

USING CHATGPT AS AN AUXILIARY TOOL IN BUSINESS CORRESPONDENCE: EXPERIENCE AND REFLECTIONS

ВИКОРИСТАННЯ CHATGPT ЯК ДОПОМІЖНОГО ЗАСОБУ В ДІЛОВІЙ КОРЕСПОНДЕНЦІЇ: ДОСВІД ТА РЕФЛЕКСІЇ СТУДЕНТІВ

This article analyses the integration of generative AI into Business English instruction, drawing on the experience of the Faculty of Management and Marketing at Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute. The study focuses on finding a balance between AI technological support and the preservation of a student's professional agency. The research involved 143 fourth-year undergraduate students with established experience using ChatGPT, which allowed the focus to shift from basic technological introduction to a deep analysis of output quality.

The methodology was based on contrastive analysis, where students compared their own drafts of business letters with AI-generated versions. Evaluations were conducted across criteria including linguistic accuracy, structural integrity, professional register, and the ability to establish strategic rapport. A preliminary audit revealed that prior to AI intervention, student-produced drafts averaged 4 to 6 linguistic errors per 100 words. This creates a significant cognitive load that AI helps mitigate, scoring 4.8 out of 5.0 for grammatical correctness.

However, qualitative analysis identified systemic limitations within the algorithms. In 82% of cases, the AI exhibited "template-dependency," producing linguistically correct but pragmatically weak texts. Students observed that ChatGPT struggled to adapt the tone of communication to the specific dynamics of client relationships. Specifically, the algorithm lacked the flexibility to convey "assertive empathy" or to calibrate strategic persistence based on a partner's importance.

Despite lower scores for linguistic precision (3.6/5.0), students proved more effective at personalizing correspondence. Approximately 74% of participants successfully integrated strategic accents that make communication effective, while the AI remained within neutral, formulaic boundaries. The results demonstrate that while AI is a powerful technical assistant, it cannot replace human agency in matters of emotional intelligence and strategic planning. The study concludes that modern education must focus on developing AI literacy, prioritizing the critical editing of machine-generated text and the preservation of the future professional's authorial voice.

Key words: Generative AI (ChatGPT), Business English (ESP), contrastive analysis, pragmatic competence, AI literacy.

У статті проаналізовано досвід інтеграції генеративного штучного інтелекту в

навчання ділової англійської мови на прикладі факультету менеджменту та маркетингу КПІ ім. Ігоря Сікорського. Основна увага зосереджена на пошуку балансу між технологічною підтримкою ШІ та збереженням професійної суб'єктності студента. У дослідженні взяли участь 143 студенти випускного курсу, які вже мають досвід роботи з ChatGPT, що дозволило змістити акцент із простого ознайомлення з технологією на глибокий аналіз якості результатів.

Методологія базувалася на контрастивному аналізі: студенти порівнювали власні чернетки ділових листів із варіантами, згенерованими ШІ. Оцінювання проводили за критеріями лінгвістичної точності, структури, професійного регістру та здатності до побудови стратегічного контакту. Попередній аудит показав, що рівень мовних помилок у самостійних роботах студентів до втручання ШІ в середньому становив 4–6 одиниць на 100 слів. Це створює значне когнітивне навантаження, яке ШІ допомагає нівелювати, отримавши 4.8 бала з 5 за критерієм граматичної коректності.

Проте якісний аналіз виявив системні обмеження алгоритмів. У 82% випадків ШІ демонстрував «шаблонну залежність», видаючи лінгвістично правильні, але прагматично слабкі тексти. Студенти зауважили, що ChatGPT важко адаптувати тон повідомлення під специфічну динаміку стосунків із клієнтом. Зокрема, алгоритму бракує гнучкості для передачі «впевненої емпатії» або калібрування стратегічної наполегливості залежно від важливості партнера.

Попри нижчий бал за лінгвістичну точність (3.6/5.0), студенти виявилися ефективнішими у персоналізації повідомлень. 74% учасників змогли додати в листи стратегічні акценти, які роблять комунікацію результативною, тоді як ШІ залишався в межах нейтральних формул. Результати доводять, що ШІ є потужним технічним асистентом, але він не здатний замінити людину в питаннях емоційного інтелекту та стратегічного планування. Висновок дослідження підкреслює: сучасна освіта має фокусуватися на розвитку ШІ-грамотності, де пріоритетом є критичне редагування «машинного» тексту та збереження авторської позиції майбутнього фахівця.

Ключові слова: Генеративний ШІ (ChatGPT), бізнес-англійська (ESP), контрастивний аналіз, прагматична компетенція, ШІ-грамотність.

UDC 811.111'27:004.8

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/ip/92.1.58>

Стаття поширюється на умовах ліцензії відкритого доступу CC BY 4.0



Kornyska Yu.A.,

orcid.org/0000-0002-4781-0807

Ph.D. (Education),

Associate Professor at the Department of English for the Humanities № 3

National Technical University of Ukraine "Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute"

Problem statement. In the modern corporate environment, effective written communication is a fundamental driver of professional success. Business documents, ranging from formal reports to daily client correspondence, do not merely transmit data; they provide a structural basis for decision-making and directly influence institutional credibility. When a text suffers from ambiguous phrasing or inconsistent

terminology, the risks often lead to tangible financial losses or an erosion of reputation. Within this context, mastering Business English writing requires grammatical accuracy, logical structural organization, and the consistent use of a professional register.

For ESP learners, developing these skills presents a significant challenge. The task requires the integration of discipline-specific language with strict

formal conventions. Our preliminary observations indicate that student-produced drafts, prior to AI intervention, typically exhibit a notable density of errors averaging 4 to 6 linguistic or stylistic lapses per 100 words. These issues frequently stem from the difficulty of simultaneously managing complex syntax, specialized terminology, and overarching rhetorical strategies. Traditional instruction often provides insufficient opportunities for students to apply these abilities in unpredictable, client-oriented scenarios.

At the same time, the emergence of AI-based assistants like ChatGPT has introduced a new variable into higher education. While AI can enhance the grammatical correctness and clarity of a draft, its ability to replicate an authentic, client-centered perspective remains a subject of debate. These shifting conditions create a pressing pedagogical problem: how can Business English curricula effectively incorporate AI tools without undermining a student's own professional voice? This study addresses this by comparing ChatGPT-assisted writing with original student-produced texts to identify both the practical advantages and the inherent limitations of AI-supported learning.

Analysis of recent studies and publications

The scholarly landscape regarding generative AI is defined by a tension between its transformative potential and the imperative to preserve academic standards [1]. This debate was largely catalysed by Chomsky's critique of ChatGPT as "high-tech plagiarism" [3], suggesting that such tools offer a bypass for the cognitive struggle essential to deep learning. This concern is supported by systematic reviews [7; 13], which highlight risks to academic integrity and the potential erosion of higher-order thinking skills.

In contrast, other research emphasizes the necessity of adapting to shifting professional realities. Dwivedi et al. [12] contend that algorithmic proficiency is now a requirement for modern graduates. In this light, AI shifts from a potential "cheat code" to what Mollick [9] terms "co-intelligence," freeing students to focus on conceptually complex writing projects [2; 5; 15].

For learners mastering Business English, AI can act as a scaffolding tool, enhancing lexical diversity and providing iterative feedback [1; 2; 6]. However, even proponents identify significant "blind spots." As Hosseini et al. [4; 15] point out, while AI excels at structural optimization, it remains limited in replicating the "authorial voice" – the unique intersection of originality and nuanced persuasion that defines high-stakes communication. Ultimately, the literature suggests a move toward "AI Literacy," emphasizing critical engagement over prohibition [8; 10; 14].

Unresolved aspects of the general problem.

While the technical ability of ChatGPT to produce correct business texts is established, its impact on

the development of a student's professional agency remains unclear. Specifically, there is a need to test whether direct contrastive analysis can help learners identify the point where algorithmic consistency fails to meet the requirements of complex, client-oriented rapport.

The primary **objective** of this study is to evaluate contrastive analysis as a tool for helping students distinguish between AI-generated structures and their own professional voice. By having 143 students compare their original drafts with ChatGPT outputs, we aim to assess whether this comparative method effectively prepares future economists and managers to use AI responsibly while prioritizing strategic human communication.

Main Body of Research

Methodology and experimental design

The study involved a sizable cohort of 143 fourth-year undergraduate students at the Faculty of Management and Marketing, Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute. As students of a leading technical university, this cohort is characterised by a high level of digital literacy and a proactive approach to adopting new technologies. This continuity of instruction, with all students progressing through the same three-year curriculum, ensured a synchronized baseline of both language level and disciplinary knowledge.

We began the study with a brief session to set common ground on how to evaluate Large Language Models (LLMs). Since these students were already frequent users of ChatGPT, the focus was not on introducing the tool, but on moving from casual use to a professional analysis of the output. This was critical to avoid the novelty effect—their feedback was driven by informed observation rather than the initial "wow-factor" of the technology.

To capture a range of professional discourse, students drafted three simulations: a business inquiry letter, a complaint letter, and a cover letter. These genres were selected, as each demands a different calibration of strategic communication. Students then analysed both their original drafts and the ChatGPT versions using a standardized rubric (5-point Likert scale) covering:

- Structural integrity;
- Lexical precision;
- Grammatical accuracy;
- Professional tone;
- Communicative effectiveness;
- Rapport building.

Results

The analysis revealed a consistent trend. Quantitatively, ChatGPT scored higher in Grammatical Accuracy and Structural Integrity (averaging 4.8/5.0). However, these versions exhibited a distinct "template-dependency": in approximately 82% of cases, the AI utilized near-identical opening and closing formulas. This led to a perceived tonal uniformity, where

the tonal differentiation required for a grievance was structurally indistinguishable from a routine request.

Participants noted that AI struggled with the specific client-centered perspective required for high-stakes tasks. In the Complaint Letter simulation, for instance, ChatGPT consistently produced a “polite-neutral” response. While grammatically perfect, it failed to reflect the nuanced power dynamics between the parties. Specifically, students observed that the AI could not calibrate the level of “assertive empathy” needed to address a long-term corporate partner versus a one-time service provider.

For students, the “client-centered” approach meant tailoring the argument to the recipient’s specific business goals—a task that 62% of participants felt they handled better than the AI, despite their linguistic errors. They identified that ChatGPT’s focus on “safe” professional language often resulted in a loss of strategic urgency, making the communication feel transactional rather than relational. Student drafts, while scoring lower on accuracy (3.6/5.0), demonstrated a more proactive engagement with audience expectations. In the cover letter simulation, 74% of participants deviated from templates to include personal branding, which instructors marked higher in Communicative effectiveness.

Conclusions. The findings suggest that generative AI functions more effectively as a support tool within structured pedagogical design rather than a replacement for human agency. ChatGPT serves as an instrument for enhancing technical dimensions like grammar and structural coherence, significantly reducing cognitive load. However, a critical divergence was observed regarding the “human element”: while AI outputs were praised for consistency, they were perceived to lack the creativity and emotional resonance of human authorship.

To be truly effective, the algorithmic precision of AI must be enriched by the nuanced and strategic touch of a human author. Understanding both the potential and the current limitations of these technologies is essential for modern graduates. By fostering a balanced level of AI literacy, students at the Faculty of Management and Marketing can responsibly navigate the digital workforce, ensuring they remain confident and ethical communicators.

Limitations and Future Research. The findings of this study should be interpreted within the context of the selected student population at KPI. While the sample provides substantial evidence regarding the utility of ChatGPT in a specific academic framework, the results may not be universally generalizable. Nevertheless, this research contributes empirical data to the growing body of research on AI in pedagogy, illustrating how technology can complement traditional methods without undermining human creativity.

Looking forward, the evolution of AI necessitates a focus on several research frontiers:

- Longitudinal studies: investigating how continuous exposure to AI influences the long-term evolution of students’ critical thinking.
- Comparative analysis of LLMs: researching diverse AI aids to assist educators in selecting tools that best complement pedagogical goals.
- Personalized learning: exploring how AI can offer tailored, student-centered feedback that adapts to individual trajectories.

REFERENCES:

1. Barrot J. S. Leveraging ChatGPT in the Writing Classrooms: Theoretical and Practical insights. *Language Teaching Research Quarterly*. 2024. Vol. 43. P. 43. URL: <https://doi.org/10.32038/ltrq.2024.43.03>.
2. Chan C. K. Y., Hu W. Students’ voices on generative AI: perceptions, benefits, and challenges in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*. 2023. Vol. 20, no. 1. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00411-8> (date of access: 17.02.2026).
3. Chomsky N. ChatGPT is stunning and bumpy. Here’s where Deep Learning crunches. *The New York Times*. 2023. 8 February. URL: <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/02/08/opinion/noam-chomsky-chatgpt-ai.html>
4. Disclosing generative AI use for writing assistance should be voluntary / M. Hosseini et al. *Research Ethics*. 2025. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1177/17470161251345499>
5. Does ChatGPT enhance student learning? A systematic review and meta-analysis of experimental studies / R. Deng et al. *Computers & Education*. 2024. P. 105224. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2024.105224>.
6. Huang S. Integrating Generative AI for Enhancing Students’ L2 Writing Literacy in a Bilingual Program. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*. 2024. Vol. 24, № 2. URL: <https://doi.org/10.12738/>
7. Imran M., Almusharraf N. Analyzing the role of ChatGPT as a writing assistant at higher education level: A systematic review of the literature. *Contemporary Educational Technology*. 2023. Vol. 15, no. 4. P. ep464. URL: <https://doi.org/10.30935/cedtech/13605> (date of access: 17.02.2026).
8. Kurban C. F., Şahin M. Exploring ChatGPT’s Role in Higher Education: A Literature Review. *The Impact of ChatGPT on Higher Education*. 2024. P. 41–73. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-83797-647-820241004>.
9. Mollick E. R. Co-intelligence: Living and working with AI. New York : Portfolio/Penguin, 2024. 304 p.
10. North K., Zampieri M. Features of lexical complexity: insights from L1 and L2 speakers. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*. 2023. Vol. 6. URL: <https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2023.1236963> (date of access: 17.02.2026).
11. Ouyang F., Zheng L., Jiao P. Artificial intelligence in online higher education: A systematic review of empirical research from 2011 to 2020. *Education and Information Technologies*. 2022. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-022-10925-9>.
12. So what if ChatGPT wrote it?” Multidisciplinary perspectives on opportunities, challenges and implications of generative conversational AI for

research, practice and policy / Y. K. Dwivedi et al. *International Journal of Information Management*. 2023. Vol. 71. P. 102642. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2023.102642>.

13. Strzelecki A. To use or not to use ChatGPT in higher education? A study of students' acceptance and use of technology. *Interactive Learning Environments*. 2023. P. 1–14. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2023.2209881>.

14. The development and validation of a scale on student AI literacy in L2 writing: A domain-specific perspective / L. Xu et al. *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 2025. Vol. 69. P. 101227. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2025.101227>.

15. What if the devil is my guardian angel: ChatGPT as a case study of using chatbots in education / A. Tlili et al. *Smart Learning Environments*. 2023. Vol. 10, no. 1. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-023-00237-x>.

Дата першого надходження статті до видання: 23.02.2026

Дата прийняття статті до друку після рецензування: 27.03.2026

Дата публікації (оприлюднення) статті: 20.04.2026