

УДК 372.881.111.1

Чжан Юйцин, аспирант

ФГАОУ ВО «Российский университет дружбы народов»

Москва, Российская Федерация

электронная почта: 1042248207@pfur.ru

Zhang Yuqing, Postgraduate Student

Peoples' Friendship University of Russia

Moscow, Russian Federation

e-mail: 1042248207@pfur.ru

СРАВНИТЕЛЬНОЕ ПРИМЕНЕНИЕ ИНТЕЛЛЕКТУАЛЬНЫХ СИСТЕМ ОЦЕНКИ ПИСЬМЕННОЙ РЕЧИ ПРИ ПРЕПОДАВАНИИ АНГЛИЙСКОГО ЯЗЫКА В УНИВЕРСИТЕТАХ КИТАЯ И РОССИИ

Системы интеллектуальной письменной оценки (IWA) используют искусственный интеллект для обеспечения автоматизированной обратной связи и персонализированного руководства при преподавании английского языка в университетах. В статье представлен сравнительный анализ внедрения IWA в китайских и российских университетах. Предлагаются рекомендации по улучшению использования IWA, включая подготовку преподавателей, контекстуализированную обратную связь и международное сотрудничество.

Ключевые слова: интеллектуальная оценка письменной речи; искусственный интеллект в образовании; преподавание английского языка; Китай; Россия; высшее образование.

COMPARATIVE APPLICATION OF INTELLIGENT SYSTEMS FOR ASSESSING WRITTEN LANGUAGE IN THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH AT UNIVERSITIES IN CHINA AND RUSSIA

Intelligent Writing Assessment (IWA) systems use AI to provide automated feedback and personalized guidance in university English teaching. This study compares IWA implementation in Chinese and Russian universities. The article offers recommendations for improving IWA use, including teacher training, contextualized feedback, and international collaboration.

Key words: Intelligent Writing Assessment; AI in education; English teaching; China; Russia; higher education.

With the rapid advancement of artificial intelligence (AI), intelligent writing assessment (IWA) systems have emerged as transformative tools in university English teaching. These systems employ natural language processing (NLP) and machine learning algorithms to evaluate students' written output, providing immediate scoring, error analysis, and feedback tailored to individual proficiency levels [1]. In both China and Russia, higher education institutions are exploring IWA integration to enhance writing instruction efficiency, improve feedback accuracy, and support personalized learning paths [2]. However, the successful

implementation of IWA systems depends not only on technical performance but also on their alignment with teaching practices, teacher competencies, and cultural expectations in different educational contexts [3]. Comparative studies of Chinese and Russian applications can reveal how institutional and cultural factors influence system adoption and pedagogical effectiveness.

In China, the adoption of IWA systems is largely guided by national policies promoting AI in education, such as the “Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education Action Plan” issued by the Ministry of Education. These top-down initiatives have facilitated large-scale platform integration across universities, supported by partnerships with domestic educational technology companies [4]. Chinese institutions emphasize data-driven assessment and centralized management, enabling standardized evaluation and rapid scalability. The IWA systems provide automated scoring for essays, error diagnostics, and adaptive learning suggestions, which significantly improve students’ writing practice efficiency. Nevertheless, challenges persist in teacher adaptation, as many instructors lack sufficient training in interpreting system-generated analytics or integrating them effectively into classroom instruction [5]. This can result in over-reliance on automated feedback and a reduction in pedagogical creativity.

In contrast, Russian universities tend to adopt a decentralized, bottom-up approach to IWA system implementation. Individual faculties or instructors often select open-source platforms or locally developed modules, allowing greater flexibility in aligning assessment tools with course objectives [6]. This approach encourages teacher autonomy and experimentation, fostering innovative integration of automated assessment into writing workshops and communicative English courses. However, the decentralized model also results in uneven technical support and limited standardization across institutions, which can impede large-scale data collection and comparative analysis [7]. Students may encounter variability in feedback quality, depending on system configuration and teacher guidance.

Teacher roles in both contexts are critical to maximizing the pedagogical value of IWA systems. In China, instructors face time pressures and limited professional development in AI-assisted teaching, which may hinder the interpretation of automated feedback and integration with traditional evaluation methods [5]. Russian instructors benefit from flexible implementation and increased autonomy, but differences in AI literacy and lack of continuous training programs can constrain consistent and effective use [6]. Both countries illustrate that teacher competency and engagement are central to successful IWA deployment, influencing students’ learning experience and confidence in the system.

Student responses to IWA systems also reveal context-specific patterns. Chinese students generally exhibit high engagement due to the structured integration of IWA into course assessment, yet urban-rural disparities in digital

infrastructure may affect equitable access and utilization [1]. Russian students often appreciate the personalized feedback and interactive nature of IWA tools, but inconsistent system availability and technical limitations in certain regions reduce overall effectiveness [7]. These findings underscore the importance of considering learner access, cultural expectations, and feedback interpretation when implementing intelligent assessment technologies.

Finally, ethical and technical considerations play an essential role in the sustainable application of IWA systems. Issues of data privacy, algorithmic bias, and over-automation of evaluation are common concerns in both countries [3]. China's centralized data governance facilitates efficient management but raises privacy and surveillance concerns, whereas Russia's decentralized approach reduces concentration risk but lacks standardized oversight. Ensuring transparent algorithms, ethical feedback practices, and robust data protection is vital to maintaining trust among students and teachers while promoting the long-term integration of intelligent assessment systems.

This study shows similarities and differences in IWA adoption in Chinese and Russian universities. China excels in large-scale deployment and standardized assessment but faces challenges with teacher adaptation. Russia prioritizes flexibility and teacher autonomy, though scalability is limited. Effective IWA use requires teacher training, contextualized feedback, equitable access, and ethical oversight. International collaboration can further improve its effectiveness and sustainability.

ЛИТЕРАТУРА

1. *Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V. I., Bond, M., & Gouverneur, F.* (2019). Systematic Review of Research on Artificial Intelligence Applications in Higher Education—Where Are the Educators? *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 2019. 16, Article No. 39. 27 p.
2. *Eileen du Plooy, J.* Personalized adaptive learning in university contexts. *International Journal of Learning Analytics*, 2024. 11(3). P. 77–91.
3. *Williamson, B., & Piattoeva, N.* (2022). Datafication, algorithms and the governance of learning. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 47(3). 2022. P. 215–232.
4. *Li, X., & Smith, J.* (2023). AI in Chinese and Russian higher education: Comparative perspectives. *Education and Information Technologies*, 28(1). 2023. P. 123–140.
5. *Qian, L.* Teacher professional development in AI-supported education in China. *Asian Education Review*, 15(2). 2024. – P.88–104.
6. *Abakumova, O., & Gorokhova, A.* Innovations in Russian higher education: Adaptive learning adoption. *Higher Education Studies*, 13(2). 2023. P. 45–60.
7. *Sergeeva, I.* (2025). Adaptive learning tools in Russian language education: Case studies. *Russian Journal of Education Technology*, 7(1). 2025. P. 12–28.