

PHILIPPINES

SUMMARY:

LEVERAGING AI FOR ACADEMIC WRITING FEEDBACK: A CASE STUDY OF STUDIOSTY USE AT THE UP OPEN UNIVERSITY.

Researchers:

Reinald Adrian Pugoy

Cecille Moldez

Lorena Jean Saludadez

Joshua David Sta. Rita

Key findings:

- Student acceptance and perceptions of efficacy were exceptionally high, with mean scores for ease of use and feedback clarity exceeding 4.50 (on a 5-point scale), reinforcing the university's mission to support accessible, student-driven learning with ethical AI.
- “Unlike large language models (LLMs) that generate text, Studiosity does not produce content for students. Instead, it analyses their writing and provides targeted feedback on structure, coherence, and clarity - fostering student-driven learning and reinforcing academic integrity in an open and distance learning context.”
- Studiosity’s writing feedback tool prioritises student learning by ensuring that its approach remains respectful of learner agency.
- Recommendation: Integrate Studiosity into Academic Workflows. Studiosity should be embedded within course delivery by encouraging faculty to reference AI-generated feedback during formative assessments, ensuring that the tool complements pedagogical objectives rather than functioning in isolation.
- Recommendation: Studiosity can be considered for continued inclusion as a component of UPOU's digital education ecosystem to support the university's commitment to accessibility, flexibility, and learner success.

LEVERAGING AI FOR ACADEMIC WRITING FEEDBACK: A CASE STUDY OF STUDIOSTY USE AT THE UP OPEN UNIVERSITY

Reinald Adrian Pugoy

Associate Professor, Faculty of Information and Communication Studies, UP Open University

Cecille Moldez

Assistant Professor, Faculty of Information and Communication Studies, UP Open University

Lorena Jean Saludadez

Assistant Professor, Faculty of Management and Development Studies, UP Open University

Joshua David Sta. Rita

IT Security Specialist, ICT Development Office, UP Open University

1. INTRODUCTION

It is the commitment of the University of the Philippines Open University (UPOU) to democratize access to quality education and provide high-quality academic support to its learners. In line with this mission, UPOU has embarked on a collaborative research initiative with Studiosity to integrate its AI-powered academic support tool into UPOU's digital learning environment (DLE). Studiosity delivers real-time writing feedback, tutoring, and academic assistance designed to help students improve their work through constructive, skill-building guidance. Unlike large language models (LLMs) that generate text, Studiosity does not produce content for students. Instead, it analyzes their writing and provides targeted feedback on structure, coherence, and clarity—fostering student-driven learning and reinforcing academic integrity in an open and distance learning context.

This research investigates the role of Studiosity within UPOU's DLE, with particular focus on its impact on student engagement, satisfaction, the perceived effectiveness of AI feedback, and areas for potential improvement. It also examines the tool's alignment with UPOU's institutional goals. By validating Studiosity's relevance in an open and distance e-learning setting, the study aims to offer evidence-based recommendations to possibly enhance AI-driven academic support not only within UPOU but also across other institutions exploring similar innovations.

FINAL REPORT

Considering the aforementioned, a mixed-methods approach was employed to gather both quantitative and qualitative insights from students who have used Studiosity. A survey was distributed to approximately 1,000 registered Studiosity users at UPOU; however, only about 80 students completed the questionnaire. The relatively low response rate suggests findings should be interpreted with caution, as they may not fully represent all Studiosity users.

The survey includes a five-point Likert-scale questionnaire designed to assess students' engagement, satisfaction, and perceptions. It consists of 29 items and is organized into the following categories:

- **User Engagement and Satisfaction:** Assesses frequency of use, ease of access, user satisfaction, and perceived benefits.
- **AI Feedback Effectiveness:** Evaluates the usefulness, clarity, and trustworthiness of AI-generated feedback.
- **Challenges and Opportunities:** Explores technical issues, usability concerns, and suggestions for improvement.
- **Alignment with Institutional Goals:** Measures how well Studiosity aligns with UPOU's mission, digital strategies, and academic support goals.

Open-ended questions were included as well to gather detailed insights on respondents' interactions, challenges, and suggestions with Studiosity's integration into the digital learning environment. To complement the survey data, focus group discussions (FGDs) also examined lived experiences, usage practices, and implementation issues. A multi-method analytical framework was then applied to the collected data using the following techniques:

- **Descriptive Analysis:** Examined survey data to identify trends in engagement and perceived value of Studiosity's AI feedback tool. Metrics such as mean, median, mode, standard deviation, skewness, and kurtosis were computed to summarize central tendencies, variability, and response distributions.
- **Correlation Analysis:** Explored relationships among key survey items and thematic scores to understand how different aspects of the user experience are interrelated.
- **Thematic Analysis:** Analyzed open-ended responses, FGDs, and interview transcripts to identify recurring themes and provide deeper insights into user perceptions, challenges, and suggestions.

2. OBJECTIVES

This study aims to evaluate the use of Studiosity within UPOU's digital learning environment by examining its implementation and impact. Specifically, the objectives are to:

- | | |
|---|--|
| User Engagement and Satisfaction | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Assess the level of engagement and satisfaction of UPOU students with Studiosity. |
| AI Feedback Effectiveness | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Evaluate the effectiveness of Studiosity's AI feedback in identifying and addressing writing issues. |
| Challenges and Opportunities | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Identify challenges faced by students when using Studiosity.● Explore opportunities to improve Studiosity's adoption and effectiveness at UPOU. |
| Alignment with Institutional Goals | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Assess how Studiosity aligns with the university's digital learning strategies. |

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

3.1. GENERAL DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS

The mean score across survey items consistently falls above 4.0 for most questions, suggesting generally high satisfaction with Studiosity. For instance, items related to ease of use, feedback clarity, and alignment with UPOU's mission received some of the highest average scores, often accompanied by medians and modes at 5, indicating that a majority of students expressed their strong agreement. When the mean, median, and mode are closely aligned, as they are in many of the survey items, it suggests that the responses are centered and consistent, with little deviation between the average and the most common response. This supports the conclusion that students broadly agree on the tool's value and reliability.

A low standard deviation ($SD < 1$) is observed for items such as "*Studiosity is easy to use and navigate*" and "*The feedback provided is clear and actionable.*" This consistency suggests strong agreement among respondents, indicating a shared perception of usability and clarity. In contrast, items with slightly higher SD values (i.e., around 1.0) reflect greater variability, particularly in areas such as frequency of use, comparison with human feedback, and technical difficulties, which are factors likely influenced by individual experiences or preferences.

FINAL REPORT

Table 1. Item-Level Descriptive Statistics

Survey Item	Mean	Median	Mode	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis
I frequently use Studiosity to assist with my academic writing tasks.	3.928	4.0	4.0	1.068	-1.124	0.856
Studiosity is an essential part of my learning process at UPOU.	4.108	4.0	5.0	1.071	-1.416	1.561
Studiosity is easy to use and navigate.	4.506	5.0	5.0	0.787	-2.364	7.392
Studiosity is easily accessible whenever I need it.	4.458	5.0	5.0	0.721	-1.916	5.866
The feedback provided by Studiosity is clear, constructive, and actionable.	4.506	5.0	5.0	0.571	-0.616	-0.632
I feel satisfied with the quality of feedback provided by Studiosity.	4.446	5.0	5.0	0.63	-0.68	-0.517
Studiosity aligns with my expectations for improving my writing skills.	4.422	5.0	5.0	0.701	-1.004	0.531
I believe Studiosity enhances my overall learning experience.	4.386	4.0	5.0	0.659	-0.599	-0.653
Studiosity contributes positively to my academic success.	4.398	5.0	5.0	0.764	-1.796	4.727
I would recommend Studiosity to other UPOU students.	4.59	5.0	5.0	0.542	-0.826	-0.44
Studiosity effectively identifies and corrects grammar issues in my writing.	4.457	4.0	5.0	0.571		
The feedback from Studiosity helps me improve the structure of my written work.	4.506	5.0	5.0	0.635		
Studiosity's AI feedback is as helpful as feedback from a human instructor.	4.173	4.0	4.0	0.818		
Using Studiosity has improved my overall writing skills.	4.296	4.0	4.0	0.732		
Studiosity provides constructive feedback that helps me become a better writer.	4.37	5.0	5.0	0.766		
I believe AI feedback is effective in improving the clarity and coherence of my writing.	4.296	4.0	4.0	0.798		
I trust the feedback provided by Studiosity's AI system.	4.272	4.0	4.0	0.758		

FINAL REPORT

Survey Item	Mean	Median	Mode	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis
I have experienced technical difficulties when using Studiosity**	2.275	2.0	2.0	0.993		
I find it difficult to understand how to use all of Studiosity's features**	2.212	2.0	2.0	1.052		
Studiosity's suggestions sometimes feel irrelevant or unhelpful**	2.45	2.0	2.0	1.054		
I have concerns about the privacy and security of my work when using Studiosity**	2.788	3.0	2.0	1.177		
Using Studiosity is ethical and acceptable.	4.125	4.0	4.0	0.7		
Studiosity could be improved by offering more personalized feedback**	4.188	4.0	4.0	0.828		
I believe Studiosity should expand its features for academic support**	4.288	4.0	5.0	0.814		
Studiosity supports UPOU's mission to provide accessible and flexible education.	4.577	5.0	5.0	0.675		
Studiosity aligns with the university's goal of enhancing student learning outcomes.	4.564	5.0	5.0	0.656		

** For subsequent statistical analysis, negatively worded items were reverse-scored to maintain alignment in interpretation.

The skewness values across most survey items are negative, which implies a left-skewed distribution. In practical terms, this means that responses clustered toward the more positive end of the scale, particularly "Agree" and "Strongly Agree." This pattern confirms that students not only have favorable impressions but that these favorable views were dominant across the sample. The consistency of negative skew reinforces the conclusion that Studiosity is well-received in the context of UPOU's digital learning environment.

High kurtosis values (notably in items related to usability) reflect that responses are tightly concentrated around the mean, indicating a strong consensus among students. For example, the item on ease of use has a kurtosis above 7; this is characteristic of a peaked distribution, where most students selected the highest possible rating. On the other hand, items with moderate or

FINAL REPORT

near-zero kurtosis show more dispersed feedback, suggesting a wider range of opinions. This is typically seen in items that ask about technical issues or comparisons between AI and human feedback, which are more subjective and context-dependent.

Although overall responses to Studiosity are positive, the survey highlights a few areas for potential improvement. Students generally disagree with experiencing technical difficulties ($M = 2.27$), though some note challenges in fully utilizing all features ($M = 2.21$). Perceptions of feedback irrelevance are also low ($M = 2.45$), indicating that **most students find the suggestions helpful**. However, this score is slightly higher than those for technical or navigation concerns, suggesting possible opportunities to further improve the contextual alignment of feedback. Additionally, a subset of respondents expressed moderate concerns regarding the privacy and security of their work ($M = 2.78$).

In summary, students highly appreciate Studiosity's usability and technical accessibility. They find the AI-generated feedback effective, especially for grammar and clarity. There is confidence in the AI tool, although some variation exists in how students compare it to human feedback or perceive its personalization.

3.2. CATEGORY-LEVEL DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS

We also systematically categorized the results into four thematic domains, each reflecting a distinct aspect of students' experiences with Studiosity.

Table 2. Summary of Descriptive Trends by Category

Category/Domain	Mean Score Trend	Skewness	Interpretation
User Engagement & Satisfaction	High (4.0-4.6)	Strong Negative	Strong consensus on ease of use and satisfaction
AI Feedback Effectiveness	High (4.2-4.4)	Negative	Trusted, useful feedback with slightly more variability
Challenges & Opportunities	Mixed (3.2-3.8)	Mixed	Some concerns around relevance and technical issues
Alignment with Institutional Goals	Very High (4.4-4.6)	Strong Negative	Students perceive strong alignment with UPOU's digital goals

FINAL REPORT

In **Category 1: User Engagement and Satisfaction**, students consistently rated Studiosity as highly usable and easily accessible. The alignment of statistical measures, such as high means and strong negative skewness, suggests a widespread and sustained level of satisfaction with the platform's user interface and availability. These findings establish a promising foundation of positive user sentiment that underscores Studiosity's relevance in an online learning environment.

Moving into **Category 2: AI Feedback Effectiveness**, the data indicate that students regard Studiosity as a valuable writing aid, particularly in the areas of grammar correction, structural refinement, and clarity enhancement. Although responses in this category exhibited slightly more variability than those in usability-related items, the overall trend points toward growing confidence in AI-generated feedback. This reinforces Studiosity's role not only as a writing support tool but also as a mechanism for promoting self-directed learning and academic improvement.

In contrast, **Category 3: Challenges and Opportunities** brought to light some nuanced concerns. While the majority of students still expressed positive experiences, this category captures more diverse responses, highlighting occasional issues with the contextual relevance of feedback and limited personalization. These insights present clear areas for further enhancement, such as improving feedback contextualization, enabling more detailed response options, and integrating Studiosity into instructor-mediated learning workflows.

Finally, in **Category 4: Alignment with Institutional Goals**, responses are notably consistent and overwhelmingly favorable. Students strongly affirmed that Studiosity supports UPOU's mission of providing accessible, flexible, and quality education. The high levels of agreement in this category confirm that Studiosity is not only seen as an effective learning tool but is also viewed as a strategic asset that aligns with the university's broader digital and pedagogical vision.

3.3. CORRELATION ANALYSIS

To better understand how different aspects of the Studiosity experience relate to each other, a category-level correlation analysis was conducted using Spearman's correlation coefficient (ρ). Each thematic category—(1) User Engagement & Satisfaction (2) AI Feedback Effectiveness, (3) Challenges & Opportunities, and (4) Alignment with Institutional Goals—was represented by the mean score of their respective items. The findings reveal the following key relationships:

USER ENGAGEMENT AND ALIGNMENT WITH INSTITUTIONAL GOALS

A strong positive correlation ($\rho = 0.758$, $p < 0.001$) is observed between student satisfaction and their perception of Studiosity's alignment with UPOU's mission and goals. This indicates that

FINAL REPORT

learners who are satisfied with the platform not only appreciate its functional benefits but also associate it with the university's broader vision for accessible, high-quality digital education. In other words, positive user experiences appear to reinforce institutional trust and the belief that UPOU is effectively leveraging technology to support student success. This relationship underscores the importance of ensuring both usability and pedagogical relevance, as these factors contribute to strengthening the perceived value of institutional initiatives.

USER ENGAGEMENT AND AI FEEDBACK EFFECTIVENESS

With $\rho = 0.757$ ($p < 0.001$), students who reported higher satisfaction and more frequent use of Studiosity also expressed strong appreciation for the quality and usefulness of its AI-generated feedback. This suggests that engagement with the platform is not merely a function of accessibility or ease of use, but is strongly influenced by the perceived value of the feedback in enhancing academic writing. When students believe that Studiosity's suggestions lead to meaningful improvements in their work, they are more likely to continue using the tool consistently and view it as an integral part of their learning process. This relationship emphasizes the importance of maintaining accuracy and clarity in AI-driven feedback to sustain user engagement and trust.

AI FEEDBACK EFFECTIVENESS AND ALIGNMENT WITH INSTITUTIONAL GOALS

A strong correlation ($\rho = 0.767$, $p < 0.001$) also exists between students' perceptions of feedback effectiveness and their view of the Studiosity tool as aligned with UPOU's institutional goals. This relationship suggests that effective feedback does more than improve writing skills; it reinforces students' confidence in the institution's strategic use of technology to enhance academic support. Consequently, optimizing the quality of feedback can further strengthen this alignment and build institutional trust.

CHALLENGES & OPPORTUNITIES IN RELATION TO ENGAGEMENT, FEEDBACK, AND INSTITUTIONAL ALIGNMENT

The correlation analysis indicates that the Challenges & Opportunities theme exhibits only weak and statistically non-significant relationships with other categories. Its correlation with User Engagement & Satisfaction ($\rho = 0.214$, $p = 0.061$) and AI Feedback Effectiveness ($\rho = 0.178$, $p = 0.123$) suggests that students' overall satisfaction and perceptions of feedback quality remain largely unaffected by the presence of technical or usability concerns. Similarly, the correlation with Alignment with Institutional Goals is negligible ($\rho = 0.090$, $p = 0.436$), indicating that students do not conflate operational limitations with the university's broader commitment to technology-enabled learning.

This pattern underscores an important insight: while occasional challenges such as navigation difficulties or limited personalization are acknowledged, they do not significantly erode trust in Studiosity or its perceived alignment with institutional goals. Instead, these challenges appear to be viewed as localized and fixable, rather than as indicators of systemic or strategic shortcomings. Nonetheless, addressing these issues remains critical to maintaining positive user experiences, minimizing frustration, and supporting sustained adoption.

3.4. QUALITATIVE THEMATIC ANALYSIS

The qualitative data gathered from the surveys, FGDs, and interviews were processed through thematic analysis to provide a clearer picture of students' experiences in using Studiosity, particularly the ways in which the platform assisted their learning, as well as the areas where it could be improved to better support learner experiences. Two broad thematic areas, affirmative and critical perspectives, emerged, with both themes contributing to Categories 1, 2, and 3, as enumerated above.

3.4.1. AFFIRMATIVE PERSPECTIVE

In general, students provided positive feedback regarding the usefulness of Studiosity in improving their academic writing. As a tool, students noted the following key characteristics of the learning experience facilitated by Studiosity, which better supported them in their academic writing tasks: (1) Learner-Centered, (2) Immediate, (3) Focused, and (4) Thorough.

LEARNER-CENTERED

In the narratives provided by students, they highlighted the importance and effectiveness of Studiosity's learner-centered feedbacking approach as an AI tool. Students expressed a clear preference for how AI tools should contribute to their learning experiences, with many articulating a need for the AI to avoid overstepping in providing academic assistance.

As one student noted, they are in favor of AI assistance in learning *"as long as it does not overstep with the learning process of students, and it only serves as a tool or as an aid in the learning process."* Many students cited concerns about how AI may potentially affect their critical thinking—hence the emphasis on non-intrusive AI support. This is the case with Studiosity, whose AI writing feedback tool prioritizes student learning by ensuring that its approach remains respectful of learner agency. One student remarked that Studiosity *"doesn't directly correct my works but rather teaches me what aspects I can improve on."* This clearly demonstrates the awareness students have of the importance of using Studiosity and similar AI tools with the intention of assisting in the learning process, rather than bypassing it.

FINAL REPORT

“It’s inevitable to be integrated in my academics, but I enjoy that it isn’t too intrusive or causes me to lessen my critical thinking like purely generative AI apps do.”

“I don’t like using intrusive AI writing assistants when producing written works (e.g., ChatGPT, Grammarly) and prefer suggestions similar to the AI model that Studiosity provides. It doesn’t directly correct my work but rather teaches me which aspects I can improve.”

IMMEDIATE

Another recurring theme in student narratives is the value placed on the immediacy of support provided by Studiosity. In the learning environment of UPOU, where students pursue their academic tasks independently and asynchronously, support systems may not always be readily available due to scheduling conflicts between students and faculty. This asynchronous nature often leads to delays in communication and consultation. That said, students highlighted the platform’s 24/7 availability as a key strength. The ability to receive timely feedback—without long waiting periods—was seen as essential in helping them meet academic deadlines and maintain their learning momentum. This accessibility is particularly appreciated by students balancing academic work with employment, caregiving, or other responsibilities.

“The ability to get instant feedback, even outside traditional office hours, allows me to stay on track with my assignments and boost my confidence in my work.”

“It doesn’t only give suggestions for the enhancement of my paper, but it also [helps] me submit my paperwork on time because it makes it easier for me to revise my paper.”

“The ability to connect with knowledgeable [AI] tutors anytime ensures that I can get immediate help when I’m stuck.”

FOCUSED

Students highlighted Studiosity’s ability to deliver focused and personalized feedback tailored to their specific writing submissions. Rather than offering general advice, the platform pinpoints particular areas for improvement—whether in grammar, coherence, structure, or tone—allowing students to act on clear, actionable suggestions. This targeted support is described as more helpful than standard templates or broad writing guidelines, especially for students seeking concrete direction on how to revise their work.

FINAL REPORT

The instructional nature of the feedback aligns well with learner-centered pedagogy, enabling students to make meaningful improvements in their writing rather than simply applying corrections mechanically. Students also mentioned that Studiosity’s ability to identify specific problem areas or points of improvement not only helped them revise their current outputs but also raised their awareness of the strengths and weaknesses of their writing style—contributing to the improvement of their future academic writing tasks.

“AI tools like Studiosity offer personalized tutoring services, where students can get instant feedback on their work.”

“AI tools can provide personalized learning experiences, adapt to my individual needs, and offer feedback in real-time.”

THOROUGH

Another characteristic of the assistance provided by Studiosity that was deeply appreciated by students is its ability to offer a thorough review of their outputs. Its capacity to identify common writing errors enables students to gain confidence in their work prior to submission. As one student noted, “[Studiosity] provides critical feedback to things that I tend to overlook in my papers.” Other students also described Studiosity as akin to a “fresh set of eyes” that helps them double-check or quality-assure their outputs. As another student shared, “It helps me to see some words that I overlooked—to emphasize or to remind me to give a second glance at it.” Other narratives provided by students that support this theme include the following:

“It spots common oversights in the consistency of verb tenses.”

“I think it supported me in spot-checking my work regarding grammar and sentence construction.”

“It emphasizes some small details that a student like me may have overlooked when writing—like clerical errors, misspelled words, punctuation marks, tone, and proper syntax.”

“I was typically prompted to use it during tight deadlines, when I needed an extra set of eyes to review my draft, or when I felt unsure about certain parts of my writing.”

“I used it every time we had academic tasks to ensure that I submitted my work with fewer to zero errors.”

3.4.2 CRITICAL PERSPECTIVE

While several students have acknowledged that the use of Studiosity has helped improve their writing and learning outcomes, there was also critical feedback highlighting areas where the platform can further enhance its service. Despite its accessibility, Studiosity is often limited by its inability to engage with deeper academic contexts, which can result in irrelevant or unhelpful feedback for certain tasks. In this sense, there appears to be a “CAP” to the kind of assistance Studiosity can provide learners—namely, it can be Context-Blind, Assignment Unaware, and reliant on Plain Suggestions. These limitations point to the need for more context-aware, relevant, and academically responsive AI-generated feedback, especially for complex academic work.

CONCEPT BLIND

Students have raised points for potential improvement, particularly in Studiosity’s ability to engage with deeper academic contexts. While Studiosity provides useful insights on students’ writing, it does not explore or examine the academic concepts presented in their outputs. Beyond feedback on writing mechanics, students believe that receiving input on the accuracy of their interpretation of concepts—or suggestions for supplementary or complementary ideas—would not only enhance their writing but also allow Studiosity to function more effectively as an academic tutor. These are future developments that could further improve the relevance of Studiosity in the modern academic setting. Narratives that support this theme include the following:

“I hope Studiosity can provide clearer, more specific feedback, rather than generic comments.”

“A more humane touch to consider context and experiences.”

“Honestly, I didn’t fully explore all of Studiosity’s features and mainly used it for quick feedback on writing. It could be improved by offering more in-depth support for advanced academic writing, like research methodology or theoretical frameworks. Better integration with my learning platform and more subject-specific feedback would also make it more useful for my academic and teaching needs.”

FINAL REPORT

ASSIGNMENT UNAWARE

Students expressed that Studiosity sometimes provides feedback that they cannot readily apply, as it either exceeds or falls outside the scope of the assigned task. This lack of awareness of the assignment prompt can result in feedback that is not necessarily useful or relevant to the student's specific context. Given that Studiosity is not aware of what the assignment requires, the context of its feedback may not always be applicable. A clearer understanding of the expectations students are meant to fulfil could enable Studiosity to better guide them toward revisions that help meet the demands of the task.

"Its recommendations can be out of context. If I follow all its recommendations, my 500 word essay will become 2000 words."

"Does not understand the context of the assignment, therefore providing suggestions that are sometimes not workable."

PLAIN SUGGESTIONS

Some of the feedback provided by Studiosity may be difficult for students to understand for various reasons. Per the student's suggestions, to ensure that students accurately interpret how the feedback is meant to improve their output, one possible improvement would be to integrate examples into the suggestions. This would provide more guided feedback, helping students better understand what is being asked of them and how they can apply the suggestions effectively.

"To better serve UPOU students, Studiosity could provide more detailed, example-based feedback on writing and articles, focusing on academic style and structure."

"I guess it would be good if Studiosity can help for instance give suggestions on how we can better expand, enhance, or explain our ideas — similar to grammarly."

"General feedback may be given specific examples for better understanding"

"Should provide more examples or can be integrated with Generative AI."

FINAL REPORT

Table 3. Summary of Findings and Recommendations by Category or Concern

Category or Concern	Quantitative Findings	Qualitative Findings	Recommendations
User Engagement & Satisfaction	High engagement and satisfaction (mean scores between 4.0–4.6); strong agreement on ease of use and accessibility.	Students appreciated Studiosity’s learner-centered approach, ease of access, and its non-intrusive role in learning. They valued its availability and ability to respect learner agency.	Maintain the current user-friendly design and usability; strengthen communication campaigns to increase awareness and utilization.
AI Feedback Effectiveness	Consistently high ratings (mean scores between 4.2–4.4); feedback viewed as clear, actionable, and trustworthy, with minimal variability.	Feedback was described as focused and thorough. Students valued detailed suggestions that improved grammar, structure, and clarity while supporting critical thinking.	Advocate for improvements in contextual awareness and incorporate example-based suggestions to enhance clarity and applicability.
Challenges & Opportunities	Mixed responses (mean scores between 3.2–3.8); minimal technical issues but concerns about personalization and feature complexity.	Students highlighted three main limitations: context-blind (cannot engage deeply with academic content), assignment unaware (feedback not always relevant to task), and plain suggestions (lacks examples for clarity).	Integrate Studiosity more deeply into academic workflows; encourage assignment-aware personalization to enhance relevance and user experience.
Alignment with Institutional Goals	Very strong alignment (mean scores between 4.4–4.6); clear consistency with UPOU’s mission and digital education strategy.	Students consistently affirmed that Studiosity aligns with UPOU’s goals of accessibility, flexibility, and learner support.	Continue strategic integration of Studiosity within the digital learning ecosystem and institutional development plans.
Ethics and Privacy	Moderate concerns regarding data security (mean = 2.79, SD = 1.17); variation suggests differing perceptions of risk.	While generally trusting the platform, some students expressed concern about data privacy and security of submitted work.	Strengthen data protection protocols and proactively communicate privacy and security measures to maintain user trust.

4. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The integration of Studiosity into UPOU's digital learning environment has demonstrated substantial value in supporting students' academic writing. Findings reveal strong user engagement, high satisfaction, and confidence in AI-generated feedback. Most students found the platform intuitive, accessible, and effective in providing clear, actionable suggestions for improving grammar, structure, and coherence. Furthermore, the strong alignment between Studiosity's capabilities and UPOU's mission to provide accessible and flexible education positions the tool as a strategic asset in advancing digital learning initiatives.

Despite these positive outcomes, challenges persist. Some students noted limitations in Studiosity's capacity to engage deeply with academic content (context-blind), provide assignment-aware guidance, and offer detailed, example-based suggestions—highlighting opportunities for greater personalization and improved feature usability. Additionally, moderate concerns regarding data security highlight the need to strengthen privacy communication and assurance measures. These insights underscore the importance of both addressing user concerns and advocating for enhancements that align with UPOU's pedagogical objectives.

Based on these findings, the following actions are recommended:

- **Sustain Positive User Experience.** The platform's intuitive design and user-friendly features should be maintained, and targeted communication campaigns should be implemented to promote awareness and encourage broader utilization across programs.
- **Enhance Feedback Contextualization.** Assignment-aware mechanisms and example-based suggestions should be incorporated to improve the contextual relevance and applicability of feedback for diverse academic tasks. While these enhancements depend on Studiosity's developers, UPOU should advocate for their implementation to ensure alignment with institutional pedagogical priorities.
- **Integrate Studiosity into Academic Workflows.** Studiosity should be embedded within course delivery by encouraging faculty to reference AI-generated feedback during formative assessments, ensuring that the tool complements pedagogical objectives rather than functioning in isolation.
- **Strengthen Data Security and Privacy Measures.** Institutional data protection protocols should be reinforced, and privacy measures should be communicated transparently to foster trust and support sustained adoption.

FINAL REPORT

- **Align with Institutional Priorities.** Studiosity can be considered for continued inclusion as a component of UPOU's digital education ecosystem to support the university's commitment to accessibility, flexibility, and learner success.