

EFL PEDAGOGICAL ADAPTATION IN A VIETNAMESE COLLEGE IN THE AI ERA

CHU THE LE HOANG
University of Phan Thiet

Received: 28 July 2025; Revised: 15 September 2025; Accepted for publication: 02 October 2025.

Abstract

This qualitative instrumental case study investigates how an English teacher-researcher at a Vietnamese college adapted pedagogical practices in response to student artificial intelligence integration, and how these adjustments influenced the learning processes of both English language majors and non-language majors. Research data were collected over a 12-week semester using a data triangulation framework comprising pre- and post-semester structured student interviews, weekly teacher reflection journals, and classroom document artifacts. The participant cohort consisted of eight students, including three English language majors and five non-language majors from various disciplines, and the instructor acting in a dual teacher-researcher capacity. The findings indicate a double-edged impact: while text-based AI effectively supported writing mechanics and vocabulary acquisition, heavy reliance on automated drafting coincided with persistent latency in spontaneous speaking and reduced communication reflexes. Instructional adaptations emphasizing interactive group tasks and unprompted oral exercises fostered a supportive classroom climate, though oral proficiency gaps remained challenging to resolve completely within one semester. Ultimately, this study redefines the educator's role in the AI era as an active tool curator, activity designer, and metacognitive mentor, contributing localized empirical evidence to the under-researched EFL sector in Vietnam while offering a balanced pedagogical framework for critical digital literacy.

Keywords: Artificial intelligence integration, pedagogical adaptation, English as a foreign language, speaking fluency, critical digital literacy.

1. Introduction

According to Barrot (2023), the world is now deeply affected by artificial intelligence (AI), especially in the field of teaching English as a foreign language (EFL). AI tools like ChatGPT, Grammarly, and Google Translate are very popular among students for completing assignments in class as well as at home (Phan, 2023; Meniado, 2024). This is also a major challenge today, requiring teachers to be innovative and creative in changing their teaching methods to suit the context while simultaneously encouraging critical thinking skills (Sumakul et al., 2022). This study focuses on the author's teaching journey at CTIM College Ho Chi Minh City, where he teaches two groups, including non-major students from IT, logistics, e-commerce, accounting, business administration, and language majors. Non-major students often use AI as their primary support tool for assignments, particularly in writing, yet their speaking skills and communication reflexes remain limited (The, Du, & Hoang, 2026). In contrast, language majors demonstrate better awareness of all four English skills and use AI as a supplementary rather than substitutive tool. As a direct classroom teacher, the researcher recognized the necessity of adjusting pedagogical strategies, from lesson design and activity selection to assessment practices, to adapt to the increasing AI influence. This qualitative case study, integrated with a teacher-researcher reflective approach, aims to analyze, evaluate, and draw lessons from real classroom teaching, contributing an insider perspective to the EFL community, particularly in the college sector, an underexplored area in Vietnam's EFL research landscape (Wang, 2023). The study addresses three research questions: 1.

Email: ctlhoang@upt.edu.vn

How does an English teacher-researcher at a Vietnamese college adjust pedagogical practices to adapt to AI's growing presence?. 2. How do these pedagogical adjustments influence non-language major and language major students' perceived learning processes?. 3. What obstacles and opportunities result from integrating AI into English language teaching and learning within a college context?

2. Literature Review

Artificial intelligence (AI) integration in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) instruction presents a dual impact on student skill development. Recent empirical studies demonstrate that while text-based generative AI significantly enhances vocabulary acquisition and structural writing mechanics (Sajja et al., 2023), it offers limited support for real-time oral interaction and spontaneous communication reflexes (Han, 2023). Unregulated AI usage often fosters cognitive over-reliance, encouraging students to prioritize task completion over authentic skill internalization (Tian & Zhang, 2026). Consequently, scholars emphasize the critical need for teachers to adapt instructional activity design and provide explicit pedagogical mediation in AI-assisted environments (Alamer, 2023). In the Vietnamese higher education context, learners increasingly utilize AI tools such as ChatGPT for drafting and translation tasks (Tran et al., 2025). However, non-language major students demonstrate a heightened dependency on automated translation to complete assignments, leading to diminished expressive capacity during unassisted language production (Nguyễn Lê et al., 2025; Zou et al., 2025). Meanwhile, many language instructors struggle to adapt their teaching methodologies effectively due to a lack of structured professional training in AI integration (Lap et al., 2025). While existing literature offers valuable insights into student perceptions and general AI adoption, a significant research gap remains regarding the reflective role of teacher-researchers in education institutions. Learners in colleges are predominantly non-language majors characterized by uneven language proficiency and career-oriented goals. To date, no study has systematically documented how a teacher-researcher adapts pedagogical practices in an EFL classroom, nor has any research comparatively evaluated the impact of these adjustments on language majors versus non-language majors. This qualitative case study addresses this gap by providing an insider perspective on instructional adaptation, pedagogical tensions, and student responses in a Vietnamese college.

3. Methodology

3.1. Research Design and Setting

This study employs a qualitative instrumental case study design (Stake, 1995; Yin, 2018) to examine how an EFL teacher responds to the integration of AI in a college context. The study was conducted over a 12-week semester at a college in Ho Chi Minh City and involved one teacher-researcher and eight students from two broad groups, including three language majors and five non-language majors, including students from fields such as information technology, logistics, e-commerce, accounting, and business administration. The case was selected as a bounded classroom context in which AI-related pedagogical changes could be examined within students' actual learning experiences.

An instrumental case study approach was appropriate because the classroom was used to explore a broader issue concerning AI integration in EFL education rather than being examined solely as an isolated case. The study particularly considers how pedagogical decisions were shaped by differences in students' academic backgrounds, language proficiency, and use of AI for learning. Such a context is relevant to EFL research in Vietnam because college students often have diverse disciplinary backgrounds and career-oriented learning goals, yet this educational setting remains relatively underexplored.

The researcher occupied a dual role as both instructor and researcher. As the instructor, the researcher was directly involved in classroom teaching and pedagogical decision-making. As the researcher, the author systematically observed and reflected on changes occurring during the teaching process. This insider perspective provided an opportunity to examine how instructional practices evolved in response to students' varying engagement with AI. The study therefore seeks to understand how an EFL teacher can adapt classroom practices to make constructive use of AI while continuing to support fundamental goals of language teaching and learning.

3.2. Participants

A purposive sampling strategy was employed to recruit eight students from a college in Ho Chi Minh City, comprising three English language majors (LM) and five non-language majors (NLM) across various academic disciplines. Participants were selected based on their active engagement with AI applications in English language learning and their direct experience with the adapted instructional activities during the 12-week semester. This selection ensured that participants possessed relevant contextual insights to evaluate both AI tool utility and pedagogical adjustments. Table 1 outlines participant demographics, academic majors, and their respective AI usage profiles.

Table 1 Participant Profiles and AI Usage Categorization

Code	Major Group	Program	Year	AI-Use Profile
S1	LM	English Studies	2	Moderate, strategic
S2	NLM	Information Technology	1	High reliance
S3	LM	English Studies	2	Moderate, strategic
S4	NLM	Logistics Management	1	High reliance
S5	NLM	E-Commerce	1	Moderate, dependent
S6	NLM	Accounting	1	Moderate, dependent
S7	NLM	Business Administration	1	High reliance
S8	LM	English Studies	2	Advanced, strategic

3.3. Data Collection Instruments

To ensure methodological rigor and address potential self-report bias inherent in qualitative interviews, this study established a systematic data triangulation framework (Denzin, 1978; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Three distinct data sources, structured student interviews, teacher reflection journals (TRJ), and classroom documents/student work artifacts, were collected interactively over the 12-week semester. Each data source served a complementary analytical function: student interviews captured subjective perceptions and self-reported AI habits; teacher reflection journals provided contextual observational data and recorded real-time pedagogical adaptations; and classroom artifacts provided concrete empirical benchmarks of actual linguistic performance and instructional redesign. Table 2 outlines the alignment among research questions, data sources, analytical foci, and triangulation strategies.

Table 2 Data Triangulation Matrix

Research Focus / Question	Primary Data Source	Secondary Data Source	Tertiary Data Source	Triangulation Strategy
Student engagement: How do students engage with AI-supported English learning activities?	Student interviews	Teacher Reflective Journals (TRJ)	Learning products and test results	Compare students' reported engagement with teacher observations and evidence of participation and task completion.
Learning progress: How does AI-supported learning influence students' perceived learning progress?	Student interviews	Teacher Reflective Journals (TRJ)	Learning products and test results	Cross-check students' perceptions with teachers' reflections and changes in the quality of learning products and test performance.
Learning challenges: What challenges do students encounter when using AI for English learning?	Student interviews	Teacher Reflective Journals (TRJ)	Learning products and test results	Identify recurring difficulties across interview accounts, teacher observations, and errors or weaknesses in students' work.
Pedagogical adaptation: How does the teacher adapt instructional practices in response to AI use?	Teacher Reflective Journals (TRJ)	Student interviews	Learning products and test results	Examine whether reported instructional changes align with students' experiences and observable patterns in learning outcomes.
AI use and learning autonomy: How does students' use of AI relate to their learning autonomy and independent performance?	Student interviews	Teacher Reflective Journals (TRJ)	Learning products and test results	Compare students' accounts of AI use with teacher reflections and evidence of independent thinking, revision, and task performance.

By systematically cross-referencing qualitative themes across these three data streams, the analysis minimized reliance on isolated student accounts. For instance, when a student reported utilizing AI primarily for “*vocabulary enhancement*” during interviews, this claim was systematically cross-checked against their in-class writing artifacts to verify vocabulary retention and teacher journal entries to assess spontaneous oral deployment of the same terminology. This multi-layered corroboration enhanced the internal validity and credibility of the qualitative findings

3.4. Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using Braun and Clarke’s (2006) topic analysis method, which consists of six steps such as data familiarization, initial coding, topic identification, subtopic construction and organization, topic review and naming, and finally, presentation of results with illustrative citations. The analysis process identified five specific main topics, for instance, students’ AI usage patterns, the impact of AI on language skill development, adjustments in teaching activities, learning stressors, and changes in the teacher’s role. To ensure the reliability of the study, the researchers applied criteria established by Lincoln and Guba (1985), such as enhanced authenticity through data triangulation, guaranteed transferability through detailed description of the research context and process, strengthened reliability through complete retention of research documents and procedures, and validation demonstrated through regular self-reflection and identification of the influence of personal opinions throughout the research process.

4. Findings

4.1. Patterns of AI Use

4.1.1. Popular AI Tools

Students used different AI tools such as ChatGPT and Gemini, which were popular, as general-purpose assistants. Other tools focused on specific areas. These tools helped with vocabulary, and they also helped with pronunciation. They also supported speaking practice. Students found these tools for different needs. S1-LM shared that “*I usually use ChatGPT, Gemini, and besides, I also use other applications such as Bee and Duolingo to practice more vocabulary with basic sentence patterns.*” S3-LM provided an extensive list such as “*I often use tools like ChatGPT, Grok, Gemini, and dictionary applications such as T-Flat and Penglish to look up vocabulary, and speaking applications like Speak and Duolingo.*” The simultaneous use of translation tools, dictionaries, and speaking platforms suggests students intuitively understand that no single AI tool addresses all four skills equally. S8-LM adopted the widest range following “*I use Cambridge Dictionary, Claude AI, Google Translate, Gemini, ChatGPT, Blackbox.*” Critically, the absence of teacher guidance in tool selection is problematic. Students navigate a crowded marketplace through trial and error, leading to wasted time, inconsistent outcomes, and potential reinforcement of incorrect patterns without systematic integration into the curriculum. Tool choices remain opportunistic rather than strategic, undermining AI’s potential benefits.

4.1.2. Purposes of Use

Research findings indicate that student interaction with AI ranges from utilizing tools as supportive learning scaffolds to relying on them for complete task outsourcing. Non-language majors predominantly deploy generative applications for automated translation, sentence generation, and immediate homework completion, frequently driven by assignment deadlines and lower baseline confidence. Conversely, language majors and select non-language majors utilize AI primarily as an editing assistant for proofreading, grammar verification, and vocabulary expansion. Across all participants, text-based operations like translation and drafting remain central, whereas spontaneous oral communication receives negligible technological support. This functional imbalance risks reinforcing an instructional model where written assignment completion takes precedence over conversational skill development.

4.1.3. Frequency and Degree of Dependency

Although all eight participants reported daily or weekly engagement with AI platforms, their level of cognitive reliance differed significantly based on academic major and self-regulatory awareness. Higher-

proficiency students demonstrated self-imposed boundaries, actively limiting algorithmic assistance in favor of direct instructor interaction during class. In contrast, several non-language majors reported heavy perceived dependency, observing that habitual reliance on automated translation and instant prompt responses negatively affected their spontaneous thinking reflexes and memory recall during unassisted tasks.

4.2. AI's Impact on Language Skills

4.2.1. Writing Skill Development

To establish empirical evidence of data triangulation and address the disparity between AI-assisted writing outputs and actual student writing competence, a detailed comparative textual analysis was conducted on classroom artifacts collected from S4-NLM. Specifically, S4-NLM's Week 5 home writing assignment, completed with unguided AI assistance, was systematically contrasted with a Week 6 unassisted in-class summary task. The textual analysis revealed profound stylistic, syntactical, and lexical divergences between the two submissions:

Week 5 Home Submission including AI-Assisted: The assignment exhibited high rhetorical sophistication, characterized by advanced cohesive devices, for example, *"Notwithstanding these operational constraints, the organization must adapt swiftly"* and *"Furthermore, it is imperative to acknowledge the role of modern technology"*, complex multi-clause sentence structures, and zero syntactical or mechanical errors. However, despite its formal polish, the text demonstrated an overly generic academic tone with minimal contextual tailoring, reflecting signature features of automated generative text.

Week 6 In-Class Summary without AI: In stark contrast, the unassisted sample produced under timed, in-class conditions revealed severe foundational language gaps. The text relied almost exclusively on simple Subject-Verb-Object clause structures and displayed frequent subject-verb agreement errors, for example, *"The company have many problem in communication"* and *"He do not understand the process"*, that improper tense consistency, and a narrow functional vocabulary.

This empirical disparity between the polished home submission and the constrained in-class output directly corroborates S4-NLM's interview statement: *"I usually type my main idea in Vietnamese into the tool and ask it to rewrite the whole essay because I cannot construct complex English sentences on my own."* Rather than using AI as an instructional scaffold, S4-NLM utilized the technology as an external proxy writer. This comparative artifact analysis confirms that high-scoring, AI-assisted home assignments masked underlying deficits in independent syntax internalization and active lexical recall.

4.2.2. Perceived Lack of Speaking Improvement and Communication Reflexes

While AI applications provided clear benefits for writing mechanics, their impact on oral proficiency was perceived as minimal. Participants reported that text-optimized generative models offered limited support for developing real-time interactional competence. Non-language majors observed negligible gains in spoken fluency, noting that automated tools were routinely accessed for written exercises while oral practice was largely bypassed due to performance anxiety. Consequently, heavy reliance on text-based AI coincided with perceived declines in spontaneous communication reflexes and listening responsiveness. Only participants who utilized specialized, audio-based speaking applications reported noticeable improvements in pronunciation and intonation.

4.2.3. Self-Directed Learning and Learner Autonomy

The relationship between AI use and learner autonomy is contradictory. AI offers affordances for autonomous learning, instant information access, personalized practice, and learning at one's own pace, yet can foster passive dependency. S2-NLM highlighted motivational benefits: *"AI helps me use English more and corrects my errors and provides new knowledge. Besides, AI opens up new and interesting ways of learning English instead of boring traditional methods."*

However, when asked about alternative learning methods without AI, students revealed a striking lack of autonomous strategies. S6-NLM would *"I enrolled in additional English classes at reputable centers"*, S5-NLM would *"I learned English by watching movies on YouTube with English subtitles."*, S3-

LM suggested “*I read stories in English*”. Only S8-LM proposed a highly proactive strategy: “*I will find foreigners in the park to improve my speaking, and learn vocabulary by reading newspaper articles I like*”.

The contradiction is apparent. Students say that AI helps them learn on their own, yet many students cannot explain ways to study by themselves without AI. Their independence is really a reliance, not true self-control, and when AI disappears, the support falls apart, and students fall back into passive or school-dependent modes.

4.2.4 Comparative Analysis: Language Majors vs Non-Language Majors

A thematic cross-case analysis reveals distinct divergences in AI tool adoption, metacognitive awareness, and learning autonomy between language majors (S1, S3, S8) and non-language majors (S2, S4, S5, S6, S7). Language majors approached generative AI with strategic intentionality, treating technology as a supplementary resource for idea generation, structural verification, and vocabulary enrichment while retaining authorship over their final submissions. For instance, S1-LM exercised deliberate self-regulation, stating, “Although AI is really useful, I limit its use; instead, I will ask the teacher directly in class.” Similarly, S8-LM utilized AI for structured feedback, noting, “AI helps me learn and understand faster, as well as grade and identify grammar errors to fix.” Crucially, language majors maintained a critical stance toward machine output, with S8-LM acknowledging the need to verify accuracy: “I do not have much experience controlling AI results, and I cannot always tell if the information is correct or wrong.” In contrast, non-language majors exhibited a task-oriented, highly dependent pattern of AI utilization. Driven by tight schedules and language barriers, these students routinely relied on automated tools for full-text translation and assignment completion. S4-NLM described using AI primarily for “translating and completing difficult exercises,” using generated outputs “as a reference to have my own way of writing.” However, this heavy reliance directly contributed to severe latency during spontaneous oral tasks, with S4-NLM admitting during class that she “still cannot speak in a complete sentence, instead only listing vocabulary.” Similarly, S7-NLM expressed concern over cognitive habits, stating, “I feel that I depend on AI quite a lot, which affects my thinking reflexes.” These comparative findings demonstrate that lower language proficiency increases dependency on automated proxies, highlighting the necessity of structured teacher mediation tailored to non-language major cohorts.

4.3. Pedagogical Adaptations and Student Reactions

4.3.1. Teacher Adjustments

The teacher implemented three interrelated strategies, such as increasing oral interaction and spontaneous speaking opportunities, designing activities reducing unauthorized AI use usefulness, and selectively integrating AI tools as formal instruction. S2-NLM described increased speaking emphasis: “*The teacher increased support for students to speak more and was very patient, as well as guided students to speak from basic to longer sentences*”. S3-LM described interactive activities: “*The teacher required students to interact by answering questions and going to the board more, and prepared short videos to help learners think and improve listening*”. S5-NLM reported collaborative discussion: “*The teacher required students to actively discuss answers together after exercises, and from those discussions suggested correct answers*”. S6-NLM noted curriculum-level adjustment: “*The teacher relied on learners’ general ability to create appropriate exercises, helping me absorb more effectively instead of using the textbook as the main tool*”. Departure from rigid textbook adherence is significant; textbooks contain static content AI can easily summarize. Students expressed desire for structured guidance rather than AI prohibition. S8-LM requested: “*The teacher should share which AI tools support speaking, grading, and essay correction*.” S4-NLM suggested: “*The teacher should guide students on writing prompts and analyzing advantages and disadvantages of using AI*”. Evidence from the Week 6 Teacher Reflection Journal revealed a mismatch. Students submitted sophisticated AI-assisted writing homework, but students struggled to express basic conversational ideas during warm-up sessions. This gap prompted the teacher to shift thirty percent of class time from text analysis to peer discussions. The Week 3 journal recorded that “*Students submitted AI-generated writing that was grammatically perfect but lacked personal voice*.” This observation led to the introduction of peer-editing worksheets in Week 4.

Students submitted AI-generated writing assignments that were grammatically flawless, featuring sophisticated vocabulary and advanced academic collocations such as “mitigate risks,” “facilitate synergy,” and “optimum efficiency.” However, during the 5-minute warm-up speaking session, when asked to define these terms or explain the core ideas of their own submitted essays orally without looking at their screens, 6 out of 8 students exhibited severe hesitation, frequent long pauses, and an inability to construct basic active Subject-Verb-Object sentences. When prompted to elaborate on simple follow-up questions, several non-language major students defaulted to reading silently from their phone screens or admitted to having copied full AI outputs without processing the vocabulary. This striking mismatch between polished home writing submissions and constrained spoken reflexes forced me to realize that high-quality written assignments were masking underlying oral production gaps, underscoring the urgent need to shift upcoming in-class activities away from traditional home drafting toward spontaneous, unassisted speaking and peer verification.

4.3.2. Student Perceptions

Students reported overwhelmingly positive perceptions regarding the adjusted teaching activities. S8-LM offered a holistic evaluation, stating, “I find the class dynamic, with good learning focus, because the teaching method and delivery are easy to understand, and they create physical games”. S7-NLM emphasized reduced anxiety, noting, “I feel learning is not stressful because the teacher created games, making the atmosphere comfortable and friendly, helping me remember more information”. Similarly, S3-LM provided a concrete comparison with traditional sessions: “One activity making me most energetic is games earning points, helping me focus instead of feeling sleepy or finding excuses to skip class”.

Notably, despite these challenges, no participant explicitly expressed feeling left behind, suggesting that the supportive classroom climate may have mitigated some negative affective responses. However, a critical reading indicates that positive affective responses may not fully align with immediate proficiency gains. Interview data regarding classroom difficulties revealed persistent oral communication challenges; for instance, S4-NLM struggled to form complete sentences, S5-NLM reported difficulties keeping up with listening tasks, S6-NLM frequently forgot sentence structures, and S7-NLM identified local accent interference during speaking tasks. Yet when evaluated on new classroom activities, these participants expressed unqualified approval. These observations suggest that while pedagogical adjustments successfully fostered a supportive classroom climate, they did not fully resolve pre-existing oral communication gaps in a short timeframe.

An analysis of classroom documents from Weeks 7 through 11 corroborates the instructional changes noted in student interviews. Lesson plans showed a gradual reduction in traditional, textbook-based grammar drills. These were replaced by interactive problem-solving tasks, unprompted two-minute oral presentations, and peer-editing worksheets where students evaluated AI-generated language suggestions. These material artifacts confirm that classroom activities were restructured to emphasize real-time, unassisted language use.

4.4. Pedagogical Tensions in AI-Mediated Instruction

The integration of artificial intelligence into the EFL classroom generated three central pedagogical tensions for the teacher-researcher. First, a friction emerged between the operational convenience of automated tools and the cognitive effort required for deep language processing. While AI enabled students to complete drafting tasks rapidly, it frequently encouraged passive copying and short-circuited critical reflection, particularly among non-language majors. Second, a structural disconnect arose between the polished quality of AI-assisted written submissions and students’ authentic oral fluency. Students achieved high marks on home assignments through algorithmic support but exhibited marked hesitation and vocabulary retrieval gaps during spontaneous classroom discussions. Third, the instructor experienced a tension between maintaining academic integrity and promoting digital tool adoption. Enforcing strict bans on generative AI proved impractical and counterproductive; instead, the teacher had to reframe academic honesty away from absolute prohibition toward guided,

transparent utilization and peer verification. Addressing these interrelated tensions required moving beyond passive tool acceptance toward active, structured instructional intervention.

4.5. The Evolving Role of the Teacher

Rather than diminishing the instructor's relevance, widespread student adoption of generative AI elevated the necessity of active, empathetic teacher mediation. The findings demonstrate that the instructor's role evolved across three key dimensions: tool curator, activity designer, and metacognitive mentor. As a tool curator, the teacher-researcher guided students away from indiscriminate full-text generation toward critical verification and contextual evaluation of AI outputs. As an activity designer, the instructor restructured classroom time to counteract digital dependency, reducing passive grammar presentations in favor of unprompted oral interactions, collaborative board work, and peer-editing exercises that required immediate cognitive engagement. Finally, as a metacognitive mentor, the teacher helped students build critical awareness regarding when AI serves as a legitimate learning scaffold versus an impediment to genuine skill acquisition. Ultimately, in an AI-mediated environment, the educator functions not as a traditional transmitter of grammatical rules, but as an indispensable facilitator of critical digital literacy, spontaneous communication, and authentic language learning.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

This small-scale qualitative case study provides empirical insights from a single Vietnamese college regarding how an English teacher-researcher adapted pedagogical practices to navigate the growing presence of artificial intelligence in language instruction. The findings underscore the necessity of a balanced, critically guided approach to AI integration, one that leverages technological affordances for vocabulary expansion and structural drafting support while actively addressing observed gaps in spontaneous oral fluency and independent language processing. Rather than supporting generalized claims regarding macro-level educational impacts, evidence from this bounded classroom context highlights a specific pedagogical challenge: without structured teacher mediation, unguided AI usage can exacerbate an internal skill disparity, producing learners who achieve polished written assignments through technological assistance yet struggle with real-time conversational interaction and unassisted language recall. Furthermore, the study demonstrates that learner autonomy in AI-mediated environments is frequently tool-dependent rather than self-regulated, reaffirming the essential role of the instructor as an active tool curator, content verifier, and empathetic guide. Because these conclusions are derived from a qualitative sample of eight students (three language majors and five non-language majors) within a single institution, this study explicitly acknowledges its contextual limitations and disclaims broad generalizability. Nevertheless, it offers a valuable, grounded account of classroom-level adaptation in the under-researched EFL sector. Future research should expand upon these initial findings by investigating larger, multi-institution cohorts, examining diverse disciplines, and incorporating objective, longitudinal proficiency measures to evaluate the sustained impact of AI-adapted instruction over time.

References

- Alamer, A. (2023). AI integration in language teaching: Teachers' adaptation and activity design. *System*, 115, Article 103058. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2023.103058>
- Ali, A. (2026). AI-enhanced informal digital learning of English: Effects on EFL students' cognitive, non-cognitive and oral proficiency skills. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 42(1), 18–37. <https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.10506>
- Almegren, A., Almegren, R. M., Hazaea, A. N., Mahdi, H. S., & Mohammed Ali, J. K. (2025). AI-powered ELT: Instructors' transformative roles and opportunities. *PLOS ONE*, 20(5), e0324910.
- Alonso, A. N. (2026). Empowering educators: AI integration and professional development in language education. In W. Fiorucci & A. Sforza Tarabochia (Eds.), *The impact of AI on language education: Challenges, practices, futures* (pp. 65–84). Springer Nature. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-032-16520-6_3
- 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>
- Benton, L., Kalas, I., Saunders, P., Hoyles, C., & Noss, R. (2018). Beyond jam sandwiches and cups of tea: An exploration of primary pupils' algorithm-evaluation strategies. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 34(5), 590–601. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12266>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6598.2006.00301.x>

org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

- Denzin, N. K. (1978). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Dovchin, S. (2024). Artificial intelligence in applied linguistics: A double-edged sword. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 47(3), 410–417. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ara1.24145.dov>
- Halder, S. (2026). The impact of GenAI-supported speaking practice on EFL learners' speaking anxiety, self-confidence, and willingness to take oral risks. *International Journal of English: Literature, Language & Skills*, 15(1), 189–214. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/406457404_The_Impact_of_GenAI-Supported_Speaking_Practice
- Han, Y.-J. (2023). AI in the EFL classroom: A Taiwanese teacher's self-study on pedagogical change. *Taiwan Journal of TESOL*, 20(2), 45–68. [https://doi.org/10.30397/TJTESOL.202310_20\(2\).0003](https://doi.org/10.30397/TJTESOL.202310_20(2).0003)
- Hockly, N. (2018). Artificial intelligence in language learning: Opportunities and challenges. *ELT Journal*, 72(4), 445–448. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccy034>
- Kukulska-Hulme, A., & Viberg, O. (2018). Mobile collaborative language learning: State of the art. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 49(2), 207–218. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12580>
- Lap, T. Q., Vy, P. N. T., Uyen, N. C. B., & Tuan, L. C. (2025). "Fear of missing out!": Veteran EFL teachers' perceptions of using AI-powered tools in English language teaching. *International Journal of Information and Education Technology*, 15(6), 1161–1171. <https://doi.org/10.18178/ijiet.2025.15.6.2319>
- Phan, T. N. L. (2023). Students' perceptions of the AI technology application in English writing classes. *Proceedings of the AsiaCALL International Conference*, 4, 45–62. <https://doi.org/10.54855/paic.2344>
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. SAGE Publications.
- Meniado, J. C., Huyen, D. T. T., Panyadilokpong, N., & Lertkomolwit, P. (2024). Using ChatGPT for second language writing: Experiences and perceptions of EFL learners in Thailand and Vietnam. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 7, 100313.
- Mikaeili, A. (2026). *AI-mediated language learning: Designing for agency* [Master's thesis, University of Calgary]. PRISM. <https://doi.org/10.11575/prism/51146>
- Nguyễn Lê, N. A., Nguyễn, M. T., Phan Minh, N. V., & Phạm, N. D. (2025). The effects of AI tool integration on English for Specific Purposes Learning in Logistics Education. *VietTESOL International Convention Proceedings*, 5, 365–392. <https://proceedings.viettesol.org.vn/index.php/vic/article/view/234>
- Pham, T. N., & Dang, T. X. (2025). An investigation into the application of artificial intelligence for language teaching and learning in Vietnam. *Vietnam Journal of Education*, 9(2), 265–283. <https://doi.org/10.52296/vje.2025.557>
- Sajja, R., Sermet, Y., Cwiertny, D., & Demir, I. (2023). Platform-independent and curriculum-oriented intelligent assistant for higher education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 20(1), Article 42. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00412-7>
- Saqr, M., & Alamro, A. (2021). The role of AI and learning analytics in understanding self-regulated learning. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 52(5), 1767–1783. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13127>
- Selwyn, N. (2019). Teachers and technology: The need for critical data literacies. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 50(2), 555–568. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12734>
- Silalahi, R. (2025). Indonesian EFL non-English major students' motivation to use AI in writing. *Journal of English Educational Study (JEEs)*, 8(2), 156–165. <https://doi.org/10.31932/jees.v8i2.4606>
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. SAGE Publications.
- Sumakul, D. T. Y. G., Hamied, F. A., & Sukyadi, D. (2022). Artificial intelligence in EFL classrooms: Friend or foe? *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 15(1), 232–256. <https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/LEARN/article/view/256723>
- The, N. H., Du, T. T., & Hoang, T. T. (2026). Exploring the impact of artificial intelligence on English majors' speaking skills: A case study at a Vietnamese university. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)*, Special Issue on Artificial Intelligence, (3), 166–179. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/AI3.11>
- Tian, J., & Zhang, R. (2026). Outsourcing thinking to AI? Focused immersion, AI dependency, and the double-edged impact on critical thinking. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 13(1), Article 1015. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-026-07153-8>
- Tin, H. T. (2025). The using A.I. tools on fourth-year EFL learner-autonomy: A case at Nguyen Tat Thanh University. *Global Journal of Arts Humanity and Social Sciences*, 5(1), 54–59. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14709765>
- Tran, T. T. P., Dang, T. N., & Nguyen, V. L. P. (2025). Master students' perceptions of how ChatGPT influenced critical thinking in academic writing at the Industrial University of Ho Chi Minh City. *International Journal of AI in Language Education*, 2(2), 20–39. <https://doi.org/10.54855/ijaile.25222>
- Wang, Y. (2023). English language teaching in vocational colleges in the digital age: A systematic review. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 14(3), 789–798. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1403.26>
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Zakaria, N. Y. K., Hashim, H., & Jamaludin, K. A. (2025). Exploring the impact of AI on critical thinking development in ESL: A systematic literature review. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)*, Special Issue on Artificial Intelligence, (3), 330–347. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/AI.19>
- Zhang, Y., Zhang, M., Wu, L., & Li, J. (2025). Digital transition framework for higher education in AI-assisted engineering teaching: Challenge, strategy, and initiatives in China. *Science & Education*, 34(2), 933–954. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-024-00575-3>
- Zou, F., Huang, Y., Wang, X., & Tan, Y. (2025). The use of artificial intelligence in English writing: Experiences and perceptions of non-English major students in Mainland China. *Gipan*, 7(1), 19–32. <https://doi.org/10.3126/gipan.v7i1.84232>