

Textual Typologies for AI-Assisted Writing: Integrating New Literacy Studies and Language Assessment Practices

Daniel Murcia

The Pennsylvania State University, United States

Correspondence

Email: danielmurcia@psu.edu

Abstract

This paper integrates the discussion of current digital innovations, their uses for academic writing instruction, and its implication for language assessment. Using the revisited New Literacy Studies (NLS) framework (Pegrum et al., 2018, 2022), I suggest considering a structural organization to guide practices of academic writing and their assessment: A typology of AI-Assisted Writing that includes Original, Augmented, and Synthetic texts. By connecting digital literacy studies to seminal work on textual typology (Reiss, 1970, 1989), this reflection calls for interdisciplinary discussion and the use cross-curricular approaches to align educational policies for AI-assisted writing in language assessment practices. The suggested frames serve as pedagogical anchors to ignite ideas on meaningful classroom design environments, but also as points of departure for the construction of professional development plans and teacher language assessment literacy programs that address current skills and principles when LLM-based writing steps as a disruptive tool in academic writing. The paper closes with a conclusion in the line of promoting studies that embedded digitally mediated strategic academic literacy informed by empirical evidence from diverse classrooms and across stages of Language Assessment Literacy that stakeholders may have.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received: 20 October 2025

Revised: 26 March 2026

Accepted: 24 May 2026

KEYWORDS

Digitally Assisted Writing, Generative Artificial Intelligence, Language Assessment Literacy, New Literacy Studies, LLM-Based Assessment

How to cite this article (APA 7th Edition):

Murcia, D. (2026). Textual typologies for AI-assisted writing: Integrating new literacy studies and language assessment practices. *Language Testing in Focus: An International Journal*, 13, 32–53. <https://doi.org/10.32038/ltf.2026.13.03>

Introduction¹

Whenever a new technological advance emerges, language education seems to explore its affordances and weaknesses. This exploration has brought recent reflections around the integration of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) to literacy practices (Akanda & Talukder, 2026). Mostly, the capacity of generating human-like text in natural language brings opportunities and challenges in how students engage with writing. Some of the benefits include brainstorming, drafting, revising, and editing their writing, to the expense of compromising ethical and responsible uses of these tools. This is complicating traditional writing process approaches and calls into question what we mean nowadays by originality, creativity, and academic integrity.

As mentioned in Salisbury (2018), the term “digital writing” in contemporary academic contexts might seem redundant because it is assumed that scholarly writing is now performed using digital devices. In this digital and computer-mediated writing landscape, emerging technology shapes the nature of traditional academic literacy and brings forth new environments of AI-mediated literacy which create “the need to learn, unlearn, and relearn” in terms of knowledge, skills, and principles defined for language assessment (Coombe et al., 2020). Lillis (2019) presents the concept: Digitally Assisted Literacy Practices to define in language education what students and instructors must integrate as a response to the evolving demands and expectations when learning a foreign or second language in this era. These changes extend to policy makers and curriculum designers who are considered here as stakeholders because they would reciprocally influence and be influenced by the types, frequency, and nature of interaction between students and educators in technology mediated educational settings (Vargas, 2015).

This paper is positioned to view these emergent challenges as curricular innovation opportunities for teaching designs. As GenAI takes its seat in educational settings, academic writing tutors are pressured to adopt and adapt their practices to fit the multiple opinions captured in this on-going debate. However, the main concern is still present: The lack of actionable frameworks that help language teachers anchor some ideas to navigate these changes. Therefore, this paper aims to address this gap by reflecting on the role of AI-assisted writing in contrast to traditional textual typologies frames within the context of New Literacy Studies (NLS). It does not only offer stakeholders a suggested route for integrating GenAI into their pedagogy in a way that aligns with contemporary literacy demands, but it provides a reflection that expands to the language assessment knowledge, skills, and principles to reconsider in the digital era (Nayernia & Mohebbi, 2023).

¹ This paper is part of a special issue (2026, 13) entitled: Language Assessment Literacy in the New Era: New Concerns, Same Solutions? edited by Hassan Mohebbi.

Reframing Literacy Practices under the Lense of GenAI

GenAI has emerged as a transformative force in language education, significantly reshaping how L2 writing is learned, taught, and assessed (Rong & Yao, 2026). To ground a definition for this paper, Chiu (2024) state that GenAI refers to systems capable of performing tasks associated with human intelligence, such as natural language processing, machine learning, and computer vision. In this line, systems like OpenAI's ChatGPT, Google's Gemini, and Microsoft's Copilot are key commercial examples that users across the world have incorporated to their writing practices because of their open accessibility and adaptability (Pelletier et al., 2023; Singha et al., 2024). Incorporating GenAI brings opportunities and challenges, and these can be traced back to all educational spheres: Teaching, Learning, and Assessment.

Another relevant impact with GenAI is its potential to personalize some of the educational processes. In higher education, for instance, ChatGPT has been implemented to offer individualized immediate feedback, generate examples for students, and support the compositional process when writing (Crosthwaite & Sun, 2026; Galaczi & Luckin, 2024; Ricart-Vayá, 2024). Personalizing educational processes have been particularly useful to address diverse learning needs. Makeleni et al., (2023) report that ELT teachers found GenAI beneficial for professional development and the provision of authentic language resources. Despite these benefits, challenges persist, such as concerns over cultural appropriateness, reliance on technology, and the ethical dimensions of its implementation.

Another identified challenge has to do with the professional development of teachers. For example, the work of Salmanova (2025) explores how EFL teachers integrated GenAI and gamification to their teaching. While they identified improvements in didactic strategies and student engagement, their findings also suggest the emerging need of strengthening teacher development through programs that explain how to incorporate the effective use of GenAI in their teaching practices. It is then expected that teachers and students could be equipped with the skills necessary to navigate these advanced systems. However, it is well known that some educational systems are still struggling to incorporate GenAI into education. This may be due to systemic barriers and lack of infrastructure that are still part and parcel of unequal access to these technological resources (Galaczi & Luckin, 2024).

In relation to item and test design, Galaczi and Luckin (2024) draw attention on automated marking processes which enable a personalized approach to assess specific needs of individual learners. This capacity enhances test security and integrates assessment more effectively into the learning trajectories with deeper insights into student progress and challenges offering innovative approaches to personalized assessment (Zhang & Hyland, 2018). Of course, this does not go without reservations, the integration of AI-Assisted assessment has raised some concerns in classrooms because teachers have expressed caution when over-using GenAI to classify students or handle complex tasks that require detailed and context-based feedback

(Bewersdorff et al., 2023). Together, these findings point to the duality of GenAI's impact on education: it may be a powerful tool that could reshape literacy practices and simultaneously present new challenges that require careful review by educators and institutions (Akanda & Talukder, 2026).

A debate from a different angle relates academic integrity and the authenticity of student written work in relation to GenAI usage. Large Language Models (LLMs) like ChatGPT, Claude, and Gemini can generate human-like text with minimal user effort which raises critical questions about detecting and addressing responsible uses of GenAI in assessments (Galaczi & Luckin, 2024; Rong & Yao, 2026). The most common response has been by revisiting invigilated and proctored in-class exams, while others advocate for the ethical integration of AI tools to maintain the relevance and fairness of assessments. While some challenges have cautioned the use of these tools, this paper advocates for meaningful possibilities to design learning and assessment content when using GenAI.

Exploring advancements in LLM-based assessment in relation to the assessment literacy of educators is a potential start to democratize access to high-quality educational materials while fostering greater equity in language assessment and current academic writing practices. Nevertheless, the responsible and ethical use of these technologies requires updated teacher language assessment literacy programs (Nayernia & Mohebbi, 2023) and clear guidelines and interdisciplinary collaboration among educators, applied linguists, and AI specialists.

Reflection Questions

- How could GenAI-assisted writing practices inform a revisited textual typology for L2 writing and influence its assessment?
- How could this typology contribute to the development of language assessment literacy programs in the digital era?

Theoretical Foundations

From Normative to Transformative Approaches of L2 Writing

Language students' compositions often exhibit recurring structural problems, particularly in academic writing courses. And even if there are fixed structures in academic writing genres, there are still frequent mistakes that underline the L2 writing practices of students. For instance, Reyes-Angona and Fernández-Cárdenas (2015) identify predominant organizational issues in IMRaD-style academic writing, such as repeated information in introductions and conclusions and unclear methodological sections. These shortcomings highlight the need to examine the assistance given to students as they develop their academic writing competences. L2 Writing in the academy is still of predominant importance as countless students and scholars around the world must now gain fluency in the conventions of academic writing in English to understand their disciplines, to establish their careers, or to successfully navigate their learning (Hyland, 2013).

Over the past 20 years, there have been major turns in academic writing education as the response of the global expansion of higher education. The increasing diversity of students, their multiple ethnicities, classes, and ages have created the emergence of new identities and understandings of the world. This resolves in meaning making practices that challenge traditional assumptions about students' skills and experiences. Additionally, Hyland (2013) documents how universities have become increasingly focused on teaching and learning processes as they face accountability through quality audits in accreditation processes and professional development programs. These developments highlight the growing tendency to create academic writing programs that address both genre-related structural issues and the broader contextual factors shaping literacy practices.

Considering new ways to approach genre in writing instruction should be seen as opportunities to redesign curricula and teaching methodologies. In this line, Vargas (2015) is positive about how these changes could bring innovative teaching approaches that align more closely with students' needs and academic goals for their current construction of identity. One way to achieve this is by incorporating discovery-based methods to construct knowledge through exploration and analysis, which may foster engagement with academic writing practices. In a way, these methods may appeal to the content related aspects, not necessarily exploring the tools and procedures students are using these days to write.

The persistent issues in L2 academic writing often derive from students' reliance on previous writing experiences in their educational trajectories (Cruz, 2015). Addressing these issues requires focusing on macros and micro textual dimensions of writing. At the macro level, these considerations include documentation strategies, intertextual discourse, and structural moves. While at the micro, these elements involve academic research-like conventions like lexical resources and cohesion devices.

Empirical data draw on the importance of tailoring syllabi to address these persistent problems effectively. As shown in Table 1, most challenges relate to macrostructural aspects of writing, such as organizing information and articulating one's voice in relation to sources. Tardy (2017) notes that many writing tutors feel "under-equipped" to address these macrostructural challenges, which are often overshadowed by a focus on microstructural elements like grammar and syntax.

In Martinez (2013), the terms global and linear level of writing are framed under what is known as the normative approach. Both levels refer to practices that are carried out in literacy processes where global implies providing instruction on genre and superstructural aspects of writing, and linear refers to the sequenced construction of a text. For this paper, the global and linear are respectively adjacent to the instruction of macro and micro textual dimensions in academic writing.

There is a need of flexible syllabus design which integrates evidence from empirical approaches where AI-assisted L2 writing are explored under diverse instructional settings. A base line for exploration can be as presented in Table 1. Each row displays problematic dimensions in academic writing with subdimensions that provide examples of writing challenges. Dimensions one to three are intentionally expanded as a way of directing attention to the pressing characteristics that AI-assisted writing should address. The fact that students require more support on macro-level aspects, may lead to the assumption that writing is, therefore, in need of human guidance at the global level while leaving the micro-level at the expense of technological tools such as GenAI.

Table 1

Dimensions of Problematic Textual Strands for Graduate Students in Academic Writing

Textual Dimensions	Subdimensions
<i>Macro-level Textual Dimensions</i>	
1. Documentation practices	- Searching in databases for suitable articles - Filtering relevant articles appropriate for their texts - Composing monographs
2. Intertextual positioning	- Integrating referential discourse with own voice - Using polyphony: Reference from the list of authors under the syntactic norms of in-text citing - Using attributive verbs to link multiple studies - Using connecting devices
3. Organizational moves	- Writing under the process approach - Internalizing the rhetorical moves in research papers
<i>Micro-level textual dimensions</i>	
4. Academic writing genre conventions	- Adopting lexical devices used in research papers - Mastering academic punctuation features and Latinisms (e.g., i.e, et al.) - Constructing an academic identity through pragmatic features - Overusing impersonal forms - Establishing connected discourse through cohesive devices

Note. This table integrates dimensions mentioned in Arbeláez et al. (2021), Rey-Castillo & Gómez-Zermeno (2021), Cheng (2018), Espino (2015), Reyes-Angona & Fernández-Cárdenas (2015); Swales & Feak (2012), and Hyland (2007).

Writing instruction has long called for the integration of lexico-grammatical analysis so that students can grow awareness of the metalinguistic components of their own writing (Murcia & Coronado, 2017; Li et al., 2020), however, limited attention has been placed at the organizational moves. These global components are key for advanced writing and require the assistance of tutors who can guide the assimilation of these rhetorical moves in research writing.

This is why transforming academic writing instruction requires a shift from the normative approaches. The mere focus on established static norms for writing does not align with current social transformation limiting discovery and critical

engagement (Reyes-Angona & Fernández-Cárdenas, 2015). Students must not only understand the rules of academic writing but also grasp their underlying logic and purpose. A transformative appeal to a deeper connection to academic literacy so that students produce texts that reflect their disciplinary knowledge and critical insights. In other words, by centering on reading competencies for staged writing and iterative writing processes (process approach of writing) that integrate the use of emerging technological tools.

A transformative framework of L2 writing might equip students with the tools to succeed in contemporary demands of writing and beyond. By fostering a deeper understanding of contemporary academic genres and emerging discourse conventions, students may interpret the process of writing differently and gain awareness of the expectations that tests and curricula set under assessment conditions. Other than this, a transformative approach to L2 writing should begin to consider the integration of emerging technologies such as those powered by GenAI. It is likely that most of the students will come across their usage in their writing process and that teachers will incorporate these tools to gain assessment efficiency.

Aligning Contemporary Modes of Writing to New Literacy Studies

The field of NLS in contemporary writing practices seem to coherently fit the pedagogical anchor needed to interpret new approaches and textual practices (Lillis, 2019; Rey-Castillo & Gómez-Sermeño, 2021). Instructional scenarios that depend on computer mediated writing are emerging as common literacy practices and should be a core component of discussion in academic writing curriculum design. Reflections over how writing should be guided in contemporary classrooms and its integration to GenAI developments would be a critical point of inquiry to keep up with current innovation demands.

Lillis and Scott (2007) define Academic Literacies as the social practice of reading and writing; however, the emergence of digitally mediated reading and writing appeals to revisit this definition to understand shifts in cognitive and developmental skills engaged when technology is part of this frame. Thus, this paper proposes adopting Pegrum's et al. (2018) conceptualization of academic digital literacies as the "ensemble" of skills needed to effectively manage meaning in an era characterized by digitally networked communications, including blended communications that exploit both analogue and digital channels.

Rey-Castillo and Gómez-Sermeño (2021) document pedagogical approaches to design learning experiences under the assistance of digital tools. Some of these include desktop or cloud-based text processors, online translators, and paraphrasing software to correct typing mistakes, spelling slips or refer to word and phrase banks with accurate grammatical examples for writers; however, incoming technology with generative text capabilities have never been part of the written routines of most teaching and assessment environments. Such disruption in the traditional writing classroom shifts

our focus to NLS frameworks. Pegrum et al. (2018, 2022) present an NLS-based framework which revisits digital literacies considering the increasing complexity and four different areas of focus: Communicating, Informing, Collaborating, and Re-designing. Table 2 presents the progressive nature of literacy from print literacy to more current conditions such as code, robotic, and AI literacy. As well as additional literacy foci that address the multiple contemporary reading and writing practices.

Table 2

Pegrum et al. (2018) revised framework of digital literacies.

	First Focus: Communicating	Second Focus: Informing	Third Focus: Collaborating	Fourth Focus: (Re-) Designing
	Print literacy			
	Texting literacy			
	(+ <i>Predictive literacy</i>)			
	Hypertext literacy	Tagging literacy		
		(+ <i>Hashtag literacy</i>)		
	Multimodal literacy	Search literacy	Personal literacy	
		Informational literacy	(+ <i>security literacy</i>)	
		(+ <i>Data literacy</i>)	Network literacy	
		Filtering literacy	Participatory literacy	
			Intercultural literacy	
	Gaming literacy			
	(+ <i>gamification literacy</i>)			
	Spatial literacy			
	Mobile literacy			
	Code literacy		Ethical literacy	Critical literacy
	(+ technological literacy)			(+ <i>Critical digital literacy</i>)
	(+ Robotic/AI literacy)			(+ <i>Critical mobile literacy</i>)
				(+ <i>Critical material literacy</i>)
				(+ <i>Critical philosophical lit.</i>)
				(+ <i>Critical academic lit.</i>)
				Remix literacy

Note. This table appears as it is originally presented in the revisited framework of Pegrum et al. (2018, p.5). Labels with the “+” symbol indicate the additions made by the authors in this updated frame.

Table 2 serves as an anchor for curriculum design because it provides the categories of literacy that consolidate the identity of computer mediated writing practices. Scanning from a horizontal perspective, one could center on a specific focus for syllabus design. This is, if the learning outcomes of a course are expected to behave at the level of informing, students will be prompted to study intertextual positioning by consulting and screening articles from databases, all this at the macro level textual dimensions (see table 1). When consolidating skills for filtering sorts of data from databases, students will be cultivating their competences in what is called in table 2 as: Data Literacy.

A framework like this one is a key component for rethinking writing instruction. It forces writing tutors to move in a multidimensional space of literacies where reading and writing are not fixed to traditional formats, but the inclusion of current integrations of technology in the ways we use language these days. As Pegrum et al. (2018, p.5) claim, integrating NLS to writing update practices provide a “more sophisticated understandings, more finely tuned technical skills, and/or more complex teaching and learning strategies [for the writing classroom].”

Reflection on Stakeholder Perspectives

Insights from Perception Data

To bring empirical data to this reflection, data extracts from Murcia et al. (2025) were drawn from multiple individuals of English as a second language undergraduate program from two universities in Colombia, South America. The data touches upon the integration of GenAI in writing and assessment which allowed to gather varied responses from students, teachers, and administrators. The study created a compilation of themes from focus groups and surveys which reveal opportunities and concerns. Some of these were the provision of personalized feedback and efficiency in writing, alongside concerning matters regarding originality, academic integrity, and over-reliance on AI technologies.

Regarding the opportunities, the participants frequently mentioned that GenAI tools provide a platform for immediate, targeted feedback, which supports students in improving their writing. One teacher in Murcia et al. (2025) stated: *"AI tools like ChatGPT allow students to refine their drafts with suggestions for grammar and vocabulary, which is particularly useful for those with limited language proficiency."*

² Administrators echoed this by emphasizing on how AI-assistance can reduce the burden of marking student writing by automating assessment tasks like providing feedback.

Students, however, provided most of the opinions about the efficiency and accessibility of AI tools. A participant from the student survey stated: *"Using AI in my assignments has saved me time and helped me better understand how to structure my essays."* Students highlighted that the personalized AI recommendations helped them understand some complex writing requirements which gave them confidence in their academic abilities when writing texts in their L2.

Despite these opportunities, stakeholders expressed some concerns. For instance, teachers worried about the over-reliance on AI. They brought statement like: *"The risk is that students may use AI to generate complete assignments, bypassing critical thinking and genuine engagement with the material."* Similarly, key stakeholders like administrators emphasized the importance of detecting and addressing issues of

² These voices are samples extracted from the data in the study Murcia et al. (2025). The text is translated to English from the original samples in Spanish.

originality and academic misconduct. As one administrator stated: *"Our challenge lies in distinguishing authentic student work from AI-generated content, without discouraging the ethical use of these tools."*

Additionally, students expressed mixed feelings. The majority group valued AI's assistance, but a few others worried about its limitations. For instance, one survey participant noted: *"AI suggestions are helpful, but they don't always understand the context of my ideas, which sometimes makes the feedback irrelevant."* As mentioned in Galazci and Luckin (2024), some limitations of GenAI feedback are the lack of context sensitivity these systems have of the writing trajectory of the students. Thus, this is a call for the distributed mentoring possibilities when integrating writing tutors and AI-assisted writing practices in the learning experience.

Implications for L2 Writing Practices and their assessment

By including these voices, this paper addresses the need of considering textual typology suggestions that could support contemporary writing routines and offer critical insights for the design of writing tasks and possibilities of their assessment. Teachers and administrators saw augmented texts (See table 3, collaborations between students and AI tools) as a potential middle ground that balances authenticity with technological support. One teacher mentioned: *"If we could guide students on how to use AI responsibly, their work could reflect both their ideas and the tool's enhancements."* This claim reinforces the need for guided pedagogical strategies that incorporate GenAI within ethical boundaries. At the same time, it opens the space for integration of digital tools perceived as positive enhancements for students' writing development.

These insights suggest that writing tasks could focus on the development of macro and micro textual dimensions when using digital tools. For example, students could be assigned with tasks to identify areas for improvement in AI-generated drafts (Synthetic texts). This would foster their critical thinking and incorporate reflective thinking components where students articulate their writing process and how they used AI to support their work.

On a complementary note, voices of teachers advocated for assessments that distinguish between the contributions of students and AI. One teacher suggested: *"We need rubrics that evaluate both the student's input and their ability to critically engage with AI tools."* This is a relevant call to reflect about writing and the need for process-based assessment models of writing that prioritize learning outcomes over the final product evaluation. This would require training programs that address the skills needed for language educators to integrate GenAI effectively. Within this assessment literacy need, an administrator mentioned: *"Workshops on AI in education could help teachers develop new methods to assess hybrid writing practices."* This highlights the broader institutional responsibility to support educators in adapting to the evolving

landscape of academic writing through specific language assessment literacy (LAL) programs that address these concerns.

In summary, the voices of educational stakeholders bring a balanced view of GenAI's potential and challenges. It is intended then that by aligning stakeholder perspectives with revisited textual typologies and language assessment frameworks, we could address the gaps in current AI integration for writing instruction and assessment practices.

AI-Assisted L2 Writing

The integration of GenAI in the language classroom ignited changes in meaning negotiations, and more specifically to why, where, and how we write. The answer to these questions puts forward a reflection about meaning making practices in the digital era and their implications in instructional environments. It is not just using technology to read and write; there is more to it that deserves further attention.

The integration of digital devices has been part of the prospects for the XXI century education literacy (Lillis, 2019; Lillis & Scott, 2007; Strobl et al., 2018; Pegrum et al., 2022). These projections are expected to be negotiated by teachers and students who could discuss the ways in which computerized writing aids and the automatization of formatting processes can be incorporated within the current routines of writing academically. After all, these technological affordances respond to the how the evolving nature of the writing process and its instruction (Strobl et al., 2018,). Additionally, as stated in Lillis (2019), these digital integrations could be articulated to existing frameworks on academic writing instruction which can be contrasted with empirical evidence across varied contexts and teaching modalities.

This reflection belongs to an interdisciplinary discussion with stakeholders, especially the academic community who should engage with actors from the information and technology sciences, i.e., Data analysts, software developers and engineers, among others. Out of the multiple routes this reflection could take, I chose to offer a proposal that can aid the focus of prospective scenarios of L2 writing instruction: a textual typology for the integration of GenAI assisted L2 writing instruction and its assessment through the lens of NLS frameworks.

Revisiting Textual Typologies: AI-Assisted Writing and Assessment

Textual typologies provide a foundational framework for understanding how texts function in various communicative contexts, influencing both their creation and evaluation. Originally proposed by Katharina Reiss in the 1970s, text typology builds on seminal work from Karl Bühler's classification of language functions into 1. informative, 2. expressive, and 3. appellative categories. Reiss (1989) contributed to these categories to define corresponding text types which provide more contemporary labels: 1. Informative texts, focused on conveying factual content; 2. expressive texts, emphasizing aesthetic and creative expression; and 3. operative texts, aiming to

persuade or elicit a behavioral response. There is a supplementary category called 4. audio-medial texts, which integrates visual and auditory elements to enhance communication.

By placing the content itself as the primary focus, informative texts prioritize logical clarity and factual accuracy. Examples of this typology include academic reports and manuals, where precision and brevity are essential. As for expressive texts, the author's priority is their creative intent and aesthetic dimensions. This typology is frequent in poetry or literature, categories that require in-depth interpretation while preserving the original artistry. Finally, operative texts, like advertisements or political speeches, focus on persuading the audience's actions or beliefs, often using rhetorical strategies (Reiss, 1989).

These typologies are not always discrete; hybrid texts often combine elements of multiple categories. For instance, a biography may be informative and expressive because it conveys factual details about an individual while adhering to literary conventions. Another example may be a religious speech that blends operative and informative functions by persuading the audience while sharing doctrinal information. Considering this, Reiss (1989) insists on evaluating these texts based on the predominant typology but to recognize that texts occur within a hybrid nature.

Connecting this to the context of AI-Assisted Writing, these typologies serve as the bases for considering new dimensions. One should recognize that typologies of texts have been tightly connected and inspired to current social tendencies and their ways of communicating. In that sense, the way language is used influences textual typology but their labels are still related to the core functions of communication. For example, a suggested typology may be: original texts (those generated solely by human effort), these types of texts could be related with expressive or informative categories, which demand authenticity and personal voice. A second category may be: augmented texts, texts created through collaboration between humans and AI tools. As seen in AI-assisted marketing content, these texts might integrate informative precision with operative efficiency. A latter category: synthetic texts, yet fully generated by AI, these texts do not appeal for creative or expressive depth which challenge traditional notions of authorship and originality. They have started to join the pool of current language usage particularly in contexts where rudimentary communication is frequent, for instance, soliciting information to a company and chatbot customer experience related communicative contexts.

Within an AI-assisted framework, textual typologies could be categorized into three primary types: original, augmented, and synthetic texts (See table 3). These typologies reflect unique processes of text creation and interaction while providing a lens for interpreting how current writing practices have evolved with the integration of technological advancements. These categories are suggested to stakeholders to design assessments that account for the complexities of AI-Assisted Writing.

Table 3
AI-Assisted Textual Typology

Text Typology	Characteristics
Original Texts	Relies on human creativity and stylistic expression. Aligns with Reiss's aesthetic discourse. Focuses on originality and voice.
Augmented Texts	Combines human authorship with digital tool assistance. Enhances creative and technical output through AI tools or predictive text.
Synthetic Texts	Fully generated by LLMs. Replicates human-like writing via natural language processing techniques.

The first category in this typology is original texts. These are characterized by their reliance on human creativity and stylistic expression. A type of text that aligns with Reiss's (1970, 1989) notion of aesthetic discourse, that which emphasizes on originality as its core nature, but also seeks for creativity and human experiences at the forefront. What is prioritized here is the author's individual voice and agency when writing. Some examples of this typology could be found in literary works, personal narratives, and reflective essays. The assessment of original texts can adopt a more traditional and long-established criteria, including descriptors such as coherence, creativity, and adherence to the creative writing genre conventions. Writing tasks that seek originality may involve prompts that encourage anecdotal expression or the recounting of personal lived experiences. This would enable students to connect deeply with their product which is far from what an AI generated output can do.

As for augmented texts, this typology would represent a hybrid form of writing, where human authors collaborate with digital tools to enhance their creative and technical output. This is perhaps what most closely aligns with digitally assisted processes, which might include generative AI tools, predictive text, grammar checkers, or any other technological interventions. An example of this would be a student using ChatGPT to brainstorm ideas or Microsoft Word's predictive typing to refine phrasing. As mentioned in classical typologies, hybrids can occur; thus, writing tasks can balance efficiency with creativity, allowing for more comprehensive and polished writing. Assessment strategies for augmented texts should focus not only on the final product but also on the student's ability to critically engage with the technology. Rubrics may include criteria for originality, but the suggested weight should be on the procedural aspects of the writing process and the effective use of digital tools. Assessment of augmented is shifted more on the critical engagement with the suggestion by GenAI and the decisions made by the author to accept or reject them. This cognitive process of AI integration would obviously require further development aligned with informed ethical and responsible follow up.

Lastly, synthetic texts appeal to those written entirely by generative AI systems without direct human authorship other than the prompt. These texts replicate human-

like writing through natural language processing and algorithmic structures, often produced by LLMs in their multiple versions across models. This typology may be controversial because it raises unique pedagogical and assessment challenges, with a more direct responsibility on the ethical use of AI and the authenticity of student work. A synthetic text must not replace original texts because it violates authorship and infringes normative and ethical procedures in writing.

Writing tasks involving synthetic texts might focus on developing effective prompts or critically analyzing the AI-generated content for accuracy, relevance, and coherence. Some suggested assessment strategies for synthetic texts could involve evaluating the prompt design as a critical stage of the writing process, the critical analysis of the GenAI's output, and the student's ability to integrate or use the generated content meaningfully.

These suggested typologies in AI-Assisted Writing are relevant to the debate on writing instruction in the digital era. They can be used to design tasks that align with specific text functions, such as using GenAI to draft informative summaries or models of writing for writing style analysis. However, these affordances also present challenges, particularly in maintaining ethical and transparent assessment practices and potential access inequity to frontier GenAI models. For instance, distinguishing between augmented and synthetic contributions in student writing requires clear guidelines and robust evaluation frameworks suited to the needs of each educational context.

Reiss's classic textual typology offers a valuable lens for revisiting the role of texts in AI-Assisted contexts. By understanding the interplay between text typologies and communicative functions, educators and language assessors can develop more context-sensitive methodologies to teaching and assess writing. This involves the acknowledgement of the potential in GenAI tools to enhance textual production but without leaving aside the ethical implications of their use, ensuring that assessments remain fair, transparent, and aligned with educational objectives. By designing tasks under the lens of these typologies, stakeholders could address the diverse ways students engage with writing in the digital age and promote learning within NLS practices that moves away from normative approaches to writing.

Writing Task Design under AI-Assisted Textual Typologies

In order to be more specific about the ways in which AI-Assisted Writing could be assessed, this section explores relations with the revised Bloom's Taxonomy (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001), providing a comprehensive framework to guide cognitive goals in writing assessment and task design. The premise of this section lies on using the levels of Bloom's Taxonomy (i.e., Remember, Understand, Apply, Analyze, Evaluate, and Create) to inform targeted assessments and learning outcomes using the original, augmented, and synthetic texts typology.

An example of this could be designing writing tasks to engage with the creative domain in Bloom's taxonomy. Because this category emphasizes on leveraging human lived experiences and reflection to produce original solutions, a writing task suitable at this level could involve crafting essays or narratives that showcase unique perspectives, even when augmented by AI tools. Hence, writing task design integrates the augmented textual typology coherent to the intentions of promoting students create level in terms of cognitive domain. This would be an approach that enhances writing practices under an NLS frame with the use of technology.

Rubrics tailored to AI-Assisted Writing should consider leveraging human and GenAI contributions. For original texts, criteria can emphasize creativity, coherence, and the depth of argumentation. Augmented texts require additional dimensions, such as evaluating the effective integration of AI feedback and the user's competences to employ these tools. In the case of synthetic texts, rubrics should prioritize the quality of the prompts, critical engagement with GenAI outputs, and the refinement of AI-generated content into a cohesive final product. These rubrics aim to ensure fairness, transparency, and alignment with the affordances of AI-assisted writing.

As for LLM-based feedback mechanisms, systems should evolve to correspond to the cognitive goals outlined by Bloom's Taxonomy. That is, for lower-order skills, such as remembering and understanding, GenAI tools could offer immediate corrective feedback, addressing micro textual level issues like grammar or sentence structure (See table 1). However, in higher-order skills like evaluating and creating demand feedback that fosters metacognition and critical engagement. GenAI tools could suggest alternative perspectives or encourage reflections on ethical dimensions within arguments, aligning with Zaphir et al.'s (2024) emphasis on metacognitive awareness when using AI-assisted writing.

Furthermore, there is potential benefit in using GenAI capabilities to foster cognitive development across more complex levels in Bloom's taxonomy. That is to say, when working at the analyzing level, GenAI could support the identification of patterns and relationships within texts by guiding students as they strengthen their analytical reasoning. This guided utility of GenAI may facilitate those assessments not only measures writing outcomes but also provide dynamic support for the learning process itself.

A further area for exploration addresses the challenges regarding the quality and depth of writing feedback. AI-assisted tools have focused with great effort at the micro textual dimension of writing. This is, there is a wide variety of digital tools in the market that support grammar and syntax revision, but these often fall short in guiding macro textual elements like argument coherence and genre alignment in a way that results meaningful for students (Cheng et al., 2024; Kurt & Kurt, 2024). Educators must bridge this gap by providing distributed mentoring through human-mediated feedback that complements the efficiency of GenAI feedback. This distributed

approach may promote students' engagement with the cognitive demands of writing at both the micro and macro levels.

Together, AI-Assisted Writing and Bloom's Taxonomy, offer educators ideas for designing writing assessments and feedback mechanisms that foster meaningful learning experiences. This alignment is an attempt to address the diverse needs of students while preparing them to navigate the complexities of hybrid writing practices, as well as ensuring their cognitive and creative growth which is at the core of digital academic literacy in NLS.

Table 4 presents a horizontal relationship that could operate as a design framework for L2 writing instruction and assessment procedures:

Table 4

Relational Table for AI-Based Textual Typologies: Cognitive Goals, Academic Applications, and Language Assessment Strategies

AI-Based Textual Typology	Learning Taxonomy	Cognitive Skills	Academic Products	Digital Macroliteracies	Assessment Type	Teaching Strategies
1.Original Text	Creating, Applying	Advanced writing processes (e.g., composing, organizing, revising)	Essays, reflective papers, personal narratives	Print, texting, hypertext, critical, personal literacy	Product-based assessment focused on originality (AoL)	Encourage personal expression through reflective writing task
2. Augmented Text	Remembering, Applying, Analyzing	Decision-making in text generation (e.g., grammar correction, style enhancement)	AI-assisted summaries, Collaborative projects	Multimodal, search, network, mobile, data literacy	Process-based assessment emphasizing tool use (AfL - Dynamic)	Scaffold tasks with guidelines on critical AI engagement
3.Synthetic Text	Understanding, Analyzing, Evaluating	Analysis and critique of AI-generated content/output	Textual comparisons, peer-reviewed prompts	Critical, ethical, AI literacy	Iterative self-assessment using AI feedback (AasL - Ipsative)	Promote reflective activities comparing human and AI outputs

Note. AoL= Assessment of Learning; AfL = Assessment for Learning; AasL= Assessment as Learning.

The relational table 3 is suggested for tasks design purposes as it relates AI-Based Textual Typologies with cognitive goals, possible academic products, the type of assessment that could be implemented, and some language assessment strategies. This frame is a suggestion that integrates a structured representation of how different typologies of AI-Assisted Writing align with learning taxonomy (Zaphir et al., 2024)

and what assessment protocols could be conducted to measure the writing development of students under the specific circumstances portrayed in current digitally driven learning environment.

This AI-based textual typology does not intend to create a new approach for writing instruction, but for stakeholders to interpret the current phenomena from a different perspective. It is an invitation to reflect about the current writing practices in the varied learning environments and chose with fine grained awareness how to assess writing preserving validity. If done conscientiously, students will not be penalized for using digital resources in the classroom when these can be used as positive capabilities for their learning. In other words, if we transform our approaches to traditional methodologies of writing instruction, there could be space for synthetic texts to be implemented in the classroom instead of rejecting all GenAI output. For instance, students could be asked to generate text and submit their analysis of those texts as the product to be assessed, not asking them to compose essays and mark them as final products. Overall, ethical concerns may be reduced if the approaches to assess the written products follow an alternative logic.

Repositioning Language Assessment Literacy and Ethical Aspects in the Era of AI-Assisted Writing

The discussion presented in this paper suggests that AI-Assisted writing is not to be treated as an unacceptable practice in current writing practices, instead it should be considered as the variable igniting reflection toward the type of writing that is produced, mediated, and assessed in the contemporary language classrooms. From this perspective, a proposed textual typology does more than classifying textual products in different words, it is offering a way to interpret new forms of human and technology participation, and by doing so, it invites to reconsider what counts as evidence in L2 writing assessment and which constructs are relevant for writing assessment in the digital era (Murcia, 2024).

This frame is meaningful to rethink traditional approaches to language assessment literacy which emphasized on knowledge of the constructs, scoring procedures, and feedback practices, but placing in the background the digital conditions that increasingly shape how students “do” their writing. In this sense, a revisited textual typology becomes relevant for writing pedagogy, and to rethink the scope of LAL itself in contexts where students interact with digital tools as part and parcel of their compositions and learning processes.

This is a relevant point when considering the contextual dimensions of assessment from multiple studies and diverse voices (Arbeláez et al., 2021; Cruz, 2015; Pegrum et al., 2022; Salisbury, 2018; and Vargas, 2016). If students now write through a continuum of interactions with GenAI, then assessment cannot remain anchored to assumptions of individual production detached from the tools and practices now used to mediate these writing practices. The issue is not simply to identify whether AI has

been used or not, but how and for what purposes. A digitally responsive understanding of LAL therefore requires more than procedural competences in assessment design. It requires sensitivity to the holistic environment of writing, that is, how students plan, prompt, revise, and negotiate meaning with GenAI. Seen in this light, the proposed typology can support teachers in making assessment decisions beyond binary distinctions such as determining whether a text is authentic or not. This is a key move because the presence of GenAI does not remove the need to assess, but it makes evident the limitations of assessment models that do not take into account the sociocultural and technical characteristics of contemporary writing.

At the same time, this textual typology raises ethical questions that are not separated from LAL (Borenstein & Howard, 2021). The challenge is to identify misuse or prevent irresponsible uses of GenAI while understanding how ethical concerns emerge from particular assessment conditions and institutional expectations. Principles like fairness, transparency, authorship, and student agency are important here, but these are not because there is an emerging technology, they have always been part of the assessment environment and will now coexist with the current uses of technological devices. The question then is how language assessment systems are responding to technological change, whether these will value the written product over the process, or the creation of policies for acceptable AI usage that go beyond the language of cheating. For this reason, ethical reflections should not stop at policing and detection, table 4 can serve as a starting point for imagining shifts from normative toward more transformative approaches that recognize mediation, process validity, and responsible use of GenAI in academic writing.

This discussion also suggests that AI Literacy and LAL should not be considered separate domains. They both intersect when teachers make decisions about what is legitimate support, meaningful feedback, and expected textual production. Ethical reasoning is a core dimension of literacy for assessment in digital environments which includes the capacity to evaluate when GenAI supports learning, when it compromises students' agency, when it amplifies inequities and obscures the process approach in writing development. Therefore, NLS offers a strong conceptual anchor for the development of policies and programs in LAL. The value of this framework stands in its attention to literacy as a social practice that involves meaning making with multiple modes and digital tools. This is very useful for responding to the concerns voiced by stakeholders, including teachers and students, who must navigate expectations which do not keep pace with the realities of AI-Assisted writing. Linking LAL initiatives in a NLS perspective would allow programs to move beyond decontextualized training in assessment techniques to a more specific preparation in digital mediation, critical interpretation, ethical deliberation, and perhaps, pedagogical adaptability.

In conclusion, policy and program development should not aim only to regulate AI use, how about creating spaces where teachers can learn to interpret changing writing practices and where students can develop more reflexive forms of participation in

them. The reflections in this paper contribute to an AI-based textual typology that other than naming emergent forms of writing, it provokes a possible broader reorientation of writing assessment and LAL. By labelling original, augmented, and synthetic texts, the typology opens a space for discussing what should be assessed and the type of evidence of learning needed. The framework proposed here is not intended as a fixed solution, but to be considered as a heuristic for further dialogue, curriculum design, and policy development. My aim is to help teachers, researchers, and institutions move toward forms of assessment that are more context-sensitive, ethically grounded, and more responsive to the realities of AI-Assisted writing in the digital era.

ORCID

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3146-6116>

Publisher's Note

The claims, arguments, and counter-arguments made in this article are exclusively those of the contributing authors. Hence, they do not necessarily represent the viewpoints of the authors' affiliated institutions, or EUROKD as the publisher, the editors and the reviewers of the article.

Acknowledgements

This reflection is the result of the varied conversations held with my students and their concerns about the writing of their thesis. Without their concerns it would not have been possible to come up with insights and the connections established for this paper. Deep gratitude with Dr. Hernán Gil and Dr. Rosa Maria Guilleumas who trusted my competence to guide these students in their master's writing journey. Finally, special thanks to Ying Luo who read the initial version of the manuscript and prompted interesting insights to make this a deeper reflection on the field.

Funding

This project received no external funding.

CRedit Authorship Contribution Statement

Daniel Murcia: Conceptualization, Methodology, Investigation, Data Curation, Writing – Original Draft, Writing – Review & Editing

Generative AI Use Disclosure Statement

During the editing phase of this work, the author used the legacy model GPT-4o with Notion to proofread and improve the readability and language. After using these tools, the author reviewed and edited the content as needed and takes full responsibility for the content of the publication.

Ethics Declarations

World Medical Association (WMA) Declaration of Helsinki–Ethical Principles for Medical Research Involving Human Participants

This study was conducted in accordance with the ethical principles of the World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki. Perception data belongs to the data collected in Murcia et al. (2025). All participants provided informed written consent prior to participation, and participation was voluntary.

Competing Interests

The author declares that there are no competing interests.

Data Availability

The data used for this study are textual accounts found in Murcia et al. (2025).

References

- Akanda, F., & Talukder, T. (2026). AI writing tools in English writing: Reviewing teachers' and students' views on benefits and concerns. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 13, Article 102437. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2026.102437>
- Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (Eds.). (2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives*. Longman.
- Arbeláez, M. C., Garzón, M. L., Henao, L. S., Puerta, C. E., Salazar, T., Gutiérrez, K., Guerra, D. M., & Machado, K. H. (2021). *La escritura académica: Un reto para la formación posgradual*. Editorial Universidad Tecnológica de Pereira.
- Bewersdorff, A., Seßler, K., Baur, A., Kasneci, E., & Nerdel, C. (2023). Assessing student errors in experimentation using artificial intelligence and large language models: A comparative study with human raters. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 5, Article 100177. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2023.100177>
- Borenstein, J., & Howard, A. (2021). Emerging challenges in AI and the need for AI ethics education. *AI and Ethics*, 1, 61-65. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-020-00002-7>
- Cheng, A. (2018). *Genre and graduate-level research writing*. University of Michigan Press.
- Cheng, Y., Zhang, Y., & Ma, X. (2024). Assessing writing with generative AI: An evidence-centered design perspective. *Assessing Writing*, 62, Article 100872. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2024.100872>
- Chiu, T. K. F. (2024). The impact of Generative AI (GenAI) on practices, policies and research direction in education: a case of ChatGPT and Midjourney. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 32(10), 6187–6203. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2023.2253861>
- Coombe, C., Vafadar, H., & Mohebbi, H. (2020). Language assessment literacy: What do we need to learn, unlearn, and relearn? *Language Testing in Asia*, 10, Article 3. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-020-00101-6>
- Crosthwaite, P., & Sun, S. (2026). Generative AI and L2 written feedback studies: A scoping review. *RELC Journal*, 57(1), 82–97. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882251386530>
- Cruz, A.G. (2015). La atención de la escritura académica en el posgrado: una experiencia en la UPN. *Revista de investigación educativa*, 9, 51-59. <https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=521651961006>
- Espino, S. (2015). La enseñanza de estrategias de escritura y comunicación de textos científicos y académicos a estudiantes de posgrado. *Revista Mexicana de Investigación educativa*, 20 (66), 959-976. http://www.scielo.org.mx/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S140566662015000300012&lng=es&tlng=es
- Galaczi, E., & Luckin, R. (2024). *Generative AI and language education: Opportunities, challenges and the need for critical perspectives*. Cambridge University Press & Assessment.
- Hyland, K. (2007). Genre pedagogy: Language, literacy and L2 writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(3), 148-164. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.07.005>
- Hyland, K. (2013). Writing in the university: Education, knowledge and reputation. *Language Teaching*, 46(1), 53–70. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000036>

- Kurt, G., & Kurt, Y. (2024). Enhancing L2 writing skills: ChatGPT as an automated feedback tool. *Journal of Information Technology Education: Research*, 23, Article 24. <https://doi.org/10.28945/5370>
- Li, Y., Ma, X., Zhao, J., & Hu, J. (2020). Graduate-level research writing instruction: Two Chinese EAP teachers' localized ESP genre-based pedagogy. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 43, Article 100813. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2019.100813>.
- Lillis, T. (2019). 'Academic literacies': Sustaining a critical space on writing in academia. *Journal of Learning Development in Higher Education*, 15, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.47408/jldhe.v0i15.565>
- Lillis, T., & Scott, M. (2007). Defining academic literacies research: Issues of epistemology, ideology and strategy. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 4(1), 5–32. <https://doi.org/10.1558/japl.v4i1.5>
- Makeleni, S., Mutongoza, B., & Linake, A. (2023). Language education and artificial intelligence: An exploration of challenges confronting academics in Global South universities. *Journal of Culture and Values in Education*, 6(2), 158–171. <https://doi.org/10.46303/jcve.2023.14>
- Murcia, D. (2024). Perceptions of automatized writing evaluation mediated by an Intelligent Tutoring System in an undergraduate course of academic writing. In D. Murcia, C.A. Hoyos, & J. Henao. *Métodos alternativos de enseñanza en bilingüismo, artes visuales y música como resultados de investigación en la Facultad de Bellas Artes y Humanidades* (pp. 9–34) . Editorial UTP. <https://doi.org/10.22517/9789587229011>
- Murcia, D., Jaime Osorio, M. F., Jaramillo Calderon, L. F., & Hoyos Pipicano, Y. A. (2025). GenAI in language teaching, learning, and assessment: Stakeholders insights from two undergraduate language programs. *Lenguaje*, 53(1S), Article e20314387. <https://doi.org/10.25100/lenguaje.v53i1S.14387>
- Murcia, D., & Coronado, L. M. (2017). *Caracterización interlingüística de la producción textual en inglés de estudiantes de Licenciatura en Lengua Inglesa* [Master's thesis, Universidad Tecnológica de Pereira]. Repositorio Institucional Universidad Tecnológica de Pereira. <https://repositorio.utp.edu.co/items/87161707-7e63-4d55-bf8b-6d46a1d9a7e5/full>
- Nayernia, A., & Mohebbi, H. (2023). Teachers' online language assessment literacy. In Z. Tajeddin & C. Griffiths (Eds.), *Language education programs: Perspectives on policies and practices* (Vol. 34, pp. 121–140). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-38754-8_8
- Pegrum, M., Dudeney, G., & Hockly, N. (2018). Digital literacies revisited. *The European Journal of Applied Linguistics and TEFL*, 7(2), 3–24. <https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/digital-literacies-revisited/docview/2342473158/se-2>
- Pegrum, M., Hockly, N., & Dudeney, G. (2022). *Digital literacies* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Pelletier, K., Robert, J., Muscanell, N., McCormack, M., Reeves, J., Arbino, N., & Grajek, S. (2023). *EDUCAUSE horizon report: Teaching and learning edition*. EDUCAUSE. <https://www.educause.edu/horizon-report-teaching-and-learning-2023>
- Reiss, K. (1989). Text types, translation types and translation assessment. In A. Chesterman (Ed. & Trans.), *Readings in translation theory* (pp. 105–115). Oy Finn Lectura Ab.
- Rey-Castillo, M., & Gómez-Zermeño, M. G. (2021). *Dificultades de la escritura académica de estudiantes de maestría*. *Revista Electrónica Educare*, 25(2), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.15359/ree.25-2.4>
- Reyes-Angona, S. & Fernández-Cárdenas, J. M. (2015). La escritura académica en la formación en línea de docentes de escuelas públicas mexicanas. *Revista Electrónica de Investigación Educativa*, 17(2), 1–15. <http://redie.uabc.mx/vol17no2/contenido-reyesfdez.html>
- Ricart-Vayá, A. (2024). *ChatGPT as a tool to improve written expression in English as a foreign language*. *Íkala, Revista de Lenguaje y Cultura*, 29(2), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.17533/udea.ikala.354584>
- Rong, M., & Yao, Y. (2026). *From assistance to advancement: A systematic review of how GenAI supports L2 writing learning from the lens of activity theory*. *ECNU Review of Education*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20965311261437802>
- Salisbury, L.E. (2018). Just a tool: instructors' attitudes and use of course management systems for online writing instruction. *Computers and Composition*, 48, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2018.03.004>
- Salmanova, S. (2025). Gamification and AI in language learning: A new era of digital education. *Acta Globalis Humanitatis et Linguarum*, 2(1), 262–269. <https://doi.org/10.69760/aghel.02500134>
- Singha, S., Singha, R., & Jasmine, E. (2024). Enhancing language teaching materials through artificial intelligence. In F. Pan (Ed.), *AI in language teaching, learning, and assessment* (pp. 22–42). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-0872-1.ch002>

- Strobl, C., Ailhaud, E., Benetos, K., Devitt, A., Kruse, O., Proske, A., & Rapp, C. (2018). Digital support for academic writing: a review of technologies and pedagogies. *Computers and Education*, 131, 33-48. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2018.12.005>
- Swales, J. M., & Feak, C. B. (2012). *Academic writing for graduate students: Essential tasks and skills* (3rd ed.). University of Michigan Press.
- Tardy, C. M. (2017). The challenge of genre in the academic writing classroom: Implications for L2 writing teacher education. In J. Bitchener (Ed.), *Teaching writing for academic purposes to multilingual students: Instructional approaches* (pp. 69–83). Routledge.
- Vargas, A. (2015). La escritura académica en el posgrado: la perspectiva del estudiante. Un estudio de caso. *Redu Revista de Docencia Universitaria*, 14(1), 97-129. <https://doi.org/10.4995/redu.2016.5807>
- Zhang, Z.V., & Hyland, K. (2018). Student engagement with teacher and automated feedback on L2 writing. *Assessing Writing*, 36, 90–102. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2018.02.003>
- Zaphir, L., Lodge, J. M., Lisec, J., McGrath, D., & Khosravi, H. (2024). *How critically can an AI think? A framework for evaluating the quality of thinking of generative artificial intelligence* [Preprint]. arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2406.14769>