Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 5, May, 2026
Website: usajournals.org
This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

MAJOR DIFFICULTIES IN IMPLEMENTING AI TOOLS TO IMPROVE WRITING COMPETENCE

Bobur Suyunov
Head of Department, Lecturer, Narpay foreign languages faculty,
Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages, Samarkand, Uzbekistan
Independent Researcher, Uzbekistan National Pedagogical University
Tashkent, Uzbekistan
E-mail: bobur.suyunov.95@gmail.com
+998979130403

Abstract

Artificial intelligence (AI) tools are increasingly used to support writing in English language education, offering opportunities for grammar correction, vocabulary development, idea generation, text organization, and personalized feedback. Despite these possibilities, the implementation of AI tools in writing instruction involves substantial pedagogical, technological, ethical, and linguistic challenges. This article examines the major difficulties associated with integrating AI-assisted writing tools into English language learning and proposes practical approaches for addressing them. The study employs a narrative literature review and conceptual analysis of research on automated writing evaluation, AI-supported language learning, academic integrity, digital literacy, and human–AI collaboration. The analysis identifies several interrelated challenges: inaccurate or misleading feedback, overdependence on automated assistance, reduced learner autonomy, academic integrity concerns, privacy and data-protection risks, unequal access to technology, limited contextual and cultural sensitivity, and difficulties in assessing authentic writing competence. Examples from B2-level writing instruction illustrate how AI-generated corrections may improve surface-level accuracy while overlooking argument quality, intended meaning, or genre conventions. The article argues that AI should be treated as a supportive educational resource rather than a substitute for learner thinking or teacher expertise. Effective implementation requires explicit AI literacy instruction, transparent classroom policies, task designs that emphasize drafting and

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 5, May, 2026
Website: usajournals.org
This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

reflection, verification of AI-generated suggestions, and assessment methods that make learners' writing processes visible. The article concludes that the educational value of AI depends less on the availability of a particular tool than on the quality of the pedagogical framework in which it is used. Since this article is based on a narrative review and conceptual analysis rather than original experimental data, its proposed strategies should be tested through future empirical research.

Keywords: Artificial intelligence, AI-assisted writing, English language learning, writing competence, automated writing evaluation, academic integrity, digital literacy, learner autonomy, feedback, educational technology.

Аннотация

Инструменты искусственного интеллекта (ИИ) всё активнее используются в обучении письменной речи на английском языке. Они предоставляют возможности для исправления грамматических ошибок, расширения словарного запаса, генерации идей, организации текста и получения персонализированной обратной связи. Однако внедрение ИИ в обучение письму сопровождается существенными педагогическими, технологическими, этическими и языковыми трудностями. В статье рассматриваются основные проблемы использования ИИ-инструментов в развитии письменной компетенции и предлагаются практические способы их преодоления. Исследование основано на нарративном обзоре научной литературы и концептуальном анализе работ, посвящённых автоматизированному оцениванию письменных работ, цифровому обучению языкам, академической добросовестности, цифровой грамотности и взаимодействию человека с ИИ. Выявлены взаимосвязанные проблемы: неточность или неоднозначность автоматической обратной связи, чрезмерная зависимость учащихся от цифровых инструментов, снижение самостоятельности, риски нарушения академической добросовестности, вопросы конфиденциальности и защиты данных, неравный доступ к технологиям, недостаточная чувствительность к культурному и коммуникативному контексту, а также сложности оценки

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 5, May, 2026
Website: usajournals.org
This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

подлинных навыков письма. Примеры заданий уровня B2 показывают, что ИИ может исправлять поверхностные языковые ошибки, но при этом не всегда распознаёт слабую аргументацию, авторский замысел или особенности жанра. В статье подчёркивается, что ИИ должен выступать вспомогательным образовательным ресурсом, а не заменой самостоятельного мышления учащегося или профессиональной компетенции преподавателя. Эффективное внедрение требует обучения работе с ИИ, прозрачных правил его использования, заданий, ориентированных на процесс написания и рефлексию, проверки автоматически созданных рекомендаций и методов оценивания, позволяющих проследить ход работы над текстом. Поскольку статья основана на обзоре литературы и концептуальном анализе, предложенные решения нуждаются в дальнейшей эмпирической проверке.

Ключевые слова: искусственный интеллект, письмо с использованием искусственного интеллекта, изучение английского языка, письменная компетенция, автоматизированная оценка письменных работ, академическая честность, цифровая грамотность, автономия обучающегося, обратная связь,
образовательные технологии.

Annotatsiya
Sun’iy intellekt (SI) vositalari ingliz tilida yozish ko‘nikmalarini rivojlantirishda tobora keng qo‘llanilmoqda. Ular grammatik xatolarni aniqlash, lug‘at boyligini kengaytirish, g‘oyalar ishlab chiqish, matn tuzilishini yaxshilash va individual fikr-mulohaza olish imkonini beradi. Shu bilan birga, SI vositalarini yozma nutqni o‘rgatish jarayoniga joriy etish pedagogik, texnologik, axloqiy va lingvistik qiyinchiliklarni yuzaga keltiradi. Ushbu maqolada ingliz tilida yozish kompetensiyasini rivojlantirish uchun SI vositalaridan foydalanishdagi asosiy muammolar tahlil qilinadi hamda ularni bartaraf etish bo‘yicha amaliy tavsiyalar ishlab chiqiladi. Tadqiqot avtomatlashtirilgan yozuvni baholash, SI yordamida til o‘rganish, akademik halollik, raqamli savodxonlik va inson–SI hamkorligiga oid ilmiy adabiyotlarning narrativ sharhi hamda konseptual tahliliga asoslanadi.

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 5, May, 2026
Website: usajournals.org
This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

Tahlil natijasida avtomatik fikr-mulohazaning noto‘g‘ri yoki chalg‘ituvchi bo‘lishi, o‘quvchilarning texnologiyaga ortiqcha qaramligi, mustaqil fikrlashning susayishi, akademik halollik bilan bog‘liq muammolar, shaxsiy ma’lumotlarni himoya qilish xatarlari, texnologiyalardan teng foydalanish imkoniyatining mavjud emasligi, madaniy va kommunikativ kontekstni to‘liq hisobga olmaslik hamda haqiqiy yozish kompetensiyasini baholashdagi qiyinchiliklar aniqlanadi. B2 darajasidagi yozma topshiriqlar misolida SI ayrim grammatik xatolarni tuzatishi mumkinligi, biroq dalillarning kuchi, muallif maqsadi yoki janr talablarini har doim ham to‘g‘ri baholay olmasligi ko‘rsatiladi. Maqolada sun’iy intellekt o‘quvchi tafakkuri va o‘qituvchi tajribasining o‘rnini bosuvchi vosita emas, balki ta’limni qo‘llab-quvvatlovchi resurs sifatida qaralishi kerakligi ta’kidlanadi. Samarali foydalanish uchun SI savodxonligini rivojlantirish, aniq foydalanish qoidalarini belgilash, yozish jarayoni va refleksiyaga asoslangan topshiriqlarni tashkil etish, SI tavsiyalarini tekshirish hamda o‘quvchining mustaqil mehnatini ko‘rsatadigan baholash usullaridan foydalanish zarur. Maqola narrativ sharh va konseptual tahlilga asoslangani sababli, taklif etilgan yechimlar kelgusida empirik tadqiqotlar orqali sinovdan o‘tkazilishi lozim.

Kalit so‘zlar: sun’iy intellekt, sun’iy intellekt yordamida yozish, ingliz tilini o‘rganish, yozuv kompetensiyasi, yozma ishlarni avtomatlashtirilgan baholash, akademik halollik, raqamli savodxonlik, ta’lim oluvchining mustaqilligi, qayta aloqa, ta’lim texnologiyalari.

INTRODUCTION

Writing is a complex language skill that requires learners to coordinate grammar, vocabulary, organization, critical thinking, genre awareness, and an understanding of the intended audience. For learners of English as a foreign language, producing a clear and coherent text can be especially demanding because they must manage linguistic accuracy while developing ideas and communicating a meaningful message. At the B2 level of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), learners are expected to produce clear, detailed texts on a range of subjects, develop arguments, support opinions with relevant reasons and examples, and adapt their language to different

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 5, May, 2026
Website: usajournals.org
This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

communicative purposes (Council of Europe, 2020). These requirements cannot be fulfilled through grammar correction alone: effective writing also depends on the ability to select relevant content, organize ideas logically, evaluate evidence, and revise a text in response to feedback. The growing availability of artificial intelligence tools has created new possibilities for supporting this process. AI-based writing assistants can suggest grammatical corrections, identify repeated vocabulary, offer alternative expressions, generate outlines, summarize information, and provide comments on coherence or tone. Tools such as grammar assistants, automated writing evaluation systems, and generative conversational models may offer rapid support that learners can access beyond classroom hours. For example, a student writing an opinion essay about online learning may ask an AI assistant to identify unclear sentences, suggest more precise vocabulary, or explain why a paragraph lacks a clear topic sentence. Used critically, such assistance can make feedback more immediate and give learners additional opportunities to review their work.

Nevertheless, the presence of AI does not automatically lead to improved writing competence. AI systems can generate inaccurate explanations, misunderstand a writer's intention, recommend unnecessarily complicated language, or produce fluent but unsupported claims. Learners may accept suggested revisions without understanding the underlying language principles, and some may rely on AI to generate entire assignments rather than using it to develop their own ideas. Such practices can reduce the amount of meaningful writing practice and make it difficult for teachers to determine what a student can accomplish independently. UNESCO (2023) therefore emphasizes the importance of a human-centred approach to generative AI in education, including attention to educational purpose, privacy, inclusion, and the role of human agency. The implementation of AI in writing instruction also raises questions of fairness and access. Students may have different levels of digital literacy, different levels of access to reliable internet connections and paid tools, and different abilities to formulate effective prompts or evaluate AI-generated responses. In addition, AI systems may not always respond appropriately to culturally specific examples, local contexts, or the conventions of a particular academic genre. A suggested expression may be grammatically correct but unsuitable for a formal complaint letter, a research

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 5, May, 2026
Website: usajournals.org
This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

abstract, or a persuasive essay. Teachers must therefore help students understand that the fluency of an AI-generated answer does not guarantee its accuracy, relevance, or appropriateness.

The central problem addressed in this article is the gap between the potential of AI to support writing and the practical difficulties that arise when these tools are introduced into language education without sufficient guidance. The article asks: What are the major difficulties in implementing AI tools to improve English writing competence, and what pedagogical strategies can help address them? Its objectives are to identify the principal challenges, illustrate how they may appear in B2-level writing tasks, and propose a framework for responsible and effective classroom use. The article argues that AI is most educationally valuable when it supports learners' planning, drafting, feedback interpretation, and revision while preserving the learner's responsibility for the final text.

METHODOLOGY

This article uses a narrative literature review and conceptual analysis to examine the difficulties associated with implementing AI tools in writing instruction. A narrative review is suitable for synthesizing ideas from different research areas, including automated writing evaluation, computer-assisted language learning, generative AI in education, academic integrity, and digital literacy. The purpose is not to calculate a pooled statistical effect or claim that a new intervention has been experimentally validated, but to organize relevant findings and develop practical recommendations for English language teaching.

The conceptual analysis draws on established work concerning automated writing evaluation and feedback, including research by Warschauer and Grimes (2008) and Stevenson and Phakiti (2014), alongside literature on AI-supported language learning and the use of generative AI in education. The CEFR Companion Volume (Council of Europe, 2020) provides the basis for defining B2-level writing expectations, while UNESCO's guidance on generative AI in education and research (2023) informs the discussion of human agency, responsible use, privacy, and educational policy. Research on large language models and AI writing support, including Kasneci et al. (2023), is considered to clarify both potential benefits and limitations. The analysis was organized into four stages.

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 5, May, 2026
Website: usajournals.org
This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

First, the key learning demands of B2-level writing were identified, including content development, cohesion, coherence, lexical range, grammatical accuracy, register, and independent revision. Second, the principal uses of AI in writing were mapped, including grammar correction, vocabulary support, idea generation, outlining, feedback, and text revision. Third, the main implementation difficulties were grouped into pedagogical, linguistic, ethical, technological, and assessment-related categories. Finally, practical examples and recommendations were developed to show how teachers and students can use AI while retaining human judgment and learner responsibility. The examples in this article are illustrative scenarios rather than data collected from a participant sample. No original experiment, survey, interview, classroom observation, or statistical analysis was conducted for this conceptual review. Accordingly, the article does not report sample sizes, pre-test and post-test scores, or causal claims about the effectiveness of any specific AI tool. Its recommendations should be interpreted as theoretically informed guidance that can be evaluated in future classroom-based research.

RESULTS

The conceptual analysis identifies eight major difficulties in implementing AI tools to improve writing competence: unreliable feedback, overdependence and reduced learner autonomy, academic integrity concerns, privacy and data protection, unequal access and digital literacy, limited contextual sensitivity, challenges in assessing authentic competence, and insufficient teacher preparation and institutional guidance. These difficulties are interrelated. For example, a learner who cannot evaluate AI-generated feedback may accept inaccurate corrections, while a teacher without a clear institutional policy may struggle to distinguish appropriate assistance from inappropriate substitution of the learner's own work. One major difficulty is that AI-generated feedback is not always correct, complete, or appropriate for the learner's purpose. Automated tools can identify many spelling and grammatical errors, but writing quality involves more than surface-level correctness. A sentence may be grammatically accurate while presenting an unsupported claim, an unclear reference, or a weak connection with the paragraph's main idea. Generative AI can also offer confident

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 5, May, 2026
Website: usajournals.org
This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

explanations that are incomplete or mistaken, making it necessary for learners to verify suggestions rather than accepting them automatically. For example, a B2-level learner might write: "Although online education is convenient, it can reduce students' opportunities to develop communication skills." An AI assistant could recommend replacing "reduce" with "eliminate" to make the sentence sound stronger. However, "eliminate" changes the meaning by suggesting that online education removes communication opportunities entirely. The original wording may be more accurate because it expresses a limitation without exaggerating the claim. If the learner accepts the revision without considering its meaning, the sentence may become less precise despite appearing more emphatic. AI tools may also over-edit a student's writing by replacing clear language with complex expressions that exceed the learner's current ability or do not fit the intended genre. In formal academic writing, a suggestion can sound sophisticated while obscuring the original point. Teachers should therefore encourage learners to compare the original sentence with the revised version, identify the nature of the proposed change, and decide whether it improves meaning, accuracy, and appropriateness. A useful classroom rule is that every substantial AI-generated revision should be explainable by the learner. A second difficulty arises when students become dependent on AI to generate ideas, construct paragraphs, select vocabulary, and correct every sentence. Although these functions may save time, excessive reliance can reduce opportunities to practise the cognitive and linguistic processes through which writing competence develops. If learners repeatedly submit AI-generated text without planning or drafting independently, they may produce polished assignments while remaining unable to reproduce the same performance without assistance. Consider a student asked to write a B2-level opinion essay about whether university attendance should be compulsory. If the student asks an AI system to generate the entire essay, copies the response, and submits it, the assignment provides little evidence of the student's ability to formulate a position, develop arguments, or organize paragraphs. By contrast, the student could first create an outline independently, write a draft, and then ask the AI tool to identify unclear arguments or recurring grammar problems. The student would remain responsible for deciding which suggestions to accept and for producing the final version. The educational distinction is between AI as a

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 5, May, 2026
Website: usajournals.org
This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

substitute for thinking and AI as a support for thinking. To strengthen autonomy, teachers can require students to submit an initial outline, a first draft, a short record of selected AI suggestions, and a revised version accompanied by a reflection explaining the changes. Such a process encourages learners to use AI purposefully and makes the development of the text more visible. It also helps students recognize that the objective of writing instruction is not merely to produce a flawless final document, but to develop the ability to communicate independently and effectively. Academic integrity is one of the most widely discussed challenges associated with generative AI. The boundary between acceptable assistance and inappropriate substitution is not always obvious. Grammar correction, brainstorming, and feedback may be permitted in some courses, whereas generating a complete assignment and presenting it as entirely independent work may violate institutional expectations. Different institutions and instructors may adopt different rules, so learners need explicit guidance rather than assumptions about what is allowed. For example, using an AI tool to explain the difference between “although” and “despite” can be a legitimate learning activity. Asking the tool to generate a complete essay and submitting it without disclosure may misrepresent the student’s work. A more responsible procedure would involve using AI to clarify a concept or identify possible weaknesses, checking the suggestions, writing or revising the text personally, and disclosing AI assistance when required by the institution or assignment instructions. Teachers should establish clear, task-specific policies that explain whether AI can be used for brainstorming, language correction, outlining, paraphrasing, translation, or full-text generation. These policies should also clarify when disclosure is necessary and how students can document their use of AI. Assessment should focus not only on the final product but also on the learner’s ability to explain the argument, justify language choices, respond to questions, and demonstrate an understanding of the submitted work. The aim should be to uphold academic integrity while teaching responsible use, rather than relying solely on punishment or attempting to prohibit every form of AI assistance. AI writing tools may require users to enter drafts, personal details, educational information, or unpublished research into an external platform. Depending on the service and its settings, submitted content may be stored or processed in ways

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 5, May, 2026
Website: usajournals.org
This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

that learners do not fully understand. This creates concerns about privacy, confidentiality, ownership of student work, and the handling of sensitive information. Students may unknowingly upload personal details or confidential institutional material when seeking writing feedback. For instance, a student preparing a reflective essay about a family experience might paste a draft containing names, contact information, or sensitive personal details into an AI system. If these details are unnecessary for the writing task, sharing them creates avoidable privacy risks. Similarly, teachers should be cautious about entering identifiable student essays or confidential assessment materials into external systems without authorization and an understanding of the platform's data practices. Responsible implementation requires teachers and institutions to explain what information should not be shared, review the privacy terms of approved tools, and follow relevant institutional and legal requirements. Learners should be encouraged to remove names and identifying details before requesting feedback and to use institutionally approved platforms where available. Privacy is not a secondary technical issue: it is part of the ethical conditions under which AI can be used in education. Access to AI tools is not equally distributed. Some students have reliable internet connections, modern devices, and access to advanced paid features, while others may depend on shared devices, limited mobile data, or free versions with restricted functionality. If assignments assume that every student has identical access, AI-supported writing instruction may unintentionally widen existing educational inequalities. Differences in digital literacy can create further disparities because students vary in their ability to formulate prompts, assess generated content, and use feedback effectively. For example, two students may be asked to improve the same essay using AI. One student may know how to request feedback on coherence without asking the tool to rewrite the entire text, while the other may enter a broad instruction such as "Make this perfect" and receive a complete rewrite that is difficult to learn from. The difference in outcomes may reflect prompt-writing experience and digital literacy as much as English proficiency. Teachers can reduce these inequalities by teaching basic AI literacy explicitly and offering alternatives for students who cannot access a particular platform. Activities can be completed using approved free tools, printed feedback

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 5, May, 2026
Website: usajournals.org
This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

examples, teacher-created sample outputs, or peer-review procedures. The core learning objective should remain achievable without requiring students to purchase a subscription. Institutions should also consider whether their technology policies create fair conditions for all learners and provide support where possible.

AI systems may generate fluent language without fully understanding the communicative context in which a text will be used. Appropriate writing depends on purpose, audience, genre, cultural expectations, and the relationship between the writer and reader. A phrase that is acceptable in an informal discussion may be inappropriate in a formal email, while a direct translation may preserve the words of an expression but fail to communicate its intended meaning naturally.

For example, a student writing a formal email to a university administrator may ask an AI tool to make the message "more friendly." The tool could produce expressions that sound overly casual or insufficiently respectful for the institutional relationship. Similarly, an AI-generated example about university life may reflect assumptions that do not fit the student's local context. Learners should not assume that an answer is universally appropriate simply because it is grammatically fluent.

Teachers can address this challenge by asking learners to evaluate AI suggestions against the genre, audience, and purpose of the assignment. Students might compare two versions of a formal email and explain which is more suitable for the intended recipient. They can also be asked to replace generic examples with relevant evidence from their own context and to check factual claims against reliable sources. This approach develops pragmatic competence and critical awareness rather than encouraging uncritical imitation of AI-generated language.

AI tools complicate the assessment of writing because a polished final text may not accurately represent the student's independent ability. Traditional assessment often emphasizes the final product, but AI-assisted writing makes it more important to understand how the text was developed and what the learner can explain or reproduce independently. At the same time, AI-detection tools are not fully reliable and should not be treated as definitive proof that a student has used AI improperly. False accusations can damage trust and unfairly penalize learners. A more balanced assessment strategy combines the final written product with

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 5, May, 2026
Website: usajournals.org
This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

evidence of the writing process. Teachers can collect outlines, drafts, revision histories where appropriate, brief reflections, and explanations of major language choices. Short in-class writing tasks or oral discussions can provide additional evidence of independent competence. For example, after submitting an essay on online education, a student might be asked to explain the strongest supporting argument, justify the use of a particular linking expression, or revise a paragraph in class. These activities help teachers evaluate understanding rather than relying exclusively on the appearance of the final text. Assessment rubrics should also distinguish between linguistic accuracy, content development, organization, lexical range, and task fulfilment. AI can improve some surface-level features while leaving deeper weaknesses unchanged. Therefore, a text should not receive a high evaluation merely because it contains few grammatical errors. The student's ability to develop relevant arguments, use evidence, maintain coherence, and adapt the text to its purpose remains central to writing competence. Effective implementation depends on teachers' ability to select suitable tools, explain their limitations, design meaningful activities, and evaluate AI-assisted work fairly. Without appropriate preparation, teachers may either reject potentially useful tools or use them without clear learning objectives. Unclear institutional policies can create inconsistent expectations across courses, leaving students uncertain about permitted practices and disclosure requirements. Professional development should include practical instruction in prompt design, verification of generated information, privacy-aware use, feedback evaluation, academic integrity, and the integration of AI into writing-process pedagogy. Teachers also need opportunities to compare outputs from different tools, identify recurring weaknesses, and discuss how AI can support learners at different proficiency levels. Institutional guidance should provide transparent rules and examples rather than relying on vague statements such as "use AI responsibly." A coherent implementation plan can begin with a limited, clearly defined activity, such as asking students to use an AI tool to identify possible cohesion problems in a paragraph. The teacher can model how to verify each suggestion, discuss examples of incorrect feedback, and require students to explain their decisions. Once learners understand the process, AI support can be introduced into outlining, revision, and self-assessment activities. Gradual implementation is more likely to

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 5, May, 2026
Website: usajournals.org
This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

develop critical competence than simply giving students access to a tool and expecting them to use it effectively.

DISCUSSION

The analysis suggests that the principal challenge in AI-assisted writing is not simply the presence of technical errors, but the need to maintain a productive relationship between technological assistance and human learning. AI can provide rapid feedback and help learners notice language patterns, but the educational value of that feedback depends on the learner's ability to interpret, verify, and apply it. If students accept every suggestion without reflection, the tool may improve the appearance of a text while contributing little to the development of independent competence. If students compare alternatives, check meanings, and justify revisions, AI can become a resource for active learning. This distinction is particularly important at B2 level, where learners are expected to move beyond basic sentence accuracy and develop clear, detailed, well-organized texts. A learner may correct articles and verb forms with AI support but still struggle to build a convincing argument or select relevant evidence. Consequently, teachers should integrate AI into a broader writing process that includes idea generation, planning, drafting, feedback, revision, and reflection. Each stage should have a clear learning objective, and students should understand which decisions remain their own responsibility. The findings also indicate that AI literacy should be treated as part of language education rather than as a separate technical skill. Learners need to know how to formulate focused requests, compare generated alternatives, recognize uncertainty, verify facts, protect private information, and acknowledge assistance according to institutional rules. For example, instead of asking an AI system to rewrite an entire essay, a student could ask it to identify two places where the argument needs more explanation without changing the original wording. This narrower request preserves the student's authorship and directs attention towards a specific writing skill.

A human-centred approach also requires a reconsideration of assessment. Final-product assessment remains important, but it should be complemented by evidence of the learner's process and understanding. Drafts, short reflections, in-

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 5, May, 2026
Website: usajournals.org
This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

class writing, oral explanations, and revision decisions can provide a more comprehensive picture of competence. Such assessment does not require teachers to prohibit all AI use; rather, it makes the purpose and boundaries of assistance explicit. It also reduces dependence on automated AI-detection tools, whose results should be interpreted cautiously and never treated as conclusive evidence on their own. Equity and privacy must be considered alongside pedagogy. Students should not be disadvantaged because they cannot afford a premium AI service or because their internet access is limited. Likewise, the convenience of obtaining feedback should not encourage learners to share sensitive personal information or confidential academic material. Institutional policies, accessible alternatives, and clear guidance can help ensure that the benefits of AI are not limited to students with greater technological resources. These conclusions should be interpreted in light of the article's methodological limitations. The study synthesizes selected literature and develops a conceptual framework; it does not establish that the recommended practices produce measurable gains in writing performance. Future research could compare different levels of AI support, such as grammar-only feedback, guided revision feedback, and unrestricted text generation, while measuring changes in writing quality and independent performance. Researchers could also examine whether students with different levels of English proficiency benefit in different ways, how teachers implement AI policies, and how learners' critical AI literacy develops over time. Studies conducted in Uzbek EFL settings would be particularly useful for understanding local access conditions, educational expectations, and the needs of students preparing for CEFR-based assessments.

CONCLUSION

Artificial intelligence tools offer meaningful opportunities to support English writing instruction through rapid feedback, language suggestions, idea development, and assistance with revision. However, their implementation creates significant challenges involving feedback reliability, learner dependence, academic integrity, privacy, unequal access, contextual appropriateness, assessment validity, and teacher preparation. These challenges demonstrate that access to AI alone is insufficient to improve writing competence. The quality of

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 5, May, 2026
Website: usajournals.org
This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

the learning process depends on how tools are selected, how their outputs are evaluated, and whether learners remain actively responsible for their own writing. The article proposes that AI should be used as a guided assistant rather than as a replacement for independent thinking or teacher expertise. Students should first engage with their own ideas and drafts, then use AI for a clearly defined purpose, verify its recommendations, decide which changes are appropriate, and reflect on the final result. Teachers can support this process by establishing transparent policies, teaching AI literacy, protecting student data, providing equitable alternatives, and assessing both the final text and the process through which it was produced. At B2 level, particular attention should be given to argument development, cohesion, vocabulary, grammatical control, register, and the ability to explain and defend writing choices. In conclusion, responsible AI integration requires a balance between technological innovation and established principles of language learning. AI tools can make writing support more accessible and responsive, but they cannot independently guarantee accuracy, originality, critical thinking, or communicative effectiveness. Their educational value emerges when they are embedded in a carefully designed process that promotes learner agency, critical evaluation, ethical practice, and continuous improvement. Further empirical research is needed to determine which forms of AI assistance are most effective, under what conditions, and for which learners.

REFERENCES

1. Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment—Companion volume. Council of Europe Publishing. https://www.coe.int/en/web/common-european-framework-reference-languages/cefr-companion-volume
2. 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
3. Kasneci, E., Sessler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., Gasser, U., Groh, G., Günnemann, S., Hüllermeier, E., Krusche, S., Kutyniok, G., Michaeli, T., Nerdel, C., Pfeffer, J., Poquet, O., Sailer, M., Schmidt, A., Seidel,

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 5, May, 2026
Website: usajournals.org
This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

T., ... Kasneci, G. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. Learning and Individual Differences, 103, Article 102274. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274
4. Miao, F., & Holmes, W. (2023). Guidance for generative AI in education and research. UNESCO. https://doi.org/10.54675/EWZM9535
Stevenson, M., & Phakiti, A. (2014). The effects of computer-generated feedback on the quality of writing. Assessing Writing, 19, 51–65. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2013.11.007
5. UNESCO. (2023). Guidance for generative AI in education and research. UNESCO. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000386693
Warschauer, M., & Grimes, D. (2008). Automated writing assessment in the classroom. Pedagogies: An International Journal, 3(1), 22–36. https://doi.org/10.1080/15544800701771580
6. 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
7. Teng, M. F., & Huang, J. (2026). Assessing ChatGPT feedback for EFL learners' engagement and writing performance. International Journal of Applied Linguistics. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.70155.