

The Impact of AI-Assisted Self-Editing on Error Awareness in English Sentence Writing: A Case Study of a Vietnamese University

Pham Minh Trung

School of Education, Lincoln University College, Malaysia

Corresponding author: phd.minhtrungpham@lincoln.edu.my

Abstract

Artificial intelligence (AI) is increasingly shaping educational practices, particularly in the teaching and learning of writing at the tertiary level. In the Vietnamese context, although tools such as ChatGPT are becoming more accessible, their pedagogical integration into English-major writing classes remains limited and underexplored. This study explores students' perceptions of AI-assisted self-editing and its potential to enhance error awareness in English sentence writing, based on a case study at a Vietnamese university. A descriptive survey design was employed with 58 undergraduate English-major students who engaged in guided self-editing activities using ChatGPT under teacher instruction. Data were collected using a structured questionnaire that examined perceived usefulness, ease of use, error awareness, self-editing confidence, and perceived limitations. The findings indicate that students generally hold positive perceptions of ChatGPT, particularly regarding its usefulness and accessibility. Students also reported increased awareness of grammatical errors and greater engagement in reflecting on their mistakes. In addition, the use of ChatGPT was associated with improved confidence and a growing sense of autonomy in revising writing. However, concerns were raised regarding feedback accuracy and overreliance on AI. Overall, the study highlights the potential of AI-assisted self-editing to promote more reflective, learner-centered writing practices in Vietnamese higher education.

Keywords: *AI-Assisted Self-Editing, ChatGPT, EFL Writing, Error Awareness, Learner Autonomy*

Introduction

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into education has substantially transformed teaching and learning practices, particularly within language education. Recently, AI-powered tools such as ChatGPT have been increasingly utilized in writing instruction, providing immediate feedback, error correction, and revision suggestions (Kasneci et al., 2023). These capabilities offer new opportunities for interactive, individualized learning, particularly in developing writing skills. Within English as a Foreign Language (EFL) education, writing is among the most challenging skills for learners, especially at the sentence level (Hyland, 2019). Grammatical features such as verb tense, subject-verb agreement, and article usage present persistent difficulties. According to Bitchener and Ferris (2012), these error types are challenging to master due to complex rule systems and first language transfer. In Vietnam, writing instruction at many universities, including Vinh Long University of Technology Education, has traditionally relied on teacher-

centered feedback, with students largely passive in identifying and correcting errors. Such approaches may limit learners' opportunities to reflect on their writing and develop independent self-editing skills. (Escalante et al., 2023) Recently, AI tools have been conceptualized as mediating resources that can transform feedback delivery and utilization. Rather than serving a corrective function solely, these tools enable learners to receive immediate, personalized responses and to participate more actively in revision. Ranalli (2021) suggests that technology-mediated feedback can promote learner interaction with feedback and revision, although the degree of engagement and self-regulation depends on how learners respond to and utilize the feedback. In the Vietnamese EFL context, emerging research has identified both opportunities and challenges associated with integrating tools such as ChatGPT, particularly regarding student engagement and perceptions (Le et al., 2024). However, most existing studies focus on writing outcomes, with limited exploration of how learners experience and interpret AI-supported feedback. Specifically, there remains insufficient understanding of how AI may assist learners in noticing and comprehending grammatical errors during revision. Addressing this gap is crucial for developing a comprehensive understanding of AI-assisted self-editing as a learner-centered practice.

Rationale of the Study

Although there is increasing interest in AI-assisted language learning, the integration of tools such as ChatGPT into writing instruction within Vietnamese higher education remains limited and lacks a systematic structure. At Vinh Long University of Technology Education, English-major students are exposed to AI technologies with growing frequency; however, their usage is predominantly informal and is not supported by explicit pedagogical frameworks. As a result, the potential of these tools to facilitate meaningful learning in writing has not been fully realized.

In the Vietnamese context, existing research has primarily focused on students' general perceptions of ChatGPT, particularly its usefulness for idea generation and error correction (Le et al., 2024). Although these studies offer valuable insights, they provide limited examination of how learners interact with AI during the revision process. Specifically, there is a lack of research on students' perceptions of ChatGPT for self-editing and its contribution to developing sentence-level error awareness. This gap is significant when considered in relation to the Noticing Hypothesis (Schmidt, 1990), which underscores the necessity of conscious attention in language acquisition. Effective learning requires that learners not only receive feedback but also actively notice and comprehend their errors. Self-editing is essential in this context, as it encourages learners to reflect on their writing and assume responsibility for improvement (Hyland, 2019). However, many Vietnamese EFL learners continue to depend heavily on teacher feedback and may lack both the confidence and strategies required for independent revision (Huy & Ngoc, 2024).

Given these considerations, it is necessary to examine how students perceive AI-assisted self-editing and whether guided use of ChatGPT enhances their awareness of grammatical errors, confidence in revision, and overall learning experience. By focusing on English-major students at Vinh Long University of Technology Education, this study provides context-specific insights into the meaningful integration of AI in writing instruction. The findings aim to contribute to a nuanced understanding of AI-assisted learning and to inform the development of reflective, learner-centered writing practices in Vietnamese higher education.

Review of Related Literature

AI in L2 Writing Instruction

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) in second language writing instruction has received increasing scholarly attention. AI technologies, such as ChatGPT, provide immediate and individualized feedback to students, in contrast to the delayed and often limited responses typically offered by teachers (Kasneci et al., 2023). These tools help learners identify and correct errors and understand the underlying reasons for their mistakes. By offering corrections, explanations, and alternative expressions, AI tools enable more efficient revision and foster greater engagement with the writing process. (Yang et al., 2024) Recent research has emphasized the pedagogical value of generative AI in language learning, particularly its capacity to reform feedback practices and create personalized learning environments (Tlili et al., 2023). In the context of second-language writing, AI tools have been shown to facilitate interactive, adaptive revision processes, allowing learners to engage with feedback in more meaningful ways (Warschauer & Grimes, 2024). For example, Zhai (2023) demonstrates that AI tools can create interactive, adaptive learning environments, enabling learners to receive real-time feedback and revise their writing incrementally. Similarly, Li et al. (2023) argue that AI-generated feedback encourages greater learner involvement by prompting students to interact with and revise their writing, although the degree of engagement may depend on how learners utilize the feedback. Collectively, these findings indicate that AI tools not only enhance writing performance but also promote more dynamic and learner-centered approaches to writing instruction (An, 2025).

In addition to the quality of feedback, learners' perceptions and utilization of AI tools significantly influence the effectiveness of AI-assisted writing. Learner attitudes, including perceived usefulness, ease of use, trust in feedback, and concerns regarding overreliance, are critical in shaping engagement with AI-supported learning (Zhai, 2023; Le et al., 2024). Positive perceptions are generally associated with more active engagement with feedback and a greater willingness to revise, whereas uncertainty or scepticism may restrict meaningful use. Consequently, understanding students' perceptions is essential for evaluating the pedagogical value of AI in writing instruction. Rather than viewing AI solely as a tool for improving writing outcomes, recent studies emphasize the importance of considering how learners experience and interpret AI-supported feedback throughout the learning process. (Yang et al., 2023) This perspective is particularly pertinent in contexts such as Vietnamese EFL classrooms, where AI integration is still emerging, and learners may require guidance to use these tools effectively.

Error Awareness and the Noticing Hypothesis

Error awareness constitutes a fundamental aspect of second language acquisition, particularly in the development of writing skills, as it enables learners to distinguish between their current language use and target forms. In the writing process, individuals make ongoing decisions regarding grammar, vocabulary, sentence structure, and the organization of ideas. When learners become aware of their errors, they are more likely to reflect on the underlying causes and consider strategies for improvement. This reflective process fosters deeper engagement with the language, moving beyond mechanical correction of mistakes. Consequently, learners are more likely to internalize and retain linguistic knowledge, rather than merely correcting errors temporarily. The

Noticing Hypothesis posits that conscious attention to linguistic forms in input is necessary for acquisition to occur (Schmidt, 1990). Thus, exposure to correct language forms alone is insufficient; learners must actively notice and focus on specific features, particularly those that differ from their existing knowledge. Schmidt (1990) differentiates between input, intake, and learning, asserting that only consciously noticed linguistic features become intake and are subject to internalization. In the context of writing, effective feedback requires that learners first identify the presence of an error (noticing), comprehend the reason for its incorrectness (awareness), and subsequently apply the correct form in future writing tasks (learning). Absent this process of noticing and understanding, feedback may result only in superficial correction, offering limited benefit for long-term language development. (Mackey, 2006) Subsequent research supports this perspective, emphasizing that conscious attention to form is essential for transforming input into intake and promoting language development (Leow, 2015; Godfroid et al., 2013).

Feedback is most effective when it encourages learners to actively engage with their errors rather than passively accept corrections. Self-editing is essential in this process, as it requires learners to identify, analyze, and revise their own errors. Hyland (2019) argues that developing writing skills involves not only improving grammatical accuracy but also fostering learners' awareness of language use, enabling them to reflect on and manage their own language more effectively. The effectiveness of noticing is further influenced by cognitive and affective factors, including attention, motivation, and confidence. Learners are more likely to attend to feedback when they actively participate in the revision process and perceive the learning activity as useful and meaningful. (Pham, 2021) Tools that provide immediate and interactive feedback, such as AI-assisted writing systems, can enhance the noticing process by offering learners opportunities to revisit errors, reflect on them, and make real-time revisions. Recent studies indicate that interactive feedback environments promote deeper cognitive processing and sustained attention to language forms (Godfroid et al., 2013). Therefore, the Noticing Hypothesis provides a valuable framework for understanding how AI-assisted self-editing can foster learners' error awareness. By enabling students to interact with feedback, identify their own mistakes, and reflect more critically on their language use, AI tools such as ChatGPT can promote active engagement in the learning process and foster deeper, more meaningful language development.

AI-Assisted Self-Editing in Writing

Recent research has increasingly examined the potential of artificial intelligence (AI) tools to support self-editing practices in second language writing. Specifically, AI-assisted self-editing allows learners to engage with feedback dynamically, revise their writing through multiple iterations, and explore alternative forms of expression. This approach aligns with the concept of technology-mediated corrective feedback, which provides timely, individualized support to learners. Ranalli (2021) notes that digital feedback tools can foster more active engagement by enabling learners to test hypotheses, receive immediate responses, and refine their language use through repeated interaction. Similarly, Li et al. (2023) found that AI-generated feedback can promote learner engagement when students actively process corrections and make iterative improvements to their writing. Recent studies further indicate that AI-generated feedback can improve both writing quality and learner engagement, particularly when students interact actively with feedback rather than passively accept corrections (Wang & Han, 2023; Yan et al., 2024).

The effectiveness of AI-assisted self-editing depends not only on the availability of feedback but also on the manner in which learners engage with it. While AI tools can provide accurate corrections and explanations, learners may become overly reliant on these tools without fully understanding the underlying grammar rules. This issue has been previously identified in research on automated writing evaluation systems, which indicates that learners sometimes accept corrections without reflection, potentially limiting deeper learning (Stevenson & Phakiti, 2014). Therefore, AI-assisted feedback is unlikely to be effective unless learners actively process and comprehend the feedback provided.

In this context, learners' perceptions of AI tools are particularly influential in determining the effectiveness of AI-assisted feedback. According to Zhai (2023), factors such as perceived usefulness, ease of use, and trust in AI-generated feedback shape how learners interact with these tools and the extent of their benefit. When learners regard AI as helpful and reliable, they are more likely to engage deeply with feedback and utilize it as a learning resource rather than merely a source of correction. More broadly, generative AI is increasingly conceptualized as a collaborative partner in learning, enabling learners to co-construct knowledge through ongoing interaction with AI systems (Mollick, 2024). Collectively, these perspectives indicate that AI-assisted self-editing should be regarded not only as a technological innovation but also as a learner-centered pedagogical practice. The effectiveness of this approach depends on students' attitudes, engagement levels, and learning strategies. Consequently, examining learners' perceptions of AI use is essential for determining effective integration into writing instruction and for supporting deeper learning processes, including reflection, error awareness, and learner autonomy.

AI in Vietnamese EFL Writing Contexts

In Vietnam, the integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into language education remains in its early stages. Writing instruction at many universities continues to emphasize teacher-centered feedback, with students relying extensively on instructors for error correction (Nguyen & Tran, 2020). While this method addresses errors, it may restrict students' development of independent revision skills and metacognitive awareness. A significant limitation of teacher-centered feedback is its tendency to foster passive learning behaviours. When corrections are provided directly, students often concentrate on producing the correct form rather than understanding the underlying causes of their errors. Previous research indicates that learners in these contexts frequently depend on explicit correction and may not actively analyze or reflect on their mistakes (Littlewood, 1999; Nguyen & Gu, 2013). Consequently, students have fewer opportunities to cultivate self-regulated learning strategies, such as independently reviewing their writing and evaluating language use.

Teacher-centered approaches can constrain the development of metacognitive awareness, defined as learners' ability to reflect on and manage their own learning processes (Al-Azzam, 2024). When feedback is primarily provided by teachers, students may become less confident in editing their own writing and may lack experience in independently identifying grammatical errors (Ranalli, 2021). Such outcomes are often associated with classroom practices that prioritize teacher authority and correct answers over learner independence, thereby impeding students' ability to plan, monitor, and evaluate their own writing effectively (Duong, 2014).

Recent studies in the Vietnamese context indicate that students often engage with feedback at a surface level, focusing on error correction without fully understanding the underlying issues (Le et al., 2024). This surface-level engagement may hinder long-term language development, as learners are more likely to repeat the same mistakes in future writing tasks. Furthermore, when students are not actively involved in the feedback process, they may struggle to transfer learned concepts to new writing situations. These limitations suggest that traditional feedback practices may not effectively foster deeper cognitive engagement or support the development of independent revision skills. In contrast, learner-centered approaches, such as AI-assisted self-editing, can offer greater opportunities for active participation, reflection, and the cultivation of learner autonomy (Benson, 2013). By enabling students to interact with feedback and revise their writing iteratively, these methods may facilitate deeper learning. However, research remains limited regarding Vietnamese students' perceptions of AI use in this context, particularly concerning error awareness and sentence-level writing. This gap indicates a need for further research into student perceptions of AI-assisted self-editing within specific educational contexts, such as among English-major students at Vinh Long University of Technology Education. A clearer understanding of these perceptions could enable educators to develop more effective and learner-centered approaches for integrating AI into writing instruction.

Research Questions

Based on the aims of the study, the following research questions are formulated to explore students' perceptions of AI-assisted self-editing and its role in supporting error awareness in English sentence writing:

1. How do English-major students perceive the use of AI-assisted self-editing (ChatGPT) in English sentence writing?
2. How do students perceive the role of AI-assisted self-editing in enhancing their awareness of grammatical errors?
3. How does AI-assisted self-editing influence students' confidence and autonomy in revising their own writing?
4. What benefits and challenges do students perceive when using ChatGPT for self-editing in writing?

Methodology

Research Design

A descriptive survey research design was employed to investigate students' perceptions of AI-assisted self-editing and its contribution to enhancing error awareness in English sentence writing. Instead of assessing learning outcomes through comparative analysis or testing, the study prioritizes the exploration of students' experiences, attitudes, and self-reported learning following participation in guided self-editing activities with ChatGPT. The research design centers on the collection of self-reported data via a structured questionnaire, facilitating the examination of students' perceived abilities to identify errors, interpret feedback, and build confidence in revising their own writing.

Participants

The study sample comprised 58 first-year undergraduate students majoring in English at Vinh Long University of Technology Education. These students demonstrated comparable levels of English proficiency, as indicated by their educational backgrounds and current academic programs. All participants engaged in identical AI-assisted self-editing activities during the research. Participation was voluntary, and students received

information regarding the research objectives prior to data collection. Confidentiality and anonymity were upheld throughout the research process.

Instruments

To collect data, the study employs the following instruments:

Guided Self-Editing Tasks

Students complete a series of sentence-writing tasks designed to practice common grammatical structures, including:

- verb tense
- subject–verb agreement
- article usage
- sentence structure

These tasks serve as the basis for students’ interaction with ChatGPT during the self-editing process.

Analysis

Error Awareness Questionnaire

A structured questionnaire employing a five-point Likert scale is administered following the self-editing activities. This instrument measures students’ perceptions in four primary domains:

- Error awareness: ability to identify and understand grammatical errors
- Grammatical understanding: awareness of language rules and corrections
- Self-editing confidence: confidence in revising writing independently
- Perceptions of AI use: usefulness, ease of use, and limitations of ChatGPT

Several open-ended questions are also included to gather deeper insights into students’ experiences and opinions.

Optional Reflective Notes

As part of the self-editing process, students may be required to write brief reflections on their learning experiences, including the types of errors they identified and insights gained from ChatGPT feedback. These reflections provide supplementary qualitative data for the study.

Ethical Considerations

Participants receive information regarding the study’s purpose and are advised of their right to withdraw at any time. Data collection is conducted anonymously and exclusively for research purposes. Personal identifying information remains undisclosed.

Findings and Discussion

The questionnaire results offer a comprehensive overview of students’ perceptions of AI-assisted self-editing with ChatGPT in five key areas: perceived usefulness, ease of use, error awareness, self-editing confidence, and perceived limitations. Section A (Perceived Usefulness) indicates that students hold generally positive views regarding the usefulness of ChatGPT in supporting English sentence writing. Mean scores range from 3.64 to 3.84, reflecting overall agreement among participants. The statement “Using ChatGPT improves my English sentence writing” achieved the highest mean score ($M = 3.84$, $SD = 0.93$), while “ChatGPT helps me correct grammatical errors effectively” received a slightly lower mean ($M = 3.64$, $SD = 0.91$). The relatively low standard deviation values

(SD = 0.81-0.93) indicate that students' responses are consistent, suggesting a shared perception of ChatGPT as a beneficial tool for writing support.

Section B reveals a similar pattern, focusing on students' perceptions of ChatGPT's ease of use. Participants generally rate ChatGPT as accessible and user-friendly, with mean scores between 3.67 and 3.91. The statement "It is easy to interact with ChatGPT when revising my writing" receives the highest rating ($M = 3.91$, $SD = 0.95$), indicating that most students feel comfortable using the tool during revision. In contrast, "I find it easy to understand the feedback provided by ChatGPT" receives the lowest mean score ($M = 3.67$, $SD = 1.00$), suggesting that while ChatGPT is considered easy to use, interpreting its feedback may present challenges. The relatively higher standard deviation values ($SD = 0.92$ - 1.00) further indicate variability in students' experiences with the tool.

More importantly, the results from Section C highlight the role of ChatGPT in enhancing students' error awareness. All items in this section receive high mean scores, ranging from 3.83 to 3.95, reflecting strong agreement among participants. Specifically, students report increased awareness of common grammatical mistakes ($M = 3.95$, $SD = 0.98$) and a greater ability to reflect on their errors ($M = 3.95$, $SD = 0.91$). Although the statement "I can identify errors more easily after using ChatGPT" has a slightly lower mean ($M = 3.83$, $SD = 0.84$), the overall findings indicate that ChatGPT facilitates both error identification and deeper reflection on language use, increasing confidence and autonomy in the self-editing process. The mean scores range from 3.33 to 4.09, reflecting overall agreement among the participants. In particular, students show a strong willingness to revise their writing after receiving feedback ($M = 4.09$, $SD = 0.94$) and report a greater sense of responsibility for improving their work ($M = 3.97$, $SD = 0.90$). However, the item "I rely less on my teacher to correct my errors" receives the lowest mean score ($M = 3.33$, $SD = 1.09$). This reflects that although students feel more confident in revising their writing, they still consider teacher support important. The relatively higher variation in responses for this item also indicates that students differ in the extent to which they depend on teacher feedback.

Section E demonstrates that students recognize several limitations associated with ChatGPT. Mean scores range from 3.52 to 4.45, reflecting moderate to strong agreement. The highest-rated item, "ChatGPT cannot fully replace teacher feedback" ($M = 4.45$, $SD = 1.02$), indicates that students continue to view teachers as essential. Students also acknowledge the importance of teacher guidance ($M = 4.00$, $SD = 1.14$) and report some uncertainty regarding the accuracy of AI-generated feedback ($M = 4.07$, $SD = 1.15$). While concerns about overreliance exist ($M = 3.52$, $SD = 1.23$), they are less pronounced. The higher standard deviation values in this section suggest greater variability in students' perceptions, particularly concerning trust in AI tools.

The responses to open-ended Questions 26–29 offer deeper insight into students' experiences with ChatGPT during the self-editing process. Overall, students recognize both the strengths and limitations of the tool. Many participants describe ChatGPT as fast, convenient, and effective for correcting errors. Immediate feedback is frequently cited as a key advantage, enabling students to revise their writing more efficiently. Students also report that ChatGPT helps identify grammatical mistakes, detect minor errors, and provide suggestions for sentence improvement. Some participants note that the tool supports the production of more natural and accurate sentences, facilitates appropriate vocabulary selection, and enhances understanding of grammar structures. However,

students also identify several challenges. A common concern is that ChatGPT does not always fully interpret user intent, occasionally resulting in unclear or irrelevant responses. Some students question the accuracy and reliability of the feedback, particularly when explanations differ from those provided by teachers. Additionally, several participants indicate that certain explanations are difficult to understand due to their generality or complexity. Although less frequently mentioned, technical issues such as limited access to advanced features and the requirement for stable internet connectivity are also perceived as disadvantages.

The impact of ChatGPT on writing practices reveals both positive and mixed outcomes. Many students report improved accuracy, heightened error awareness, and a more efficient revision process. Some also note increased confidence and a better understanding of sentence structure. However, these advantages are not universal. Certain students experience only moderate improvement, while others express concerns about overreliance on the tool or reduced independent thinking. In some cases, students report decreased confidence in their writing abilities when unable to use ChatGPT effectively. Overall, the results indicate that students generally perceive ChatGPT as a valuable support tool for writing. They appreciate its ease of use, speed, and ability to highlight errors, which contributes to greater confidence during revision. Nevertheless, students also acknowledge its limitations, particularly in terms of accuracy and clarity, and recognize the potential risk of excessive dependence. These findings suggest that ChatGPT can enhance writing and error awareness, but its effectiveness depends on appropriate usage. The tool appears most beneficial when combined with teacher guidance, which promotes deeper understanding and more meaningful application of feedback.

This study investigates English-major students' perceptions of using ChatGPT for AI-assisted self-editing and examines the relationship between these perceptions and their awareness of grammatical errors in sentence writing. The results indicate that students generally hold positive attitudes toward ChatGPT, although notable differences exist in their engagement with AI-generated feedback. These findings suggest that AI tools can facilitate writing development by offering corrections and suggestions and by promoting more active student participation in the revision process. It should be noted that these conclusions are based on students' self-reported perceptions rather than on direct measures of learning outcomes.

AI-Assisted Self-Editing and the Noticing Hypothesis

A key finding of this study is that a substantial proportion of students strongly agreed that ChatGPT increased their awareness of errors in writing. Participants reported that the tool not only facilitated the identification of mistakes but also prompted consideration of the underlying causes and potential improvements. These results indicate that AI-assisted self-editing extends beyond basic error correction and fosters more active engagement with language. Theoretically, this outcome aligns with the Noticing Hypothesis (Schmidt, 1990), which posits that conscious attention to language forms is essential for learning. In the present study, ChatGPT appears to facilitate this process by enabling students to recognize discrepancies between their own writing and more accurate language forms. The immediacy of feedback allows students to revise their sentences as the learning process continues. Furthermore, the relatively high ratings for items related to understanding and reflection suggest that students are not only noticing errors but are also engaging in deeper analysis of those errors. Thus, ChatGPT may support learning by

creating opportunities for reflection and deeper understanding, rather than solely correcting mistakes.

AI, Engagement, and Emerging Learner Autonomy

In addition to error awareness, the findings underscore the influence of ChatGPT on students' engagement with the writing process. Students generally perceived the tool as both useful and easy to use, which appears to reduce barriers to participation and foster more frequent engagement with feedback. This is particularly evident in the high willingness to revise, indicating that students are not only receiving feedback but are also motivated to implement it. These results align with the framework of AI-supported learning, in which technologies enhance engagement by providing immediate, personalized, and interactive feedback (Ranalli, 2021; Zhai, 2023). Recent studies further indicate that AI can serve as an active learning partner, prompting learners to participate in iterative revision and deeper processing of feedback (Warschauer & Grimes, 2024; Mollick, 2024). In the present study, these features appear to facilitate a more active learning process, characterized by iterative revision rather than single-instance correction. In summary, the findings regarding learner autonomy present a nuanced perspective. While students reported increased confidence and a heightened sense of responsibility for improving their writing, they did not express a significant reduction in dependence on their teachers. These results suggest that learner autonomy is developing incrementally rather than supplanting traditional instructional support. Thus, students are becoming more proactive in managing their learning while continuing to acknowledge the essential role of teacher guidance.

Trust, Limitations, and the Need for Guided Use

While students generally perceived ChatGPT positively, the findings also reveal several concerns that warrant attention. Some students expressed uncertainty regarding the accuracy of ChatGPT's feedback, and others reported difficulty understanding certain explanations. These concerns are significant because they may affect how students engage with and respond to AI-generated feedback. Notably, many students strongly agreed that ChatGPT cannot fully replace teacher feedback. This indicates that students regard AI as a valuable support tool, but not as a substitute for teachers. Students continue to depend on teachers for clearer explanations, validation, and deeper understanding during the revision process. This observation reinforces the notion that AI, despite its capabilities, does not fully replicate the pedagogical sensitivity of human instructors. Furthermore, variation in responses regarding overreliance indicates that students do not engage with AI uniformly. This finding is consistent with recent studies showing that learner engagement with AI-generated feedback varies considerably, with some students adopting a critical approach and others employing more passive strategies (Yan et al., 2024). Some students use ChatGPT as a learning tool, carefully considering feedback and reflecting on their errors, whereas others use it primarily for rapid error correction. This distinction highlights a key challenge in AI-supported education: the effectiveness of AI depends not only on the technology itself, but also on learners' approaches to its use. Consequently, the findings underscore the importance of guided integration, in which teachers assist students in critically interpreting feedback, verifying the accuracy of corrections, and understanding the underlying language rules.

Implications for the Vietnamese EFL Context

These findings are particularly significant in the Vietnamese EFL context, where writing instruction has traditionally followed teacher-centered practices. Previous studies indicate

that students often depend heavily on teacher feedback and possess limited experience with independent revision. The positive perceptions of ChatGPT observed in this study suggest that AI-assisted self-editing may encourage more active and participatory learning behaviors. Increased willingness to revise, heightened error awareness, and growing confidence among students all indicate progress in this direction. Nevertheless, the ongoing reliance on teacher guidance suggests that this shift is gradual rather than transformative. In contexts where learners are not yet familiar with self-directed learning, the integration of AI should be supported by explicit instructional guidance. Teachers remain essential for helping students interpret feedback, develop critical awareness, and avoid superficial engagement. Thus, the role of AI is to complement and enhance existing pedagogical practices, fostering a more balanced learning environment that integrates technological support with human guidance.

Conclusion

This study investigated English-major students' perceptions of AI-assisted self-editing with ChatGPT and its potential to enhance error awareness in English sentence writing in a Vietnamese university context. The findings indicate that students generally perceive ChatGPT as a useful and accessible tool that supports the writing process, particularly by facilitating error identification and encouraging reflection on language use. Additionally, many students reported increased confidence and greater engagement during the revision process. Several limitations should be considered when interpreting these findings. Students raised concerns regarding the accuracy and clarity of AI-generated feedback and recognized the risk of overreliance on the tool. These concerns underscore the significance of how ChatGPT is implemented, rather than the tool itself. Greater learning potential emerges when students engage critically with feedback. The study also presents implications for teaching practice. AI tools such as ChatGPT can be effectively integrated into writing instruction to promote more active and learner-centered revision practices, while teacher guidance remains essential. Teachers play a crucial role in helping students interpret feedback critically, develop effective self-editing strategies, and avoid excessive dependence on AI-generated corrections. In educational contexts such as Vietnam, where teacher-centered approaches are prevalent, ChatGPT may facilitate a gradual transition toward increased learner autonomy. However, the findings should be interpreted with caution, as they are based on self-reported data from a relatively small sample at a single institution, which may limit generalizability. Furthermore, the study primarily addresses students' perceptions rather than providing direct evidence of improvement in writing performance. Future research could investigate the long-term effects of AI-assisted self-editing on actual writing development and examine how various teaching approaches influence students' engagement with AI-generated feedback.

In conclusion, ChatGPT demonstrates potential as a supportive tool for developing writing skills and enhancing error awareness. Its effectiveness, however, relies on thoughtful integration into instructional practices and active learner engagement. When appropriately utilized, ChatGPT can foster more reflective and independent learning in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) writing contexts.

References

- Al-Azzam, S. M. (2024). Metacognitive Strategy Instruction in L2 Reading: A Systematic Review of Research Trends (2015–2024). *Arts for Linguistic & Literary Studies* 7(4). <https://doi.org/10.53286/arts.v7i4.2858>
- An, T. H. (2025). An investigation into the influence of AI tools on syntactic maturation in EFL writers at selected Vietnamese universities. *Contemporary Research in Education and English Language Teaching*, 7(2). <https://doi.org/10.55214/26410230.v7i2.7122>
- Benson, P. (2013). *Teaching and researching autonomy* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. R. (2012). *Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing*. Routledge.
- Duong, T. M. (2014). EFL Teachers' Perceptions of Learner Autonomy and Their Classroom Practices: A Case Study. *International Journal of Education and Management Engineering* 4(2), 9-17. <https://doi.org/10.5815/ijeme.2014.02.02>
- Escalante, J., Pack, A. & Barrett, A. (2023). AI-generated feedback on writing: insights into efficacy and ENL student preference. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education* 20. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00425-2>
- Godfroid, A., Boers, F., & Housen, A. (2013). An eye for words: Gauging the role of attention in incidental L2 vocabulary acquisition by means of eye-tracking. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 35(3), 483-517. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263113000119>
- Hyland, K. (2019). *Second language writing* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Huy, N. V. & Ngoc, V. H. (2024). A Phenomenological Analysis of the Obstacles Impeding Vietnamese EFL Learners' Willingness to Communicate in English. *International Journal of English Language Studies*, 62, 142-152. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijels.2024.6.2.21>
- Kasneci, E., Sessler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., Gasser, U., Groh, G., Günemann, S., Hüllermeier, E., Krusche, S., Kutyniok, G., Michaeli, T., Nerdinger, F., Pfeffer, J., Poquet, O., Sailer, M., Schmidt, A., Seidel, T., ... Kasneci, G. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 103, 102274. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274>
- Le, T. T., Hua, H. H., & Pham, T. T. (2024). Exploring the impacts of ChatGPT in EFL writing: Student perceptions of opportunities and challenges in Vietnamese higher education. *Kognisi: Jurnal Ilmu Keguruan*, 1(2), 107-124. <https://doi.org/10.59698/kognisi.v1i2.175>
- Leow, R. P. (2015). *Explicit learning in the L2 classroom: A student-centered approach*. Routledge.
- Li, Y., Link, S., & Hegelheimer, V. (2023). Rethinking the role of AI in L2 writing: Student engagement with AI-generated feedback. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 4, 100110. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2023.100110>

- Littlewood, W. (1999). Defining and developing autonomy in East Asian contexts. *Applied Linguistics*, 20(1), 71-94. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/20.1.71>
- Mollick, E. (2024). *Co-intelligence: Living and working with AI*. Penguin Press.
- Nguyen, T. T. M., & Gu, Y. (2013). Strategy-based instruction: A learner-focused approach to developing learner autonomy. *Language Teaching Research*, 17(1), 9-27. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168812457528>
- Pham, H. T. (2021). Computer-mediated and face-to-face peer feedback: student feedback and revision in EFL writing. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 35(2), 1-37. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2020.1868530>
- Ranalli, J. (2021). L2 student engagement with automated feedback on writing: Potential for learning and issues of trust. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 52, 100816. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2021.100816>
- Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11(2), 129-158. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/11.2.129>
- Stevenson, M., & Phakiti, A. (2014). The effects of computer-generated feedback on the quality of writing. *Assessing Writing*, 19, 51-65. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2013.11.007>
- Tlili, A., Shehata, B., Adarkwah, M. A., Bozkurt, A., Hickey, D. T., Huang, R., & Agyemang, B. (2023). What if the devil is my guardian angel? ChatGPT as a case study of using chatbots in education. *Smart Learning Environments*, 10(1), 15. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-023-00237-x>
- Yang, H., Gao, C. & Shen, H. (2024). Learner interaction with, and response to, AI-programmed automated writing evaluation feedback in EFL writing: An exploratory study. *Education and Information Technologies* 29. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-11991-3>
- Wang, Y., & Han, Z. (2023). The effects of AI-based feedback on second language writing development. *Language Learning & Technology*, 27(2), 1–20.
- Yang, H., Gao, C. & Shen, H. (2023). Learner interaction with, and response to, AI-programmed automated writing evaluation feedback in EFL writing: An exploratory study. *Education and Information Technologies* 29. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-11991-3>
- Warschauer, M., & Grimes, D. (2024). Artificial intelligence and second language writing: Opportunities and challenges. *Journal of Second Language Writing*.
- Zhai, X. (2023). ChatGPT user experience: Implications for education. *SSRN Electronic Journal*.