

AI-powered Feedback in Continuation Task: Strategies and Pedagogical Implications

Yuyin Sheng

China West Normal University, Nanchong, Sichuan, China

Abstract: This study proposes a pedagogical framework for integrating AI-powered feedback into continuation task. While automated systems offer immediate corrective feedback, their limitations in evaluating narrative coherence necessitate hybrid models. Drawing on recent empirical studies, this paper outlines strategies combining AI efficiency with teacher mediation to enhance L2 writing outcomes.

Keywords: AI-powered Feedback, Continuation Task, L2 Writing Pedagogy, Hybrid Feedback Model.

1. Introduction

Continuation task, which requires learners to extend a given text while maintaining coherence with the source material, has gained prominence in L2 writing pedagogy for its ability to develop narrative competence and textual cohesion. However, providing timely, individualized feedback on such complex writing tasks poses significant challenges for instructors, particularly regarding the evaluation of thematic consistency and narrative continuity.^[1] The advent of generative AI and automated writing evaluation (AWE) systems has introduced new possibilities for addressing these challenges. Recent research indicates that AI-powered tools can provide immediate feedback on grammar and vocabulary, thereby accelerating the revision process. Nevertheless, AI systems often lack the contextual sensitivity necessary to evaluate rhetorical appropriateness-crucial elements in continuation writing tasks. This paper argues for a strategic, mediated approach to AI implementation that harnesses the efficiency of automated feedback while preserving the irreplaceable role of teacher guidance in developing higher-order writing skills^[2].

2. Literature Review

The integration of artificial intelligence in writing instruction has evolved from simple grammar checkers to sophisticated large language models (LLMs) capable of generating contextualized feedback. Recent studies demonstrate that Chat GPT and similar tools can effectively identify surface-level errors and offer revision suggestions, leading to short-term improvements in linguistic accuracy^[3]. In the Chinese EFL context, Sun and Xu found that combining teacher feedback with generative AI feedback produced significant added value in improving college students' English writing quality, with benefits accumulating over multiple feedback cycles^[4]. However, empirical evidence also reveals substantial limitations. Steiss et al. compared human and ChatGPT feedback on student writing, finding that while AI provides comprehensive surface-level corrections, it often misses nuanced rhetorical issues and produces generic suggestions that lack disciplinary specificity. Similarly, Alharbi observed that although AI tools improve writing mechanics, they may undermine long-term retention if used without pedagogical scaffolding^[5]. These findings underscore

the necessity of maintaining human oversight in AI-enhanced writing classrooms.

Continuation writing tasks require learners to comprehend source texts thoroughly and produce linguistically appropriate extensions that maintain narrative coherence. This pedagogical approach emphasizes the synergy between reading and writing, demanding that students attend to both micro-level linguistic features and macro-level textual organization^[6]. The complexity of such tasks makes them particularly challenging for automated evaluation, as AI systems often struggle to assess intertextual coherence and creative narrative development.

Beyond cognitive and linguistic outcomes, recent investigations have also turned to the affective and motivational repercussions of AI-powered feedback. Kwon et al. (2024) found that EFL students often experience reduced writing anxiety when receiving immediate automated corrections, yet they simultaneously report a sense of detachment from the learning process if feedback feels impersonal or repetitive. This emotional duality suggests that AI tools can lower the affective filter for lower-proficiency learners, but may inadvertently diminish intrinsic motivation for more advanced writers who crave nuanced, appreciative commentary on their creative choices. Furthermore, Guo et al. (2024) documented that students' trust in AI feedback fluctuates significantly depending on their prior digital literacy and the transparency of the system's reasoning. When AI suggestions are presented without explanations, learners tend to either accept them uncritically or reject them arbitrarily, leading to inconsistent revision behaviours. These findings reinforce the argument that technological affordances alone do not guarantee pedagogical benefit; rather, the affective ecology of the writing classroom-including peer interactions, teacher encouragement, and self-efficacy beliefs-must be deliberately nurtured alongside cognitive skill development. Consequently, any pedagogical framework that integrates AI must incorporate strategies for sustaining learner engagement, fostering a growth mindset, and explicitly addressing the emotional responses that automated systems inevitably provoke.

3. Problem and Solutions

Current research identifies several critical issues when AI feedback is implemented without pedagogical mediation. First, AI systems tend to prioritize grammatical accuracy over

narrative coherence, potentially leading students to focus on isolated errors rather than global text organization^[7]. Second, the "black box" nature of AI feedback can confuse students who lack the metalinguistic knowledge to evaluate suggestions critically. Third, over-reliance on AI correction may inhibit the development of self-editing strategies and creative risk-taking^[8].

Solution 1: Implementing a Hybrid Feedback Model

To address these limitations, this paper proposes a hybrid feedback model that distributes feedback responsibilities between AI systems and instructors^[9]. In this framework, AI tools such as Grammarly or ChatGPT are deployed initially to address lower-order concerns-grammar, spelling, and lexical choice-whereby allowing teachers to concentrate on higher-order aspects such as narrative coherence, thematic development, and stylistic sophistication. Implementation requires structured protocols: students first process AI feedback independently, documenting their revisions and rationale. Subsequently, teachers review both the original AI suggestions and student responses, providing meta-feedback that guides learners in critically evaluating automated recommendations. Zhu and Liu demonstrated that this two-stage process not only improves writing quality but also develops students' critical digital literacy in Chinese university contexts.

For successful implementation, this hybrid model demands clear role differentiation and structured timelines. In practice, teachers should design a feedback receipt form that prompts students to: (a) record each AI suggestion they accept or reject, (b) justify their decision with reference to the source text's tone and narrative logic, and (c) note any suggestions they find ambiguous or potentially misleading. This documentation transforms passive correction into active reflection, enabling teachers to diagnose common misconceptions during the subsequent meta-feedback session. Moreover, teacher training is essential: instructors must develop competence in evaluating AI outputs, recognising when automated recommendations undermine coherence (e.g., suggesting a more sophisticated verb that alters the protagonist's emotional stance), and crafting follow-up questions that push students toward deeper revision. Empirical evidence from Luo, Hu, and Zhong (2025) indicates that such structured mediation not only elevates final writing quality but also reduces the time teachers spend on surface-level error correction, allowing them to dedicate class hours to peer discussion of narrative alternatives and stylistic refinement. This reallocation of instructional effort represents a significant pragmatic advantage in large-enrolment EFL contexts.

Solution 2: Developing Hierarchical Feedback Mechanisms

Drawing upon the CHATWELL system design, continuation writing instruction should employ hierarchical AI feedback that progresses from mechanical accuracy to discourse-level coherence. This four-tier approach includes: (1) error detection at the word and sentence level; (2) suggestions for syntactic complexity; (3) paragraph organization and transition markers; and (4) macro-level evaluations of narrative consistency with the source text. Such scaffolding ensures that students address foundational accuracy before tackling complex rhetorical challenges. For continuation writing specifically, tier-four feedback should include analysis of narrative voice consistency-areas where AI currently requires teacher supplementation.

To illustrate, consider a continuation task where learners extend a mystery story. Tier-1 AI feedback might flag subject-verb agreement errors; tier-2 could recommend subordinating conjunctions to increase sentence variety; tier-3 would highlight missing transitional phrases between paragraphs; and tier-4 might generate a coherence score based on lexical overlap with the source text. However, tier-4 currently cannot reliably judge whether the newly introduced suspect aligns with the original author's foreshadowing cues-a gap that teachers fill by providing qualitative comments on plausibility and suspense maintenance. Teachers can also customise tier-4 prompts, for example, instructing the AI to compare the student's ending against common narrative archetypes extracted from the source genre, thereby offering heuristic rather than prescriptive guidance. Such adaptive use of hierarchical feedback ensures that students progressively build editing autonomy, moving from dependence on external correction to internalised criteria for narrative wholeness.

Solution 3: Cultivating Feedback Literacy Through Critical Engagement

To prevent over-reliance on AI suggestions, instruction must prioritize feedback literacy development. Pedagogical activities should include comparing AI feedback with teacher and peer comments, evaluating the contextual appropriateness of suggested revisions, and reflecting on instances where AI suggestions might alter intended meaning. Furthermore, prompt engineering instruction enables students to obtain more sophisticated AI feedback. Rather than simply submitting drafts for correction, learners should craft specific queries regarding narrative continuity or thematic resonance, transforming AI from a passive error-correction tool into an interactive collaborative partner (Mahapatra, 2024).

Solution 4: Integrating Peer Review and Teacher Professional Development

A complementary strategy involves embedding AI feedback within a broader peer-review cycle. Students first generate AI suggestions, then exchange drafts with classmates who apply the same evaluation criteria, and finally receive teacher synthesis. This triangulation encourages learners to compare multiple perspectives, discerning which AI recommendations are substantiated by peer intuition and which are contradicted. In practice, peer reviewers can be trained to focus specifically on narrative engagement and character consistency-dimensions where AI remains weak-while AI handles linguistic mechanics. Such integration not only alleviates teacher workload but also fosters collaborative meaning-making, as students negotiate conflicting feedback and co-construct revision priorities. Parallely, institutions should invest in ongoing professional development that equips teachers with data literacy skills to interpret AI analytics (e.g., error frequency heatmaps, lexical diversity trajectories) and use these insights for formative assessment. Teacher communities of practice can share effective prompt-engineering techniques and develop discipline-specific rubrics that combine automated metrics with human-judged creativity indicators. Without such capacity building, even the most sophisticated hybrid framework risks being underutilised or misapplied. Therefore, sustainable AI integration hinges on systemic support for both learner feedback literacy and instructor technological pedagogical content knowledge.

4. Conclusion

AI-powered feedback represents a transformative tool for

continuation writing instruction, offering unprecedented opportunities for immediate, personalized scaffolding. However, its effective implementation requires strategic pedagogical frameworks that combine automated efficiency with human insight. By adopting hybrid feedback models, hierarchical scaffolding mechanisms, and explicit feedback literacy instruction, educators can harness AI's potential while mitigating risks of over-reliance and superficial learning. Future research should examine longitudinal impacts of AI feedback on narrative competence and investigate optimal ratios of automated to human feedback across different proficiency levels. Additionally, as generative AI technologies continue evolving, subsequent studies must explore how multimodal AI feedback might further enhance the unique demands of continuation writing tasks, particularly in fostering creativity and intertextual sensitivity. Ultimately, the goal is not to replace teacher feedback but to create a synergistic ecosystem where AI and human expertise collaboratively support the development of sophisticated L2 writing abilities, ensuring that technological innovation serves pedagogical excellence rather than diminishing the complex, fundamentally human nature of narrative composition.

Technology also plays an increasingly important role in fostering autonomous learning. Digital platforms, online dictionaries, language learning applications, artificial intelligence tools, and multimedia resources provide students with abundant opportunities for individualized learning beyond the classroom. Teachers should guide students to use these resources critically and responsibly rather than relying on them passively.

References

- [1] Alharbi, A. (2023). The impact of ChatGPT on EFL writing: A critical review. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics*, 8(2), 123–135.
- [2] Barrot, J. S. (2023). Using ChatGPT for second language writing: Pitfalls and potentials. *Assessing Writing*, 57, 100745.
- [3] Boudouaia, A., Mouas, S., & Kouider, A. (2024). The effect of ChatGPT feedback on EFL students' writing performance. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 37(4), 789–812.
- [4] Cheng, W., et al. (2025). CHATWELL: An AI-enabled adaptive tutoring system for improving composition skills in L2 students. *Disability and Rehabilitation: Assistive Technology*, 20(2), 178–189.
- [5] Guo, K., et al. (2024). AI-generated feedback in L2 writing classrooms: Student perceptions and learning outcomes. *Language Learning & Technology*, 28(1), 45–62.
- [6] Guo, X., & Wang, X. (2024). AI-generated feedback in English writing instruction: A systematic review. *Journal of Educational Technology Development and Exchange*, 17(1), 23–41.
- [7] Kwon, J., et al. (2024). Large language models in EFL writing: A mixed-methods investigation. *System*, 120, 103–118.
- [8] Link, S., et al. (2020). The effects of automated writing evaluation on L2 writing: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 49, 100753.
- [9] Luo, M., Hu, X., & Zhong, C. (2025). The collaboration of AI and teacher in feedback provision and its impact on EFL learner's argumentative writing. *Education and Information Technologies*, 30(2), 1567–1585.