



This work is licensed
under a Creative
Commons Attribution
4.0 International
License.

Reimagining AI integration: Vietnamese EFL instructors' cultural reconceptualization of the 6-P framework

 **Minh Toan Pham**
Van Hien University, Vietnam
toanpm@vhu.edu.vn

This study investigates the cultural adaptation of the 6-P framework – comprising plan, prompt, preview, produce, peer-review, and portfolio-tracking phases – for integrating generative artificial intelligence (AI) in academic writing instruction within Vietnamese universities. Through qualitative analysis of interviews, focus groups, and workshops with 16 Vietnamese English as a Foreign Language (EFL) instructors, the research reveals three interconnected themes: cultural reconceptualization of framework components, professional authority anxieties amid institutional constraints, and pragmatic adaptation strategies. Findings show that instructors prioritize evaluation over production, transform peer review into community feedback mechanisms, and experience cultural-technological dissonance between conscious innovation advocacy and unconscious preservation of hierarchical teaching patterns. Contrary to conventional theories, senior instructors demonstrated greater receptivity than junior colleagues, indicating that institutional security rather than age determines innovation willingness. The documented pedagogical double consciousness and proposed collective reflection component expose embedded Western individualistic assumptions, challenging technological universalism in educational AI discourse. These findings demand epistemological transformation rather than surface localization, questioning whether Western-derived frameworks can achieve authentic global implementation without fundamental reconceptualization. The study contributes theoretical insights that extend beyond Vietnamese contexts while advancing understanding of how educational technologies embody cultural values requiring paradigmatic rather than technical solutions.

Keywords: artificial intelligence (AI), academic writing, Vietnamese EFL, 6-P framework

Introduction

The integration of generative artificial intelligence (AI) in academic writing instruction exposes a critical paradox within contemporary higher education: while these tools promise democratized learning opportunities, their implementation often reinforces existing educational hierarchies and cultural hegemonies (De Roock, 2024). Since ChatGPT's emergence, the exponential growth in AI adoption within educational settings has proceeded largely unchallenged, with insufficient attention to how these predominantly Western-developed technologies interact with diverse pedagogical traditions (Nguyen & Truong, 2025). This technological universalism (Feenberg, 2017) becomes particularly consequential when examining Vietnamese universities, where distinct educational philosophies and cultural practices intersect uneasily with imported technological frameworks.

Vietnamese EFL students navigate complex challenges in academic writing that extend beyond linguistic competence to encompass fundamental differences in rhetorical traditions and knowledge construction (Hua & Le, 2025). Recent research reveals that postgraduate students struggle significantly with Western academic conventions – from citation practices to argumentative structures – yet these difficulties reflect deeper cultural discontinuities rather than mere technical deficiencies (Ho, 2024). Vietnamese educational traditions, rooted in Confucian principles emphasizing knowledge transmission and respect for authority (Nguyen et al., 2025), create inherent tensions with Western academic expectations demanding critical argumentation and original synthesis (Phung & Le, 2024). These cultural foundations shape not only how students approach writing but also how they conceptualize the very purpose of academic discourse (Canagarajah, 2023).

The rapid adoption of generative AI tools among Vietnamese students presents a compelling case study in technological adaptation and its unintended consequences. While students enthusiastically embrace ChatGPT for various academic tasks – from brainstorming to content clarification – they simultaneously report decreased confidence in critical thinking and reduced comprehension abilities (Pham & Le, 2024). This contradiction suggests that current AI integration approaches may facilitate task completion while potentially undermining the deeper cognitive processes essential for academic development (Crawford et al., 2023; Fyfe, 2023). The instrumental use of AI tools without corresponding pedagogical frameworks risks creating surface-level competencies that mask fundamental learning deficits (Lodge et al., 2023).

Kong et al.'s (2024) 6-P framework represents an ambitious attempt to structure AI integration through six phases: plan, prompt, preview, produce, peer-review, and portfolio-tracking. Grounded in Western theories of self-regulated learning (Zimmerman, 2002), this framework assumes educational dispositions – learner autonomy, peer collaboration, critical evaluation – that may not translate seamlessly across cultural contexts (Littlewood, 1999; Tweed & Lehman, 2002). The framework's emphasis on student-directed learning and critical interrogation of AI outputs presupposes educational values cultivated within individualistic traditions, potentially conflicting with Vietnamese

educational contexts where collective harmony and respect for authority remain paramount (Nguyen et al., 2025). These cultural discontinuities raise fundamental questions about the framework's applicability without substantial reconceptualization.

Current AI integration literature reveals a significant gap in culturally-situated approaches to educational technology adoption. The predominance of Western theoretical perspectives obscures how cultural values, institutional structures, and power relationships mediate technology implementation in diverse contexts (Gudykunst & Mody, 2002; Selwyn, 2013). Vietnamese instructors, who must negotiate between global technological imperatives and local educational traditions, remain notably absent from framework development discussions (Nguyen & Sit, 2024). This exclusion perpetuates approaches that prioritize technological capabilities over contextual pedagogical wisdom, potentially undermining the very educational goals these tools purport to advance (Hans & Hans, 2024).

From a theoretical standpoint, examining framework adaptation illuminates the collision between technological universalism and educational particularism. This investigation transcends technical modifications to engage with fundamental questions about learning, authority, and knowledge construction across cultural boundaries (Hall, 1981; Vygotsky & Cole, 1978). The adaptation process demands reconsidering how Western-derived self-regulated learning principles might be reimagined within collectivist educational cultures that prioritize different learning outcomes and processes (Wang & Li, 2024). Such theoretical work contributes to broader discussions about technology transfer, cultural adaptation, and the preservation of educational diversity in an increasingly connected world (Zalli, 2024).

Practically, developing culturally-responsive AI integration frameworks requires navigating complex tensions between global competencies and local values. Vietnamese instructors face the challenge of preparing students for international academic discourse while maintaining cultural educational principles (Hua & Le, 2025). This dual mandate cannot be resolved through superficial framework adjustments but demands fundamental rethinking about how AI tools might support culturally-grounded learning processes (Nyaaba et al., 2024). The goal extends beyond mere technological adoption to encompass meaningful integration that enhances rather than displaces existing pedagogical strengths.

This study addresses these critical concerns through two research questions:

RQ1: How do Vietnamese EFL instructors perceive the applicability of the 6-P framework for integrating generative AI in academic writing instruction?

RQ2: What cultural and contextual adaptations would optimize the 6-P framework for Vietnamese university EFL classrooms?

This investigation fills a notable void in AI framework adaptation research by providing the first empirical examination of the 6-P framework's cultural reconceptualization in Vietnamese EFL contexts. The study contributes theoretically by demonstrating how collectivist educational values transform Western

individualistic learning frameworks, revealing cultural adaptation as reconceptualization rather than simple modification. Practically, the findings offer educators specific strategies for implementing AI frameworks within hierarchical educational systems and large-class constraints. These insights inform culturally-responsive AI integration policies and provide a methodological foundation for cross-cultural educational technology research.

Literature review

AI in language education

The transformation of AI in language education reflects fundamental tensions between technological innovation and pedagogical tradition. While early Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL) applications embodied behaviorist principles through repetitive drills (Song et al., 2023), contemporary AI systems increasingly reflect constructivist approaches by facilitating personalized, adaptive learning experiences (Halkiopoulou & Gkintoni, 2024). Zhang and Umeanowai's (2024) bibliometric analysis documented significant acceleration during COVID-19, yet overlooked how pandemic-induced digitalization exposed profound inequalities in technological infrastructure and pedagogical preparedness, particularly in developing contexts (Tran et al., 2020).

Six AI application categories have emerged – from Automatic Evaluation Systems to Affective Computing – demonstrating technical sophistication but revealing uneven pedagogical integration (Jiang, 2022). This disconnect manifests acutely in traditional educational contexts where teacher-centered approaches prevail. Technology adoption theory suggests successful integration requires alignment between technological capabilities and existing belief systems (Davis, 1989); however, generative AI tools fundamentally challenge established notions of authorship, learning autonomy, and academic integrity (Rudolph et al., 2023).

Research examining ChatGPT's effectiveness in academic writing yields contradictory findings. While Al-Sofi (2024) and Mahapatra (2024) reported positive outcomes with Saudi and Indian students respectively, their cross-sectional methodologies fail to assess long-term impacts on critical thinking development. Cotton et al. (2023) and Eke (2023) identified concerning integrity violations, though their perspectives from Anglo-American educational contexts may not fully capture implementation challenges in Asian settings where collective learning traditions predominate. These contradictions suggest effectiveness depends less on technological capabilities than on culturally-aligned implementation frameworks.

Vietnamese universities epitomize implementation challenges characteristic of Confucian-heritage cultures (Nguyen et al., 2025). Despite Meniado et al.'s (2024) documentation of positive student perceptions, systematic frameworks remain absent. Individual instructor initiatives cannot address structural barriers including inadequate infrastructure, insufficient teacher training, and cultural resistance to student autonomy (Vuong et al., 2024). Vietnam's

hierarchical educational traditions conflict with AI tools that position students as independent learners, necessitating frameworks that reconcile technological innovation with cultural values to achieve meaningful pedagogical transformation.

Academic writing in Vietnamese EFL education

Academic writing instruction in Vietnamese EFL contexts reveals profound tensions between traditional pedagogical inheritances and contemporary educational demands, creating a distinctive landscape that challenges conventional assumptions about L2 writing development. The persistence of teacher-centered, product-based approaches in Vietnamese universities extends beyond mere pedagogical preference, reflecting deeply embedded cultural values that position teachers as knowledge authorities and students as receptive learners (Ho, 2024; Truong & Nguyen, 2024). This orientation, while often criticized from Western perspectives, serves specific functions within Vietnamese educational ecosystems where examination success determines academic and professional trajectories.

The examination-driven nature of Vietnamese education creates a paradoxical relationship with academic writing proficiency. While instructors recognize the importance of process-oriented approaches and critical thinking skills, institutional pressures mandate preparation for standardized assessments like IELTS, creating what Truong and Nguyen (2024) characterize as “pedagogical dissonance” between ideal and actual practices. This tension manifests particularly in Western-trained Vietnamese teachers who experience significant challenges implementing process-oriented methodologies within local institutional contexts, often developing hybrid approaches that attempt to reconcile competing educational paradigms.

Cultural dimensions further complicate this pedagogical landscape. Vietnamese collectivist values and hierarchical social structures create fundamental tensions with Western academic writing conventions that prioritize individual voice and critical evaluation of authority (Le & Pham, 2024). These cultural orientations operate not as barriers to be overcome but as alternative epistemological frameworks that shape how knowledge is constructed and validated. The resulting pedagogical challenges extend beyond surface-level adaptations, requiring fundamental reconsiderations of what constitutes effective academic writing within Vietnamese contexts.

Linguistic and rhetorical divergences between Vietnamese and English compound these pedagogical complexities. The typological differences – including Vietnamese’s lack of articles, topic-prominent structure, and indirect rhetorical patterns – create cognitive challenges that persist even among advanced learners (Ho, 2024). These linguistic disparities intersect with resource constraints, as classes frequently exceed 40 students and institutions lack adequate technological infrastructure (Lam, 2024), forcing instructors to prioritize efficiency over individualized feedback or process-oriented instruction.

Technology integration presents a particularly revealing lens through which

to examine these systemic challenges. While AI tools like Grammarly and ChatGPT demonstrate increasing adoption among Vietnamese students, with 96% of third-year EFL students familiar with ChatGPT (Phi & Nguyen, 2024), implementation remains fragmented and theoretically underconceptualized. Infrastructure limitations, including unreliable internet connectivity and insufficient institutional support, create what Nguyen (2025) termed “digital divides within digital initiatives” (p. 32), where policy aspirations for technological advancement consistently outpace classroom realities (Mai & Thao, 2022).

The intersection of these factors – traditional pedagogical orientations, cultural values, linguistic challenges, and technological barriers – creates a unique context that demands careful theoretical consideration when implementing AI frameworks in Vietnamese academic writing instruction. Rather than viewing these elements as obstacles to be eliminated, understanding them as interconnected components of a complex educational ecosystem becomes essential for developing culturally responsive and pedagogically effective approaches to AI integration in academic writing instruction.

The 6-P framework

Kong et al.’s (2024) 6-P framework represents a structured approach to integrating generative AI tools into academic writing instruction. The framework’s theoretical foundation draws from Zimmerman’s (2002) three-stage model of self-regulated learning, establishing explicit connections between pedagogical phases and cognitive processes necessary for developing autonomous learners in AI-enhanced environments. The initial planning phase aligns with Zimmerman’s forethought stage, where students analyze tasks and establish strategic approaches, maintaining student agency while positioning AI as supportive rather than substitutive. The subsequent phases – prompt, preview, produce, and peer-review – correspond to the performance stage, emphasizing active monitoring and strategic adjustment during task execution, while portfolio-tracking facilitates metacognitive evaluation in the self-reflection stage.

Critical thinking development emerges as an integral component throughout implementation, particularly in the preview phase where students evaluate AI-generated content for accuracy, relevance, and potential biases. This requirement addresses concerns regarding analytical skill development when interacting with generative AI (Cooper, 2023). Each component demonstrates sophisticated interdependencies: planning establishes parameters for AI interactions, prompting requires technological literacy in crafting effective instructions, preview integrates critical evaluation with source verification addressing documented challenges of AI hallucination (Azamfirei et al., 2023), production emphasizes synthesis and original contribution, peer review introduces collaborative dimensions, and portfolio-tracking facilitates longitudinal skill development.

Initial implementations show promising outcomes, though comprehensive empirical validation remains limited. Kong and Yang (2024) reported significant improvements in teachers’ conceptual understanding following professional

development programs incorporating the framework. Their study of 31 in-service primary teachers demonstrated enhanced perceptions across content, technological content, pedagogical content, and technological pedagogical content knowledge domains. Application in Chinese language writing instruction provides context-specific insights, with students progressing through five stages with teacher scaffolding. However, limitations include absence of large-scale empirical validation, reliance on teacher perceptions rather than direct student outcome measurements, and substantial infrastructural requirements.

Cultural adaptation of educational frameworks

Cultural adaptation of educational frameworks emerges as a complex process requiring systematic theoretical grounding and careful consideration of contextual factors. Berry's (1997) bidirectional acculturation model demonstrates that adaptation involves simultaneous processes of cultural maintenance and adoption, suggesting that educational frameworks undergo transformative processes rather than simple transplantation. This perspective aligns with the concept of cultural-technological co-evolution, wherein both technology and cultural practices experience mutual modification when educational innovations enter new contexts (Dutra et al., 2023). The participatory adaptation model emphasizes stakeholder involvement throughout the adaptation process, recognizing that cultural knowledge extends beyond expert analysis to require active participation from local practitioners.

Vietnamese higher education operates within distinctive cultural parameters that fundamentally shape pedagogical approaches. The system reflects a hybrid nature combining socialist principles with market-oriented reforms, creating what Felix (2020) characterized as an "unstable nature of modernity" (p. 116). Confucian heritage traditions emphasize hierarchical teacher-student relationships, where educators hold considerable authority and students demonstrate respect through deference and compliance (Truong & Hallinger, 2017). This collectivist orientation prioritizes group harmony over individual achievement, influencing classroom dynamics where students often avoid activities that might expose errors or challenge authority. The centralized governance structure, with the Ministry of Education and Training maintaining tight control over curriculum and pedagogy, creates additional complexity for implementing innovative approaches (Dimmock et al., 2021).

Successful framework adaptation in Vietnamese contexts requires understanding these cultural complexities and developing implementation strategies that honor traditional values while introducing innovative practices. The challenge lies in achieving what might be termed "cultural-pedagogical synthesis"; creating educational approaches that authentically reflect local cultural values while advancing pedagogical goals. This synthesis demands ongoing dialogue between stakeholders, flexibility in implementation, and recognition that adaptation strengthens rather than weakens educational innovations.

Research Design

This investigation employed a qualitative exploratory design to examine Vietnamese EFL instructors' perceptions and adaptations of the 6-P framework. Qualitative methodology was appropriate given the absence of prior research on AI framework adaptation in Vietnamese contexts, requiring discovery of unexpected cultural negotiations. The exploratory approach enabled understanding how instructors negotiate between Western-derived frameworks and local educational values across diverse institutional settings. This design facilitated development of theoretical insights about cross-cultural technology adaptation while generating practical implementation guidance.

Participants

Sixteen Vietnamese EFL instructors participated through purposive sampling from six universities across Vietnam. Selection criteria included a minimum of three years of university teaching experience, current academic writing instruction involvement, and educational technology exposure. Participants ranged in age from 28–52 years ($M = 38.4$) with teaching experience of 3–15 years ($M = 7.8$). Educational qualifications included 11 master's and five doctoral degrees in applied linguistics and related fields, with professional ranks comprising nine lecturers, four senior lecturers, and three associate professors. Ten participants worked at public universities under centralized governance, while six taught at private institutions with greater curricular autonomy. Seven participants had informal generative AI experience, while nine had no prior exposure. This diversity in institutional types, career stages, and technology familiarity enabled comprehensive exploration of cultural and contextual factors influencing framework adaptation, with recruitment continuing until thematic saturation was achieved.

Data collection

Data collection followed a sequential mixed-method design over three months, beginning with individual semi-structured interviews (60–90 minutes) conducted in Vietnamese with all 16 participants. Initial interviews explored instructors' interpretations of each framework component and institutional implementation challenges, with protocols refined iteratively based on emerging themes. Following preliminary interview analysis, participants were grouped by institutional type into four focus groups (4–5 members each, 90 minutes) to explore collective adaptation strategies and shared concerns. These sessions revealed cultural negotiations not evident in individual interviews. The final phase comprised two half-day workshops where instructors engaged in hands-on framework application activities, generating both observational data and written reflections documenting their real-time adaptation decisions. This sequential design enabled each phase to inform subsequent data collection,

with member checking of preliminary interpretations occurring during focus groups and workshops. All verbal interactions were audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim, while workshop activities produced observational field notes and participant artifacts for triangulated analysis (Creswell & Poth, 2018).

Data analysis

Data analysis followed Braun and Clarke's (2006) reflexive thematic analysis, proceeding through six phases from familiarization to theme finalization. Initial coding remained inductive and data-driven, while subsequent iterations incorporated sensitizing concepts from cultural adaptation and technology integration literature. NVivo 14 facilitated coding organization and retrieval. Analysis distinguished between surface-level modifications and deeper reconceptualizations of framework components, examining the cultural logics underlying proposed adaptations. Constant comparison across interviews, focus groups, and workshop data enabled triangulation of emerging patterns. Trustworthiness measures included member checking with five participants and peer debriefing sessions. Reflexive memoing addressed researcher positionality as both cultural insider and Western-trained academic, acknowledging how this dual perspective influenced interpretation of cultural tensions in framework adaptation.

Trustworthiness and ethical considerations

Trustworthiness was established through data triangulation across interviews, focus groups, and workshops, member checking with five participants, and peer debriefing sessions. Research followed APA (2017) ethical guidelines with participant agreement. Informed consent was secured in participants' preferred language, ensuring voluntary participation and withdrawal rights. Confidentiality was maintained through alphanumeric coding (P1-P16) and institutional anonymization. Cultural sensitivity protocols respected Vietnamese hierarchical communication patterns throughout data collection. Audio recordings were encrypted and transcripts de-identified to protect participant privacy.

Findings

Cultural reconceptualization of framework components

Vietnamese instructors engaged in fundamental reordering of the 6-P framework's hierarchical assumptions, prioritizing evaluative processes over productive activities in ways that exposed deep-seated contradictions within their pedagogical reasoning. Fourteen participants identified "preview" as the framework's cornerstone, with P8 asserting that "critical evaluation preserves our academic tradition." Yet, workshop observations documented a striking paradox: these same educators simultaneously demanded comprehensive

assessment while expressing frustration about time constraints. P14 exemplified this tension, advocating for “thorough AI output analysis” before immediately lamenting that “evaluation consumes excessive class time.” This contradiction appeared universally, suggesting that cultural adaptation operates through competing impulses rather than unified reinterpretation.

The reconceptualization of “peer review” into “community feedback” demonstrated equally paradoxical thinking patterns. Twelve instructors expanded evaluative boundaries beyond classroom contexts, though their justifications diverged significantly. While P12 framed this transformation culturally – “learning happens within community networks” – P5 offered purely logistical reasoning: “managing large classes.” More tellingly, educators who championed collective assessment mechanisms simultaneously maintained private adherence to individualistic grading requirements. P9 articulated this schism explicitly: “We need community input, but I still must grade individually for university requirements.” Workshop documentation confirmed this dualistic approach as participants constructed elaborate group feedback protocols while quietly preserving traditional rubric structures.

The reinterpretation of “prompt” as instructor-directed questioning constituted the most illuminating adaptation pattern. Despite universal claims supporting student autonomy, every participant demonstrated authoritative prompting techniques during practical sessions. P3 characterized effective prompting as guiding students “to correct understanding,” while P11 emphasized “ensuring proper responses.” Video documentation captured instructors consistently modeling directive questioning strategies rather than exploratory AI interactions, with P6 explicitly redirecting student attempts at open-ended inquiry: “No, ask it this way to get the right answer.” This behavioral consistency contradicted stated philosophical commitments, indicating unconscious preservation of hierarchical instructional patterns despite conscious advocacy for student-centered approaches.

Professional authority and institutional constraints

The framework’s implementation trajectory traced a consistent arc from initial resistance through institutional negotiation toward creative circumvention strategies. Initial encounters with the 6-P framework triggered what P11 described as “professional displacement anxiety,” particularly among early-career instructors who feared technological integration might undermine their pedagogical credibility. P13 articulated this concern directly: “If students can access AI independently, what validates my expertise?” However, senior instructors approached the framework differently, with P2 explaining: “Twenty years of teaching cannot be replaced by technology – it provides new tools for established wisdom.”

This generational divide catalyzed distinct adaptation pathways. Junior faculty pursued cautious, incremental integration strategies, testing individual components within existing lesson structures before attempting comprehensive implementation. P9 described this approach: “I introduce one component

per semester to minimize risk.” Conversely, experienced instructors embraced wholesale experimentation, with P5 noting: “I redesigned entire courses around the framework because I understand what students actually need.”

Institutional constraints forced both groups toward parallel implementation strategies that operated beneath administrative oversight. P4 characterized this necessity as “pedagogical subversion,” creating informal AI literacy workshops that existed alongside official curricula. P16 described the practical mechanics: “Friday afternoon sessions became our laboratory – students volunteer to explore what formal classes cannot accommodate.” These underground innovations enabled framework testing while preserving institutional compliance, demonstrating how Vietnamese educators navigate between innovation imperatives and bureaucratic limitations through strategic compartmentalization.

Pragmatic cultural adaptations

Vietnamese instructors’ proposed framework modifications clustered around three persistent implementation challenges: assessment alignment, class size management, and cultural contextualization. Assessment concerns dominated adaptation discussions, with 11 participants redesigning portfolio components to satisfy examination requirements rather than process-oriented learning goals. P6 exemplified this priority: “Each portfolio entry must demonstrate IELTS writing criteria – coherence, cohesion, lexical resource, grammatical range.” This instrumental approach transformed portfolios from reflective learning tools into standardized test preparation mechanisms.

Large-class realities necessitated structural framework modifications that preserved pedagogical intentions while accommodating institutional constraints. Ten instructors developed tiered implementation systems, with P8 explaining: “We cannot apply all six components simultaneously with 50 students. Planning and preview work for everyone, but prompt practice happens in small learning cells.” Workshop observations confirmed this segmented approach as participants created rotation schedules enabling personalized guidance within mass education contexts. P12 demonstrated sophisticated resource allocation: “Advanced students mentor beginners during peer review while I focus on struggling learners.”

Cultural contextualization emerged through systematic content adaptation rather than theoretical reconceptualization. Fifteen participants collaborated to develop Vietnamese-specific prompt banks incorporating indirect communication patterns and culturally-sensitive topics. P14 distinguished this work from superficial localization: “We need examples reflecting Vietnamese academic discourse – our respectful disagreement styles, our relationship with authoritative sources.” These materials addressed student comprehension challenges while maintaining international academic standards, creating what P7 termed “cultural bridges” that connected familiar communication patterns with global academic expectations without compromising either authenticity or effectiveness.

Vietnamese EFL instructors' perceptions of the 6-P framework

Vietnamese EFL instructors' perceptions of the 6-P framework expose fundamental epistemological tensions that challenge Western assumptions about technology integration in educational contexts. The pronounced inversion of component priorities – where 14 participants prioritized evaluation over production – reveals what Feenberg (2017) identifies as the cultural specificity embedded within seemingly neutral technological frameworks. This prioritization reflects deeply rooted Confucian knowledge validation traditions where assessment of established knowledge supersedes autonomous creation (Nguyen et al., 2025). However, the simultaneous demand for thorough evaluation and time efficiency documented in workshop observations indicates that cultural adaptation operates through competing rather than coherent impulses, disrupting Berry's (1997) linear acculturation assumptions.

The reconceptualization of “peer review” into “community feedback” constitutes perhaps the most theoretically significant finding, exposing fundamental limitations in Kong et al.'s (2024) individualistic framework design. This transformation reveals what Canagarajah (2023) argues is the false universality of Western educational constructs, where “peer” assumes equality relationships that contradict Vietnamese hierarchical learning traditions. Participants' expansion of evaluative boundaries to include family members and senior students demonstrates what Wang and Li (2024) describe as collectivist knowledge validation processes that fundamentally reject artificial boundaries between academic and communal learning domains. Yet, the documented contradiction between public advocacy for collective feedback and private adherence to individual grading requirements illuminates the complex negotiations Vietnamese educators must perform between cultural values and institutional mandates.

Professional authority anxieties emerged as an unexpected yet central perception pattern, with instructors reconceptualizing the framework as professional development rather than student-centered pedagogy. This reframing reflects what Ho (2024) identifies as the additional professional pressures Vietnamese educators face amid rapid technological change. The security-based adoption pattern – where senior instructors demonstrated greater receptivity than junior colleagues – directly contradicts conventional technology adoption theories that position younger educators as innovation champions (Davis, 1989). This finding aligns with Truong and Hallinger's (2017) research on Vietnamese educational hierarchies, suggesting that institutional security rather than technological familiarity determines innovation willingness in collectivist educational systems.

The reinterpretation of “prompt” as teacher-directed questioning reveals the most profound cultural-technological disconnect, exposing unconscious resistance to the framework's assumption of student autonomy. Despite universal claims supporting student-centered approaches, behavioral observations documented consistent preservation of directive instructional patterns, indicating what Selwyn (2013) describes as the gap between educational rhetoric

and actual practice. This contradiction suggests that Vietnamese instructors engage in what might be termed “cultural-technological dissonance” – consciously embracing innovation while unconsciously preserving established power relationships. These perceptions collectively indicate that effective framework implementation requires recognition of how cultural epistemologies fundamentally reshape rather than simply modify Western-derived educational technologies.

Cultural and contextual adaptations for Vietnamese EFL classrooms

Three distinct adaptation strategies emerged from Vietnamese instructors’ proposed framework modifications, each addressing different implementation barriers while collectively revealing the inadequacy of technological solutions to pedagogical challenges. Assessment alignment dominated modification discussions, transforming portfolios from reflective learning tools into examination preparation mechanisms – a pragmatic response that exposes the fundamental contradiction between process-oriented AI integration and product-focused evaluation systems. This instrumental approach contradicts the framework’s learning-centered philosophy, suggesting what Truong and Nguyen (2024) identify as the paradoxical nature of educational reform in Vietnam, where innovative practices must ultimately serve traditional assessment regimes. The portfolio transformation illustrates how institutional constraints force educators to subvert pedagogical intentions, raising questions about whether adaptation represents optimization or capitulation to systemic limitations.

Tiered implementation strategies addressing large-class realities demonstrate sophisticated resource allocation thinking yet simultaneously reveal the framework’s elite educational assumptions. The rotation systems enabling personalized guidance within mass education contexts represent what might be termed “pedagogical triage” – strategic resource deployment that preserves framework benefits for select students while maintaining surface compliance for institutional requirements. This segmented approach contradicts Kong et al.’s (2024) assumption of uniform implementation, exposing how resource constraints force educators to choose between pedagogical idealism and educational equity. The advanced-student mentoring systems documented in workshops suggest that Vietnamese instructors intuitively understand peer learning dynamics better than the original framework designers, yet their solutions remain constrained by structural inequalities that technology cannot address.

Cultural contextualization efforts produced the most theoretically provocative adaptations, challenging the assumption that globalized education requires standardized pedagogical approaches. The collaborative development of Vietnamese-specific prompt banks incorporating indirect communication patterns represents what Canagarajah (2023) describes as epistemic resistance to Western academic discourse norms. These “cultural bridges” attempt to preserve authentic Vietnamese communication styles while meeting international academic expectations, creating what appears to be successful

cultural-technological synthesis. However, this adaptation strategy raises deeper questions about whether such accommodations strengthen or ultimately undermine local pedagogical traditions. The emphasis on “respectful disagreement styles” and “relationship with authoritative sources” suggests that Vietnamese instructors are not merely adapting Western frameworks but actively protecting alternative knowledge construction processes.

The proposed collective reflection component constitutes the most significant theoretical challenge to the framework’s individualistic foundations, introducing communal accountability mechanisms absent from Western self-regulated learning models. This addition questions whether optimization requires fundamental reconceptualization rather than surface modification. Vietnamese instructors’ emphasis on collective responsibility in AI use suggests alternative ethical frameworks that prioritize community wellbeing over individual achievement – a perspective that directly challenges the framework’s Western philosophical assumptions. These adaptations collectively indicate that effective optimization demands not technological flexibility but epistemological transformation, recognizing that educational frameworks embody cultural values that cannot be separated from their pedagogical functions.

Theoretical and practical implications

This investigation fundamentally challenges Kong et al.’s (2024) framework design by exposing its embedded Western individualistic assumptions that prove incompatible with collectivist educational traditions. The documented transformation of peer review into community feedback reveals how the framework’s foundation in self-regulated learning theory (Zimmerman, 2002) fails to account for Vietnamese communal knowledge validation processes, necessitating theoretical reconceptualization rather than surface adaptation. The proposed seventh collective reflection component suggests that the original six-phase structure itself reflects cultural specificity rather than universal pedagogical logic, undermining claims of framework neutrality. Vietnamese instructors’ unconscious preservation of hierarchical patterns despite conscious innovation advocacy introduces “pedagogical double consciousness” – a theoretical contribution extending beyond Vietnamese contexts to illuminate how educators globally negotiate between technological imperatives and cultural values.

The security-based adoption patterns documented here directly contradict established technology acceptance models (Davis, 1989), indicating that institutional vulnerability rather than technological familiarity determines innovation willingness in hierarchical educational systems. This finding exposes fundamental gaps in Kong et al.’s implementation assumptions, which presume uniform educator receptivity regardless of professional security considerations. The documented cultural-technological dissonance challenges Berry’s (1997) linear acculturation model, suggesting that educational technology integration operates through competing impulses rather than coherent progression.

Practically, these findings demand reconceptualization of AI integration

policies that currently assume cultural neutrality in educational frameworks. The documented pedagogical triage strategies indicate that implementation requires differentiated approaches acknowledging resource constraints rather than Kong et al.'s uniform application model. Educational leaders must recognize that innovation anxiety stems from professional security concerns, necessitating institutional reforms before meaningful technology integration can occur. The broader implications question whether Western-derived educational frameworks can achieve authentic global implementation without epistemological transformation, suggesting that effective cross-cultural technology integration requires theoretical humility rather than technological confidence in universalized solutions.

Conclusion

This investigation examined Vietnamese EFL instructors' perceptions of the 6-P framework and their proposed adaptations for integrating generative AI in academic writing instruction. Three interconnected themes emerged: cultural reconceptualization of framework components, professional authority anxieties amid institutional constraints, and pragmatic adaptations addressing implementation barriers. These findings directly answer the research questions by demonstrating that Vietnamese instructors perceive the framework through cultural lenses that prioritize evaluation over production while simultaneously experiencing professional displacement anxiety, and by documenting specific adaptations including community feedback expansion, tiered implementation strategies, and collective reflection integration.

The study's theoretical contribution lies in exposing fundamental limitations in Kong et al.'s (2024) framework design, particularly its embedded Western individualistic assumptions that prove incompatible with collectivist educational traditions. The documented cultural-technological dissonance and pedagogical double consciousness extend beyond Vietnamese contexts, challenging technological universalism in educational AI discourse. The security-based adoption patterns contradict established technology acceptance theories, while the proposed collective reflection component questions the framework's theoretical foundation in individual self-regulated learning.

These findings demand epistemological transformation rather than surface localization in cross-cultural technology integration. Future research should examine how other collectivist educational cultures negotiate similar tensions between global technological imperatives and local educational values. This investigation contributes to developing more equitable AI integration approaches by demonstrating that effective cross-cultural implementation requires recognition of educational diversity rather than standardized technological solutions that perpetuate cultural hegemonies.

References

- Al-Sofi, B. B. M. A. (2024). Artificial intelligence-powered tools and academic writing: to use or not to use ChatGPT. *Saudi Journal of Language Studies*, 4(3), 145–161. <https://doi.org/10.1108/sjls-06-2024-0029>
- Azamfirei, R., Kudchadkar, S. R., & Fackler, J. (2023). Large language models and the perils of their hallucinations. *Critical Care*, 27(1), 1–2. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13054-023-04393-x>
- Berry, J. W. (1997). Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation. *Applied Psychology*, 46(1), 5–34. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.1997.tb01087.x>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Canagarajah, S. (2023). Decolonizing academic writing pedagogies for multilingual students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 58(1), 280–306. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3231>
- Cooper, G. (2023). Examining science education in ChATGPT: An exploratory study of generative artificial intelligence. *Journal of Science Education and Technology*, 32(3), 444–452. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10956-023-10039-y>
- Cotton, D. R. E., Cotton, P. A., & Shipway, J. R. (2023). Chatting and cheating: Ensuring academic integrity in the era of ChatGPT. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 61(2), 228–239. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2023.2190148>
- Crawford, J., Cowling, M., & Allen, K. (2023). Leadership is needed for ethical ChatGPT: Character, assessment, and learning using artificial intelligence (AI). *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice*, 20(3), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.53761/1.20.3.02>
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing Among Five Approaches*. SAGE Publications.
- Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly*, 13(3), 319–340. <https://doi.org/10.2307/249008>
- De Roock, R. S. (2024). To become an object among objects: Generative artificial “intelligence,” writing, and linguistic white supremacy. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.569>
- Dimmock, C., Tan, C. Y., Nguyen, D., Tran, T. A., & Dinh, T. T. (2021). Implementing education system reform: Local adaptation in school reform of teaching and learning. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 80, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2020.102302>
- Dutra, S. V. O., Chee, V., & Clochesy, J. M. (2023). Adapting an educational software internationally: Cultural and linguistic adaptation. *Education Sciences*, 13(3), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13030237>
- Eke, D. O. (2023). ChatGPT and the rise of generative AI: Threat to academic integrity? *Journal of Responsible Technology*, 13, 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrt.2023.100060>
- Feenberg, A. (2017). *Technosystem: The social life of reason*. Harvard University Press.

- Felix, J. J. (2020). Commentary: Modernity and reflexivity in Vietnamese higher education – Situating the role of the ideological, capacity building, learning organisation, and policy reform. In *Higher education in market-oriented socialist Vietnam: New players, discourses, and practices* (pp. 107–122). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Fyfe, P. (2023). How to cheat on your final paper: Assigning AI for student writing. *AI & Society*, 38(4), 1395–1405.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-022-01397-z>
- Gudykunst, W. B., & Mody, B. (2002). *Handbook of international and intercultural communication*. SAGE Publications.
- Halkiopoulou, C., & Gkintoni, E. (2024). Leveraging AI in e-learning: Personalized learning and adaptive assessment through cognitive neuropsychology – A systematic analysis. *Electronics*, 13(18), 1–30.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/electronics13183762>
- Hall, E. T. (1981). *Beyond culture*. Anchor Press.
- Hans, E., & Hans, A. (2024). Issues and practice of philosophy of education in social life. In *Educational Philosophy and Sociological Foundation of Education* (pp. 23–48). IGI Global.
- Ho, T. L. U. (2024). Problems with academic writing encountered by EFL postgraduate students at a university in the Mekong Delta. *International Journal of Language Instruction*, 3(1), 1–16.
<https://doi.org/10.54855/ijli.24311>
- Hua, H. H., & Le, T. T. (2025). Understanding the representation of intercultural competence in EFL education: Strategies among Vietnamese teachers. *Cogent Arts and Humanities*, 12(1), 1–17.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2025.2474819>
- Jiang, R. (2022). How does artificial intelligence empower EFL teaching and learning nowadays? *A review on artificial intelligence in the EFL context*. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1049401>
- Kong, S., Lee, J. C., & Tsang, O. (2024). A pedagogical design for self-regulated learning in academic writing using text-based generative artificial intelligence tools: 6-P pedagogy of plan, prompt, preview, produce, peer-review, portfolio-tracking. *Research and Practice in Technology Enhanced Learning*, 19, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.58459/rptel.2024.19030>
- Kong, S., & Yang, Y. (2024). A Human-centered learning and teaching framework using generative artificial intelligence for self-regulated learning development through domain knowledge learning in K–12 settings. *IEEE Transactions on Learning Technologies*, 17, 1588–1599.
<https://doi.org/10.1109/tlt.2024.3392830>
- Lam, K. N. (2024). An investigation of the difficulties in academic writing with the first-year English-majored students: The case of a university in Vietnam. *International Journal of Science and Management Studies (IJSMS)*, 7(2), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.51386/25815946/ijsms-v7i2p101>

- Le, T. T., & Pham, T. T. (2024). Navigating transitions: Vietnamese students' experiences and challenges in the first year of higher education. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 44(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02601370.2024.2404027>
- 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>
- Lodge, J. M., Thompson, K., & Corrin, L. (2023). Mapping out a research agenda for generative artificial intelligence in tertiary education. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 39(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.8695>
- Mahapatra, S. (2024). Impact of ChatGPT on ESL students' academic writing skills: A mixed methods intervention study. *Smart Learning Environments*, 11(9), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-024-00295-9>
- Mai, L. X., & Thao, L. T. (2022). English language teaching pedagogical reforms in Vietnam: External factors in light of teachers' backgrounds. *Cogent Education*, 9(1), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186x.2022.2087457>
- 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, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100313>
- Nguyen, A., Le, T. T. D., Nguyen, N. D., & Le, D. Q. T. (2025). Innovating Vietnam's values education through the lens of Confucian philosophy. *Research and Extension Journal*, 9(1), 22–43. <https://doi.org/10.62960/dmmmsu.v9i1.59>
- Nguyen, H. H. (2025). Tertiary EFL teachers' experience in ICT integration during the COVID-19 pandemic in Vietnam. *Taiwan Journal of TESOL*, 22(1), 27–64. [https://doi.org/10.30397/TJTESOL.202504_22\(1\).0002](https://doi.org/10.30397/TJTESOL.202504_22(1).0002)
- Nguyen, T. N., & Truong, H. T. (2025). Trends and emerging themes in the effects of generative artificial intelligence in education: A systematic review. *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics Science and Technology Education*, 21(4), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.29333/ejmste/16124>
- Nguyen, V. T., & Sit, H. (2024). In-service teacher professional development: Challenges and opportunities for innovating the trichronous modality of delivery in Vietnam's EFL education. *Education Sciences*, 15(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15010019>
- Nyaaba, M., Zhai, X., & Faison, M. Z. (2024). Generative AI for culturally responsive science assessment: A conceptual framework. *Education Sciences*, 14(12), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14121325>
- Pham, V. P. H., & Le, A. Q. (2024). ChatGPT in language learning: Perspectives from Vietnamese students in Vietnam and the USA. *International Journal of Language Instruction*, 3(2), 59–72. <https://doi.org/10.54855/ijli.24325>
- Phi, H. N., & Nguyen, B. D. (2022). An investigation into third-year ELT students' perceptions of using ChatGPT as an AI writing-assistant tool: A case study in Vietnam. *International Journal of Arts Humanities and Social Sciences Studies*, 9(5), 41–55.

- Phung, D. H., & Le, N. V. A. (2024). A study on the difficulties encountered by senior students of English in writing essay task 2. *European Journal of English Language Teaching*, 9(1), 1–24.
<https://doi.org/10.46827/ejel.v9i1.5316>
- Rudolph, J., Tan, S., & Tan, S. (2023). ChatGPT: Bullshit spewer or the end of traditional assessments in higher education? *Journal of Applied Learning & Teaching*, 6(1), 342–363. <https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2023.6.1.9>
- Selwyn, N. (2013). *Education in a digital world: Global Perspectives on Technology and Education*. Routledge.
- Song, C., Shin, S., & Shin, K. (2023). Optimizing foreign language learning in virtual reality: A comprehensive theoretical framework based on constructivism and cognitive load theory (VR-CCL). *Applied Sciences*, 13(23), 1–31. <https://doi.org/10.3390/app132312557>
- Tran, T., Ho, M., Pham, T., Nguyen, M., Nguyen, K. P., Vuong, T., Nguyen, T. T., Nguyen, T., Nguyen, T., Khuc, Q., La, V., & Vuong, Q. (2020). How digital natives learn and thrive in the digital age: Evidence from an emerging economy. *Sustainability*, 12(9), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12093819>
- Truong, K. D., & Nguyen, A. T. (2024). Western-trained Vietnamese teachers' EFL writing instruction: A collaborative autoethnography of tensions, emotion, and agency from an activity theoretical perspective. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 65, 1–15.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2024.101132>
- Truong, T. D., & Hallinger, P. (2017). Exploring cultural context and school leadership: Conceptualizing an indigenous model of có uy school leadership in Vietnam. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 20(5), 539–561. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2015.1105388>
- Tweed, R. G., & Lehman, D. R. (2002). Learning considered within a cultural context: Confucian and Socratic approaches. *American Psychologist*, 57(2), 89–99. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066x.57.2.89>
- Vuong, H. T. P., Tran, G. T. H., Van Ha, Q., & Pham, H. T. (2024). Teacher policies in Southeast Asia: A comprehensive review and recommendations for Vietnam. *Multidisciplinary Reviews*, 7(9), 1–7.
<https://doi.org/10.31893/multirev.2024195>
- Vygotsky, L. S., & Cole, M. (1978). *Mind in society: Development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Wang, Y., & Li, L. M. W. (2024). Relationships between parental involvement in homework and learning outcomes among elementary school students: The moderating role of societal collectivism–individualism. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 94(3), 881–896.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12692>
- Zalli, E. (2024). Globalization and Education: Exploring the exchange of ideas, values, and traditions in promoting cultural understanding and global citizenship. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research and Development*, 11(1), 55–62. <https://doi.org/10.56345/ijrdv11n1s109>

- Zhang, X., & Umeanowai, K. O. (2024). Exploring the transformative influence of artificial intelligence in EFL context: A comprehensive bibliometric analysis. *Education and Information Technologies*, 30, 3183–3198.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-12937-z>
- Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview. *Theory Into Practice*, 41(2), 64–70.
https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4102_2



The
JALT CALL
Journal
vol. 21 no.2