Available on: https://jsshrs.ep-journals.org/ E-ISSN: 3051-3561, P-ISSN: 3051-3553

Journal of Social Science and Human Research Studies

Volume : 02 Issue : 07 July-2026

Supporting Self-Regulated Writing in EFL Classrooms with ChatGPT: A Small-Scale Classroom Study

Tuong Thi Xuan Thu
Ho Chi Minh City University of Foreign Language – Information Technology, Vietnam

Dang Thi Kim Giao
Ho Chi Minh City University of Foreign Language – Information Technology, Vietnam

Published Date: July 11, 2026 **Article DOI: 10.65150/EP-jsshrs/V2E7/2026-18**

ABSTRACT: Generative AI tools are becoming common in language education, but their use in EFL writing classes still needs careful guidance. This study examines how ChatGPT supports self-regulated writing in an EFL classroom, with a focus on the performance phase. Ten Vietnamese EFL university leaners at A2–B1 level completed a short classroom-based writing activity. They wrote an initial draft, used a self-monitoring checklist, interacted with ChatGPT through focused prompts, recorded their revision decisions, and produced a revised draft. The data included initial and revised drafts, prompt logs, self-monitoring checklists, revision decision logs, and short reflections. The findings show that ChatGPT helped learners check clarity, coherence, grammar, vocabulary, and sentence expression while writing. The mean writing score increased slightly from 6.60 to 6.96. However, the improvement was limited and was mainly found at the sentence level. Some learners also depended on ChatGPT suggestions when they lacked confidence. The study suggests that ChatGPT can support drafting and self-monitoring during the performance phase when it is used with teacher guidance, focused prompts, and clear revision tasks.

KEYWORDS: ChatGPT, EFL writing, self-regulated learning, self-monitoring, writing revision

1. INTRODUCTION

Generative AI tools are now widely used in education. In language learning, ChatGPT has received much attention because it can respond quickly, provide language feedback, and support leaners during writing. Many EFL learners use it to check grammar, improve vocabulary, generate ideas, and revise sentences. These uses are helpful, especially in writing classes where leaners often need immediate feedback.

However, using ChatGPT in EFL writing also raises concerns about passive use and overreliance. Some learners may use it mainly to rewrite sentences or produce a full essay. They may also accept suggestions without thinking about their own meaning. This problem is important because writing is not only a final product but also a recursive process of planning, drafting, checking, and revising. Writers often move back and forth between ideas, language, and revision while composing a text (Chang, 1998). Self-regulated learning offers a useful way to understand this process. Zimmerman (2002) explains that self-regulated learners are active in setting goals, using strategies, monitoring their progress, and evaluating their own learning. In EFL writing, this means that leaners need to check whether their ideas are clear, whether their sentences support the main point, and whether their language is suitable. Studies on EFL writing also show that self-regulated strategies, such as planning, text-generating, self-monitoring, and revising, are closely related to writing development (Bai et al., 2024; Guo et al., 2021).

This study focuses on the performance phase of self-regulated writing. This phase takes place while leaners are working on the task. They draft, monitor their language, check their ideas, and make changes during writing. It is an important stage because many EFL learners know what they want to say, but have difficulty expressing it clearly in English. They may also fail to notice weak links between ideas or repeated language errors. In such cases, ChatGPT may serve as a support tool. It can help leaners ask questions, check unclear sentences, and receive feedback while they are still developing their drafts.

Recent studies suggest that ChatGPT can support EFL writing in several ways. Song and Song (2023) found that ChatGPT-assisted instruction helped EFL learners improve writing skills and motivation. Han et al. (2023) showed that learner–ChatGPT interaction can be built into an EFL writing platform to support essay revision. These studies show that ChatGPT can be useful in writing instruction, but they also point to the need for careful classroom guidance. Prompt use is one important issue. Woo et al. (2023) found that EFL learners need guidance in prompt engineering because many leaners rely on trial and error when using ChatGPT for writing. This means that leaners need to learn how to ask useful questions, not only how to receive answers.

The benefits of ChatGPT also depend on how leaners engage with the tool. Rong et al. (2025) showed that learner engagement with AI-guided chatbot feedback involves both interaction and revision. Leaners do not benefit only because feedback is available. They benefit when they

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

think about the feedback, select useful suggestions, and revise their own writing. This point is also supported by Yang et al. (2025), who found that learners who modified AI-generated text showed better writing quality than those who accepted AI suggestions without change. In EFL classrooms, this issue has practical meaning. Teachers need to help leaners use ChatGPT as a writing support tool, not as a replacement writer. For this reason, writing instruction should help leaners develop both language ability and control over their own learning process.

Based on this background, the present study examines how ChatGPT can support self-regulated writing in an EFL classroom, with a focus on the performance phase. The study uses a small classroom-based design with ten Vietnamese EFL university leaners at A2–B1 level. The leaners wrote an initial draft, used a self-monitoring checklist, interacted with ChatGPT through focused prompts, recorded their revision decisions, and produced a revised draft. The study does not aim to prove the statistical effectiveness of ChatGPT. Instead, it explores how leaners used ChatGPT to support drafting, monitoring, and revision during writing.

The study is guided by the following research questions:

(1) How do EFL learners use ChatGPT to support drafting during the performance phase of writing?
(2) How does ChatGPT help learners monitor clarity, coherence, and language use while writing?
(3) What challenges appear when learners use ChatGPT suggestions for revision?

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. EFL Writing and the Writing Process

Writing is a difficult skill for many EFL learners. It requires more than grammar knowledge. Leaners need to organize ideas, choose suitable words, connect sentences, and revise their texts. For lower-level learners, these demands often occur at the same time. As a result, they may have ideas but cannot express them clearly in English.

Writing is also a process. It is not a simple movement from the first sentence to the final sentence. Writers often return to earlier ideas, change words, add examples, and revise unclear parts. Chang (1998) describes writing as a recursive and messy process. This view is useful in EFL writing because learners often move between thinking, drafting, checking, and revising. They do not complete one stage fully before moving to the next.

Process-based writing instruction supports this view. It sees writing as a set of connected activities, such as planning, text-generating, reviewing, and revising. Guo et al. (2021) show that process-based instruction can influence learners' use of self-regulated learning strategies in EFL writing. Their study is important because it connects writing instruction with learner control. However, they also found that instruction during the while-writing stage had limited influence on learners' SRL strategy use. This point is relevant to the present study because it suggests that learners may need more direct support while they are drafting and monitoring their writing.

In this study, writing is viewed as an active process. Learners are not only producing a text. They are also checking their ideas, noticing problems, asking for help, and deciding how to revise. This view fits the use of ChatGPT during writing, when learners are still shaping their ideas and language.

2.2. Self-Regulated Learning and the Performance Phase

Self-regulated learning refers to the way learners manage their own learning. Zimmerman (2002) explains that self-regulated learners set goals, use learning strategies, monitor their progress, and evaluate their own performance. In writing, this means that learners need to control both the text and the writing process. They need to check whether the main idea is clear, whether the support is enough, and whether the language is suitable.

SRL is closely related to EFL writing. Bai et al. (2024) examined struggling EFL writers and showed that SRL strategies include planning, text-generating, self-monitoring, and collaborative learning. These strategies matter because writing problems are not only language problems. They are also problems of control. Some learners have ideas but do not know how to organize them. Some focus on grammar and forget coherence. Others revise surface errors but ignore unclear meaning.

The performance phase is especially important in this study. In Zimmerman's model, this phase happens while learners are doing the task. In writing, it includes drafting, monitoring, strategy use, and control of attention. It is different from the forethought phase, where learners prepare before writing. It is also different from the reflection phase, where learners evaluate the task after finishing it. The performance phase is the moment when learners must act. They turn ideas into sentences and check whether the text is moving in the right direction.

For many EFL learners, this phase is difficult. They may start with a plan but lose control while writing. They may also write many sentences without checking whether the ideas are connected. This is why self-monitoring is important. Learners need simple ways to stop, check, and adjust their writing. A checklist, a prompt log, and a revision decision log can support this process. These tools make monitoring visible.

Technology can also support SRL in writing. Han et al. (2021) found that technology-mediated SRL helped EFL learners improve writing performance and perceived SRL strategy use. Their study did not focus on ChatGPT, but it suggests that digital tools can support writing when they are linked to learning strategies. This point is useful for the present study. ChatGPT should support learners' self-monitoring and revision decisions, not only correction.

2.3 ChatGPT in EFL Writing Instruction

ChatGPT has created new possibilities for EFL writing instruction. It can provide quick feedback, explain grammar, suggest words, and respond to learners' questions. Song and Song (2023) found that ChatGPT-assisted language learning improved EFL learners' writing skills and motivation. Their study also noted concerns about overreliance and the need for careful use. This balance is important. ChatGPT can support writing, but it can also reduce learner effort if it is used without guidance.

Han et al. (2023) developed RECIPE, a platform for EFL learners to revise essays through interaction with ChatGPT. Their work shows that ChatGPT can be built into a writing process where learners interact with the tool, evaluate responses, and revise their essays. This point is

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

relevant to the present study because writing with ChatGPT should involve more than receiving a corrected text. It should include interaction between the learner, the draft, the feedback, and the revision.

Prompt use is another key issue. Woo et al. (2023) studied EFL learners' prompt engineering pathways when they completed a writing task with ChatGPT. They found that learners used different types of prompts and often went through a trial-and-error process. This suggests that learners cannot be expected to use ChatGPT effectively without support. They need to learn how to ask focused questions. For example, "Is my topic sentence clear?" is more useful for learning than "Rewrite my essay."

The way learners respond to AI feedback also matters. Rong et al. (2025) examined learner engagement with AI-guided chatbot feedback in EFL writing. They showed that engagement includes interaction and revision. Learners may ask questions, receive feedback, and make changes, but the quality of engagement can be different. Some learners think carefully about the feedback. Others only accept suggestions at a surface level. This distinction is important for self-regulated writing.

Yang et al. (2025) also highlight the value of active engagement. Their study found that learners who modified AI-generated text improved writing quality more than those who accepted AI-generated text without change. This finding supports the use of a revision decision log in the present study. Learners need to record whether they accept, partly accept, or reject ChatGPT's suggestions. This step helps them stay responsible for their own writing.

Previous studies have shown that ChatGPT can support EFL writing, feedback, and revision. However, less attention has been given to how learners use ChatGPT during the performance phase of self-regulated writing. This study addresses that point by examining how EFL learners use ChatGPT while drafting, monitoring, and revising.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research Design

This study used a small-scale classroom-based qualitative design. It examined how EFL participants used ChatGPT during the performance phase of writing. The focus was not on proving a strong statistical effect. Instead, the study explored how the participants used ChatGPT to draft, monitor, and revise their writing.

The study was designed as a short classroom activity. The participants wrote an initial draft without ChatGPT, completed a self-monitoring checklist, interacted with ChatGPT through focused questions, recorded their revision decisions, and produced a revised draft. This design was selected because the study aimed to observe the writing process, not only the final product. The prompt logs, checklists, revision decision logs, and revised drafts were used to understand how the participants worked with ChatGPT during writing.

3.2. Participants and Context

The participants were ten Vietnamese EFL university students. Their English proficiency was estimated to be around A2–B1 based on teacher observation and a short writing task completed before the ChatGPT activity. The group included lower-intermediate and intermediate students. They were able to write short opinion essays in English, but they still had common problems with grammar, word choice, sentence clarity, and coherence.

The activity was conducted in a general English writing class. All participants were given the same writing topic: Can online communication replace face-to-face interaction? This topic was chosen because it was familiar to the participants. It also allowed them to express an opinion, give reasons, and provide examples. The task was suitable for A2–B1 learners because it did not require specialist knowledge.

All participants were coded as P01 to P10. Their names were not used in the analysis. They were informed about the purpose of the activity. Their writing data, prompt logs, revision decision logs, and reflections were used anonymously. No personal names or identifying information were reported.

3.3. Classroom Procedure

The activity followed six main steps.

First, the teacher explained the purpose of the activity. The participants were told that ChatGPT could be used as a support tool, but not as a writer. They were also told not to ask ChatGPT to write the whole essay.

Second, the participants wrote an initial draft without using ChatGPT. They wrote a short argumentative essay of about 180–220 words. The essay had to include an opinion, reasons, examples, and a short conclusion.

Third, the participants completed a self-monitoring checklist. The checklist asked them to check whether their opinion was clear, whether their ideas were connected, whether their examples were enough, and whether there were grammar or vocabulary problems.

Fourth, the participants used ChatGPT to ask specific questions about their drafts. They were guided to ask questions such as "Is my opinion clear?", "Which sentence is unclear?", "Can you explain my grammar mistakes?", and "Is this word suitable?" They copied their questions into a prompt log.

Fifth, the participants completed a revision decision log. In this log, they recorded ChatGPT's suggestions and decided whether to accept, partly accept, or reject each suggestion. They also wrote a short reason for each decision.

Sixth, the participants wrote a revised draft and answered three short reflection questions. The reflection asked what ChatGPT helped them with, which suggestion they did not use, and whether they still felt in control of their writing.

3.4. Data Collection

The data came from five sources. (1) The first source was the initial drafts. These drafts showed what the participants could produce before using ChatGPT. (2) The second source was the self-monitoring checklists. These checklists showed what the participants noticed about their own writing before asking ChatGPT. (3) The third source was the ChatGPT prompt logs. These logs showed what kinds of questions the participants asked during the writing process. (4) The fourth source was the revision decision logs. These logs showed how the participants

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

responded to ChatGPT's suggestions. (5) The fifth source was the revised drafts and short reflections. These data showed what changes the participants made after using ChatGPT and how they understood their own use of the tool.

Together, these data sources helped show how ChatGPT supported drafting, monitoring, and revision during the performance phase.

3.5. Data Analysis

The data were analyzed through descriptive scoring and qualitative coding.

First, the initial and revised drafts were scored with an analytic rubric. The rubric had four criteria: task response and idea clarity, coherence and organization, language use, and vocabulary and expression. Each criterion was scored on a 2.5-point scale. The total score was 10. The drafts were assessed by two experienced EFL writing instructors. The two raters scored the drafts independently. The final score for each draft was the average of the two scores. When there was a large difference between the two scores, the raters discussed the case and reached an agreed score.

Second, the prompt logs were coded according to their main purpose. Five prompt types were used: idea checking, coherence and clarity checking, grammar checking, vocabulary checking, and revision guidance. This coding helped identify how the participants used ChatGPT while they were drafting and monitoring their writing.

Third, the revision decision logs were coded into three types: accepted, partly accepted, and rejected. This coding showed whether the participants used the suggestions directly, adapted them, or decided not to use them.

Finally, the drafts, reflections, and logs were read together to identify common patterns. The analysis focused on three areas: how ChatGPT supported drafting, how it supported self-monitoring, and how the participants made revision decisions.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the main findings from the classroom activity. The analysis focuses on three areas: changes in writing quality, participants' use of ChatGPT prompts, and participants' revision decisions. The aim is not to prove that ChatGPT improved writing in a statistical way. Instead, it is to show how the participants used ChatGPT during drafting, monitoring, and revision.

4.1. Changes in Writing Scores

The initial and revised drafts were scored with a 10-point rubric. The scores were used as descriptive evidence to show the general direction of change after the participants used ChatGPT. Table 1 shows the scores of the ten participants.

Table 1: Writing Scores Before and After ChatGPT Support

Participant	Level	Initial draft	Revised draft	Gain
P01	A2	5.5	6.3	+0.8
P02	A2	5.3	5.9	+0.6
P03	A2+	6.0	6.6	+0.6
P04	A2+	6.1	6.4	+0.3
P05	B1	6.8	7.2	+0.4
P06	B1	7.0	7.4	+0.4
P07	B1	7.1	7.1	0.0
P08	B1	7.1	7.4	+0.3
P09	B1	7.1	7.3	+0.2
P10	B1+	8.0	8.0	0.0

The mean score increased from 6.60 in the initial drafts to 6.96 in the revised drafts. The average gain was 0.36. This indicates a small improvement. The change was not large, and it was not the same for all participants. Most participants improved slightly. The clearest changes appeared in grammar, word choice, and sentence clarity. For example, P01 corrected phrases such as "some situation" and "have meeting." P02 corrected phrases such as "in many time," "by online," and "it save time." These revisions made the drafts clearer and more accurate. However, the main ideas were still simple. The revisions improved sentence-level accuracy more than content development.

The B1-level participants showed smaller gains. Their initial drafts were already clearer and more organized. For example, P07 had a clear position from the first draft. The revision improved some phrases, such as "normal situations" and "fully give," but the overall structure and argument did not change much. For this reason, the total score stayed the same.

P10 also showed no gain in total score. This does not mean that ChatGPT was not useful. The revised draft had some better phrases, such as "keep in contact" and "less meaningful." However, the first draft was already strong for the task. The changes were small refinements, so they did not raise the overall score.

Overall, the score changes suggest that ChatGPT helped some participants improve their drafts, but the improvement was limited. The scores should be read as descriptive evidence, not as proof of strong improvement.

4.2. Prompt Use During the Performance Phase

The prompt logs showed how the participants used ChatGPT while working on their drafts. Each prompt was coded according to its main purpose. Five types were used: idea checking, coherence and clarity checking, grammar checking, vocabulary checking, and revision guidance. Table 2 shows the distribution of prompt types.

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Table 2: Types of Prompts Used by Participants

Prompt type	Frequency	Percentage
Coherence and clarity checking	17	34%
Vocabulary checking	11	22%
Grammar checking	10	20%
Idea checking	9	18%
Revision guidance	3	6%
Total	50	100%

The most common prompt type was coherence and clarity checking. This means the participants did not use ChatGPT only for grammar correction. They also asked whether their ideas were clear, whether a sentence sounded unnatural, or whether the essay was logically connected. For example, P03 asked, "Can you find sentences that are unclear or unnatural?" P06 asked whether the phrase "deeper communication" was clear for readers. P07 asked whether the phrase "feel the atmosphere of the conversation" was clear. These prompts show self-monitoring because the participants tried to check how their writing might be read by another person.

Vocabulary checking was also common. Participants often asked whether a phrase was natural. This happened across levels. P01 asked whether "real feeling" was a good phrase. P08 asked about "deep understanding." P10 asked for B1-level alternatives for weak or unnatural phrases. These prompts show that the participants used ChatGPT as a language resource, but they did not always ask for a full rewrite.

Grammar checking accounted for 20% of the prompts. This is expected for A2–B1 participants because many of them still had problems with plural nouns, articles, verb forms, and prepositions. However, grammar was not the only focus. The performance phase is not only about correcting errors. It also includes checking meaning, structure, and clarity while writing.

Revision guidance was the least frequent prompt type. Only three prompts asked ChatGPT to help decide what to revise or what to reject. This suggests that the participants could ask for feedback, but still needed support in making revision decisions. This point is consistent with Woo et al. (2023), who showed that EFL learners often need guidance in prompt use when writing with ChatGPT.

4.3. ChatGPT Supported Language Control and Sentence Clarity

The revised drafts showed many small but useful changes in language. These changes were mostly related to grammar, collocation, word choice, and sentence clarity.

For lower level participants, the changes were often direct and easy to see. P02 changed "it save time" to "it saves time," and "do not need go" to "do not need to go." P04 changed "more easy" to "easier" and "without going to office" to "without going to the office." These changes did not make the essays advanced, but they made the sentences more correct and easier to read.

For intermediate participants, the changes were more about natural expression. P06 changed "make close relationship" to "build close relationships." P08 changed "wrong understanding" to "misunderstandings." P09 changed "important human relationships" to "close personal relationships." These changes made the writing clearer and more suitable for the topic.

The data suggest that ChatGPT was useful for language control during the performance phase. It helped the participants notice problems that they could not fully see by themselves. However, the revised drafts still kept learner features. They did not become overly polished. Active modification of AI generated text has been found to support writing quality more than accepting AI output without change (Yang et al., 2025). In the present study, the participants often used ChatGPT suggestions, but many of them adapted the suggestions to their own level. This helped keep the revised drafts close to their original writing.

4.4. Participants' Revision Decisions

The revision decision logs showed how the participants responded to ChatGPT's suggestions. Each decision was coded as accepted, partly accepted, or rejected. Table 3 presents the results.

Table 3: Participants' Revision Decisions

Decision type	Frequency	Percentage
Accepted	48	66.7%
Partly accepted	13	18.1%
Rejected	11	15.3%
Total	72	100%

Most suggestions were accepted. This was common when the suggestion corrected a clear grammar or vocabulary problem. For example, the participants accepted changes in plural nouns, articles, and common phrases. These suggestions were easy to understand and apply. However, the participants did not accept everything. They partly accepted 13 suggestions and rejected 11 suggestions. This shows that they had some control over the revision process.

The rejected suggestions were often related to full rewriting, more formal style, or new ideas. P01 rejected the suggestion to rewrite the whole essay because it was too difficult and did not sound like the participant's writing. P07 rejected a more academic conclusion because it sounded too formal. P10 rejected an extra counterargument because it made the essay too broad. These cases show that some participants

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

understood that not every AI suggestion was suitable. This is part of self-regulated writing because the participants had to judge the feedback, not just receive it.

At the same time, the data also showed a risk. Some lower-level participants accepted many suggestions because they were not confident. P02 wrote in the reflection, "A little yes," when asked whether the participant still controlled the writing. This answer suggests that the participant used ChatGPT actively, but still depended on it to some degree.

This finding supports the need for guided use of ChatGPT. Learners should not only learn how to ask ChatGPT for help. They also need to learn how to judge the suggestions. A revision decision log is useful for this purpose because it asks learners to explain why they accept, partly accept, or reject feedback.

4.5. Summary of Findings

Overall, the findings show that ChatGPT supported the participants mainly during monitoring and revision. It helped them check unclear sentences, coherence, grammar, and word choice while they were working on their drafts. It also helped them make small revisions at the sentence and phrase level.

However, the support was limited. Some revised drafts became clearer, but they did not receive a higher total score. This shows that clearer language did not always mean stronger writing as a whole.

The findings also show the need for teacher guidance. Participants who asked focused prompts received more useful feedback. Those who explained their revision decisions showed more control over their writing. For this reason, learners need support in asking better prompts, checking AI feedback carefully, and keeping their own voice in writing.

5. PEDAGOGICAL AND EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

The findings suggest that ChatGPT can support EFL writing when it is used with clear classroom guidance. It should not be introduced as a tool that simply corrects or rewrites texts. Instead, it should be used as part of a writing process in which learners draft, monitor, question, and revise.

First, teachers should guide learners to ask specific prompts. General prompts such as "Rewrite my essay" do not support self-regulated writing and may lead leaners to copy AI output without thinking. More useful prompts are focused and limited. For example, learners can ask, "Is my opinion clear?", "Which sentence is unclear?", or "Can you explain this grammar mistake?" These prompts help them stay active during writing.

Second, ChatGPT should be used with a self-monitoring checklist. The checklist helps learners know what to check before asking ChatGPT. Without a checklist, some leaners may focus only on grammar. With a checklist, they are reminded to check the main idea, reasons, examples, coherence, vocabulary, and conclusion. This makes the use of ChatGPT closer to the performance phase of self-regulated learning.

Third, teachers should ask learners to keep a prompt log. The prompt log shows how they interact with ChatGPT. It also helps teachers see whether leaners ask useful questions or depend too much on the tool. In this study, many prompts focused on coherence, clarity, grammar, and vocabulary. This shows that prompt logs can make the writing process visible.

Fourth, learners should complete a revision decision log. This log is important because it asks them to explain their decisions. They need to say whether they accept, partly accept, or reject ChatGPT's suggestions. This step can reduce passive use. It also helps learners understand that AI feedback is not always suitable for their level, meaning, or writing style.

The findings also suggest that teachers should assess the writing process, not only the final draft. If only the final essay is assessed, leaners may use ChatGPT to produce a cleaner text without learning much from the process. Teachers can assess the initial draft, prompt log, checklist, revision decision log, and revised draft together. This gives a fuller picture of how learners use ChatGPT.

For EFL classrooms in Vietnam and similar contexts, these implications are important. Digital tool use does not automatically lead to learner autonomy. Leaners need to know how to ask, check, decide, and revise. Therefore, ChatGPT should be integrated into writing instruction as a support for self-regulated learning. It can help learners monitor their writing during the performance phase. However, the teacher still plays an important role. The teacher designs the task, gives the checklist, guides prompt use, and helps learners judge AI feedback.

6. LIMITATIONS

This study has several limitations. First, the number of participants was small. The study involved only ten Vietnamese EFL university leaners. Therefore, the findings cannot be generalized to all EFL learners.

Second, the study used only one writing task. The topic was familiar and suitable for A2–B1 learners, but other topics may lead to different results. A more difficult topic may require different kinds of support from ChatGPT.

Third, the activity was conducted in a short classroom setting. It showed how participants used ChatGPT in one writing activity, but it did not examine long-term changes in writing ability or self-regulated learning.

Fourth, the study focused mainly on the performance phase. It did not examine the forethought phase or the reflection phase in depth. Future research may explore how ChatGPT supports the full cycle of self-regulated writing.

Finally, the scoring was used only as descriptive evidence. The study did not include statistical testing. For this reason, the score changes should be interpreted carefully. They show patterns in this small group, not strong evidence of general improvement.

7. CONCLUSION

This study examined how ChatGPT supported self-regulated writing in an EFL classroom, with a focus on the performance phase. The findings showed that ChatGPT helped participants check their drafts, monitor clarity and coherence, and revise grammar and word choice. The support was most visible at the sentence and phrase level.

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

However, ChatGPT did not improve all parts of writing equally. Changes in idea development and organization were smaller. Some participants also needed more guidance in deciding which suggestions to accept, partly accept, or reject. This shows that ChatGPT should be used as a guided support tool rather than as a replacement writer.

The study suggests that ChatGPT can be useful in EFL writing classes when it is connected to self-monitoring and revision decisions. In the performance phase, learners need to draft, monitor, and revise at the same time. ChatGPT can support this process, but its value depends on how learners use it. With teacher guidance, it can help learners become more aware of their writing problems and more responsible for their revisions. It can support self-regulated writing, but it cannot replace the learner's role in thinking, choosing, and revising.

Ethics Statement

The study involved a small classroom-based writing activity. All participants were informed about the purpose of the activity. Their writing data, prompt logs, revision decision logs, and reflections were used anonymously. No personal names or identifying information were reported.

Informed Consent Statement

Informed consent was obtained from all participants before their anonymized classroom data were used for this study.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Funding Statement

This research received no external funding.

Data Availability Statement

The data are not publicly available because they contain classroom-based learner writing, prompt logs, and reflection data.

Author Contribution Statement

Both authors contributed to the study conception, research design, data analysis, manuscript writing, revision, and approval of the final version.

Acknowledgments

ChatGPT was used only for language editing support. The author developed the study design, analysis, and content, and takes full responsibility for the manuscript.

REFERENCES

1) Bai, B., Guo, W., & Wang, C. (2024). Relationships between struggling EFL writers' motivation, self-regulated learning (SRL), and writing competence in Hong Kong primary schools. *Applied Linguistics Review*. https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2020-0131
2) Chang, K.-S. (1998). Writing as a recursive and messy process and some implications for EFL writing classes. *영어어문교육*, *4*, 1–14.
3) Guo, W., Bai, B., & Song, H. (2021). Influences of process-based instruction on leaners' use of self-regulated learning strategies in EFL writing. *System*, *101*, 102578. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102578
4) Han, J., Yoo, H., Kim, Y., Myung, J., Kim, M., Lim, H., Kim, J., Lee, T. Y., Hong, H., Ahn, S.-Y., & Oh, A. (2023). RECIPE: How to integrate ChatGPT into EFL writing education. In *Proceedings of the Tenth ACM Conference on Learning @ Scale (L@S '23)*. Association for Computing Machinery. https://doi.org/10.1145/3573051.3596200
5) Han, Y., Zhao, S., & Ng, L.-L. (2021). How technology tools impact writing performance, lexical complexity, and perceived self-regulated learning strategies in EFL academic writing: A comparative study. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*, Article 752793. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.752793
6) Rong, M., Yao, Y., Li, Q., & Chen, X. (W.). (2025). Exploring student engagement with artificial intelligence-guided chatbot feedback in EFL writing: Interactions and revisions. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 1-30. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2025.2539979
7) Song, C., & Song, Y. (2023). Enhancing academic writing skills and motivation: Assessing the efficacy of ChatGPT in AI-assisted language learning for EFL leaners. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *14*, Article 1260843. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1260843
8) Woo, D. J., Guo, K., & Susanto, H. (2023). Cases of EFL secondary leaners' prompt engineering pathways to complete a writing task with ChatGPT. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.05493*
9) Yang, K., Raković, M., Liang, Z., Yan, L., Zeng, Z., Fan, Y., Gašević, D., & Chen, G. (2025). Modifying AI, enhancing essays: How active engagement with generative AI boosts writing quality. In *LAK25: The 15th International Learning Analytics and Knowledge Conference*. Association for Computing Machinery. https://doi.org/10.1145/3706468.3706544
10) Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview. *Theory Into Practice*, *41*(2), 64–70.

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Corresponding Author: Tuong Thi Xuan Thu