LOUGKA - KALAM Reçu le: 12/07 / 2026 Accepté le: 10/11 / 2026 Publié le: 26/11 / 2026

From Correction to Pedagogical Mediation: Teaching Academic Arabic Writing in the Era of Large Language Models — Toward a New Didactics of Argumentative Skills

✍Djamila KADIRI
djamila.kadiri@univ-mosta.dz
Abdelhamid Ibn Badis University of Mostaganem / Algeria

✍Hanifi BENNACEUR
hanifi.bennaceur@univ-mosta.dz
Abdelhamid Ibn Badis University of Mostaganem / Algeria

ABSTRACT:

The rapid integration of large language models (LLMs) into higher education is reshaping academic writing instruction in ways still poorly understood. In Arabic-speaking universities, where writing instruction has traditionally rested on a corrective paradigm centred on lexical accuracy and stylistic conformity, tools such as ChatGPT raise questions that go beyond plagiarism. When students can generate texts whose fluency exceeds their own production, what remains of the teacher's authority as corrector? And what becomes of the argumentative competences academic writing is supposed to cultivate? Drawing on Hyland's work on academic discourse, Vygotsky's sociocultural theory of mediation, the Arabic-Islamic tradition of ḥijāj reformulated by Taha Abderrahmane, and recent empirical work on LLMs in second-language writing, this article argues that the teacher's role must shift from a corrective-normative pole toward a mediating-critical one. It proposes a four-posture model of the mediating teacher and outlines four transferable pedagogical sequences.

KEYWORDS: **generative AI; academic Arabic writing; argumentative competence; pedagogical mediation; ḥijāj.**

لغة – كلام الاستلام: 2026/07/12 القبول: 2026/11/10 النشر: 2026/11/26

من التصحيح إلى الوساطة البيداغوجية: تدريس الكتابة الأكاديمية باللغة العربية في ظل نماذج اللغة الكبيرة — نحو ديداكتيك جديدة للمهارات الحجاجية

✍ جميلة قديري
djamila.kadiri@univ-mosta.dz
جامعة عبد الحميد بن باديس – مستغانم / الجزائر

✍ حنيفي بن ناصر
hanifi.bennaceur@univ-mosta.dz
جامعة عبد الحميد بن باديس – مستغانم / الجزائر

ملخص البحث

يُحدث الاندماج المتسارع لنماذج اللغة الكبيرة في التعليم العالي تحولاتٍ عميقةً في تعليم الكتابة الأكاديمية، لا سيّما في الجامعات العربية التي طالما استندت إلى نموذجٍ تصحيحيّ يُعنى بضبط المفردة وسلامة التركيب. غير أنّ ظهور أدوات من قبيل «شات جي بي تي» و«كلود» يطرح إشكاليات تتجاوز مسألة الانتحال؛ فحين يغدو في وسع الطالب أن يُنتج نصًّا يفوق كتابته الشخصية في فصاحته الظاهرة، فأيّ سلطةٍ تبقى للمدرِّس بوصفه مصحِّحًا؟ وأيّ مصيرٍ للكفايات الحجاجية والمعرفية التي يُفترض في الكتابة الأكاديمية أن تُنشئها؟ يقترح هذا المقال إجابةً نظرية-تحليلية، اعتمادًا على أعمال هايلاند في الخطاب الأكاديمي، ونظرية فيغوتسكي في الوساطة، والتقليد العربي-الإسلامي في الحجاج كما بلوَره طه عبد الرحمن، والدراسات الحديثة في توظيف نماذج اللغة الكبيرة في تعليم الكتابة. ويُدافع عن أطروحةٍ مؤدّاها أنّ دور المدرِّس ينبغي أن ينزاح من قطبٍ تصحيحيّ-معياريّ إلى قطبٍ وسائطيّ-نقديّ. ويقترح لذلك أنموذجًا رباعيّ المواقع للمدرِّس الوسيط، مع أربع تتابعاتٍ بيداغوجية قابلة للتحويل.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الذكاء الاصطناعي التوليدي؛ الكتابة الأكاديمية العربية؛ الكفاية الحجاجية؛ الوساطة البيداغوجية؛ الحجاج.

1. Introduction:

Few technological shifts have entered university classrooms as abruptly as the public release of ChatGPT in late 2022. Within a matter of months, an artefact that had previously belonged to the specialised world of natural language processing became a fixture in students' daily academic routines — drafting essays, summarising sources, generating outlines, rephrasing paragraphs, and, increasingly, producing entire assignments. Empirical evidence gathered since then leaves little room for doubt about the scale of the phenomenon: a majority of undergraduates across a range of national contexts now report using generative AI in their coursework, and academic writing is the domain in which the tools are most systematically deployed (Kasneci et al., 2023; Cotton et al., 2024). The pedagogical situation of the university teacher of writing has, in other words, changed materially — and, in most institutional settings, faster than the didactic frameworks meant to guide such teaching.

The Arabic-speaking university is not exempt from this shift. On the contrary, the particular history of academic writing instruction in the Arab world — long shaped by a corrective and normative tradition attentive to lexical propriety, syntactic accuracy and stylistic conformity — makes the arrival of LLMs especially destabilising. When a first-year student can, in the space of a single prompt, obtain an essay whose surface fluency, cohesion and terminological range surpass what she could produce unaided, the corrective posture that has historically defined the teacher's authority is no longer sufficient. The teacher continues, of course, to identify grammatical, orthographical and stylistic errors; but the pedagogical question has silently migrated. It is no longer only how to correct the text but how to teach a student to think, argue, and write when the text itself has ceased to be a reliable index of the student's intellectual activity.

The problem is not merely one of academic integrity, though that is how it has most often been framed in the emerging literature (Cotton et al., 2024). It is, more fundamentally, a problem of argumentative and epistemic formation. Academic writing, as decades of work in English for Academic Purposes have shown, is not the transmission of neutral content into a neutral form; it is the socialisation of a novice into disciplinary ways of reasoning, positioning oneself, and engaging critically with prior scholarship (Hyland, 2004; Swales, 1990). What LLMs displace is not primarily the product — the essay — but the process through which such reasoning is cultivated. If that process is silently outsourced, the teacher may continue to correct impeccable Arabic sentences while the argumentative subject behind them quietly dissolves.

The present article develops a theoretical and analytical response to this situation, oriented specifically toward the Arabic-speaking higher education context. It argues that the pedagogical role of the teacher of academic Arabic writing must undergo a substantive reconfiguration: from a corrective-normative pole, still indispensable but no longer sufficient, toward a mediating-critical pole that treats LLM outputs as objects of scholarly evaluation rather than as substitutes for student production. The argument proceeds in six movements. Section 2 sets out the conceptual framework. Section 3 analyses how the practice of academic writing in Arabic is being reshaped by generative tools. Section 4 proposes a four-posture model of the mediating teacher. Section 5 outlines four transferable pedagogical sequences. A brief conclusion identifies the limits of the argument and points to lines for further empirical investigation.

2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Academic writing as disciplinary socialisation

The framework adopted here rests on the premise, well established in the English for Academic Purposes tradition, that academic writing cannot be adequately described as the mere transposition of ideas into standardised prose. Hyland (2004, 2005, 2008) has argued extensively that academic texts are the surface manifestation of a deeper process of socialisation into disciplinary

communities. To learn to write academically is to learn to position oneself in relation to prior scholarship, to hedge or emphasise claims according to disciplinary conventions, to signal engagement with an anticipated reader, and to construct an authorial voice recognisable within a specific field. Swales (1990) had already shown, through his celebrated analysis of research article introductions, that even the most apparently descriptive stretches of academic prose are governed by rhetorical moves that novices must gradually appropriate.

This account has two consequences for the argument developed here. The first is that the product of academic writing — the finished essay, memoir or article — is inseparable from the process that produces it. The cognitive process model formulated by Flower and Hayes (1981) already emphasised planning, translating and reviewing as recursive operations through which meaning is constructed rather than transcribed. The second consequence is that academic writing is intrinsically argumentative. Even in genres that appear expository, the writer is expected to advance a position, anticipate objections and mobilise evidence — operations that presuppose a subject capable of holding a stance. This last point is decisive for the argument that follows, since it is precisely the argumentative subject that is at risk when generative tools take over the drafting of the text.

2.2 Mediation as a pedagogical concept

To reconceptualise the role of the teacher in the age of generative AI, the notion of mediation offers a productive starting point. Vygotsky's sociocultural theory (1978) treats higher mental functions as originating in socially mediated activity: the child does not develop cognitively in isolation, but through the internalisation of cultural tools and semiotic systems made available by more competent others. Writing itself, in this view, is a mediating tool that transforms thought as much as it expresses it. Applied to the university classroom, this framework foregrounds the fact that the teacher is not merely an evaluator of finished products but a participant in the semiotic environment through which students learn to think.

This perspective becomes particularly relevant when generative AI enters the classroom. As Warschauer et al. (2023) have observed, LLM outputs are not neutral instruments but powerful mediating artefacts whose value depends entirely on how they are integrated into a wider pedagogical activity. Left to themselves, they can short-circuit the very process through which academic thought is formed; embedded in a mediated activity guided by a competent teacher, they can serve as objects of critical examination that accelerate learning. The teacher's function, in Vygotskian terms, is to secure the conditions under which the new tool contributes to development rather than replacing it.

2.3 The Arabic-Islamic tradition of ḥijāj

The Western theoretical scaffolding sketched above must be complemented, in the Arabic-speaking context, by a tradition that has its own robust conceptualisation of argumentation. Plantin (1996, 2016) and Amossy (2010) have offered systematic accounts of argumentation as a linguistic and discursive practice within the francophone tradition, but the concept of ḥijāj has a longer and denser genealogy in Arabic thought. Taha Abderrahmane (1998, 2000) has proposed one of the most influential contemporary reformulations of this tradition, distinguishing three modalities of reasoning — demonstration (burhān), argumentation proper (ḥijāj) and disputation (taḥājj) — and locating academic argumentative activity firmly within the second. In his account, ḥijāj is neither a rhetorical ornament nor a subset of formal logic; it is a discursive activity in which the speaker commits herself to a claim addressed to an interlocutor who retains the right to contest it. Al-Azzawi (2006) has extended this line of thought by showing how argumentative structures are inscribed in the resources of the Arabic language itself.

The relevance of this tradition to the present argument is threefold. First, it provides a locally rooted conceptual vocabulary for describing what is at stake when students outsource their writing:

not simply the production of correct sentences but the assumption of a discursive commitment before an interlocutor. Second, it establishes that argumentative competence is not an imported category superimposed on Arabic pedagogy but a constitutive dimension of the language's own intellectual heritage. Third, it invites a pedagogical reorientation in which the teaching of academic writing is understood as the formation of a muḥājj — an arguer — rather than as the drilling of stylistic norms.

2.4 Generative AI and the emerging concept of critical AI literacy

The final component of the framework is the rapidly growing body of work on generative AI in second-language writing. Barrot (2023), Su et al. (2023) and Guo and Wang (2024) have documented both the affordances of ChatGPT for argumentative writing instruction and its recurring limitations: organisational feedback tends to be strong, content-level feedback weaker; grammatical accuracy improves, argumentative depth does not automatically follow. Han and Li (2024) and Escalante et al. (2023) have shown that students often accept AI feedback uncritically, absorbing suggestions that would be resisted if they came from a peer or a teacher. Warschauer et al. (2023) frame these findings within three constitutive contradictions — imitation, rich-get-richer and with-or-without — that structure the pedagogical situation of the L2 writer confronted with generative tools.

From this literature has emerged the concept of critical AI literacy, most recently articulated by Wang and Wang (2025) in their APSE model (Awareness, Prompting, Sourcing, Evaluation) and, from a different angle, by Walter (2024), who situates prompt engineering and critical thinking as complementary competences of the AI-literate student. Cotton et al. (2024) add the ethical dimension by insisting that academic integrity in the age of LLMs cannot be secured through detection alone; it requires the cultivation of a reflective relation to the tools themselves. Bender et al. (2021) supply the epistemological background: LLMs do not understand meaning but recombine linguistic forms probabilistically — a reminder that has direct consequences for how their outputs must be evaluated in academic contexts.

Taken together, these four strands — disciplinary socialisation, sociocultural mediation, the Arabic-Islamic ḥijāj tradition, and critical AI literacy — provide the conceptual architecture required to reframe the teaching of academic Arabic writing in the era of LLMs.

3. TRANSFORMATIONS OF ACADEMIC ARABIC WRITING UNDER LLMs

3.1 Surface gains and their pedagogical seductions

Any honest analysis of what generative AI does to academic Arabic writing must begin with an acknowledgement of the very real gains it produces at the level of surface quality. Students who struggle with orthographical accuracy, with the correct placement of hamza, with the agreement rules that govern gendered adjectives or with the intricate morphology of Arabic verb forms often see, in the outputs of ChatGPT or Claude, a level of formal correctness they could not previously reach. The tools generate syntactically well-formed sentences, mobilise an extended lexical range, and produce cohesive transitions between paragraphs. For a beginning writer, and especially for one who has internalised years of red-inked correction as the dominant experience of writing, this is a genuinely liberating encounter.

The Arab world literature on writing pedagogy has long identified the weakness of Arabic academic prose among university students as a chronic concern (Bouhouch & Al-Dhunaybat, 2007). Difficulties reported in that literature — poverty of vocabulary, weak inter-sentential cohesion, mechanical reliance on copy-and-paste from online sources — are precisely the areas in which generative tools show their strongest immediate effect. Recent empirical studies confirm this pattern in other second-language contexts: Barrot (2023) documents measurable improvements in coherence and grammatical accuracy when learners incorporate ChatGPT into their writing routine,

and Guo and Wang (2024) find that AI-generated feedback consistently outperforms teacher feedback on organisational dimensions of the text.

Yet the same evidence base reveals a subtler and more troubling pattern. Guo and Wang (2024) also observe that AI feedback lags behind teacher feedback on content-level dimensions — the depth of argumentation, the pertinence of examples, the coherence of the epistemic stance. Han and Li (2024) show that students tend to accept AI suggestions with a docility they would not display before a peer or a teacher, absorbing rephrased formulations without interrogating the substantive drift these often introduce. The surface gains, in other words, come bundled with a substantive loss whose contours must be traced with some care.

3.2 The dissolution of the argumentative subject

That loss is most visible when one examines argumentative writing in particular. The Arabic-Islamic tradition, as reformulated by Taha Abderrahmane (1998, 2000), conceives ḥijāj as an activity in which a speaker publicly commits to a claim addressed to an interlocutor who retains the right of contestation. Argumentative writing, in this sense, presupposes a subject who takes a position, anticipates objection, and mobilises evidence — operations that are not merely rhetorical but epistemic and, ultimately, ethical. What generative AI reshapes is precisely the relationship between the writer and this commitment.

Consider the ordinary case of a student assigned to write a five-page argumentative essay on a contested question in Arabic linguistics. The traditional writing process, however imperfectly executed, at least required the student to formulate an initial position, to search for supporting sources, to organise them into a coherent argumentative sequence, and to negotiate the tensions that inevitably emerged along the way. Each of these operations produced friction — the productive friction that Flower and Hayes (1981) identified as the cognitive engine of the composing process. When ChatGPT drafts the essay in a matter of seconds, that friction disappears. The student receives a text she has not argued into existence. She may then edit it, adjust its terminology, insert a personal example. But the fundamental architecture of the argument has been established elsewhere, by an artefact that, in the sober formulation of Bender et al. (2021), does not understand meaning but recombines linguistic forms probabilistically.

This is not a moralising objection about laziness. It is a pedagogical observation about the conditions under which argumentative competence is formed. If the argumentative subject never has to inhabit the position of a muḥājj — one who claims and defends before a real or anticipated interlocutor — the competence itself does not develop. The essay may improve; the writer, as an arguer, does not.

3.3 The three contradictions of the Arabic-writing student before generative tools

The empirical literature on second-language writing under generative AI has begun to name these tensions with growing precision. Warschauer et al. (2023) formulate three constitutive contradictions that structure the situation of the L2 writer: the imitation contradiction (the tool provides a fluency the writer has not yet acquired, which may accelerate learning or substitute for it), the rich-get-richer contradiction (the tool amplifies existing advantages, so that students with stronger linguistic capital extract more from it), and the with-or-without contradiction (writers must now be evaluated in a world where the tool exists, but pedagogically must sometimes write without it).

Transposed to academic writing in Arabic, these three contradictions acquire specific inflections. The imitation contradiction is intensified by the diglossic nature of Arabic: students often struggle with the classical register, and the tool provides an immediate access to a level of formal Arabic prose that they may never have produced unaided. The rich-get-richer contradiction operates along a socio-linguistic axis: students who already command the register benefit disproportionately

from the tool, while those who most need pedagogical support risk being masked, not remediated, by its polished output. The with-or-without contradiction takes on political weight: institutional policies oscillate between prohibition and permissive integration, leaving individual teachers to negotiate a workable middle ground with limited guidance.

3.4 Detection is not a pedagogical strategy

A widespread first-order response to this situation has been the mobilisation of AI-detection tools. Cotton et al. (2024) offer a nuanced discussion of academic integrity in the era of ChatGPT and reach a conclusion that has been confirmed by successive waves of research: detection alone cannot secure the pedagogical goods at stake. Detection tools are unreliable, especially on shorter texts and on outputs that have been lightly edited by the student. They generate false positives that disproportionately penalise second-language writers, whose stylistic profile can resemble AI-generated prose even when produced entirely by hand.

More fundamentally, however, detection addresses only the symptom — the presence of AI-generated text in a submitted assignment — and not the pedagogical problem — the fact that argumentative competence is failing to form. A student who successfully evades detection has not thereby learned to argue; a student who is caught has not thereby been taught. Cotton et al. (2024) themselves argue for a proactive and ethical repositioning of institutions, one that treats generative AI as a pedagogical object to be engaged with rather than an infraction to be policed.

4. FROM CORRECTION TO MEDIATION: A FOUR-POSTURE MODEL OF THE TEACHER

The analysis developed so far invites a reconfiguration rather than a repudiation of the teacher's role. Correction does not disappear; it ceases to be sufficient. What is required is a repositioning in which the teacher assumes a set of postures adapted to a pedagogical environment in which fluent prose is no longer a scarce good and in which argumentative competence has become the properly educational stake. This section proposes a four-posture model of the mediating teacher, developed by extrapolation from Vygotsky's (1978) account of mediated learning, Hyland's (2005, 2008) analysis of academic discourse socialisation, and the empirical findings of the recent literature on generative AI in second-language writing. The four postures are not sequential stages but concurrent registers that the teacher activates according to the pedagogical situation.

4.1 The critical evaluator

The first posture repositions the teacher as an evaluator of AI outputs alongside the student. Rather than treating a ChatGPT-generated paragraph as a forbidden object or as a finished draft to be lightly polished, the teacher joins the student in interrogating its substantive quality. This posture rests on a claim that Bender et al. (2021) have made with unusual clarity: the surface fluency of an LLM output is not a reliable indicator of its argumentative or referential accuracy. A paragraph may be grammatically impeccable and epistemically hollow. Hallucinated references, misattributed positions, terminologically confused framings and quietly flattened distinctions all coexist with syntactic elegance.

The critical evaluator posture translates this observation into a concrete pedagogical activity. The teacher opens the AI output on the shared screen and, with the student, submits it to a systematic examination: are the sources cited real? Do they say what the text claims they say? Is the argumentative sequence coherent, or does it dissolve under scrutiny into a series of plausible-sounding but disconnected assertions? Does the terminology reflect the disciplinary community's actual usage, or does it flatten distinctions that matter? This activity is precisely what Wang and Wang (2025), in their APSE model, place at the heart of critical AI literacy.

4.2 The prompt trainer

The second posture recognises a fact that pedagogical discourse has been slow to internalise: prompting is now a competence of academic writing, not a peripheral technicality. Walter (2024) has argued convincingly that prompt engineering, when taught as a critical activity, is a vehicle for the very cognitive operations — clarification of intent, specification of criteria, articulation of an audience — that have long defined the pre-writing phase in the cognitive process tradition (Flower & Hayes, 1981). A well-formed prompt already contains, in condensed form, the argumentative architecture of the text it is meant to produce.

As prompt trainer, the teacher makes the crafting of the prompt itself a pedagogical object. Students are asked not to hide their prompts but to expose, refine and defend them. A weak prompt produces a generic, quickly written text. A structured prompt that specifies the argumentative thesis, the disciplinary framing, the target audience, the required sources and the counterarguments to be engaged produces something closer to a serious academic draft. The pedagogical work lies in guiding students from the first form of prompt to the second, and in showing that the discipline of prompt formulation is inseparable from the discipline of thinking. Wang and Wang (2025) place this competence at the second position of their APSE model.

4.3 The integrity guardian

The third posture attends to the ethical dimension of the pedagogical situation. Cotton et al. (2024) have shown that academic integrity in the era of ChatGPT cannot be reduced to the detection of infractions; it requires the active cultivation of a reflective relation to the tools among students themselves. The integrity guardian posture is not a return to a policing conception of the teacher's authority. It is closer to what Vygotsky (1978) described as the more competent other who initiates the novice into a shared normative framework — in this case, the ethical framework of academic discourse itself.

Concretely, this posture involves helping students to develop a nuanced vocabulary of use: what does it mean to consult an LLM, to co-draft with it, to outsource to it? Which of these practices are compatible with authorship, and which are not? The recent literature on authorial voice under generative AI, and especially the review by Al Hosni (2025), provides a starting point for such a vocabulary. Rather than issuing prohibitions that will be evaded, the integrity guardian works with students to construct disclosure practices, to articulate a personal ethics of AI-assisted writing, and to identify the point at which a text ceases to belong to its putative author.

4.4 The argumentative guide

The fourth posture is, in a sense, the most traditional and the most decisive. If academic writing is, at bottom, the formation of a muḥājj (Taha Abderrahmane, 1998, 2000) — one who assumes and defends a discursive commitment before an interlocutor — then the teacher's ultimate responsibility is to accompany the student in that formation. The argumentative guide is the posture in which the teacher intervenes on precisely those dimensions where generative AI is, empirically, weakest: the depth of argumentation, the pertinence of examples, the coherence of the epistemic stance across the text.

Guo and Wang (2024) have shown that AI feedback outperforms teacher feedback on organisational dimensions but lags substantially on content-level ones. Rather than being a source of embarrassment for the profession, this asymmetry defines the space in which the teacher's expertise remains not merely relevant but structurally necessary. The argumentative guide reads the student's draft not primarily to correct its language — the AI can now do much of that — but to interrogate its claims, to press its evidence, to expose its unexamined assumptions, and to suggest counterarguments the student has not yet considered. This is the work that the Arabic-Islamic

tradition of ḥijāj has always recognised as the properly educative activity, and it is the work that generative tools cannot substitute for.

5. FOUR TRANSFERABLE PEDAGOGICAL SEQUENCES

The theoretical framework and the four-posture model developed above remain of limited value unless they can be translated into concrete classroom activities. This section outlines four transferable pedagogical sequences designed for university-level Arabic writing instruction. Each activates one or more of the four postures and can be adapted to different disciplinary contexts, from linguistics and literary studies to the social sciences.

5.1 The comparative dé-génération workshop

The first sequence engages the critical evaluator posture directly. Students are asked to bring to class two versions of the same short argumentative passage on a shared question: one produced without any AI assistance, another obtained from an LLM using a prompt they have themselves formulated. In small groups, the two versions are examined side by side according to a rubric that distinguishes surface features (grammar, cohesion, lexical range) from substantive ones (argumentative depth, referential accuracy, coherence of stance). The activity typically reveals a pattern already documented by Guo and Wang (2024): the AI version wins on surface, the student version on substance. What matters is that the students themselves reach this observation. The workshop closes with a collective reformulation that integrates the substantive strengths of the student text into a linguistically improved version.

5.2 The prompt refinement sequence

The second sequence operationalises the prompt trainer posture. Students receive a broad academic question and are asked to produce, in three iterations, prompts of increasing structural precision. The first prompt is deliberately vague; the second incorporates a thesis and a target audience; the third specifies the disciplinary framing, the required argumentative moves and the counterarguments to address. The three AI-generated outputs are then compared. Students discover experimentally what Walter (2024) has argued theoretically: that the discipline of prompt formulation is inseparable from the discipline of academic thought. The exercise makes visible the fact that a well-constructed prompt already contains, in condensed form, the argumentative architecture that a competent writer would deploy.

5.3 The sourced rewriting exercise

The third sequence combines the integrity guardian and argumentative guide postures. Students receive an AI-generated paragraph that contains at least one hallucinated reference, one flattened distinction and one unexamined assumption. Their task is to rewrite the paragraph so that it can honestly be submitted as academic work. This requires verifying each cited source, restoring the distinctions the AI has erased, and making explicit the assumptions the AI has left implicit. The exercise dramatises the epistemological point made by Bender et al. (2021) — that surface fluency and referential accuracy are independent variables — and cultivates the disclosure practices that Cotton et al. (2024) identify as central to a reflective academic ethics of AI use.

5.4 The oral defence of a hybrid text

The fourth sequence addresses the dimension of academic writing that generative AI cannot substitute for: the assumption of a public discursive commitment. Students produce a short argumentative text with AI assistance and then defend it orally before their peers, who are free to question any element of the argument, request the sources, and press counter-examples. The exercise reactivates the classical Arabic-Islamic conception of ḥijāj as a public activity of claiming and defending (Taha Abderrahmane, 1998; Al-Azzawi, 2006). It rapidly reveals whether the student has genuinely appropriated the argument written under her name, and it repositions academic writing as the preparation of a discursive act rather than as the production of a document to be graded in silence.

The activity operationalises Vygotsky's (1978) insight that the internalisation of higher cognitive functions is mediated through socially situated interaction.

Each of these four sequences is modest in its ambition and demanding in its execution. What they aim to demonstrate is that concrete pedagogical alternatives exist between the two dominant institutional postures — prohibition and permissive integration — and that these alternatives take seriously both the affordances of the tools and the argumentative formation of the student.

6. CONCLUSION

The argument developed in this article can be summarised in a single claim: the pedagogical situation created by generative AI in the teaching of academic Arabic writing does not call for the intensification of the corrective paradigm, nor for its wholesale abandonment, but for a repositioning of the teacher from a corrective-normative pole toward a mediating-critical one. This repositioning has been specified through a four-posture model — critical evaluator, prompt trainer, integrity guardian, argumentative guide — and translated into four transferable pedagogical sequences designed for university classrooms in Arabic-speaking higher education.

The theoretical foundations of this proposal draw on four convergent traditions: Hyland's account of academic writing as disciplinary socialisation, Vygotsky's sociocultural theory of mediation, the Arabic-Islamic tradition of ḥijāj as reformulated by Taha Abderrahmane, and the emerging conceptualisation of critical AI literacy in the recent literature on second-language writing. Together, these traditions specify what is at stake when generative tools enter the writing classroom: not merely academic integrity, but the formation of an argumentative subject capable of assuming a public discursive commitment.

The argument developed here is theoretical and analytical rather than empirical, and this constitutes its principal limitation. The four postures and the four sequences require systematic empirical validation in Arabic-speaking universities, through classroom observation, longitudinal studies of student writing development, and comparative assessment of argumentative competence across pedagogical configurations. Further research should also examine the specific behaviour of leading generative models in Arabic, building on the benchmarking work initiated by Khondaker et al. (2023). What this article offers, more modestly, is a coherent conceptual architecture within which such empirical work can be designed, and a set of pedagogical hypotheses whose value awaits their testing.

REFERENCES

Al Hosni, J. K. (2025). Preserving authorial voice in academic texts in the age of generative AI: A thematic literature review. Arab World English Journal, 16(3), 244–258.

Amossy, R. (2010). L'argumentation dans le discours. Armand Colin.

Barrot, J. S. (2023). Using ChatGPT for second language writing: Pitfalls and potentials. Assessing Writing, 57, 100745. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2023.100745

Bender, E. M., Gebru, T., McMillan-Major, A., & Shmitchell, S. (2021). On the dangers of stochastic parrots: Can language models be too big? In Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAccT '21) (pp. 610–623). Association for Computing Machinery. https://doi.org/10.1145/3442188.3445922

Cotton, D. R. E., Cotton, P. A., & Shipway, J. R. (2024). Chatting and cheating: Ensuring academic integrity in the era of ChatGPT. Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 61(2), 228–239. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2023.2190148

Escalante, J., Pack, A., & Barrett, A. (2023). AI-generated feedback on writing: Insights into efficacy and ENL student preference. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 20(1), Article 57.

Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. College Composition and Communication, 32(4), 365–387.

Guo, K., & Wang, D. (2024). To resist it or to embrace it? Examining ChatGPT's potential to support teacher feedback in EFL writing. Education and Information Technologies, 29, 8435–8463. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-12146-0

Han, J., & Li, M. (2024). Exploring ChatGPT-supported teacher feedback in the EFL context. System, 126, 103481.

Hyland, K. (2004). Genre and second language writing. University of Michigan Press.

Hyland, K. (2005). Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing. Continuum.

Hyland, K. (2008). Academic discourse: English in a global context. Continuum.

Kasneci, E., Sessler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., et al. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. Learning and Individual Differences, 103, 102274. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274

Khondaker, M. T. I., Waheed, A., Nagoudi, E. M. B., & Abdul-Mageed, M. (2023). GPTAraEval: A comprehensive evaluation of ChatGPT on Arabic NLP. In Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (pp. 220–247). Association for Computational Linguistics. https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-main.16

Plantin, C. (1996). L'argumentation. Seuil, coll. Mémo.

Plantin, C. (2016). Dictionnaire de l'argumentation. Une introduction aux études d'argumentation. ENS Éditions.

Su, Y., Lin, Y., & Lai, C. (2023). Collaborating with ChatGPT in argumentative writing classrooms. Assessing Writing, 57, 100752. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2023.100752

Swales, J. M. (1990). Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings. Cambridge University Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes (M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman, Eds.). Harvard University Press.

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, Article 15. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00448-3

Wang, C., & Wang, Z. (2025). Investigating L2 writers' critical AI literacy in AI-assisted writing: An APSE model. Journal of Second Language Writing, 67, 101195.

Warschauer, M., Tseng, W., Yim, S., Webster, T., Jacob, S., Du, Q., & Tate, T. (2023). The affordances and contradictions of AI-generated text for writers of English as a second or foreign language. Journal of Second Language Writing, 62, 101071. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2023.101071

العزاوي، أبو بكر. (2006). اللّغة والحجاج (ط1). الدار البيضاء: العمدة في الطبع.

بوحوش، عمار، والذنيبات، محمد محمود. (2007). مناهج البحث العلمي وطرق إعداد البحوث. الجزائر: ديوان المطبوعات الجامعية.

عبد الرحمن، طه. (1998). اللّسان والميزان أو التكوثر العقلي (ط1). الدار البيضاء – بيروت: المركز الثقافي العربي.

عبد الرحمن، طه. (2000). في أصول الحوار وتجديد علم الكلام (ط2). الدار البيضاء – بيروت: المركز الثقافي العربي.