International Journal of Educational Development
ISSN Print: 3104-4263
ISSN Online: 3104-4271
CD ISSN: 3104-428X
https://doi.org/10.63313/IJED.9054

# Construction of a "Feedback-Revision" Teaching Model for Senior High School English Continuation Writing Based on Generative AI

**YanJun Pei**
China West Normal University, Nanchong, 637000, China
Email: 1554931278@qq.com

**How to cite this paper:** Pei, Y. J. (2026). Construction of a "Feedback-Revision" Teaching Model for Senior High School English Continuation Writing Based on Generative AI. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 3(1), 16-25. ISSN Print: 3104-4263; ISSN Online: 3104-4271. https://doi.org/10.63313/IJED.9054
**Published: 2026-04-10**

Copyright © 2026 by author(s) and Erytis Publishing Limited.
This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0).
http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/
CC BY 4.0

## Abstract

Aiming at the dilemmas of lagged feedback, single dimension and lack of personalization in the traditional "feedback-revision" process of senior high school English continuation writing teaching, this study, supported by the Output Hypothesis, the Interaction Hypothesis (Continuation Theory), Process Writing Theory and Formative Assessment Theory, and combined with the technical advantages of generative AI, constructs a closed-loop teaching model: Pre-reading Preparation-First Draft Writing-AI Feedback Generation and Interpretation-Targeted Revision-Teacher Review-Iterative Optimization. The model defines the collaborative roles of AI, students and teachers, and realizes three major transformations: the feedback mode from "single subject" to "human-machine collaboration", the feedback dimension from "single error correction" to "full coverage of CAF three dimensions", and the student role from "passive reception" to "active processing". Through theoretical interpretation, current situation analysis, model construction and case verification, this study confirms that the model can effectively resolve the contradiction between supply and demand of traditional feedback, improve the language quality of continuation writing, and cultivate students' feedback literacy and critical thinking. The study provides theoretical reference and practical path for "reducing burden and improving efficiency" in senior high school English writing teaching in the digital era.

## Keywords

Generative AI; Senior High School English; Continuation Writing; Feedback-revision; Teaching Model Construction

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1. Research Background

The General Senior High School English Curriculum Standards (2017 Edition 2020 Revision) clearly proposes that senior high school English teaching should attach

importance to the deep integration of modern information technology and English courses, and encourage teachers to use artificial intelligence to create a personalized learning environment. As the core question type in the New College Entrance Examination English, continuation writing closely integrates language input and output, posing high requirements for students' logical thinking, discourse construction, and language expression accuracy and richness. However, current continuation writing teaching is confronted with a prominent dilemma of "imbalance between supply and demand of feedback". Traditional manual feedback is time-consuming, often limited to grammatical error correction, and fails to provide in-depth guidance on discourse coherence and syntactic complexity. Students suffer from insufficient vocabulary, single sentence patterns and frequent Chinglish for a long time, leading to low learning efficiency and difficulty in improving language quality substantially.

The rapid development of generative AI represented by ChatGPT provides a new opportunity to break this deadlock. It has powerful natural language processing capabilities, can provide multi-dimensional feedback beyond grammar checks, and generate personalized evaluations with detailed explanations and revised examples for specific contexts. Such fine-grained feedback makes up for the shortage of teachers' grading energy in large-class teaching. Although existing studies have focused on AI-assisted writing, there is still a lack of systematic theoretical construction and practical exploration on optimizing the "feedback-revision" link of senior high school English continuation writing with AI feedback.

## 1.2. Research Significance

### 1.2.1. Theoretical Significance

First, expand the theoretical boundary of the integration of generative AI and second language writing teaching. Previous technology-assisted writing studies mostly focused on traditional rule-oriented systems, emphasizing grammatical error correction. This study focuses on ChatGPT, exploring its impact on the CAF (accuracy, complexity, fluency) dimensions of continuation writing, making up for the deficiency of existing studies that ignore detailed language indicators. Second, extend the application scope of Continuation Theory proposed by Wang Chuming (2016) to the human-machine collaboration context, verifying whether AI-generated feedback can serve as an effective scaffold to promote the coordinated development of learners' interlanguage. Third, improve the cognitive theory of "feedback processing" in second language writing, focusing on students' process of understanding, evaluating and decision-making on AI feedback, revealing the micro-cognitive mechanism of feedback.

### 1.2.2. Practical Significance

First, provide a feasible path to alleviate the "contradiction between supply and demand of feedback" in writing teaching. The hybrid feedback mode of "teacher-led,

AI-assisted generation, students' independent revision" uses AI to undertake mechanical error correction and polishing work, freeing teachers from tedious grading and realizing "reducing burden and improving efficiency". Second, promote the transformation of writing evaluation from "single error correction" to "language polishing and improvement", guiding students to pay attention to long and difficult sentences rewriting and advanced vocabulary replacement, and improving the problem of language poverty. Third, promote the coordinated development of students' language ability and feedback literacy, transforming students from passive feedback recipients to active evaluators, and exercising their critical thinking and autonomous learning abilities.

### 1.3. Research Ideas and Framework

This study follows the research idea of "theoretical combing-current situation analysis-model construction-application explanation-challenge response". The thesis framework is divided into seven parts: introduction, theoretical basis, literature review, dilemma analysis, model construction, challenges and responses, conclusion and prospect.

## 2. Theoretical Basis

### 2.1. Output Hypothesis

Proposed by Swain (1985), the Output Hypothesis emphasizes the independent value of language output in second language acquisition, and summarizes three functions of output: noticing/triggering function, hypothesis-testing function and metalinguistic function (Swain, 1995). Continuation writing is a high-intensity language output task. In this model, generative AI feedback acts as a key external trigger, which can accurately point out language errors to improve accuracy and provide polishing suggestions to encourage students to try advanced sentence patterns to improve complexity, perfectly conforming to the core requirements of the Output Hypothesis.

### 2.2. Continuation Theory

Wang Chuming (2016) proposed Continuation Theory based on the learning-promoting mechanism of continuation writing, with the core of "interactive coordination". Learners internalize the language structure and narrative style of the original text through pre-reading, and consciously approach the original text in continuation output. This study extends Continuation Theory to "human-AI" interaction: AI-generated high-quality feedback becomes a new "preceding text", and students start the second round of "continuation" in revision, thus achieving a significant improvement in language quality.

### 2.3. Process Writing Theory

Originated from the American writing teaching reform in the 1970s, Process Writing

Theory redefines writing as a "process-oriented" cognitive activity, dividing the writing process into five interrelated links: pre-writing preparation, first draft writing, feedback, revision and rewriting. This theory supports the closed-loop design of "writing-AI feedback-revision" in this study, emphasizing the dominant position of students in the writing process, which is highly consistent with the concept of "students take the initiative to interpret feedback and optimize writing independently".

### 2.4. Formative Assessment Theory

Proposed by Scriven in the 1960s and further developed by Black & William, Formative Assessment Theory is a dynamic evaluation method running through the teaching process, aiming to adjust teaching strategies and optimize learning effects through continuous feedback. In this study, generative AI is regarded as an efficient formative assessment tool, providing detailed error correction and suggestions to help students complete the leap from current writing level to potential development level. Combined with teacher review, it forms a complete formative evaluation system of "technical diagnosis + humanistic guidance".

## 3. Research Status at Home and Abroad

### 3.1. Research Status of Senior High School English Continuation Writing

Continuation writing promotes second language acquisition through "coordination effect" (Wang Chuming, 2012). Swain's Output Hypothesis provides theoretical support, holding that feedback is the key to guide learners to notice the gap between interlanguage and target language. Domestic scholars Jiang Lin and Chen Jin (2015) confirmed through empirical research that continuation writing combined with targeted feedback can reduce students' writing error rate by 21% and increase clause density by 15%. However, existing feedback modes have obvious limitations: peer feedback is limited by students' language level; teacher feedback is authoritative but difficult to achieve immediate and personalized coverage; traditional AWE systems mainly focus on vocabulary and grammar error correction, with limited help for language complexity and deep logic coordination.

### 3.2. Research Status of Writing Feedback

Teacher feedback has a significant role in promoting writing quality, but it faces problems such as general comments and lagged feedback (Bitchener, 2008). Peer feedback can enhance students' reader awareness, but the quality is limited by students' evaluation ability, and the adoption rate is only 40% (Min, 2006). Traditional AWE feedback has the advantage of immediacy, but it is mechanical and one-sided, lacking guidance on content depth (Grimes & Warschauer, 2010). In terms of WCF types, Ellis (2008) divides feedback into direct feedback, indirect feedback and metalinguistic feedback. Domestic scholar Hou Jiandong (2018)

confirmed that metalinguistic feedback has a more lasting effect on improving writing accuracy. Overall, existing studies focus on accuracy correction while ignoring the impact on complexity and fluency, and lack research on students' cognitive processing process of feedback.

### 3.3. Research on the Application of Generative AI in Second Language Writing

Foreign studies have confirmed that ChatGPT performs well in deep cohesion, vocabulary diversity and narrative logic. Domestic scholars Wang Yihang et al. (2024) pointed out that ChatGPT can significantly improve the vocabulary breadth and depth of students' works. Guo & Wang (2023) found that ChatGPT provides balanced feedback in content, structure and language dimensions. However, AI feedback is still insufficient in dealing with ideological depth and logical complexity (Wu Mian, 2024). Scholars at home and abroad advocate constructing a complementary human-machine collaboration ecology, but there is still a lack of CAF index empirical research and students' feedback adoption behavior research for continuation writing tasks.

### 3.4. Research Status of CAF Framework

CAF (Complexity, Accuracy, Fluency) is the core indicator to measure second language writing quality. Skehan (1998) put forward the "Competition Hypothesis", while Robinson (2001) proposed the "Cognition Hypothesis". Larsen-Freeman (2006) introduced the Complex Dynamic Systems Theory, pointing out that CAF development presents non-linear characteristics. Domestic studies focus on CAF development under continuation writing tasks. Wang Chuming (2015) believed that continuation writing promotes the coordinated development of the three CAF dimensions through the "reading-to-write" mechanism. However, existing CAF research lacks empirical evidence on the impact of generative AI on senior high school continuation writing, and ignores students' cognitive decision-making process from receiving feedback to internalizing revision.

## 4. Practical Dilemmas of the Feedback Mode in Senior High School English Continuation Writing Teaching

### 4.1. Imbalance Between Feedback Supply and Teaching Demand

First, dimension imbalance: traditional feedback focuses on grammatical error correction, ignoring the improvement of language complexity and fluency, leading to students' plain language and single sentence patterns. Second, timeliness imbalance: the long feedback cycle makes students' writing enthusiasm decline, and the guiding value of feedback is greatly attenuated. Studies have shown that when the feedback cycle exceeds 3 days, students' adoption rate of revision suggestions will drop by more than 40%. Third, personalization imbalance: the "one-size-fits-all" feedback

method cannot meet the differentiated needs of students at different levels, reducing the effectiveness of feedback.

### 4.2. Passive Dilemma of Students' "Feedback Processing"

On the one hand, cognitive passivity: traditional feedback lacks explanation of error causes and revision methods, leading students to mechanically implement suggestions and unable to form sustainable writing ability. On the other hand, behavioral passivity: students are in a passive receiving position, lacking critical evaluation of feedback, blindly accepting suggestions and difficult to develop creative writing ability.

### 4.3. Functional Limitations of Feedback Subjects

Teacher feedback is authoritative but has insufficient coverage due to time cost; peer feedback is interactive but lacks depth, only 62.3% of peer feedback can involve plot rationality evaluation (Deng Yunshuang, 2022); traditional AWE feedback is immediate but inflexible, based on rule matching mechanism, lacking context perception ability and unable to adapt to the openness of continuation writing.

## 5. Construction of the "Feedback-Revision" Teaching Model Based on Generative AI

### 5.1. Core Concept of the Model

Taking "human-machine collaboration, student-oriented, precise empowerment" as the core concept, the model realizes three major transformations: feedback mode from "single subject" to "human-machine collaboration"; feedback dimension from "single error correction" to "full coverage of CAF three dimensions"; student role from "passive reception" to "active processing".

### 5.2 Components of the Model

#### 5.2.1. Participants

Generative AI undertakes basic error correction, language polishing and logical prompting; students complete first draft writing, feedback interpretation, targeted revision and reflective transfer; teachers are responsible for task design, prompt optimization, feedback interpretation guidance and in-depth review focusing on logical depth and emotional value.

#### 5.2.2. Core Goals

Short-term goals: improve the CAF indicators of continuation writing texts. Long-term goals: cultivate students' feedback literacy, critical thinking ability and autonomous writing ability.

#### 5.2.3. Supporting Conditions

Technical tools: ChatGPT, offline feedback sheets, L2SCA syntactic complexity analysis tool. Teaching preparation: standardized AI prompt templates, feedback interpretation guide manual, personal error list.

### 5.3. Operation Process of the Model (Six Closed-Loop Links)

Pre-reading Preparation: Activate context and language reserve, clarify CAF three-dimensional goals.
First Draft Writing: Complete personalized continuation within limited time and retain real language errors.
AI Feedback Generation and Interpretation: AI outputs structured feedback, and students interpret it by the "three-step interpretation method".
Targeted Revision: Conduct critical adoption of AI suggestions and clearly mark revision traces.
Teacher Review: Explain common problems, provide stratified guidance and sublimate thinking.
Iterative Optimization: Establish personal error list and excellent expression bank, and carry out cyclic practice.

### 5.4. Detailed Rules for Key Links

#### 5.4.1. Prompt Optimization for AI Feedback Generation

Standardized prompts clarify AI's role as senior high school English teacher, scoring standards and CAF requirements, ensuring feedback is accurate, structured and suitable for students' cognitive level.

#### 5.4.2. Guidance Strategies for Students' Feedback Interpretation

Teach students the "three-step interpretation method": identify feedback types, analyze the rationality of suggestions, and handle ununderstood or unapproved suggestions.

#### 5.4.3. Focus Directions of Teacher Review

Focus on common error explanation, feedback adoption guidance, logical depth improvement and emotional value leading, making up for the shortcomings of AI in ideological depth and plot logic guidance.

## 6. Model Application Instructions and Teaching Cases

### 6.1. Application Scenario Adaptation

The model is applicable to regular classroom teaching, pre-exam special training and stratified teaching. For underachieving, intermediate and top students, the focus of AI feedback and teacher review can be adjusted differentially to meet different

development needs.

### 6.2. Teaching Case Fragment

Taking campus volunteer activities as the theme, the student's first draft has typical tense and noun number errors. AI feedback points out error locations, types, causes and gives revision suggestions, and optimizes sentence complexity and discourse fluency. After revision, the language is more accurate and coherent. Teachers focus on emphasizing the grammatical rule of "object clause tense consistent with main clause" and guide students to enrich plot details.

## 7. Challenges in Model Application and Coping Strategies

### 7.1. Potential Challenges

Technically, generative AI has the risk of "hallucination" and unstable feedback standards; students may over-rely on AI and lack feedback interpretation ability; teachers face the challenges of role transformation and insufficient digital literacy.

### 7.2. Coping Strategies

Standardize AI prompt templates and conduct teacher secondary screening of feedback to reduce AI hallucination; carry out feedback literacy training, require students to write revision reflection logs to cultivate critical thinking; strengthen teachers' digital literacy training, clarify the core role of teachers as guides, and promote the integration of technology and teaching.

## 8. Conclusion and Prospect

### 8.1. Research Conclusion

Generative AI is highly compatible with the "feedback-revision" link of senior high school English continuation writing, and its multi-dimensional, personalized and immediate feedback advantages can effectively solve the dilemmas of traditional feedback mode. The six-link closed-loop model constructed in this study is supported by multiple theories, clarifying the collaborative roles of AI, students and teachers, with theoretical rationality and practical operability. The model can not only improve the CAF language quality of continuation writing, but also cultivate students' feedback literacy and critical thinking, providing a new path for the digital transformation of senior high school English writing teaching and helping to realize "reducing burden and improving efficiency".

### 8.2. Research Prospect

In the future, we can compare the adaptability differences of different generative AI tools in this model, design differentiated implementation plans for students at different levels, and carry out long-term tracking research to explore the long-term

effect of the model in cultivating students' high-level abilities.

## References


[1] Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. Journal of Second Language Writing, 17(1), 102-118.

[2] Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2008). The value of written corrective feedback for migrant and international students. Language Teaching Research, 12(3), 409-435.

[3] Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. Journal of Second Language Writing, 12(3), 267-299.

[4] Ellis, R. (2008). A typology of written corrective feedback types. ELT Journal, 63(2), 97-107.

[5] Ferris, D. R. (1995). Student reactions to teacher response in multiple-draft composition classrooms. TESOL Quarterly, 29(1), 33-55.

[6] Ferris, D. R. (1999). The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes: A response to Truscott (1996). Journal of Second Language Writing, 8(1), 1-11.

[7] Guo, K., & Wang, D. (2023). To resist it or to embrace it? Examining ChatGPT's potential to support teacher feedback in EFL writing. Education and Information Technologies.

[8] Grimes, D., & Warschauer, M. (2010). Utility in a fallible tool: A multi-site case study of automated writing evaluation. Computers & Education, 55(1), 424-423.

[9] Keh, C. L. (1990). Feedback in the writing process: A model and methods for implementation. ELT Journal, 44(4), 294-304.

[10] Larsen-Freeman, D. (2006). The emergence of complexity, fluency, and accuracy in the oral and written production of five Chinese learners of English. Applied Linguistics, 27(4), 590-619.

[11] Min, H. T. (2006). The effects of trained peer review on ESL students' revision types and writing quality. Journal of Second Language Writing, 15(2), 118-148.

[12] Mizumoto, A., & Eguchi, M. (2023). Exploring the potential of using an AI language model for automated essay scoring. Research Methods in Applied Linguistics, 2(2), 100050.

[13] Robinson, P. (2001). Task complexity, task difficulty, and task production: Exploring interactions in a componential framework. Applied Linguistics, 22(1), 27-57.

[14] Skehan, P. (1998). A Cognitive Approach to Language Learning. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[15] Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), Input in Second Language Acquisition. Newbury House.

[16] Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), Principles and Practice in Applied Linguistics. Oxford University Press.

[17] Wang, C. M. (2012). Continuation writing—an effective method to improve foreign language learning efficiency. Foreign Language World, (5), 2-7.

[18] Wang, C. M. (2016). Learning through "continuation". Modern Foreign Languages, (6), 784-793+873.

[19] Jiang, L., & Chen, J. (2015). The influence of continuation writing on the development of accuracy, complexity and fluency of English writing. Modern Foreign Languages, 38(3), 366-375.

[20] Hou, J. D. (2018). The influence of metalinguistic corrective feedback on English writing accuracy. Foreign Language Research, (2), 57-63.

[21] Deng, Y. S. (2022). Application of peer feedback in senior high school English continuation writing teaching [D]. Nanchang: Jiangxi Science and Technology Normal University.

[22] Wang, Y. H., Mao, Y. S., & Dong, Y. J. (2024). An empirical study on ChatGPT-enabled feedback for senior high school English continuation writing. Educational Measurement and Evaluation, (5), 71-83.

[23] Wu, M. (2024). Research on personalized feedback mechanism of AI writing tools in English writing teaching. Education and Teaching, (23), 160-163.

[24] Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China. (2017). General Senior High School English Curriculum Standards (2017 Edition). Beijing: Beijing Normal University Press.