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**Abstract:** This paper examines potential biases in AI-generated feedback on student writing, focusing on how ChatGPT 4.0 adjusts feedback for students identified as Hispanic. Utilizing Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count (LIWC) and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), this study investigates differences in feedback discourse, examining the potential impact on diverse student populations and the risk of exacerbating existing educational inequalities. Findings reveal ChatGPT provides feedback that reflects higher levels of clout to Hispanic students, suggesting variations in authority and expertise in the language used. These patterns may reflect and influence broader socio-historical conditions, raising concerns about the reinforcement of existing educational disparities. This study underscores the need for critical evaluation of AI in educational settings to prevent the magnification of biases and ensure equitable educational experiences.
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Common ethical frameworks for artificial intelligence in education discuss the need to address bias (Digital Promise, n.d.; Hibbert et al., 2024; Druga et al., 2021). It is well known that AI replicates human biases (Benjamin, 2020), but less clear is how these biases present in educational contexts and how they may impact educational systems that use AI. In this proposal, we describe an initial investigation into the biased textual features of feedback given to students by ChatGPT. We use linguistic inquiry and word count (LIWC; Pennebaker et al., 2015) as well as critical discourse analysis (CDA; Janks, 1997) to analyze how ChatGPT may adjust writing feedback in response to prompts that mention the learner is Hispanic. We will discuss how biased feedback patterns in large language models (LLM) such as ChatGPT could have significant impacts on systemic inequality, exacerbating current societal patterns.

This work builds on previous research on how LLMs adjust writing scores in response to socioeconomic and racial descriptions of simulated students (Authors, 2024a). The authors have produced large samples of LLM-produced feedback in response to the same student writing sample (control variable) but different descriptions of simulated students (independent variables). For example, when ChatGPT 3.5 is told that a student attends an inner-city school, on average it assigns a significantly lower score than when this variable is not mentioned, even though the writing sample being graded is the same every time (Authors, 2024a). In reaction to these findings, some educators have discouraged against using AI to assign grades, but most continue to promote using AI for feedback (Furze, 2024).

Moreover, if LLMs adjust writing scores in response to student demographics, they may also adjust feedback language. It is critical to understand how AI might adjust feedback to align with societal discourse patterns based on student identities so that AI does not undermine equitable and inclusive educational practices. Thus, this study seeks to answer the research questions (RQs):

1. Does feedback given by ChatGPT 4.0 use different discourse patterns when a student is labeled as Hispanic?
2. How might these patterns impact students and society?**Theoretical Framework**

We address these research questions using two methods of analysis: LIWC and CDA. LIWC is based on research that indicates the words people use reflect their thinking patterns and relationships (Pennebaker et al., 2015, p. 1). In this study, we focused on four composite measures from the LIWC analysis: analytic, clout, authentic, and tone.

To deepen our investigation, we examine instances of the LIWC construct of clout in ChatGPT-generated feedback given to students from various demographic backgrounds, utilizing Fairclough's model for CDA (Janks, 1997). Fairclough's CDA explores connections between language, power, and society through three analytical levels: text analysis (description), processing analysis (interpretation), and socio-cultural analysis (explanation) (Janks, 1997). It reveals how language choices relate to social meanings, power relations, and cultural norms.

## 

## **Methods**

We created a set of 2000 LLM-produced student feedback samples using ChatGPT 4 version 0613. The prompts included a description of a student and a writing sample to be evaluated. The prompt began with “This passage was written by a 7th grade…“ followed by a student description that included randomly selected variables:

* Race (Black, White, or not included)
* Ethnicity (Hispanic or not included)
* Gender (boy, girl, or not included)
* School type (inner-city public school, suburban school, or not included)
* Free lunch status (receives free lunch or not included)

After the description, each prompt stated “Give the student highly personalized feedback on the writing sample and a single final score from 0-100.” Then, one of two writing samples from the Oregon Common Core State Standards Samples of Student Writing (“Appendix C: Samples of Student Writing,” n. d.) was provided each time. One sample was rated by human graders as a 2/4 and the other 3/4.

While teachers are unlikely to use direct descriptions of their students in feedback requests, research indicates that direct descriptors are not needed to demonstrate bias (Hofmann et al., 2024). In this study, we used direct descriptors to enable more direct comparisons between variables, but additional research should determine whether similar patterns will occur from implicit indicators.

While this proposal focuses on analysis of the text feedback, a multiple regression analysis of assigned scores indicated that student description significantly predicts students' scores, *F*(9, 1990) = 351.068, *p* < .001, with an *R²* = .614. Notably, Passage Level (*B* = 12.104, *p* < .001) and Black (*B* = 1.085, *p* < .001) were significant predictors of students' scores, whereas other variables, including ethnicity, were not. Although ethnicity was not a significant predictor of score, the LLM may still be adjusting feedback language in response to the variable. For this study, we chose to focus on ethnicity because we are located at Hispanic-serving institutions.

### 

### **RQ 1: LIWC Analysis and Findings**

We used the LIWC software to calculate mean percentile scores of the four composite LIWC variables (analytic, clout, authentic, and tone). We found the mean percentile score differences of the four composite categories using a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) test with ethnicity as a fixed factor and other variables described above as covariates. The dependent variables were the percentile LIWC category scores.

Table 1 provides descriptive statistics for ethnicity and each LIWC category. A multivariate analysis indicates that ethnicity does not have a significant multivariate effect on the combined dependent variables overall (*p* = 0.131). However, the univariate tests reveal that ethnicity significantly affects clout scores (*F* = 5.528, *p* = 0.019), suggesting that there is a notable difference in clout based on ethnicity when controlling for the other variables. ChatGPT 4.0 used language with higher clout qualities—discourse that presents more authority, expertise, and confidence—when the simulated student writer was described as Hispanic.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Ethnicity and LIWC Category Scores

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| LIWC Category | Ethnicity | N | Mean Percentile | SD |
| Analytic | No Ethnicity Description | 974 | 70.03 | 14.34 |
| Hispanic | 1026 | 69.60 | 14.05 |
| Clout | No Ethnicity Description | 974 | 87.16 | 11.94 |
| Hispanic | 1026 | 88.34 | 11.02 |
| Authentic | No Ethnicity Description | 974 | 28.27 | 15.21 |
| Hispanic | 1026 | 28.68 | 16.06 |
| Tone | No Ethnicity Description | 974 | 69.35 | 23.41 |
| Hispanic | 1026 | 70.70 | 21.87 |

Note: Sample sizes differ because variables were produced randomly.

### 

### **RQ 2: CDA Analysis and Findings**

ChatGPT 4.0 used language that reflected higher expertise and authority (clout) when a student was described as Hispanic. What does this mean practically, and how might it both reflect and impact broader socio-historical conditions? Although the variables influencing the clout score in the LIWC analysis are not published, we focused CDA text analysis on three textual features that could reasonably indicate the clout characteristics described by Boyd et al. (n.d.): modal verbs, directives, and point of view. Each of these features may provide insight into authority, leadership, certainty, and expertise communicated by the LLM.

For our CDA, we chose responses featuring student writing that was rated at level two out of four by human evaluators. We selected students with both high and low scores for the LIWC variable of clout (Table 2). Our analysis involved three interconnected processes focusing on:

1. Text Analysis: linguistic features such as modals, directives, and point of view to understand potential biases in ChatGPT's language.
2. Processing Analysis: how ChatGPT constructs and delivers feedback, considering its alignment with broader educational and social objectives.
3. Social Analysis: the socio-historical conditions that shape and are influenced by the feedback, focusing on the perpetuation of educational outcomes and inequities.

This approach enabled a critical assessment of AI-generated feedback, emphasizing its implications for fostering equity and inclusive engagement in educational contexts.

Table 2. Qualitative Sample

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Simulated Student | Gender | Race | Ethnicity | School | Free Lunch | Passage Level | Response Word Count | Score | Clout Percentile |
| Sam |  | White |  |  |  | 2 | 220 | 70 | 48.12 |
| Jaime |  |  | Hispanic | Inner-city | Free lunch | 2 | 127 | 65 | 99 |
| Jason | boy | White |  | Suburban | Free lunch | 2 | 160 | 70 | 51.23 |
| Angel | boy |  | Hispanic |  | Free lunch | 2 | 235 | 70 | 99 |

#### **Text Analysis**

In Tables 3 to 5, we analyze ChatGPT's language in student feedback, focusing on modal verbs, directives, and point of view, and consider its potential impact on student engagement. This examination explores how ChatGPT's language can shape educational outcomes for students from diverse backgrounds.

Table 3 analyzes the use of modal verbs such as “should,” “could,” and “may” in feedback to different demographics. In our samples, feedback in response to prompts that did not label the student as Hispanic frequently used “should,” “could,” and “would,” while Hispanic students’ feedback included a wider range like “might” and “will.”

Table 3. Modals in student feedback

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Simulated Student | Student Demographic | Modals | Cases |
| Sam | White | Should (4)  Could (3)  Total (7) | “‘To much' **should** be 'too much', 'begginning' **should** be 'beginning', 'lonley' **should** be 'lonely'. Additionally, it's important that the pronoun 'Them' **should** not be capitalized unless it is at the beginning of a sentence or a proper noun. The student **could** also benefit from working on sentence structure to ensure each sentence contains one complete thought. For example, the sentence 'But the second traveler also felt sorry for the old lady and mistakenly gave her too much money, but later the first traveler was feeling sad and guilty because he just left her there in the cold.' **could** be broken into two sentences or restructured…However, their essay **could** benefit from a more detailed analysis of exactly how the story illustrates this principle.” |
| Jaime | Hispanic, inner-city, free lunch | Could (1)  Will (1)  Might (1)  Would (1)    Total (4) | “To strengthen your writing even further, you **could** pay attention to your punctuation, spelling, and capitalization… Incorporating more details from the text to support your analysis **will** also boost the quality of your work. You **might** find it helpful to break up your information into multiple paragraphs to make your points clear and organized. A more clear conclusion [**would**] end your piece strongly.” |
| Jason | White, suburban, boy | Could (1)  Can (1)  Should (1)  Would (2)  Total (5) | “The work **could** be improved through enhanced sentence structure and correct grammar use. The shift in perspective mid-sentence **can** create confusion, and the overuse of 'and' breaks the flow of the text. Attention to punctuation, capitalization, and correct spelling **should** also be considered, as it brings professionalism and clarity to the work. It **would** also be beneficial to include more specific examples from the text to back up assertions and to fully explain thoughts. For example, in mentioning the theme of the story, explaining how this theme is portrayed and how specific actions of the characters reflect this **would** be beneficial.” |
| Angel | Hispanic, free lunch, boy | Can (1)  Could (1)  Will (1)  Total (3) | “Using a variety of sentence structures (short, medium, long sentences) **can** make your story more interesting, and help to communicate your thoughts clearly… Finally, your writing **could** be more engaging if you included more details about the characters, such as descriptions of their emotions, surroundings, and actions… If you work on these areas, I am certain your writing **will** become even better!” |

Table 4 examines instructional directives like “remember” and “keep practicing,” highlighting the guidance ChatGPT provides and its potential influence on student revisions and learning. Table 5 categorizes feedback into first-person, second-person, and third-person perspectives, illustrating the levels of personalization and depersonalization in the feedback.

Table 4. Directives in Student Feedback

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Simulated Student | Student Demographics | Directives | Cases |
| Sam | White | Remember, keep practicing, don’t forget  Total (3) | “**Remember**, there's always room for improvement. **Keep practicing**, and **don't forget** to proofread your work for spelling and punctuation.” |
| Jaime | Hispanic, inner-city, free lunch | Keep working    Total (1) | “**Keep working** hard, your insights are valuable!” |
| Jason | White, suburban, boy | Keep on writing, practicing; remember to proofread  Total (2) | “**Keep on writing, practicing,** and **remember to proofread** your assignments for areas of potential improvement.” |
| Angel | Hispanic, free lunch, boy | Let’s work, be careful, remember, let’s pay attention, keep up, continue to express, work on, keep practicing  Total (8) | “**Let's work** onsome areas to make your writing even better… Moreover, **be careful** with the use of punctuation in your writing. **Remember**, we only begin a new sentence with a capital letter after a full stop, question mark, or exclamation mark.  Moreover, **let's pay attention** to spelling and specific details… **Keep up** the great effort in your writing and **continue to express** your ideas and thoughts like in this story. If you **work on** these areas, I am certain your writing will become even better! … **Keep practicing**!” |

Table 5. Points of View of Sentences in Student Feedback

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Simulated Student | Student Demographics | Points of View of Sentences | Cases |
| Sam | White | Third-person (11 )  Second-person (2)    Total (13) | *“***This student** wrote a thoughtful and compassionate take on their subject matter… That being said, the thoughtfulness, understanding, and morality shown in this essay are very commendable.”  “Remember, there's always room for improvement. Keep practicing, and don't forget to proofread **your** work for spelling and punctuation.” |
| Jaime | Hispanic, inner-city, free lunch | Second-person (7)  Third-person (1)    Total (8) | “**You've** shown that **you** understand the concept of theme and the emotions of the characters in the story, which is a great step.”  “For instance, **the word** 'too' is spelled incorrectly as 'to', 'lonely' is spelled 'lonley', and there are a few areas where unnecessary capitalization occurs.” |
| Jason | White, suburban, boy | Third-person (7)  Second-person (1) | “**The student** has provided a compelling and relevant interpretation of the narrative and its moral implications, demonstrating a sense of emotional intelligence and empathy towards the story's characters. **The work** could be improved through enhanced sentence structure and correct grammar use. **The shift** in perspective mid-sentence can create confusion, and the overuse of 'and' breaks the flow of the text.”  “Keep on writing, practicing, and remember to proofread **your** assignments for areas of potential improvement.” |
| Angel | Hispanic, free lunch, boy | Second-person (8)  First-person (5)  Third-person (3) | “**You** have a nice way of explaining the different ways these two characters react to seeing someone in need. This provides a strong platform for developing a complex story… Keep up the great effort in **your** writing and continue to express **your** ideas and thoughts like in this story.”  **“I** enjoy **your** thoughtful analysis of the two travelers in **your** story and the life lesson **you** highlight in **your** writing…**Let's** work on some areas to make **your** writing even better…Remember, **we** only begin a new sentence with a capital letter after a full stop, question mark, or exclamation mark…If **you** work on these areas, **I** am certain **your** writing will become even better!”  “**One area** to improve is the structure of sentences.” |

#### **Processing Analysis**

***Modals***

The modals in ChatGPT's feedback varied among students. Feedback to non-Hispanic White students included more modals, suggesting a collaborative approach that encouraged them to consider alternatives and reflect. Feedback to Hispanic students contained fewer modals, indicating a more directive stance. This reflects research that shows marginalized students often receive more authoritative feedback, potentially reinforcing negative educational experiences (Nicolai et al., 2023). It also aligns with the higher clout patterns when ChatGPT provides feedback to Hispanic students, as feedback to students labeled as Hispanic is more direct and authoritative.

***Directives***

Also connected to the idea of leadership and power are directives; this also differed between analyzed samples. Both received instructions, but the content and focus differed, reflecting different levels of authority. Phrases like “keep practicing” and “keep working” are used differently, sometimes referring to general effort, other times to specific tasks. Hispanic students’ feedback promoted career readiness, while White students’ feedback focused on academic skills and personal growth, influencing how students perceive their education and roles.

***Point of View***

The analyzed feedback used different points of view to engage students. White students’ feedback often employed a third-person perspective, creating a formal, detached tone that positions the feedback as neutral observation. Hispanic students’ feedback frequently used a second-person or first-person perspective, creating a personal, conversational tone that implies a closer relationship but may also suggest more influence or control over their behavior.

**Social Analysis**

The disparities in ChatGPT's feedback, evident in differences in point of view, use of modals, and directives, highlighted potential biases that could perpetuate harmful educational and social outcomes.

First, in the analyzed samples, ChatGPT adopted a more authoritative tone with Hispanic students, using more modals and authoritative points of view. This can influence students' perceptions of their capacity and agency in learning environments, as collaborative feedback styles are known to enhance engagement and motivation (Nur & Butarbutar, 2022). These feedback variations also reflect broader societal issues, such as the school-to-prison pipeline (Wallace et al., 2008; Counts et al., 2018; Dohrmann et al., 2022) and entrenched systems of white supremacy (Chávez-Moreno, 2020), where authoritative approaches can signal to marginalized students that they are less capable or valued, reinforcing negative stereotypes and social hierarchies.

Moreover, ChatGPT's directives for Hispanic students focused more on work and productivity, while non-Hispanic White students received more holistic feedback. This aligns with the concept of grit, which can overlook systemic barriers and exacerbate anxiety and stress among marginalized students (Mills, 2017; Gorski, 2018). Furthermore, Hispanic students often received feedback in second-person and first-person, while White students received third-person feedback. This reflects Gillespie’s (2024) findings that LLMs may implicitly treat whiteness as the normative standard, personalizing feedback for marginalized students in ways that reinforce societal biases. It also matches Kacewic et al. (2014)’s finding that those in leadership positions use fewer first-person singular and more first-person plural and second-person singular pronouns.

## 

## **Implications**

One of the primary uses of GenAI tools such as ChatGPT in schools is to provide students feedback on their work (Authors, 2024b). Our analysis problematizes this pattern, highlighting how the textual feedback from ChatGPT 4.0 to students labeled as Hispanic mirrored societal patterns of inequality, including the tendency to use a more authoritative tone and emphasize productivity over holistic feedback. The use of first and second-person pronouns also suggests an attempt to exert more influence over the student.

Pronoun use that positively correlates with the clout score (Moore et al., 2021) has also been demonstrated to positively correlate with implicit racial bias of non-Black physicians (Hagiwara et al., 2017). This finding connects the use of pronouns, clout, and implicit bias, reinforcing findings of the CDA that ChatGPT may exert more confidence and control over Hispanic students.

Generative AI’s feedback variations for identical writing samples are universally unfair and, moreover, may reinforce or magnify existing biases, underscoring the need for equitable practices to prevent adverse impacts on marginalized students. Accordingly, AI-generated feedback should be critically monitored and guided by educators who understand their students' needs and contexts. Teachers should tailor feedback to support diverse learning needs, ensuring it empowers rather than reinforces inequity.
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