CHAPTER 27.

AI WILL EMPOWER NON-NATIVE ENGLISH WRITERS TO MASTER "STANDARD ACADEMIC ENGLISH" ✨ *AI THAT REFLECTS GLOBAL ENGLISHES USAGE AND LANGUAGE DIVERSITY CAN SUPPORT STUDENTS' WRITING*

Alice Gruber
Technical University of Applied Sciences Augsburg

AI, GRAMMAR, AND GLOBAL ENGLISHES: WHOSE VOICE IS BEING EDITED OUT?

Integrating large language models (LLMs) in education and academic writing can potentially offer valuable support to students by aiding in the development of research skills and assisting with literature synthesis, data management, and editing (Kasneci et al., 2023; Khalifa & Albadawy, 2024). Artificial intelligence-generated (GenAI) writing can appear to be an equalizer in terms of linguistic disparity, seemingly enabling people worldwide to communicate in English that is nearly indistinguishable from that of well-educated L1 writers (Warschauer et al., 2023). However, a critical perspective is essential for understanding the power dynamics and inequalities associated with GenAI-mediated L2 writing (Darvin, 2025). GenAI reflects and reinforces standard language ideologies (Smith et al., 2024) and discriminates against non-standard varieties users (Fleisig et al., 2024). As a result, GenAI seems to offer limited support for non-standard or non-native academic writers, potentially restricting their ability to express their unique voices. LLMs' emphasis on Standard American English runs counter to the inclusive paradigm of Global Englishes (GE), which challenges conventional monolithic views of English and advocates for a more pluralistic and equitable approach that embraces linguistic diversity. GE research generally views English as a set of dynamic and flexible social and cognitive resources (Hall, 2013). It also conceptualizes English

DOI: https://doi.org/1010.37514/PER-B.2026.2777.2.27

as a multi-lingua franca, recognizing the inherent multilingualism within lingua franca interactions (Jenkins, 2015, 2017).

From a GE perspective, GenAI-powered tools, similar to web-based essay assessments, threaten the linguistic diversity within English (Herrington & Stanley, 2012) and other languages, and can exacerbate students' monolingual attitudes (Jeon et al., 2024). For instance, Grammarly tends to nudge writers toward prescriptive American English norms (Kloppers, 2023), presenting its every suggestion as the only correct way to write. This emphasis on Standard English impacts minoritized language speakers, such as speakers of African American English, affecting their academic performance and self-concept (Lyn, 2022). Additionally, some AI tools offering grammar error detection are prone to over-correction (Sutter Pessurno de Carvalho, 2024), which may go unnoticed by LX writers—users of a language acquired after the age at which the first language(s) were learnt (Dewaele, 2018). In other words, GenAI is not yet capable of catering to the diverse international writing practices of all users and perpetuates the notion that certain language types are superior.

Moreover, GenAI tends to exclude idiosyncratic elements because they are not commonly found in the training data, resulting in a uniform style. This uniformity might be fitting for academic writing in fields like natural sciences, but it fails to resonate with disciplines that value creativity with language. Consequently, GenAI can undermine the distinctiveness of a writer's authorial voice (see Tan & Matsuda, this volume, for a broader discussion of GenAI and voice). It may also diminish the role of nuance, creativity, and continued linguistic innovation in many disciplines. Therefore, addressing these problematic aspects when helping student writers develop their AI literacy is crucial.

When I asked ChatGPT 4o, "Are you, ChatGPT, prescriptive when it comes to academic writing, i.e., do you stick to Academic English?" (24/07/2024), it confirmed a bias toward Standard English in academic writing contexts. It is important to note that AI-generated responses are outputs generated based on probabilistic patterns in the training data and do not reflect an internalized opinion or self-awareness.

> When it comes to academic writing, *I aim to adhere to the conventions and standards expected in academic English,* which includes maintaining formality, precision, and coherence …. *I follow standard grammar and syntax rules to ensure clarity and correctness in communication* …. I aim to maintain consistency in the use of language, *whether it's American or British English*, depending on the user's preference or the context provided … *However, I also recognize the importance of clarity and accessi-*

> *bility, especially for non-native English speakers* …. In summary, while I adhere to the conventions of academic English, *I am flexible and responsive to the specific needs and preferences of the user.* (emphases added)

While ChatGPT's response acknowledges the diverse backgrounds within academic audiences ("the importance of clarity and accessibility, especially for non-native English speakers"), it inadvertently categorizes non-native and non-standard speakers as being less competent. It does not recognize the diversity in reading and writing abilities among native speakers and the fact that some of the most effective academic writers include non-native speakers—and the existence of many standard Englishes worldwide, thereby reinforcing the native/non-native binary and perpetuating linguistic hierarchies. The claim to "adhere to the conventions and standards expected in academic English, which includes maintaining formality, precision, and coherence" falsely implies that varieties of English other than Standard American English lack or fall short when it comes to formality, precision, and coherence. This framing not only upholds the native/non-native binary but also perpetuates the marginalization of linguistic diversity in academic writing.

HOW CAN WE DISMANTLE THE IDEA THAT AI IS AN EQUALIZER WHEN IT ACTUALLY REINFORCES LINGUISTIC HIERARCHIES AND STANDARD ACADEMIC ENGLISH?

To address problematic aspects of GenAI, such as the language ideologies embedded within AI systems, writing instructors can establish strong pedagogical guidelines to foster student awareness of the assumptions influencing AI-generated content. Engaging academic writing students in reflective discussions about AI's multifaceted impact on the writing process, including issues like overcorrections and standard ideology bias, helps them recognize and critically evaluate these biases.

A practical approach for a writing instructor is to video-record their use of GenAI for academic writing, highlighting features such as overcorrections and prescriptivism. This video demonstration can showcase effective practices while highlighting inherent GenAI issues. The recorded demonstration can then serve as a basis for discussion with both L1 and LX academic writing students.

Another pedagogical approach to help writing students develop awareness of prescriptive English norms in AI involves having them classify AI-flagged rules as prescriptive or descriptive in an academic text of their choice. Students analyze

flagged errors and reflect on which changes are essential for clarity or accuracy and which may be unnecessary, thereby enhancing their critical engagement with linguistic norms.

Similarly, a further strategy is comparative text analysis using two similar academic texts: one written in "Standard Academic English" and the other containing features of non-native English such as L1-influenced grammatical structures and culture-specific rhetorical patterns. GenAI feedback on the standard English paper would likely be positive, while the feedback on the second version would focus on corrections, despite both texts being comprehensible. By comparing the feedback, students can see how GneAI privileges native-like writing conventions over clarity, prompting a discussion on what "correctness" means in AI-generated feedback.

Collaborative and guided reflections of this kind aligns with the MLA *Student Guide to AI Literacy*, which emphasises the importance of being able to "evaluate GenAI outputs for bias in language, culture, gender, ethnicity, and other social biases" (MLA-CCCC Joint Task Force on Writing and AI, 2024, p.2).

DESIGNING INCLUSIVE AI SYSTEMS

To truly promote inclusivity, LLMs should be (re)programmed to actively recognize and accommodate diverse linguistic backgrounds. Additionally, utilizing specialized programs that accommodate diverse linguistic backgrounds and focus on providing feedback on coherence, comprehensibility, and clarity rather than solely on grammar and punctuation would be highly beneficial. While tools such as Grammarly offer style and clarity suggestions, they are very much rooted in Standard American English. Achieving a high level of adaptability and inclusivity for diverse linguistic needs requires interdisciplinary collaboration and technical adjustments. Designing adaptive, non-language biased GenAI tools is an interdisciplinary effort involving applied linguists and computer scientists. Their collaboration would ensure LLMs help users achieve clarity, intelligibility and accessibility over prescriptiveness in international academic writing. GE-informed GenAI tools and GenAI that supports the legitimacy of various Englishes and language varieties would benefit academic discourse by making it more accessible, inclusive, and representative of the global academic community.

CONCLUSION

From a critical applied linguistics perspective, GenAI does not currently serve as an equalizer. Writing instructors should guide students in recognizing this

reality by fostering critical engagement with GenAI's limitations and biases. Pedagogical strategies, such as those proposed in this chapter, can support the development of students' awareness of GE and their critical understanding of GenAI biases in academic writing.

To address these challenges more holistically, LLMs must be trained to accommodate linguistic varieties by incorporating more diverse datasets, including English-as-a-lingua-franca (ELF) corpora such as *The Written ELF in Academic Settings* (WrELFA 2015), through meticulous system design. However, addressing AI bias requires more than technical adjustments; it also demands systemic change within the industry. Academics play a crucial role in advocating for these changes by drawing attention to the lack of economic and political incentives for companies to address GenAI language biases. As part of their advocacy effort, pedagogical solutions are vital in preparing users to critically engage with GenAI tools, ensuring they are equipped to recognise and challenge linguistic biases.

While systemic changes in GenAI design are essential, it is equally important to incorporate a broader perspective when revamping teaching approaches involving GenAI because teachers must "recalibrate their classroom practices" due to GenAI (Barrot, 2023, p. 4) anyway. The rapid development of AI has unclear implications for LX writing students, highlighting the need to understand how AI affects international academic writing practices, particularly from a GE perspective.

Human-AI collaboration should support academic writing students in producing high-quality texts that reflect clear authorial voices rather than prescriptive LLM-style academic language. By doing so, AI may contribute to a general shift towards the flexible language norms advocated by the GE paradigm. Writing instructors play a crucial role in this shift by encouraging students to value their linguistic identity and develop their authorial voice in AI-assisted academic writing. To achieve this, instructors must be open to the GE paradigm and ready to challenge academic publishing norms that privilege native English conventions, fostering a more inclusive and equitable academic writing environment.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to thank Professor Christopher J. Hall and the two reviewers for their feedback on earlier drafts of this chapter.

REFERENCES

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

Darvin, R. (2025). The need for critical digital literacies in generative AI-mediated L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *67*, 101186. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2025.101186

Dewaele, J. M. (2018). Why the dichotomy 'L1 versus LX user' is better than 'native versus non-native speaker.' *Applied Linguistics*, *39*(2), 236-240. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amw055

Fleisig, E., Smith, G., Bossi, M., Rustagi, I., Yin, X., & Klein, D. (2024). *Linguistic bias in ChatGPT: Language models reinforce dialect discrimination* (preprint). *arXiv*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2406.08818

Hall, C. J. (2013). Cognitive contributions to plurilithic views of English and other languages. *Applied linguistics, 34*(2), 211-231.

Herrington, A., & Stanley, S. (2012). Criterion SM: Promoting the standard. *Race and Writing Assessment*, 47-61.

Jenkins, J. (2015). Repositioning English and multilingualism in English as a lingua franca. *Englishes in Practice, 2*(3), 49-85. https://doi.org/10.1515/eip-2015-0003

Jenkins, J. (2017). The future of English as a lingua franca? In J. Jenkins, W. Baker, & M. Dewey (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English as a lingua franca* (pp. 594-605). Routledge.

Jeon, J., Lee, S., & Coronel-Molina, S. M. (2024). Rethinking AI: bias in speech-recognition chatbots for ELT. *ELT Journal*, *78*(4), 435-445.

Kasneci, E., Seßler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., Gasser, U. Groh, G., Günnemann, G., Hüllermeier, E., Krusche, S., Kutyniok, G., Michaeli, T., Nerdel, C., Pfeffer, J., Poquet, O., Sailer, M., Schmidt, A., Seidel, T., Stadler, M., Weller, J., Kuhn, J. & Kasneci, G. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. *Learning and individual differences*, *103*, 102274. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S1041608023000195

Khalifa, M., & Albadawy, M. (2024). Using artificial intelligence in academic writing and research: An essential productivity tool. *Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine Update*, 100145. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmpbup.2024.100145

Kloppers, J. (2023). Errors in errors: An exploration of Grammarly's corrective feedback. *International Journal of Computer-Assisted Language Learning and Teaching*, *13*(1), 1-16. http://doi.org/10.4018/IJCALLT.325792

Lyn, K. O. (2022). Negotiating African American language, identity, and culture in the urban classroom. *Journal of Black Studies, 53*(8), 780-795.

MLA-CCCC Joint Task Force on Writing and AI. (2024). *Student Guide to AI Literacy*. https://aiandwriting.hcommons.org/student-guide-to-ai-literacy/

Smith, G., Fleisig, E., Bossi, M., Rustagi, I., & Yin, X. (2024). *Standard language ideology in AI-generated language* (preprint). *arXiv*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2406.08726

Sutter Pessurno de Carvalho, G. (2024). *Multilingual grammatical error detection and its applications to prompt-based correction* [Master's thesis, University of Waterloo]. https://uwspace.uwaterloo.ca/handle/10012/20216

Tan, X., & Matsuda, P. K. (2026). Using AI tools detracts from student voice: Not every use of AI detracts from student voice. In C. Basgier, A. Mills, M. Olejnik, M.

Rodak, & S. Sharma (Eds.), *Bad ideas about AI and writing: Generative practices for teaching, learning, and communication*. The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2026.2777.2.30

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.

WrELFA (2015). The Corpus of Written English as a Lingua Franca in Academic Settings. Director: Anna Mauranen. Compilation manager: Ray Carey. http://www.helsinki.fi/elfa