

The EATAW / International Writing Analytics Conference

September 15-16, 2026

Book of Abstracts



UNIVERSITY OF TARTU
Institute of Foreign Languages
and Cultures



MALMÖ
UNIVERSITY

STARS: Erasmus+ Project on SRL and Writing

WORKSHOP

Daire Ó Broin

South East Technological University (SETU)

Background

Background. Self-regulated learning refers to the capacity to plan, manage, monitor and reflect on one's own learning. Learners who use SRL strategies perform considerably better, and most learners still don't use them. The reasons they give are consistent: too much effort, no time, a belief the strategy won't help in their situation, an inability to deploy it well, and a failure to prompt themselves (Foerst et al., 2017; Dignath & Büttner, 2008; Rea et al., 2022). STARS builds digital scaffolds, co-designed with learners and teachers, that carry those strategies inside the writing task.

Workshop aims

Provide hands-on experience with the SRL digital scaffolds, and explore how some of these scaffolds might be embedded in a module that you are teaching.

What you'll do. You'll go through the whole journey in the system, based on a very practical example we'll provide, applicable in academic contexts: the brief, an annotated exemplar to practise on, a self-review, a peer review, and the revision plan that comes out of it. We then step back and look at where the SRL scaffolds sat in what you've just done, and how the same sequence could be set up for your own students, in your class and in theirs. Bring a laptop.

Modelling Writing Processes in Times of AI Usage: A Study of Technology Integration and Writing Support for Students

WORKSHOP

Otto Kruse, Carina Burch, Curtis Gautschi, Dejana Jelena Milićević, Jakob Ott, and Christian Rapp

In this presentation, we report on a project in progress and present intermediate results. The project builds on a previous pre-AI writing support tool (“Thesis Writer”) and aims to explore what changes in an era of AI-assisted composition are necessary. While many students increasingly rely on AI systems as universal problem-solvers for any kind of writing task, our approach emphasizes the need to understand the intellectual and methodological steps that constitute academic writing. The new platform this project intends to build, therefore, guides students through a structured, step-by-step workflow. It links instructions with tutorials, established digital research methods, intermediate writing artefacts, and a holistic view of the overall writing process. The intention of the project is to guide students through a landscape of methodologies, concepts, and work patterns so that they can situate each step of their writing within the broader context of the research process. The project is being developed in close collaboration with the academic libraries of the Canton of Zurich. This serves the need for integrating literature searches and database usage into the platform. It also supports literature reviews and provides resources for empirical research. The goal is to create a comprehensive environment that supports students both pedagogically and procedurally throughout their writing projects. A core feature is an AI-based writing agent that offers support and feedback across all stages of the writing and research process. The presentation will outline the conceptual model behind the platform, discuss methodological challenges encountered during development, and offer insight into the prototype currently in progress.

TRAI – Thesis Writing in the Age of AI: A Trilingual Investigation of Critical Thinking, Epistemic Awareness, and Linguistic Change

WORKSHOP

Baniceru, A. C., Chitez, M., Cintar, A., Costache, A., Csuros, K., Dinca, A., Doroholschi, C. I., Kruse, O., Milićević, D. J., Osenova, P., Paev, N., Punga, L., Rapp, C., Rogobete, R., Striletschi, C., Tucan, D., & Valchev, T.

Background

The Bachelor's thesis is a capstone genre in European higher education. It involves a learning opportunity for independent inquiry and it is also a formal qualification instrument. Traditionally, it has served as a training ground for epistemic development, requiring students to evaluate sources, position themselves as authors, and align their writing with disciplinary conventions. With the rapid uptake of generative AI, a second voice has entered this process — one with markedly different epistemological qualities. Large language models do not operate on the basis of truth but of probability (Quattrocioni et al., 2025), yet they may contribute to almost every stage of thesis production. Recent data from a Swiss university show that 82% of students use AI tools, primarily ChatGPT and DeepL, for text revision, summarisation, and idea generation (Rapp et al., 2025). The consequences for critical thinking, authorial voice, and the thesis as a genre remain underexplored — particularly outside English-speaking contexts (Bowen & Watson, 2024).

TRAI (Thesis Writing in the Age of AI) is a four-year trilateral project (2025–2028) carried out by ZHAW (Switzerland), West University of Timișoara (Romania), and the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences. By focusing on German, Romanian, and Bulgarian, it directly addresses the conference's call for research on smaller language communities at the human–machine interface.

Research Questions

1. How do Bachelor's students and supervisors integrate generative AI into thesis writing, and how do they reflect on its epistemic and ethical implications?
2. Which linguistic indicators of critical thinking and epistemic awareness (hedges, boosters, author positioning, argumentation patterns) are shaped by AI-mediated writing across the three languages?
3. Can a targeted didactic intervention (MOOC) measurably support critical thinking and responsible AI use?

Methodology

TRAI combines qualitative, quantitative, and corpus-linguistic methods in a quasi-experimental pre/post design with two cohorts of third-year Bachelor's students (graduating 2026 and 2027) per country:

- Surveys on AI literacy and attitudes at the start of the final year.
- Semi-structured interviews with ≥ 30 students and 20 supervisors per country, analysed inductively through thematic analysis with double coding (Braun & Clarke, 2006).
- TEZEC, a balanced trilingual thesis corpus (≈ 300 theses, 4.5 million words), analysed for linguistic markers of critical thinking and epistemic awareness.

- MOOC intervention between waves, offering open, multilingual guidance on AI literacy, ethics, and critical thinking; effects are assessed by contrasting cohort 1 (pre-intervention) with cohort 2 (post-intervention).

The presentation will report first results from the 2026 wave and discuss methodological challenges of cross-linguistic, AI-sensitive writing research.

References

- Bowen, J. A., & Watson, C. E. (2024). Teaching with AI: A practical guide to a new era of human learning. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Quattrociocchi, W., Capraro, V., & Perc, M. (2025). Epistemological fault lines between human and artificial intelligence. arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2512.19466>
- Rapp, C., Jakob, K., Drewek, A., Kruse, O., & Waller, G. (2025). Generative KI beim Verfassen von Abschlussarbeiten: Ergebnisse einer Studierenden- und Dozierendenumfrage im Juni/Juli 2024. ZHAW Zürcher Hochschule für Angewandte Wissenschaften. <https://doi.org/10.21256/zhaw-2549>

FLAIR

WORKSHOP

Helen Hint

How can higher education move beyond simply adopting generative AI towards developing learners who can engage with it critically, creatively, ethically, and effectively? This workshop introduces the FLAIR project and its key outcomes: the FLAIR AI Literacy Framework and the accompanying Didactic Framework. Participants will explore a holistic approach to AI readiness that connects core competencies with pedagogical principles, ethical considerations, and strategic implementation. We will unpack five essential competency domains from foundational AI knowledge and critical engagement to collaborative intelligence, and demonstrate how these can be translated into concrete learning outcomes and teaching activities. Participants will leave with practical ideas for fostering meaningful AI literacy in their own educational contexts.

Fact or Fiction: Exploring Critical Media Literacy in the Current Socio-Political Climate

CLASSROOM PRACTICAL

Amanda Masterpaul and Emma Howes

This workshop centers on methodology used within a co-taught undergraduate course. The course explores ways of making meaning through experimental pedagogical practices in critical pedagogy spanning Theatre of the Oppressed, Feminist Studies, and the field of Composition and Rhetoric. Our aim is to cultivate in students a sense of critical empathy (Lobb) and literacy skills by weaving together methods for engaging with text, widely conceptualized to include linguistic, visual, and embodied modes. We will explicitly focus on digital technologies in this offering. Workshop participants will explore methods of research and writing through the composition of a shared artifact, using Newspaper Theatre as our guide. Juxtaposing lived experience and representations from digital media sources, we will draw together stories highlighting the subjectivity of “the news,” utilizing synthesis and critique as forms of meaning-making. This approach emphasizes the ideological diversity within classrooms, where multiple ways of thinking come into conversation. Participants will also be invited to experience creating texts while playing with the de-mechanization of the body (Boal), a central liberatory practice of Theatre of the Oppressed. During the workshop, participants will receive a tutorial on Newspaper Theatre techniques, and work in groups to create a performance to share with the collective. The text(s) could include current news, historical documents, cultural texts/mythologies, song lyrics, or other similar resources. Performances may be informed by previous generative activities, though participants will be invited to address any range of topics of interest to the group. The workshop will culminate with sharing of productions and a brief closing circle to discuss takeaways from the experience. We hope, through a convergence of practices bridging feminist pedagogy, composition, and Theatre of the Oppressed, we can actualize pathways towards creating inclusive and egalitarian communities. By the end of the workshop, participants will gain an understanding of the goals and basic techniques in Newspaper Theatre as a tool to cultivate embodied approaches to critical media literacy.

Writing, Thinking, and AI: Tracking Epistemic Development in Undergraduate Thesis Writing

PANEL DISCUSSION

Otto Kruse, Dejana Jelena Milićević and Christian Rapp

This panel presents ongoing research from an international project funded by the Swiss Science Foundation (Bulgaria, Romania, Switzerland) that investigates how academic writing, critical thinking, and AI literacy interact in undergraduate thesis writing. The project examines how students navigate writing processes in a context of rapidly increasing AI adoption, and how these practices shape their epistemic development. Using multiple data sources and analytic approaches, the project seeks to capture the evolving relationship between thinking, writing, and AI-supported knowledge work.

Part 1: How critical thinking, AI use, and academic writing intersect in thesis writing: An introduction to the TRAI project This presentation explores the basic epistemological changes that AI introduced to thinking, knowledge creation, and writing. It looks at the implications of artificial intelligence that interferes with human thinking. Epistemology was created for humans – is it valid for AI too? And how does AI interfere with the epistemic authorities that traditionally govern thesis writing and research in general? Students have to adapt to the new technology and receive – measured against its high importance – comparatively little instruction and orientation for it. We study how students react to the new challenge and want to learn more about how AI use is changing thinking and text production patterns. The introduction will reflect on four issues: language use, epistemic blindness of AI, epistemic decisions in thesis writing, and the development of epistemic consciousness.

Part 2: Tracing students' reflective awareness of AI use and its self-reported influence on epistemic consciousness: Findings from interview studies We will present findings from qualitative interview studies conducted across all three countries in 2025–2026, examining how undergraduate thesis writers reflect on their use of generative AI tools. The interviews focus on students' sense of authorship and agency, how they judge and filter AI-generated output, and whether AI use deepens or rather replaces their own thinking.

Part 3: Adapting to a new thinking technology: Questionnaire based insights into practices and attitudes toward AI use among students and supervisors We will present data (primarily quantitative and some qualitative data) collected via questionnaire in three countries in summer 2026 researching usage patterns, prompting, motivational aspects and self-perception when using AI for thesis writing. Together, these contributions offer a multi-method perspective on how AI is reshaping the cognitive and epistemic dimensions of student writing, and how Writing Analytics can help make these transformations visible.

To Hell with Composing: Shifting Writing—and Instruction—to the Analysis of Text

PROVOCATION

Chris Anson

The increasing sophistication of generative AI programs is obviating the need to attend to processes of composing that have preoccupied writers, and writing instruction, for decades—processes such as structuring ideas, choosing the best words to convey meaning, avoiding writer’s block and procrastination, and navigating the complexities of voice and genre. Put simply, generative AI is increasingly doing the heavy lifting of composing, creating outputs in a fraction of the time it takes writers to do it themselves. But all the usual rhetorical and linguistic dexterity is still necessary for the human analysis of outputs, such as weighing the text against expectations of content, style, lexis, organization, adherence to genre conventions, and readability. Under these circumstances, attending to composing processes may be less important than applying skills of reading, interpreting, and analyzing text. In the new world of written discourse, such a shift means that writing is less about generating language and more about interrogating it; that authorship is less important than judgment; that revision, not composing, becomes the primary context for writers and for teachers of writing; that rhetorical awareness takes on greater importance; and that the definition of “writing” expands to include prompt engineering, selecting appropriate outputs, annotating and critiquing the outputs, and transforming text across diverse contexts. The process of composing is still shared by human and machine, but now the machine is First (and often imperfect) Author and the human is a more insightful and knowledgeable Editor. What, then, are the implications of this shift for academic and professional writing? How will writing instruction be transformed but still maintain a crucial focus on teaching important forms of both declarative and procedural knowledge about written discourse? [n.b.: This abstract was written by a human.]

Neuroadaptive Writing Analytics

PROVOCATION

Kyle Oddis

What does it mean to consider cognitive diversity in writing, especially in AI-mediated learning environments? Neurodivergent writers, including autistic, ADHD, and dyslexic writers, may demonstrate composing practices that challenge assumptions about pacing, organization, coherence, application of genre knowledge, or revision development, for instance. AI-mediated writing environments complicate how writing activity is interpreted. Differences in drafting behavior, revision movement, or stylistic consistency, for example, can become difficult to interpret without attention to variances in neurotypes and executive function (EF). Considering divergent neurotypes through an adaptive lens creates an opportunity to reconsider what WA tools and frameworks surface when identifying patterns in writing development. Neuroadaptive writing analytics is for examining writing with attention to EF variability and rhetorical adaptability. A neuroadaptive approach attends to differences in revision pathways, feedback uptake, organizational movement, drafting rhythms, and adaptive composing strategies across writers and situations. How might WA better account for variability within writing processes without treating divergence as outlier data? How might research expand shared understandings of writing process by engaging with composing practices that do not align neatly with standardized expectations of how writing should look, develop, or unfold across time? As we continue to engage in discussion surrounding AI-mediated composing environments, neuroadaptive writing analytics offers a provocation for thinking carefully about how writing processes are interpreted, assessed, and understood.

Cognitive Surrender and the Design Problem of Writing

PRESENTATION

Susan Lang

Generative AI has prompted widespread concern about academic integrity in writing-intensive courses, leading many instructors to focus on preventing and detecting unauthorized use. Such responses address a surface-level problem while leaving a deeper pedagogical issue unresolved. Drawing on research in cognitive psychology, particularly the concept of “cognitive surrender,” this work examines how students can complete writing tasks by delegating both discursive production and evaluation to AI systems, thereby weakening the long-assumed link between writing and thinking. Situating this shift in relation to John Bean’s *Engaging Ideas* (1996) and writing-to-learn pedagogies, which treat writing as a primary mode of learning, I argue that generative AI exposes a design flaw in many traditional assignments: they do not require sustained judgment, comparison, or decision-making. In response, writing tasks are reframed as cognitive environments, and principles are outlined for designing assignments that make evaluation necessary, even in AI-mediated contexts. The goal is to ensure that AI’s use in the writing process supports rather than displaces critical engagement.

The Influence of AI Language Use on Students' Evaluations: Evidence from a Case Study

PRESENTATION

Nele Karolin Teiva

In recent years, generative AI applications have increasingly become part of everyday life at universities. This development has raised the question of whether students are sufficiently aware of the limitations of these applications and capable of engaging critically with their outputs (e.g. Walter 2024). Such critical engagement is further complicated because AI systems often adopt a highly confident tone in their expression. At the same time, some experimental studies have shown that when generative AI applications use hedging devices and express their uncertainties clearly in their output, readers are more likely to question the information presented and seek additional sources (Kim et al 2024; Steyvers et al 2025). In my presentation, I introduce a case study in which I examined approximately 200 Estonian-language texts written by university students in 2023–2024 as part of the course “Introduction to Linguistics” at the University of Tartu. As part of the coursework, first-year undergraduate students were required to collaborate with a freely chosen generative AI application (e.g. ChatGPT) and to ask it about polysemous Estonian words and the relations between their meanings. The students then had to analyse the responses they received (either agreeing with those or proposing corrections), while also justifying their evaluations with reference to additional sources. They were also asked to add screenshots of their conversations with the AI application, making it possible to investigate connections between AI language use and the conclusions presented in the students' writing. The focus of the presentation is on whether, and to what extent, AI's language use influences students' evaluations and their written analyses. Preliminary results suggest that the way AI employs hedging modal constructions affects students' judgments regarding the correctness of the application's responses. The study raises an important question about whether, to what degree, and how students should be taught to notice expressions of uncertainty (as well as their absence) in both AI-generated and human writing, and whether such expressions can serve as a basis for evaluating the reliability of a text.

References

- Kim, Sunnie S. Y., Q. Vera Liao, Mihaela Vorvoreanu, Stephanie Ballard & Jennifer Wortman Vaughan. 2024. „I'm Not Sure, But...“: Examining the Impact of Large Language Models' Uncertainty Expression on User Reliance and Trust. The 2024 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency, 822–835. ACM.
<https://doi.org/10.1145/3630106.3658941>.

- Steyvers, M., Tejeda, H., Kumar, A. et al. What large language models know and what people think they know. 2025. Nature Machine Intelligence 7, 221–231. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-024-00976-7>
- Walter, Y. 2024. Embracing the future of Artificial Intelligence in the classroom: the relevance of AI literacy, prompt engineering, and critical thinking in modern education. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education 21, 15. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00448-3>

Academic Writing: Challenges to Explore Writer's Identity in the Age of AI

PRESENTATION

Pamela Olmos-Lopez

The dominant narrative positions English as the language of academia; however, studies have shown that academics and educators often draw upon multilingual repertoires (Curry & Lillis 2024, Kaufhold 2018). The multilingual environment of the university also occurs in monolingual countries for diverse reasons including the search for internationalisation, knowledge construction, mobility and the boom of digital communication. This is case of the Mexican university, my research context. The public Mexican university system uses Spanish as a means of instruction, but English and other modern languages also play a role in the literacy practices inside its disciplinary communities. In this presentation, I focus on a group of master students and their academic writing in English as an Additional language while carrying their research for writing their dissertation. I explore the use of AI technologies and their use in the students writing and research process paying particular attention to the development of their writer's identity, voice and stance. The data includes academic journals whose purpose was that students express their stance and reaction towards the articles read in the research methods class, the writing of their research proposal, an online questionnaire about the uses of AI in their writing and research process and a focus group session with the students who use it the most. By understanding how they use AI in their research and writing, we aim to find more effective ways to help them in their writing process. This research is in process, but we expect to have a list of pedagogical implications for the Higher Education classroom.

References

- Curry, M. J., & Lillis, T. (2024). Multilingualism in academic writing for publication: Putting English in its place. *Language Teaching*, 57(1), 87–100. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444822000040>
- Kaufhold, K. (2018). Creating translanguaging spaces in students' academic writing practices. *Linguistics and Education*, 45, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2018.02.001>

Orchestrating AI in Research Writing: A Qualitative Study of Students' Writing Processes and Strategy Profiles

PRESENTATION

Mirjam Weder

Cognitive writing process models conceptualise writing as a set of sub-processes such as planning, drafting, revising that draw on cognitive, motivational, and contextual resources (e.g. Hayes, 2012). The digital transformation of writing and the recent widespread adoption of generative AI challenge such models by highlighting the important role of writing technologies in text production (Bubenhofer & Weder, forthcoming). It has been suggested that AI-assisted writing should be viewed as a “co-activity of humans and machines” (Steinhoff, 2023), as it reshapes the boundary between human and technological resources (cf. Brommer & Rezat, forthcoming): sub-processes can be delegated, automated, or organized co-constructively. Since the 2022 release of ChatGPT, the debate on students' use of generative AI in higher education has moved from concerns about assessment culture and up-/downskilling (Limburg et al., 2023) to surveys of self-reported AI use (e.g. Ravšelj et al., 2025). The impact of AI on writing processes has received less attention, observational studies remain scarce, except for Jelson et al. (2025) who examined types of AI use and their relationship to self-efficacy and sense of ownership but did not address the management of sub-processes. The paper addresses this research gap through a qualitative study of students' AI-supported writing processes. The study aims to map how students orchestrate sub-processes such as prompting, handling AI-generated output, AI-assisted revision, and personal editing, and to derive individual strategy profiles of human-AI co-construction from these activities. It reports findings from twelve writing sessions conducted with L1 German speakers with varying degrees of proficiency in research writing and AI use. Participants were asked to write an introduction to a research paper. Multiple data-collection instruments were combined: screen capture (OBS Studio) and keystroke logging (Leijten & Van Waes, 2013) to record text production processes and interaction between human input and AI output; stimulated recall (Gass, 2000) to access participants' meta-cognitive processes; and a questionnaire on research writing and AI experience. Triangulation of process and recall data enabled reconstruction of individual strategy profiles. The written texts were rated for text-quality, conformity to the genre, and originality. The paper reports emerging strategy profiles related to prompting and revision, and discusses potential relations to text quality, research writing proficiency, AI experience AI, thereby contributing to a process-based typology of students' AI-supported writing strategies.

References

- Brommer, S., Rezat, S. (forthcoming). Mensch-KI-Interaktion beim Schreiben. In Schreiben mit KI – Prozesse, Praktiken und Perspektiven. transcript.
- Bubenhof, N., Weder, M. (forthcoming). Schreiben und Kommunizieren mit KI. In Bubenhof, N., Weder, M., Schreiben mit KI – Prozesse, Praktiken und Perspektiven. transcript.
- Gass, S. M./Mackey, A. (2000). Stimulated Recall Methodology in Second Language Research. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Hayes, J. R. (2012). Modeling and Remodeling Writing. In: Written Communication 29, 369–388.
- Leijten, M., Van Waes, L. (2013). Keystroke Logging in Writing Research: Using Inputlog to Analyze Writing Processes. Written Communication 30(3), 358-392.
- Ravšelj, D., et al. (2025). Higher education students' perceptions of ChatGPT: A global study of early reactions. In: PLOS ONE, 20. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0315011>.
- Steinhoff, T. (2023). Der Computer schreibt (mit). In MiDU-Medien im Deutschunterricht, IDSL II. (1), 1–16.

From Detection to Dialogue: Using AI Writing Coach—Companions to Understand Students as Writers

PRESENTATION

Lindsey Harding and Jared Holton

As generative AI becomes increasingly embedded in students' writing lives, researchers and teachers in writing-intensive disciplines need methods that move beyond detecting AI-generated text toward understanding how students actually write, think, revise, and learn with AI. This presentation introduces ArchPal, an AI-powered writing coach—companion developed and piloted at the University of Georgia (USA). ArchPal is both a pedagogical intervention and a writing analytics research site. Rather than positioning AI primarily as a threat to authorship or academic integrity, the application is designed to support students through dialogic interaction, slowing down the writing process through reflective inquiry to help students think about what they are doing, from planning and navigating assignment expectations to making connections and reflecting on revision strategies. We argue that AI writing coach—companions create a new kind of evidence for writing analytics: records of the questions students ask, the problems they name, the feedback they seek, the strategies they deploy, and the use of AI to extend—or avoid—thinking. In this sense, ArchPal allows us to study writing at the human—machine interface as a process of negotiated agency. What kinds of support do students seek from an AI companion? How do they describe their own writing challenges, habits, and confidence? When does AI-mediated coaching appear to deepen engagement with course content, ideas, writing processes, or even locally available support, like instructors, libraries, and writing centers? And where do students or instructors identify risks, limits, or moments of over-reliance? Drawing on an IRB-approved pilot study across seven undergraduate courses, this presentation describes ArchPal's design and development process, as well as our emerging analytical framework. Data sources include student and faculty surveys and interaction data from ArchPal chats. From these specifically, we track both quantitative patterns, such as frequency and types of interaction, and qualitative patterns, including the contexts in which students turned to ArchPal and the kinds of support they sought. In the session, we will first trace ArchPal's design and development history over the past 15 months, informed by core pedagogical commitments, including its emphasis on local resource routing and on coaching rather than content generation. We will then describe our IRB-approved pilot study and mixed-methods research design. Finally, we will share our emerging analytical framework for interpreting AI—student dialogue as evidence of engagement in writing processes, critical thinking, and disciplinary learning, with attention to both the possibilities and risks of using interaction data in writing research. By presenting ArchPal as a case of AI-informed writing

analytics, we show how writing programs can study AI use without reducing students' work to suspicion or surveillance. With ArchPal, the larger goals are to develop boundaried, pedagogically grounded approaches to AI-mediated writing support that meets students where they are as writers, and, at the same time, to understand how human–AI interaction shapes writing development, thinking, and learning across the curriculum.

Teaching Against the Trend, Reading Slow, Writing by Hand: Innovation in a Context of Educational Inequality

PRESENTATION

Ricardo Ayala & Maryam Farhang

The expansion of generative AI in higher education has intensified debates around authorship, authenticity and academic integrity. However, in contexts marked by educational inequality, AI-mediated writing also exposes longstanding structural weaknesses in academic literacy instruction. This paper presents a pedagogical innovation project developed within a Chilean university serving a high proportion of first-generation and socially disadvantaged students. Rather than focusing on AI detection or technological surveillance, the project proposes a curriculum-wide approach to strengthening academic writing through metacognitive development, critical reasoning, reflective metacognition and disciplinary literacy. Grounded in the Academic Literacies tradition, the proposal conceptualises writing not just as a "technical skill", although common in capitalist narratives, but rather as a situated epistemic practice tied to identity, knowledge construction and participation in disciplinary communities. The project emerges from institutional evidence showing persistent difficulties in argumentative writing, integration of prior learning and analytical reasoning across the undergraduate trajectory, particularly in disciplines where written production is central to professional formation. The paper argues that generative AI is not always a technological disruption. In our context, it became a catalyst for rethinking how universities teach writing, thinking and argumentation. In response, the project seeks to move beyond fragmented remedial approaches by embedding academic literacy across the curriculum and fostering students' awareness of their own cognitive and discursive processes. While the initiative may incorporate selected technological supports, its primary contribution lies in its pedagogical and curricular reorientation rather than in AI implementation itself. By foregrounding metacognition, equity and writing development in a Spanish-speaking context, this paper contributes to current discussions on human-machine writing relations from a perspective that prioritises educational transformation over surveillance and, sometimes uncritical, techno-optimism.

Using AI to Structure Doctoral Writing in English as an Additional Language

PRESENTATION

Alena Kačmárová

The present paper reframes the role of AI in doctoral education by introducing a practice-based model for structured self-assessment in research writing. While current discussions of generative AI in student writing tend to focus on risks to academic integrity or on its use as linguistic support, the paper shifts attention to how AI can support early-stage research development. This is particularly relevant in doctoral education, where supervisory feedback may come later in the writing process, and expectations around research design may remain implicit, which makes initial writing difficult for students. Drawing on supervisory practice at a Slovak university, the study focuses on doctoral students in the humanities writing in English as an additional language. These students often struggle not only with academic expression but also with core aspects of research design, including formulating a research problem, positioning the research within a field, aligning theoretical frameworks with analysis, and moving from descriptive to interpretative writing. The difficulties may derive from the differences between Slovak and Anglophone academic traditions, especially in expectations of explicitness, structure, and argumentation. AI systems are trained on large-scale corpora dominated by English-language academic discourse and tend to reflect Anglophone rhetorical and epistemological norms. AI can make them available for reflection and discussion and thus support student research alignment with international academic expectations if students know how to interact with AI. The paper proposes integrating AI into the preparatory phase of doctoral writing as a tool for examining reasoning and enabling self-assessment. It presents a model of structured and repeatable feedback sequence: an initial student text, prompts for AI to identify conceptual or methodological issues, AI-generated responses, and a revised and critically evaluated version of that feedback. The model is meant to provide guidance in how to formulate prompts, interpret, and critically evaluate the responses. With proper supervision, students can transfer from reception to collaborative production – they will not just accept what AI suggests but they can also use it in a more deliberate and critical way. Taken together, the model shows how a supervisor can guide a student in examining and revising their research reasoning while working with AI output as material for interpretation rather than direct adoption. The paper thus shifts AI from a corrective tool to structured self-assessment, supporting early-stage research development, epistemological awareness, greater student independence and confidence in the outcome.

Emerging Writing Development in AI-Mediated Learning Environments: Opportunities and Challenges

PRESENTATION

Egija Laganovska

The increasing presence of artificial intelligence (AI) in educational settings is reshaping how young children encounter early literacy and emerging writing experiences. While discussions about AI in education often focus on older students and issues of authorship or academic integrity, less attention has been devoted to preschool children and the developmental implications of AI-mediated learning environments. This paper explores the opportunities and challenges associated with the use of AI-supported tools in the development of writing in early childhood education. Emerging writing in preschool is a foundational process through which children begin to understand the functions of written language, experiment with symbols and letter forms, and develop early communicative competence. AI-mediated tools may provide individualised support through interactive storytelling, speech-to-text applications, adaptive feedback, and multimodal learning experiences that can foster motivation, vocabulary development, phonological awareness, and engagement in writing-related activities. Such technologies may be particularly beneficial for children with diverse learning needs and multilingual backgrounds. The paper also examines how AI technologies may influence children's creativity, independent thinking, social interaction, and engagement in play-based learning processes. Particular attention is given to the role of educators in guiding children's interaction with AI tools in developmentally appropriate and ethically responsible ways. The study discusses the importance of balancing technological innovation with opportunities for interpersonal communication, collaborative learning, and hands-on experiences that are essential in early childhood education. Furthermore, the paper highlights concerns regarding excessive screen exposure, data privacy, and the potential overreliance on automated support during foundational literacy development. This study emphasizes that artificial intelligence should function as a supportive pedagogical tool that complements, rather than replaces, human interaction and play-based learning. The research contributes to current discussions on writing development within human technology interaction by highlighting the developmental characteristics and needs of preschool children in AI-mediated educational environments.

Beyond Detection: Evaluating AI- and Human-generated Texts Through the SOLO Taxonomy in Higher Education

PRESENTATION

Anu Tammeleht

The rapid development of GenAI has fundamentally reshaped discussions around plagiarism, academic integrity, and assessment in higher education. While early concerns focused primarily on detecting AI-generated texts, current debates increasingly highlight a more important pedagogical question: how can educators evaluate the quality of understanding demonstrated in student work in an era where AI-generated responses can appear coherent, polished, and academically acceptable? This presentation builds on the recent study by Tammeleht and Löfström (2025), which examined differences between AI-generated and human-written cohesive responses to research ethics and integrity cases using the SOLO taxonomy (Structure of Observed Learning Outcomes). The presentation introduces findings showing that AI-generated texts frequently achieve a level where most of the necessary elements are present (but without connections between displayed), and occasionally relational levels of understanding (indicating some connections between the ideas), producing logically organised and linguistically fluent responses. However, human responses — particularly those produced by experts — more consistently demonstrate contextual awareness, integration of ethical principles, originality, and the ability to transfer understanding into new situations. AI-generated responses, by contrast, often remain general, predictable, and limited in their capacity to propose novel interpretations or critically engage with broader implications. Drawing from both the published research (Tammeleht & Löfström, 2025) and a workshop designed for educators on plagiarism and AI in higher education, this presentation will demonstrate how the SOLO taxonomy can function not only as an assessment framework but also as a practical pedagogical tool for analysing the depth and quality of written responses. Workshop activities included comparative analysis of AI- and human-generated texts, discussion of academic integrity in the post-plagiarism era, and collaborative evaluation of texts using SOLO levels ranging from unistructural to extended abstract. The presentation argues that the future of assessment should move beyond attempts to merely identify whether a text was written by AI or by a human author. Instead, educators should focus on evaluating evidence of critical thinking, contextual understanding, ethical reasoning, originality, and the ability to establish meaningful conceptual connections. The presentation will also explore the growing potential of AI-assisted evaluation in qualitative text analysis, while acknowledging the ethical and pedagogical risks associated with overreliance on automated systems. Although GenAI technologies continue to evolve rapidly, the

core educational challenge remains highly relevant: how can higher education foster deep learning and academic integrity in contexts where AI can reproduce mostly surface-level academic performance? The presentation concludes by proposing future-oriented assessment practices that emphasise transparency, reflective learning, and higher-order thinking rather than simple reproduction of information. This abstract was generated with the help of CurreChat (University of Helsinki AI tool) based on the author input and the draft was thoroughly revised and modified.

A Way of Integrating Scaffolded Generative AI Activities into a Professional Writing Course

PRESENTATION

Pavel Zemliansky

In April of 2026, in a series of blog posts, Tom Johnson who works as a technical writer for Google called himself a cyborg. Johnson wrote that, with the advent of AI, his job has transformed from writing software documentation from scratch to writing AI prompts, checking AI output for mistakes and inaccuracies, and revising. According to Johnson, instead of replacing the writer, as some would claim, AI is creating a “hybrid writer,” part human, part machine, figuratively speaking (Johnson, 2026). According to Lockridge and Van Ittersum (2020), a writing workflow is an understanding of how tools shape writing processes. (Ittersum and Lockridge). Just like the typewriter, the computer, and other writing technologies shaped writing workflows in the past, AI is reshaping the workflows we are used to now. The third useful concept for understanding human-AI interaction is “human in the loop.” It has been popularized in recent years by Anders, among others (2026).

Despite some voices which still advocate for a complete ban on the use of generative AI in education and for a punitive treatment of students who use AI, the increasingly emerging consensus among educators seems to be that students should be taught to use AI ethically, analytically, and critically. In this presentation, I will describe and reflect upon a course and assignment design in an introductory-level engineering communication course which teaches students two different ways to critically use generative AI tools for professional writing tasks and to reflect on that use and on what they learn about their own writing process through those interactions with AI. One such task was creating an early draft of a technical text with AI; the other was using AI to develop initial questions/points of departure for a writing project. As part of the assignments, the students were shown ways to critique and revise initial AI-produced texts.

After discussing the assignment’s rationale, design, and ways in which AI tools were used by students, I analyze samples of student writing completed with the help of AI tools as well as reflective pieces. Framing these student activities in terms of human in the loop and writing workflows allows us to get away from the categorical “yes/no” views on using and teaching AI and towards a more nuanced understanding of what AI can and cannot do for writers. The preliminary conclusions from this work demonstrate the challenges our students are likely to face in learning to work with AI and charts some directions we as teachers can take to improve the teaching of critical, ethical, and responsible use of generative AI in a writing workflow.

References

Anders, A., & Dux Speltz, E. (2024). A Human-in-the-loop Approach: Designing an AI-Assisted Workflow.

Johnson, T. (2026). The Emerging Picture of a Changed Profession: Cyborg Technical Writers — Augmented, Not Replaced, by AI

Lockridge, T., & Van Ittersum, D. (2020). Writing workflows: Beyond word processing. University of Michigan Press.

Modal Meaning in AI-mediated Translation of Medical Research Articles from English into Slovak

PRESENTATION

Zuzana Knižková

Current evaluations of AI-mediated translation in medical research writing usually focus on fluency, grammaticality, and terminological accuracy. Much less attention is paid to the way AI systems may reshape modal meaning and thereby alter certainty, caution, recommendation, or obligation in translated research texts. This is a significant gap, because in medical discourse such shifts can influence how physicians and other expert readers interpret research claims in risk-sensitive contexts. My previous research identified modality as a particularly sensitive area in the AI-mediated translation of medical texts. Building on that insight, this paper asks how NMT and LLM-based AI models render modal meaning in the translation of medical research articles from English into Slovak, and whether they tend to strengthen, weaken, or redistribute modal force in systematic ways. The study focuses on the transfer of meaning and on the interpretive consequences of modal shifts in multilingual academic writing. The paper presents a broader follow-up design that moves beyond a narrowly defined pilot setting and examines modal meaning across medical research articles in a wider discourse context. It considers both epistemic modality, linked to certainty, probability, and evidential caution, and deontic modality, linked to recommendation, obligation, permission, and prohibition. In this way, the study treats modality not as a minor grammatical feature, but as part of the rhetorical framing through which research knowledge is communicated across languages. Methodologically, the study is conceived as a corpus-based comparative analysis of English medical research articles and their AI-generated Slovak translations. It analyzes several sections of the research article in order to examine modal meaning across different parts of the text. The analysis combines close qualitative reading with manual coding of modal markers and their shifts, focusing on changes in stance, strength of meaning, and agentivity. The aim is to identify recurring patterns of modal shift across the corpus. The study is expected to offer a clearer account of how AI systems handle modal meaning in English–Slovak medical research writing and why this matters for the interpretation of certainty, caution, recommendation, and obligation in translated texts. It thus contributes to ongoing discussions of AI-mediated multilingual writing by focusing on transfer of meaning rather than surface correctness alone. The findings may be relevant to researchers, translators, reviewers, and educators concerned with multilingual academic writing in high-stakes contexts.

Students' Managing Writing Difficulties — Student and Lecturer Perspectives

PRESENTATION

Marri-Mariska Tammepõld, Nele Novek and Ilona Trigel

For university students, generative AI (GenAI) tools have become an additional support for writing academic texts. Previous research indicates that students often use GenAI tools in various stages of the writing process: generating ideas, searching for literature, obtaining information, summarizing texts, checking grammar, translating, etc. (Nebieridze & Jojua, 2024; Trigel et al., 2025; Lin & Wang, 2025). It has also been suggested that AI tools are used by students who feel less confident in their academic writing skills (Johnston et al., 2024). The results of our recent study based on a survey conducted in 2023 and 2024 among university students offer more nuance to this topic. We have found that there is a higher likelihood of university students using GenAI tools for specific stages of the writing process, instead of every writing activity they find difficult (Tammepõld et al., 2026 forthcoming). In this presentation, we will discuss this finding along with the results from a contemporaneous survey conducted among lecturers at the University of Tartu. By comparing student- and lecturer-reported writing difficulties among students and GenAI tool usage along with lecturers' reported teaching practices, we aim to identify potential gaps between perceived needs and current support. We will further explore possible explanations for students' reliance on AI tools at certain stages of the writing process, including views that some skills are tacit knowledge or should be acquired independently (see also Boice, 1993).

References

- Boice, E. R. (1993). Writing Blocks and Tacit Knowledge. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 64(1), 19–54. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.1993.11778407>
- Johnston, H., Wells, R. F., Shanks, E. M., Boey, T., & Parsons, B. N. (2024). Student perspectives on the use of generative artificial intelligence technologies in higher education. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 20(1), 2. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-024-00149-4>
- Lin, C.-Y., & Wang, C.-C. (2025). Why do graduate students use generative AI in thesis writing? The influence of self-efficacy, time pressure, and trust. *Current Psychology*, 44(12), 12071–12086. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-025-08003-7>
- Nebieridze, M., & Jojua, N. (2024). Why do students use ChatGPT and why does it matter? Reflecting on the use of AI in higher education. *Online Journal of Humanities ETAGTSU*, 9, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.52340/PUTK.2024.2346-8149.09.12>

Tammepõld, M.-M., Novek, N., Trigel, I. (2026). Students' Writing Difficulties and GenAI Tools: Helpful or a Hindrance? *Journal of Writing Analytics*, 9 [forthcoming].

Trigel, I., Komissarov, L.-M., Miilman, E., Teiva, N. K., & Tammepõld, M.-M. (2025). A Year of Generative AI: Observations from a Survey among University Students in Estonia. *Journal of Academic Writing*, 15(S2), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.18552/joaw.v15iS2.1118>

Human and AI-mediated Feedback in L2 Paragraph Writing

PRESENTATION

Mira Bekar and Ilina Kachinske (co-author)

This study explores the distinct effects of human and AI conferencing on second language learners' basic psychological needs (BPN), task engagement, and quality of revision. Interest in this issue has increased due to the growing use of AI-generated and AI-mediated written feedback. Although previous empirical studies indicate that AI can support linguistic accuracy and learner engagement, findings remain inconsistent regarding higher-order writing quality, discourse-level revision, comparisons between human and AI feedback, as well as emotional responsiveness and contextual sensitivity (e.g., Crosthwaite and Sun, 2025; Zhang et al., 2025). To address the need for a stronger human dimension in L2 writing instruction and feedback, the present study investigates teacher–student writing conferences as spaces for real-time cognitive, emotional, and agentic interaction. More specifically, the study seeks to provide an empirically grounded understanding of the unique contribution of human feedback to L2 development and to compare it with AI-mediated interactive feedback in terms of learners' basic psychological needs, task engagement, revision quality, and knowledge transfer. Thirty-two undergraduate students from one public and one private university in North Macedonia participated in the mixed-method study. Following an argumentative paragraph writing pretest, participants were randomly assigned either to a teacher–student conference group or to an AI-mediated conference group. The AI-mediated conference group was given identical prompting guidelines. After revising their paragraphs, students completed a delayed posttest designed to measure transfer of knowledge to a new writing task. All paragraphs were evaluated using an agreed-upon rubric by the two researchers, and an inter-rater reliability test using Cohen's kappa was conducted. Comparisons between pre-test, revisited and post-test paragraph writing revealed differences between the two groups in competence, relatedness, and task engagement, with students in the human-led conference condition reporting higher levels across all measures. The preliminary findings support the importance of the human dimension in feedback practices, suggesting that interpersonal interaction between teachers and students may play a crucial role in supporting learners' psychological needs and engagement during L2 writing.

References

- Crosthwaite, P., & Sun, S. (2025). Generative AI and L2 written feedback studies: A scoping review. *RELC Journal*, 00336882251386530.
- Zhang, Z., Aubrey, S., Huang, X., & Chiu, T. K. (2025). The role of generative AI and hybrid feedback in improving L2 writing skills: A comparative study. *Innovation in Language*

Learning and Teaching, 1-19.

Tracing Linguistic Change in Teacher Education Students' Writing (2010–2026)

PRESENTATION

Ieva Margeviča-Grinberga

The rapid integration of generative artificial intelligence (AI) into education has transformed academic writing practices worldwide. However, existing research has focused mainly on English-language academic writing and AI detection, with less attention paid to smaller language communities and longitudinal changes in first-language (L1) writing practices. This study addresses this gap by examining changes in academic writing in Latvian teacher education programmes between 2010 and 2026, focusing on linguistic structures, recurring writing difficulties, and the influence of other languages on L1 academic expression. The study also explores how AI-assisted writing practices may contribute to shifts in students' written discourse. A longitudinal corpus-based mixed-methods design was used. A diachronic corpus of coursework texts from teacher education programmes was compiled from archived assignments and writing samples produced between 2010 and 2026. The corpus includes texts written before and after the availability of generative AI tools. Quantitative corpus-linguistic analysis was used to identify recurring lexical, grammatical, syntactic, and discourse-level patterns across time periods. Attention was paid to English-influenced constructions, changes in academic style, cohesion strategies, and typical L1 writing errors. Qualitative discourse analysis was additionally used to examine shifts in authorial stance, argumentation patterns, and textual organisation associated with AI-mediated writing practices. Preliminary findings indicate considerable changes in students' academic writing over time. Earlier writing samples, particularly those produced before the availability of generative AI tools, revealed frequent linguistic errors in Latvian academic writing among Russian-speaking students whose proficiency in Latvian was often incomplete. These errors included non-standard sentence structures, grammatical inaccuracies, inappropriate word choice, and problems with the text's logical organisation, frequently reflecting the transfer of Russian linguistic structures. More recent writing samples demonstrate a significant decrease in visible Russian-language influence, which now appears only in isolated cases. At the same time, the data reveal an increasing presence of English-influenced syntactic constructions, lexical borrowings, and translated discourse patterns in Latvian academic writing. Recent texts also show greater structural uniformity, formulaic academic phrasing, and reduced stylistic variability, suggesting the growing influence of AI-supported writing practices. While AI mediation appears to support grammatical accuracy and standardisation, the findings also indicate potential reductions in individual authorial voice, linguistic creativity, and rhetorical

flexibility. The study contributes to current discussions on writing at the human–machine interface by moving beyond AI detection toward understanding how AI reshapes multilingual academic writing practices over time. Keywords: AI-mediated writing, English language influence, higher education, Latvian academic writing, longitudinal writing analytics, L1 writing development, teacher education.

The Challenge of AI as a Writing Instructor: Coherence, Thematic Progression, and EFL Academic Writing

PRESENTATION

Laila Haddad-Najjar and Tzipora Rakedzon

As generative AI becomes increasingly integrated into academic writing instruction, the central question is shifting from whether AI can support writing to how specific configurations of AI-mediated feedback shape writing development. While existing research has largely focused on surface-level linguistic accuracy and English-dominant contexts, considerably less attention has been paid to discourse-level writing, textual flow, and thematic progression, particularly among EFL STEM advanced writers. Existing studies further report mixed findings regarding AI's ability to support higher-order writing skills, with many AI systems improving grammatical accuracy and fluency while showing limited impact on global coherence and discourse organization. Addressing this gap, the present study investigates how a customized AI feedback tool informed by rhetorical move structures and thematic progression influences coherence in EFL academic writing. The study was conducted with 29 EFL STEM doctoral students enrolled in an academic writing course at a research university. Participants completed a pre-post intervention centered on writing research introductions. The intervention employed a customized GPT-based feedback tool embedded within a web-based academic writing platform. The tool was pedagogically aligned with course instruction and configured to provide concise, instructor-style formative feedback on rhetorical organization and thematic progression, and textual flow. Students first received explicit instruction on rhetorical moves and thematic progression, after which they drafted a 300–500-word introduction related to their own research. Drafts were uploaded to the platform, where the AI generated individualized discourse-level feedback grounded in Swales' rhetorical move model and Nwogu's given-new progression framework. Students then revised their texts in response to the feedback during a guided revision cycle. To examine changes in writing performance, texts were analyzed using the Tool for the Automatic Analysis of Cohesion (TAACO). In particular, Latent Semantic Analysis (LSA)-based measures were used to assess local and global textual cohesion. Paired-samples t-tests revealed significant improvements in adjacent and distant sentence-level semantic similarity, indicating enhanced local cohesion, stronger sentence-to-sentence connectivity, and improved information flow following the intervention. These findings suggest that participants became more successful in maintaining semantic continuity across neighboring sentences and developing ideas in a more connected and cohesive manner. However, no significant changes were found in paragraph-

level semantic similarity, suggesting that global coherence and broader discourse organization remained relatively stable despite improvements in local textual flow. These findings contribute to emerging research on AI-mediated writing by demonstrating that the pedagogical configuration of AI feedback matters substantially. AI-generated feedback appears to support specific discourse-level features when grounded in explicit rhetorical and thematic based frameworks. At the same time, the findings corroborate prior research suggesting that coherence remains relatively resistant to improvement, even in AI-supported writing environments, and help explain the mixed findings reported in the literature regarding AI's effects on higher-order writing skills. The study also foregrounds EFL STEM advanced students and writers, a population underrepresented in current AI-writing research despite their growing reliance on English-medium academic communication. Overall, the findings support a shift from AI detection toward understanding how AI reshapes writing processes, discourse organization, and pedagogical practice in multilingual academic contexts.

Discussing with a Black Hole? Metaphoric Representations of GenAI

PRESENTATION

Marge Käsper, Merje Miliste

With the rise of conversational AI, one question has become increasingly visible: who—or what—are we actually talking to when we type at our keyboards? Since chatbot interfaces are built around dialogue and interaction, it feels natural to imagine the interlocutor as A “FRIEND,” A TEACHER, A COACH, or at least as some form of living presence. Yet many current debates warn against precisely such anthropomorphization, insisting instead that GenAI should be understood as A TOOL, A “BLACK BOX,” or a fundamentally non-human system. This provocation revisits the long history of human–machine metaphors and reminds us that even the term “Artificial Intelligence,” introduced in the 1950s, was itself a strategic rhetorical construction rather than a neutral scientific label. Turning to the contemporary world of ChatGPT and other generative AI systems, we explore the colorful and strongly personifying representations that accompanied their emergence in Estonian media discourse. GenAI appears alternately as a threatening WARRIOR, an obscure ORACLE, a domesticated DEMON, A SERVANT, AN EXPERT, or a COLLABORATOR, but also as a controllable VOLUME KNOB or even a BAKERY OVEN. A growing body of writing has attempted to counter such personification by restoring a sense of technological objecthood and non-personhood, often in the name of ethical clarity and responsible AI discourse. This talk, however, asks whether dehumanizing GenAI at all costs is necessarily the solution. The question may not be whether we anthropomorphize AI, but whether humans are capable of interacting without metaphors at all. Cognitive metaphor studies suggest that we tend to understand less easily graspable objects and phenomena through more familiar and concrete ones. If interaction itself inevitably produces metaphorical framings, then the central issue may not be choosing the “correct” metaphor, but becoming critically aware of the relationships, asymmetries, expectations, and power structures that different metaphors produce. For example, when we insist that GenAI is “just a tool,” are we describing the technology—or disciplining the user? Different metaphorical framings may illuminate different aspects of GenAI. Yet without reflecting on the metaphors through which we approach GenAI, interaction risks becoming BLACK-HOLE communication: users project meanings, emotions, and intentionality into the system, only to encounter amplified versions of their own assumptions in return.

Booksprint as Method: From AI Detection to Embedded Reflection on Human-Machine Writing

PRESENTATION

Kai Löser

As generative AI becomes part of everyday academic writing, writing pedagogy faces a methodological challenge: how can human–machine writing practices be examined in ways that are pedagogically meaningful without reducing them to detection? This presentation proposes the Booksprint as a process-oriented answer. Rather than treating student writing with AI as an object to be evaluated only after texts are completed, the paper presents the Booksprint as a methodologically designed environment in which inquiry into AI-supported writing is embedded within the act of writing itself. The presentation draws on a higher-education Booksprint in which students collaboratively produce publication-oriented texts on AI in academic study and writing. Its central methodological claim is that reflective writing research can be integrated into the pedagogical design of the format. The Booksprint therefore combines collaborative drafting and revision with embedded instruments such as short self-evaluations, questionnaires on the forms and frequency of AI use, guided reflection prompts, and peer discussion. These instruments accompany the writing process and document how students use AI for idea generation, structuring, reformulation, feedback, and revision. The resulting material is not an external add-on, but part of the course’s learning architecture. This approach reframes the relationship between pedagogy and research. The Booksprint is not simply analyzed retrospectively as a case study; it functions as a structured setting in which writing processes become observable through participant reflection, iterative documentation, and collaborative exchange. In this sense, it operates at the intersection of writing pedagogy, human–machine interaction, and process-oriented writing research. It also responds directly to current debates on AI in writing instruction by moving beyond the binary of authentic versus inauthentic text production. Instead, it foregrounds writing as a situated process shaped by student agency, LLM outputs, peer feedback, genre expectations, and editorial decisions. I argue that the Booksprint offers a productive methodological model because it shifts attention from product-centered surveillance to embedded understanding. By integrating reflective instruments into collaborative writing, it makes AI use discussable, interpretable, and pedagogically actionable. The paper thus presents the Booksprint not only as an innovative teaching format, but as a methodological framework for studying and teaching writing at the human–machine interface.

Writing as an Act of Identity: Student Stances on Generative AI Use in Romanian Humanities BA Thesis Writing

PRESENTATION

Karla Csuros, Claudia Doroholschi, Cristina Băniceru, Roxana Rogobete, Dumitru Tucan, and Mădălina Chitez

Despite the rapid expansion of institutional policy and detection-oriented research on generative AI in academic writing, the emic perspectives of students, how they reason about, legitimise, resist, or accommodate AI use in their own writing practice, remain empirically underexplored (Brinkschulte et al., 2023; Cotton, Cotton & Shipway, 2024). This gap is particularly salient in humanities contexts and in non-Anglophone settings, where academic writing traditions differ substantially from the Anglophone norm (Chitez et al., 2018; Băniceru et al. 2012). This paper presents findings from a mixed-methods corpus-based study drawing on 30 semi-structured interviews with humanities students at the West University of Timișoara, all of whom had recently completed or were completing a BA thesis. The study addresses a single, focused research question: how do students in a Romanian humanities context discursively position themselves in relation to generative AI as a writing tool? The study employs a dual analytical framework. First, a corpus-based analysis of the interview transcripts tracks the frequency and collocation of key lexical fields: authorship and voice (voce, stilul meu, îmi aparține; 'my voice', 'my style', '[it] belongs to me'), ethical evaluation (etic, plagiat, transparență, 'ethical', 'plagiarism', 'transparency'), instrumental use (documentare, sinonime, traducere, verificare; 'documentation', 'synonyms', 'translation', 'verification'), and epistemic risk (greșit, inexistent, nevalidat; 'wrong', 'nonexistent', 'invalidated'). This layer maps recurring discourse patterns in how students construct hierarchies of legitimate and illegitimate AI use. Second, a discourse analysis layer applies the analytical frameworks established by Doroholschi et al. (2018) for Romanian academic discourse in CEE contexts, operationalising stance, hedging and boosting, authorial voice, and the construction of writing identity (Hyland, 2005; Ivanič, 1998) in oral discourse about writing. Preliminary findings reveal a consistent typology of student stances organised along three axes: (1) legitimate vs. illegitimate use; students draw clear, self-imposed boundaries between AI-assisted documentation, synonym-finding, and translation (acceptable) and AI-generated content or analysis (categorically rejected on ethical grounds); (2) authorial voice and identity; students articulate sustained concerns about stylistic homogenisation and the erasure of personal voice as consequences of extensive AI use, evidencing an active authorial self-awareness; (3) epistemic responsibility; cross-validating AI output through independent sources emerges as a

central self-regulation strategy, discursively constructed as a marker of intellectual integrity. These findings complement recent qualitative and phenomenological accounts of student AI dilemmas (Chan et al., 2023; Kim et al., 2025) and extend them to a linguistically and culturally distinct context. The study contributes to writing analytics debates by arguing that the shift “from detection to understanding” necessarily entails collecting and analysing students’ own accounts of AI-mediated writing. It also provides empirical grounding for institutional policy-making in contexts, such as Romanian higher education, where such data are still absent.

Keywords: generative AI, BA thesis, academic writing, student positioning, authorial voice, corpus-based discourse analysis, Romanian higher education, writing identity

Beyond the Deficit Model: Decoding the Strategic Rhetorical Matrix and Mindset of L2 Academic Writing

PRESENTATION

Yaroslava Fedoriv, Iryna Pirozhenko, and Iryna Semiankiv

As EFL writing conventions enforce rigid, low-context Anglophone standards of textual linearity, non-Anglophone rhetorical variations can be mischaracterized as logical deficiencies or a lack of analytical discipline. This study challenges this reductive deficit model by demonstrating that non-linear text progression and relational authorial positioning reflect systematic cultural cognitive frameworks rather than linguistic errors.

Using a qualitative mixed-methods of case study, this research examines undergraduate students' written samples to chart the cohort's metacognitive awareness regarding cultural epistemology, logic, and emotionality, while analyzing real-time text production under explicit structural constraints.

The findings invalidate cultural stereotypes that homogenize East-Slavic writing under a generalized collectivist umbrella. Instead, the data uncovers a unique autonomous-relational pattern specific to the Ukrainian cultural mindset, characterized by a preservation of personal independence alongside a horizontal, community-driven engagement. In text production, this manifests as a strategic preference for narrative-chronological winding, affective evaluation metrics, and dialogic discursive markers that align with reader-responsible traditions.

Demonstrating how L2 writers negotiate identity, voice, and target-language conventions, we discuss the pedagogical and instructional design implications of these findings, arguing that as writing analytics moves from "error" detection to understanding, EFL writing assessment must account for culturally grounded rhetorical matrices to preserve authorial identity and epistemic voice in non-Anglophone academic spaces.

Keywords: contrastive rhetoric, cultural mindset, EFL writing, rhetorical organisation, writing identity, Ukrainian context.

Beyond AI Detection: Reframing Academic Writing Assessment at the Human–Machine Interface

PRESENTATION

Isaiah Uchechukwu Ilo

Beyond AI Detection: Reframing Academic Writing Assessment at the Human–Machine Interface

Isaiah U. Ilo, PhD Department of Theatre Arts, University of Abuja, Nigeria The growing use of generative artificial intelligence in academic writing has placed new pressure on universities to protect academic integrity. In response, many institutions have turned to AI-detection tools as a way of identifying machine-produced text. Yet this response is not without difficulty. Evidence increasingly suggests that detection-based approaches are methodologically fragile, pedagogically narrow, and often unable to account for the complex ways in which students and scholars now write with digital assistance. The problem, therefore, is not simply whether a text is “human” or “machine-made,” but how academic judgement can respond to writing that is becoming more collaborative, layered, and technologically mediated. This paper argues that the current detection paradigm risks reducing academic writing assessment to a problem of surveillance. Such a move may protect institutional authority in the short term, but it does little to address the deeper educational questions raised by generative AI: how students interpret sources, develop arguments, demonstrate disciplinary reasoning, and take responsibility for their intellectual choices. From this angle, AI-assisted writing should not be treated only as a threat to authenticity, but also as a challenge to existing models of assessment. Situated within debates on academic literacies, writing assessment, and human–AI interaction, the paper proposes a shift toward more interpretive and context-sensitive assessment practices. Rather than relying primarily on probabilistic detection systems, universities may need to foreground writing processes, reflective authorship statements, oral defence, iterative drafting, transparent AI-use disclosure, and discipline-specific standards of reasoning. These practices are not perfect solutions, but they offer a more educationally meaningful way of evaluating scholarly work in an age where writing is increasingly hybrid. The paper further suggests that the future of academic integrity will depend less on detecting machine-generated text and more on cultivating critical AI literacy, ethical transparency, and defensible authorship. Ultimately, it calls for a movement away from policing AI use as a purely technical problem and toward understanding how scholarly writing, supervision, and assessment are being reshaped at the human–machine interface.

Keywords: Generative AI; Academic Writing Assessment; AI Detection; Academic Integrity; Human–Machine Writing; AI Literacy

Improving Peer Feedback Practice through Intervention: A Study of 7,043 Students

PRESENTATION

Brian Gogan

My presentation shares results from a writing analytics study of 7,043 undergraduate writers' peer feedback writing practices. At my institution—a high research, PhD-granting public institution in North America—first-year writing students use the Eli Review platform to exchange written feedback about their in-process writing each week. Research on Eli Review-facilitated peer feedback exchange suggests a clear benefit to student writers (Gogan & Atkins, 2020; Hart-Davidson & Meeks, 2020; Mitchum et al., 2024). Using advanced statistical modeling and the R programming language, I present results from tests that look for relationships between: feedback writing performance variables (word count, comment count); identity variables (gender, race); and, academic variables (grade point, major). My presentation shares data visualizations to explain the test results and pedagogical takeaways to the audience.

References

- Gogan, B., & Atkins, S. (2020). Peer Review Practice, Student Identity, and Success in a First-Year Writing Pilot Curriculum: An Equity-Minded Analysis. *The Journal of Writing Analytics*, 4(1), 55-103.
- Hart-Davidson, W., & Meeks, M. G. (2020). Feedback analytics for peer learning: Indicators of writing improvement in digital environments. In D. Kelly-Riley & N. Elliot (Eds.) *Improving outcomes: Disciplinary writing, local assessment, and the aim of fairness*. (pp. 79-92) Modern Language Association.
- Mitchum, C., Rodrigo, R., & Koenig, S. (2024). How Do We Know It Works? Feedback Loops to Raise the Messy Middle in Online Formative Peer Assessment. *College Composition & Communication*, 75(3), 513-533.

Citing at the Machine-Human Interface: Development and Applications of SourceMapper

PRESENTATION

Megan Kane

Students are often taught how to format citations correctly, but they receive far less support in understanding how citations function rhetorically within academic writing. How can students learn not only to cite sources, but to integrate, evaluate, and position research effectively within disciplinary conversations? And what role might computational tools play in supporting these endeavors? This presentation reports on the ongoing development and classroom implementation of SourceMapper, a machine learning–supported tool designed to identify citations in student writing and classify them according to type and rhetorical function. Drawing on research in citation studies and genre analysis (Swales, 1980; Hyland, 2000; Petrić, 2007; Scheidt & Middleton, 2021), SourceMapper identifies citation features at the sentence level and tags rhetorical functions such as reporting, transforming, and evaluating, allowing instructors and students to visualize patterns of source use and compare them to disciplinary norms (Kane, 2025). In this presentation, I will highlight SourceMapper’s ongoing development as a platform for identifying and rhetorically tagging citations in student writing. I will discuss current work on expanding the platform’s citation-term dictionary, refining machine learning classifiers trained on annotated citation data, and improving the platform’s ability to identify rhetorical citation functions across genres and disciplines. I will also introduce the development of a custom-trained chatbot feature designed to support reflective revision practices, building off emerging research on GenAI tools as targeted feedback partners (Pottmeyer, Hershock, Wetzel, & Mineroff, 2026). Additionally, I will discuss recent implementations of SourceMapper in my first-year writing classes at a four-year U.S. university. Building on scholarship suggesting that digital tools can help students better recognize and reflect on rhetorical and linguistic choices in writing (Helberg et al., 2018), I developed a classroom activity in which students uploaded drafts to the platform, examined visualizations and rhetorical tags associated with their citation practices, and reflected on their source integration strategies in relation to genre- and discipline-specific conventions. I will share preliminary student feedback on the activity as well as broader pedagogical considerations surrounding the use of writing analytics tools in writing instruction.

Writing for the Public Good: Multi-Scalar Reflections on AI-Mediated Community Engagement

PRESENTATION

Johanna Phelps

As generative AI becomes normalized in university writing environments, questions emerge about how AI mediation shapes students' civic reflection, ethical reasoning, and engagement with community-based writing. This presentation offers findings from analysis of written reflections generated by upper-division technical writing students from across disciplines such as engineering, business, humanities, and sciences. Findings invite reflection on the use of AI by undergraduate students towards public writing needs with a focus on the ethical implications of AI use in community-based teaching, a widely used practice in university-level technical writing courses in the United States. Since 2017, a reflection assignment has been the final task for multiple sections of this writing course, which includes an 8-week, community-engaged project where students develop products for off-campus stakeholders. For this reflection task, students write no more than 500 words synthesizing their learning, their work's impact on the public good, and connection of course objectives to ethical and legal concerns related to technical writing. These reflections will be analyzed to determine if the emergence and normalized use of genAI: -rhetorical complexity and readability, -depth of civic and ethical engagement, -integration of course concepts, and -stylistic or mechanical features of reflective writing. The corpus includes reflections from three instructional periods: pre genAI adoption (2020–2022), early and normalized genAI use (2022–2025), and handwritten in-class reflections produced during timed exams (2025). Findings will be generated using a comparative analysis of human coding and LLM-supported interpretation. This approach further explores the ways in which AI mediates academic and public knowledge creation and will help the audience understand how multiple tools available for analysis diverge or converge on specific results. Data from other stakeholders, including the instructor and community partners (nonprofit and government agencies who received student products to build capacity) contextualize the findings. Attendees will receive both assignments and assessment tools, as well as a matrix of strategies for faculty and students to engage ethically with off-campus partners in the co-production of knowledge.

