

CHATGPT-ASSISTED FEEDBACK AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF IELTS ACADEMIC WRITING TASK 2: A CLASSROOM-BASED STUDY

Sultonov Hasan Furqat o'g'li

Toshkentdagi Webster universiteti

MA TESOL magistratura bitiruvchisi, filolog, pedagog

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.22806681

Received: 10-September 2026 | Accepted: 16-September 2026 | Published: 17-September 2026

ABSTRACT:

The increasing use of generative artificial intelligence (AI) in English language education has created new opportunities for providing immediate and individualized feedback on student writing. This classroom-based study investigates the role of ChatGPT-assisted feedback in the development of IELTS Academic Writing Task 2 performance among B2-level learners. The study was conducted at the OPEN WORLD learning centre in Tashkent, Uzbekistan, and involved 30 IELTS learners aged 14–18 who were studying in two groups of 15 students. The intervention lasted 15 days and consisted of six iterative writing cycles followed by a final timed writing task. During each cycle, learners first completed an IELTS Writing Task 2 essay independently in class within the IELTS time limit of 40 minutes. They then used a standardized ChatGPT prompt to identify major grammar problems, improve clarity, and receive three suggestions for improving clarity. Learners recorded and considered the feedback before rewriting the same essay at home. The teacher subsequently reviewed the AI-generated feedback and the students' revised writing and used recurring problems to inform subsequent classroom instruction. All essays were assessed according to the four IELTS Writing criteria: Task Response, Coherence and Cohesion, Lexical Resource, and Grammatical Range and Accuracy. The mean Writing score increased from Band 5.5 at baseline to Band 6.0 by the end of the intervention. Classroom observations also indicated a reduction of approximately four to five article and word-use errors in later writing compared with learners' initial performance. The findings suggest that ChatGPT-assisted feedback can support learners' noticing, revision, and development of grammatical and lexical accuracy when it is integrated into a teacher-mediated instructional process. However, because the study employed a one-group classroom-based design without a control group and involved incomplete attendance, the observed improvement cannot be attributed exclusively to ChatGPT. The study therefore supports the use of ChatGPT as a supplementary formative feedback tool rather than as a replacement for teacher feedback.

KEYWORDS:

ChatGPT, generative AI, IELTS Writing Task 2, automated feedback, EFL writing, teacher-mediated feedback, B2 learners, writing development

The rapid development of generative artificial intelligence has begun to influence the way foreign languages are taught and learned. Among the emerging AI tools, ChatGPT has attracted considerable attention because it can generate explanations, identify potential language problems, provide alternative formulations, and offer immediate feedback on learner-produced texts. These characteristics make generative AI particularly relevant to second-language writing, where learners traditionally depend heavily on teachers for correction and feedback.

Writing is one of the most demanding components of IELTS preparation. In Academic Writing Task 2, learners are expected to respond appropriately to a given question, organize their ideas coherently, use an appropriate range of vocabulary, and demonstrate accurate and sufficiently complex grammatical structures. The IELTS Writing assessment therefore evaluates performance through four criteria: Task Response, Coherence and Cohesion, Lexical Resource, and Grammatical Range and Accuracy.

For learners at approximately B2 level, persistent problems with articles, word choice, collocations, grammatical accuracy, and sentence clarity may prevent them from achieving higher writing bands. Traditional teacher feedback can address these problems effectively, but providing detailed and individualized feedback after every writing task can be demanding, particularly when several learners require support simultaneously. Generative AI may offer a supplementary solution by providing immediate feedback while learners are still engaged with their own writing.

However, the pedagogical value of AI-generated feedback should not be considered independently of the teacher. AI systems may identify useful problems but can also provide inappropriate or unnecessary suggestions. Consequently, teacher validation and mediation remain important when AI is introduced into language-learning environments. The present study investigates a classroom-based intervention in which ChatGPT was incorporated into repeated IELTS Writing Task 2 practice. Rather than comparing ChatGPT directly with teacher feedback, the study examines a pedagogical cycle in which learners produced an initial essay, received standardized ChatGPT feedback, analyzed the feedback, rewrote the same essay at home, and received teacher assessment. The teacher also used recurring errors identified during the process to determine which language areas required additional classroom attention.

INTRODUCTION

The study aims to explore whether this repeated ChatGPT-assisted writing and revision process was associated with improvement in learners' IELTS Writing performance and reductions in recurring grammatical and lexical errors.

Research Questions

The study addresses the following research questions: To what extent did learners' IELTS Writing performance change following a 15-day ChatGPT-assisted writing intervention?

What changes were observed in learners' grammatical and lexical errors, particularly in article use and word choice, throughout the writing cycles?

How can teacher-mediated ChatGPT feedback support the iterative development of IELTS Academic Writing Task 2?

Literature Review

Artificial Intelligence in Language Learning

Artificial intelligence has increasingly been incorporated into language education through automated writing evaluation, intelligent tutoring systems, machine translation, and generative language models. These technologies can provide learners with rapid access to language-related information and individualized learning opportunities.

One potential advantage of generative AI is immediacy. Unlike conventional teacher feedback, which may require considerable time before learners receive corrections, AI can respond almost instantaneously to a learner's written text. This immediacy may encourage learners to notice problems while the writing process is still cognitively active.

Nevertheless, immediate feedback does not automatically guarantee effective learning. Learners need to understand the feedback, evaluate whether it is appropriate, and apply it to subsequent writing. Therefore, AI feedback is most pedagogically useful when it is incorporated into an instructional process rather than treated as an independent source of authority.

AI-Assisted Writing Feedback

Writing feedback is generally intended to help learners identify weaknesses and improve subsequent performance. Traditional feedback may address grammatical accuracy, lexical choice, organization, and content development. Generative AI can potentially extend this process by providing multiple suggestions and explanations within a short period. For IELTS learners, this may be particularly valuable because the examination requires candidates to produce an extended argument within a strict time limit. Repeated feedback and revision may help learners recognize recurring patterns in their writing and gradually develop greater control over them.

However, AI-generated feedback has limitations. Large language models do not always distinguish between genuine errors and stylistic alternatives. They may also suggest changes that are grammatically possible but unnecessary or less appropriate for the intended meaning. For this reason, teacher verification remains important.

Feedback, Noticing, and Revision

Effective writing development involves more than receiving corrections. Learners need to notice problematic forms, understand why they are problematic, and apply new

knowledge when producing later texts. The present study therefore places learner noticing and revision at the centre of the intervention.

The writing cycle used in the study provides several opportunities for learning: learners first produce language independently, subsequently examine AI-generated feedback, record important observations, and then rewrite the same task. This process potentially transforms feedback from a simple correction mechanism into a repeated learning activity.

IELTS Academic Writing Task 2

IELTS Academic Writing Task 2 assesses candidates' ability to respond to an academic-style question through a structured written argument. Performance is evaluated according to Task Response, Coherence and Cohesion, Lexical Resource, and Grammatical Range and Accuracy. The present study uses these four criteria as the basis for teacher assessment. Particular attention is given to lexical and grammatical development because recurring problems in these areas were prominent in learners' initial writing and were also frequently identified during the ChatGPT-assisted feedback process.

Methodology

Research Design

The study employed a **classroom-based, one-group longitudinal intervention design**. It can also be described as a small-scale classroom action-research or practitioner-research project because the intervention was integrated into regular IELTS instruction and the teacher used observed learner difficulties to inform subsequent teaching. The study did not employ a separate control group. Therefore, the purpose was not to establish that ChatGPT alone caused improvement, but to examine changes associated with a repeated pedagogical process involving ChatGPT feedback, learner revision, teacher mediation, and continued writing practice.

3.2 Setting and Participants

The study was conducted at the OPEN WORLD learning centre in Tashkent, Uzbekistan.

The participants were 30 IELTS learners divided into two groups of 15 students. Their ages ranged from 14 to 18 years. The learners were approximately at B2 level, based on their previous IELTS mock-test performance and CEFR-equivalent interpretation.

The learners were primarily preparing for IELTS for educational purposes.

Attendance was not completely consistent throughout the intervention. On some days, approximately two or three learners from each group were absent. Consequently, the number of completed writing products varied across writing cycles, and the study does not assume that every participant completed every writing task.

3.3 Baseline Assessment

Before the intervention, the learners completed a mock IELTS assessment. Their mean Writing score was approximately **Band 5.5**.

The baseline writing samples demonstrated recurring problems with grammatical and lexical accuracy. In the initial essays, learners produced approximately eight to nine

noticeable errors in the target areas, with roughly half relating to article use and half involving inappropriate or inaccurate word use.

3.4 Teacher-Assessor

The learners' writing was assessed by an experienced IELTS teacher with an overall IELTS score of 8.5 and a Writing score of 8.0, as well as approximately eight years of teaching experience.

Essays were evaluated using the four IELTS Writing assessment criteria:

- Task Response
- Coherence and Cohesion
- Lexical Resource
- Grammatical Range and Accuracy

3.5 Intervention Procedure

The intervention lasted approximately 15 days and consisted of six writing cycles followed by a final timed essay. Each cycle followed the same basic procedure.

Stage 1: Initial Classroom Writing

Learners completed an IELTS Academic Writing Task 2 question independently in class. They were given approximately 40 minutes, corresponding to the standard IELTS Writing Task 2 time limit.

The teacher monitored learners during the writing process and observed recurring linguistic difficulties.

Stage 2: ChatGPT-Assisted Feedback

After completing the essay, learners spent approximately 20 minutes using ChatGPT to analyze their writing.

The same standardized prompt was used throughout the intervention:

“Show me main grammar mistakes and improve clarity and suggest three changes to improve clarity.”

Using the same prompt across writing cycles helped maintain consistency in the feedback procedure.

Stage 3: Learner Noticing

Learners examined the feedback provided by ChatGPT and recorded relevant errors and suggestions in their notes. Particular attention was given to recurring problems, including article use, word choice, collocations, grammatical accuracy, and sentence clarity.

Stage 4: Teacher Validation

The teacher reviewed the ChatGPT feedback and checked whether the suggested corrections were appropriate.

This step was important because AI-generated feedback was not treated as automatically correct. The teacher also observed which problems occurred repeatedly across learners.

Stage 5: Home Revision

Learners rewrote the same IELTS Writing Task 2 essay at home. The second version addressed the same topic and responded to the same question as the initial classroom essay.

The purpose of the revision was to allow learners to apply the feedback they had received and avoid repeating previously identified errors.

Stage 6: Teacher Assessment and Subsequent Instruction

The revised essays were reviewed by the teacher. Recurring problems observed across learners were subsequently incorporated into classroom instruction.

For example, when article use and problematic word choice repeatedly appeared in learner writing and ChatGPT feedback, these areas received additional instructional attention.

This created an iterative cycle:

Initial writing → ChatGPT feedback → learner noticing → teacher validation → home revision → teacher assessment → targeted instruction → subsequent writing.

3.6 Writing Tasks

Across the intervention, learners produced six initial classroom essays and six corresponding home revisions. These twelve writing products were followed by a thirteenth and final essay.

The final, 13th essay was completed in class under timed conditions and was treated as the final writing performance rather than as another home revision.

Thus, the 13 writing products can be represented as:

Importantly, the six initial essays and their six revisions were based on the same prompts within each cycle. Therefore, the revised essays were analyzed as evidence of revision following feedback rather than as completely independent writing tasks.

3.7 Data Sources

The study drew on several sources of evidence:

- Baseline IELTS Writing performance;
- Initial classroom Writing Task 2 essays;
- ChatGPT-generated feedback;
- Learners' notes and observations during feedback sessions;
- Home revisions;
- Teacher assessments based on the four IELTS Writing criteria;
- Final timed Writing Task 2 performance;
- Teacher observations of recurring grammatical and lexical errors.

4. Results

4.1 Change in Overall Writing Performance

The most notable quantitative finding was an increase in the mean IELTS Writing score.

The mean score therefore increased by approximately **0.5 IELTS band** during the study period.

This improvement indicates that the learners demonstrated stronger overall Writing performance following the intervention. However, the result should be interpreted as an observed change associated with the intervention rather than definitive evidence that ChatGPT independently caused the increase.

4.2 Changes in Grammatical and Lexical Accuracy
Learners' initial writing demonstrated approximately eight to nine noticeable errors in the target areas. Approximately half of these problems involved article use, while the remaining errors were related primarily to word use. Over the course of the writing cycles, the teacher observed a reduction of approximately four to five errors in these areas in later writing.

The reduction was particularly noticeable in:

- article use;
- inappropriate word choice;
- lexical combinations and collocations;

recurring grammatical errors.

These observations suggest that repeated exposure to feedback, learner noticing, revision, and subsequent instruction may have contributed to greater awareness of recurring linguistic problems.

4.3 Development Across Writing Cycles

The repeated writing structure allowed learners to encounter similar problems multiple times rather than receiving feedback only once.

For example, an article error identified in an initial essay could be:

- identified through ChatGPT feedback;
- reviewed by the learner;
- recorded in the learner's notes;
- checked by the teacher;
- addressed in subsequent classroom instruction;
- monitored in later writing.

This repeated process potentially increased the likelihood that learners would recognize and avoid the same type of error in later essays.

4.4 IELTS Writing Criteria

All essays were assessed using the four IELTS Writing criteria. The observed improvement was most closely associated with **Grammatical Range and Accuracy** and **Lexical Resource**, particularly in relation to recurring article and word-use problems.

The intervention also provided opportunities for improvement in clarity and organization. Nevertheless, the available evidence does not justify claiming that all four criteria improved equally. Therefore, the findings should emphasize the areas for which the study produced the clearest classroom evidence.

5. Discussion

The findings indicate that integrating ChatGPT into a repeated writing-and-revision process was associated with improvement in learners' IELTS Writing performance. The increase from a mean Band 5.5 at baseline to approximately Band 6.0 at the end of the intervention represents a meaningful classroom-level change over a relatively short period. One possible explanation is the immediacy of AI-generated feedback. Learners did not have to wait for teacher comments before examining potential problems in their writing. Instead, they were able to receive suggestions shortly after completing the task and immediately reflect on their language choices.

A second possible explanation is the repeated nature of the intervention. The learners did not receive ChatGPT feedback only once. They participated in six cycles involving initial writing, feedback, noticing, and revision. Repetition may have helped learners recognize recurring linguistic patterns.

The role of learner revision is also important. The second essay in each cycle was not a new response to an unrelated question. It was a revised version of the same essay. This allowed learners to directly apply feedback to their own writing. Such a process may encourage deeper noticing because learners can compare their initial and revised versions. Teacher mediation was another essential component. ChatGPT was not used as an independent evaluator. The teacher reviewed AI-generated feedback and used recurring

problems to inform subsequent instruction. This arrangement reduced the risk of learners accepting inappropriate AI suggestions without verification.

The results are therefore better understood as evidence for a **teacher-mediated AI feedback model** rather than evidence that ChatGPT can replace teachers.

The reduction in article and word-use errors is particularly relevant. These problems were already prominent in the learners' initial writing and were repeatedly addressed during the intervention. The subsequent reduction suggests that repeated feedback and explicit attention to recurring errors may have supported greater linguistic awareness. Nevertheless, several alternative explanations must be considered. Learners were simultaneously receiving regular English instruction, completing repeated IELTS writing tasks, practicing under examination conditions, revising their essays, and receiving teacher guidance. Any of these factors could have contributed to the observed improvement. Therefore, the study does not establish a direct causal relationship between ChatGPT use and the 0.5-band increase.

6. Limitations

Several limitations should be acknowledged.

First, the study used a **one-group design without a control group**. Consequently, it is impossible to determine whether the observed improvement would have occurred without ChatGPT.

Second, the intervention lasted only approximately 15 days. A longer intervention would provide stronger evidence regarding whether the observed improvements were sustained.

Third, attendance was inconsistent. Two or three learners from each group were absent on some days. Therefore, individual exposure to the complete intervention was not identical.

Fourth, the study involved a relatively small sample of 30 learners from a single learning centre. The findings may therefore not be generalizable to all IELTS learners. Fifth, the intervention combined several components, including ChatGPT feedback, teacher validation, targeted instruction, repeated writing, learner reflection, and revision. It is therefore impossible to isolate the individual effect of ChatGPT.

Sixth, the observed reduction of four to five errors was based on classroom observations rather than a fully standardized independent error-analysis procedure. Future studies should establish explicit coding categories and calculate error frequencies for every participant and every writing sample. Finally, the study focused on a relatively short-term change in IELTS Writing performance. Further research should investigate whether learners maintain these improvements after the AI-assisted intervention has ended.

7. Pedagogical Implications

The findings suggest several implications for IELTS teachers.

7.1 ChatGPT should supplement rather than replace teacher feedback

Teachers can use ChatGPT to provide rapid preliminary feedback, while retaining responsibility for validating corrections and making pedagogical decisions.

7.2 Standardized prompts can improve consistency

Using the same prompt throughout a writing intervention provides a more consistent feedback procedure. This may also make it easier for teachers and researchers to identify recurring learner problems.

7.3 Learners should actively analyze feedback

Simply showing students an AI correction may have limited pedagogical value. In the present study, learners were required to examine the feedback and take notes before re-writing their essays.

7.4 Revision should be integrated into writing instruction. The initial essay and subsequent revision created a direct connection between feedback and application. Teachers can use this process to encourage learners to recognize and correct recurring problems.

7.5 Teacher validation remains essential

AI feedback should be checked before learners treat it as authoritative. The teacher's role is particularly important when AI suggestions involve nuanced lexical choices, collocations, discourse organization, or stylistic preferences.

8. Conclusion

This classroom-based study examined the use of ChatGPT-assisted feedback in the development of IELTS Academic Writing Task 2 among 30 B2-level learners at an English learning centre in Tashkent.

The intervention consisted of six repeated writing cycles in which learners first produced a timed classroom essay, received standardized ChatGPT feedback, analyzed the feedback, and subsequently rewrote the same essay at home. The teacher validated the AI-generated feedback, assessed the writing according to the four IELTS criteria, and used recurring problems to guide subsequent instruction. A final timed essay was then completed at the end of the intervention. The learners' mean Writing score increased from Band 5.5 at baseline to Band 6.0 at the end of the intervention. In addition, classroom observations indicated a reduction of approximately four to five article and word-use errors in later writing compared with the learners' initial performance.

These findings suggest that ChatGPT can function as a useful supplementary tool for formative writing feedback, particularly when learners are encouraged to notice, record, and apply feedback through repeated revision. However, the findings should not be interpreted as evidence that ChatGPT alone caused the observed improvement. The intervention involved several interconnected factors, including teacher guidance, repeated practice, learner revision, and targeted instruction.

The central pedagogical implication is therefore not that artificial intelligence should replace teachers, but that **teacher-mediated AI feedback can create an additional layer of immediate, individualized support within the writing-learning process**. Future research should employ larger samples, control or comparison groups, standardized error-coding procedures, and longer intervention periods to determine more precisely the independent contribution of AI-assisted feedback to second-language writing development.

Important: The reference list below should be completed with the exact editions/DOIs used in the final submission. The thesis should not contain invented or unverified bibliographic information.

Appendix A. Standardized ChatGPT Prompt

The same prompt was used during the ChatGPT-assisted feedback stage of the intervention:

“Show me main grammar mistakes and improve clarity and suggest three changes to improve clarity.”

The standardized prompt was maintained throughout the six writing cycles.

Appendix B. Writing Cycle

Step 1: Timed classroom Writing Task 2

↓

Step 2: 20-minute ChatGPT feedback

↓

Step 3: Learner analysis and note-taking

↓

Step 4: Teacher validation of AI feedback

↓

Step 5: Home revision of the same essay prompt

↓

Step 6: Teacher assessment

↓

Step 7: Identification of recurring errors

↓

Step 8: Targeted subsequent instruction

Appendix C. Assessment Framework

Each essay was evaluated according to the four IELTS Writing criteria:

Task Response

Coherence and Cohesion

Lexical Resource

Grammatical Range and Accuracy

REFERENCES:

1. Council of Europe. (2020). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment—Companion volume*. Council of Europe.
2. International English Language Testing System. (n.d.). *IELTS writing band descriptors*. IELTS.
3. OpenAI. (2022). *ChatGPT*. OpenAI
4. Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge University Press.
5. Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (Eds.). (2006). *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues*. Cambridge University Press

ОБРАТНАЯ СВЯЗЬ С ПОМОЩЬЮ ЧАТГПТ И РАЗВИТИЕ НАВЫКОВ АКАДЕМИЧЕСКОГО ПИСЬМА IELTS TASK 2: ИССЛЕДОВАНИЕ, ПРОВЕДЁННОЕ В УЧЕБНОЙ АУДИТОРИИ

Султонов Хасан Фуркат угли

Вебстерский университет в Ташкенте

Выпускник магистратуры МА TESOL, филолог, педагог.

Аннотация: Растущее использование генеративного искусственного интеллекта (ИИ) в обучении английскому языку создало новые возможности для предоставления оперативной и индивидуализированной обратной связи по письменным работам студентов. В данном исследовании, проведенном в условиях учебной аудитории, изучается роль обратной связи с использованием ChatGPT в развитии навыков выполнения задания IELTS Academic Writing Task 2 среди учащихся уровня B2. Исследование проводилось в учебном центре OPEN WORLD в Ташкенте, Узбекистан, и в нём приняли участие 30 учащихся, готовящихся к IELTS, в возрасте от 14 до 18 лет, обучавшихся в двух группах по 15 студентов. Интервенция продолжалась 15 дней и включала шесть последовательных циклов письменной работы, за которыми следовало итоговое письменное задание с ограничением по времени.

В каждом цикле учащиеся сначала самостоятельно выполняли эссе IELTS Writing Task 2 в аудитории в течение установленного для IELTS времени — 40 минут. Затем они использовали стандартизированный запрос для ChatGPT с целью выявления основных грамматических ошибок, улучшения ясности изложения и получения трёх рекомендаций по повышению ясности текста. Учащиеся фиксировали и анализировали полученную обратную связь, после чего дома переписывали то же эссе. Затем преподаватель анализировал обратную связь, сгенерированную ИИ, а также исправленные письменные работы студентов и использовал выявленные повторяющиеся проблемы для планирования последующего обучения в аудитории.

Все эссе оценивались в соответствии с четырьмя критериями IELTS Writing: раскрытие задания (Task Response), связность и когезия (Coherence and Cohesion), лексический ресурс (Lexical Resource), а также грамматический диапазон и точность (Grammatical Range and Accuracy). Средний балл за Writing увеличился с Band 5.5 на исходном этапе до Band 6.0 к концу интервенции. Наблюдения в аудитории также показали сокращение примерно на четыре-пять ошибок, связанных с употреблением артиклей и слов, в последующих письменных работах по сравнению с первоначальными результатами учащихся.

Полученные результаты свидетельствуют о том, что обратная связь с использованием ChatGPT может способствовать осознанию учащимися собственных ошибок, совершенствованию письменных работ и развитию грамматической и лексической точности, если она интегрирована в учебный процесс под руководством преподавателя. Однако поскольку в исследовании использовался дизайн с одной группой без контрольной группы, а также имели место неполная посещаемость занятий, наблюдаемое улучшение не может быть исключительно связано с использованием ChatGPT. Таким образом, исследование поддерживает использование ChatGPT в качестве дополнительного инструмента формирующей обратной связи, а не в качестве замены обратной связи со стороны преподавателя.

Ключевые слова: ChatGPT, генеративный искусственный интеллект, IELTS Writing Task 2, автоматизированная обратная связь, письменная речь на английском языке как иностранном (EFL), обратная связь под руководством преподавателя, учащиеся уровня B2, развитие письменных навыков.

CHATGPT YORDAMIDA TAQDIM ETILGAN FIKR- MULOHAZALAR VA IELTS AKADEMIK YOZUV TASK 2 KO'NIKMALARINI RIVOJLANTIRISH: AUDITORIYADA O'TKAZILGAN TADQIQOT

Sultonov Hasan Furqat o'g'li

Toshkentdagi Webster universiteti

MA TESOL magistratura bitiruvchisi, filolog, pedagog.

Annotatsiya: Ingliz tilini o'qitishda generativ sun'iy intellekt (AI) tobora keng foydalanish talabalar yozma ishlariga tezkor va individuallashtirilgan fikr-mulohazalar taqdim etish uchun yangi imkoniyatlarni yaratmoqda. Mazkur auditoriya sharoitida olib borilgan tadqiqot B2 darajasidagi o'quvchilarning IELTS Academic Writing Task 2 topshirig'ini bajarish ko'rsatkichlarini rivojlantirishda ChatGPT yordamida taqdim etilgan fikr-mulohazalarning rolini o'rganishga qaratilgan. Tadqiqot O'zbekiston, Toshkent shahridagi OPEN WORLD o'quv markazida o'tkazildi va ikki guruhga bo'lingan, har bir guruhda 15 nafardan jami 30 nafar, 14–18 yoshdagi IELTS imtihoniga tayyorlanayotgan o'quvchilarni qamrab oldi. Tajriba 15 kun davom etdi hamda yakuniy vaqt chegaralangan yozma topshiriq bilan yakunlangan oltita ketma-ket yozish siklidan iborat bo'ldi.

Har bir sikl davomida o'quvchilar dastlab auditoriyada IELTS talablariga muvofiq belgilangan 40 daqiqa vaqt ichida IELTS Writing Task 2 uchun inshoni mustaqil ravishda yozdilar. Shundan so'ng ular standartlashtirilgan ChatGPT so'rovidan foydalanib, asosiy grammatik muammolarni aniqladilar, matnning ravshanligini oshirdilar va ravshanlikni yaxshilash bo'yicha uchta tavsiya oldilar. O'quvchilar taqdim etilgan fikr-mulohazalarni qayd etib, ularni tahlil qildilar va keyinchalik uyda ayni inshoni qayta yozdilar. Shundan so'ng o'qituvchi sun'iy intellekt tomonidan yaratilgan fikr-mulohazalarni hamda o'quvchilarning qayta tahrirlangan yozma ishlarini ko'rib chiqdi va takroran uchragan muammolardan keyingi auditoriya mashg'ulotlarini rejalashtirishda foydalandi.

Barcha insholar IELTS Writing baholashining to'rtta mezonini asosida baholandi: **Topshiriqqa javob (Task Response)**, **Izchillik va bog'liqlik (Coherence and Cohesion)**, **Leksik resurs (Lexical Resource)**, **Grammatik diapazon va aniqlik (Grammatical Range and Accuracy)**. Writing bo'yicha o'rtacha natija tadqiqotning dastlabki bosqichidagi **5.5-band** ko'rsatkichidan tajriba yakuniga kelib

6.0-band ko'rsatkichigacha oshdi. Auditoriyadagi kuzatuvlar ham o'quvchilarning dastlabki yozma ishlariga nisbatan keyingi yozma ishlarida artikllar va so'zlarni qo'llash bilan bog'liq xatolar soni taxminan **4–5 taga kamayganini** ko'rsatdi.

Olingan natijalar shuni ko'rsatadiki, ChatGPT yordamida taqdim etiladigan fikr-mulohazalar o'qituvchi tomonidan boshqariladigan ta'lim jarayoniga integratsiya qilingan taqdirda, o'quvchilarning o'z xatolarini anglashiga, yozma ishlarini takomillashtirishiga hamda grammatik va leksik aniqlikni rivojlantirishiga yordam berishi mumkin. Biroq tadqiqot nazorat guruhisiz bir guruh asosidagi dizayndan foydalangani va o'quvchilarning darslarda qatnashishi to'liq bo'lmagani sababli, kuzatilgan yaxshilanishni faqat ChatGPTdan foydalanish bilan bog'lash mumkin emas. Shu sababli, tadqiqot ChatGPTdan o'qituvchi tomonidan beriladigan fikr-mulohazalarning o'rnini bosuvchi vosita sifatida emas, balki **qo'shimcha shakllantiruvchi fikr-mulohaza vositasi** sifatida foydalanishni qo'llab-quvvatlaydi.

Kalit so'zlar: ChatGPT, generativ sun'iy intellekt, IELTS Writing Task 2, avtomatlashtirilgan fikr-mulohaza, ingliz tilida xorijiy til sifatida yozish (EFL), o'qituvchi tomonidan boshqariladigan fikr-mulohaza, B2 darajasidagi o'quvchilar, yozuv ko'nikmalarini rivojlantirish.