Technology Management Research*, *35*(2), 100495. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hitech.2024.100495

Tang, W. K.-W., & Zhang, X.-Y. (2026). Artificial Intelligence in English as a foreign language learning: A systematic review of technologies, tools, and their impacts. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *10*, 100595. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2026.100595

Thomas, K., Khandakar, A., Ayari, M. A., Naji, K., Al-Ali, A., Sellami, A. L., Al-Hazbi, S. M. A., & Ahamed, M. F. (2026). Artificial intelligence in the metaverse: Innovations, challenges, and future directions. *Computers and Electrical Engineering*, *137*, 111262. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compeleceng.2026.111262

Torres, P. J., & Kahveci, Y. E. (2025). Effectiveness of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in language teaching. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *9*, 100522. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2025.100522

Ukwandu, E., Omisade, O., Jones, K., Thorne, S., & Castle, M. (2025). The future of teaching and learning in the context of emerging artificial intelligence technologies. *Futures*, *171*, 103616. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2025.103616

Urzúa, C. A. C., Ranjan, R., Saavedra, E. E. M., Badilla-Quintana, M. G., Lepe-Martínez, N., & Philominraj, A. (2025). Effects of AI-Assisted Feedback via Generative Chat on Academic Writing in Higher Education Students: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *Education Sciences*, *15*(10), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15101396

Wahyuni, S., Dewi, D. S., Wulandari, R. S., Thohiriyah, Kurniadi, D., Muawanah, F. H., Chairunnisa, N. Z., & Ardhi, M. A. (2026). Evaluating students perceptions, writing outcomes, and challenges in using AI-based feedback systems for english academic writing. *Multidisciplinary Reviews*, *9*(8), 2026380. https://doi.org/10.31893/multirev.2026380

Wisniewski, B., Zierer, K., & Hattie, J. (2020). The Power of Feedback Revisited: A Meta-Analysis of Educational Feedback Research. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *10*, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.03087

Yang, N., Gao, N., & Zhang, T. (2025). Artificial Intelligence in EFL Writing Enhancement: A Study on Chatbot Feedback and Learner Autonomy. *International Journal of Web-Based Learning and Teaching Technologies*, *20*(1), 1–40. https://doi.org/10.4018/IJWLTT.390442

Yin, R. K. (2017). *Case Study Research and Applications: Design and Methods* (6th ed.). Sage.

Zhang, L., & Wang, T. (2026). Intelligent Teaching of Higher Ideological and Political Education Using Artificial Intelligence. *Journal of Cases on Information Technology*, *28*(1). https://doi.org/10.4018/JCIT.402016