

An Analysis of Vietnamese Non-English-Majored Students' Perceptions of the Teacher Feedback and ChatGPT-Based Automated Feedback in Learning English Writing Skills through Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions

Tin Hoang Ho^{*}, Dung Hoang Le



Use your smartphone to scan this QR code and download this article

University of Social Sciences and Humanities, VNU-HCM, Vietnam

Correspondence

Tin Hoang Ho, University of Social Sciences and Humanities, VNU-HCM, Vietnam

Email: us.hoangtin@gmail.com

History

- Received: 24-02-2026
- Revised: 23-07-2026
- Accepted: 31-08-2026
- Published Online: 28-09-2026

DOI :<https://doi.org/10.32508/vnuhcmjssh.v10i3.1323>



Check for updates

Copyright

© VNUHCM Journal. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license.

ABSTRACT

Despite their importance, the use of automated feedback and teacher feedback has been debated globally and in Vietnam. Moreover, few studies examined Vietnamese students' perception of the automated feedback compared with teacher feedback through a cultural lens. Therefore, the present study aims to investigate how Vietnamese non-English-majored students perceive teacher feedback and automated feedback which is based on generative artificial intelligence in learning English writing skills through the six cultural dimensions suggested by Hofstede. This qualitative exploratory study, which was undertaken at a selected university language center in Ho Chi Minh City, collected reflection papers from 22 non-English-majored students at A2 level of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages and held interviews with 10 of them to discover their perceptions of the teacher feedback and automated feedback. The data were subjected to thematic analysis and compared using Hofstede's cultural dimensions, given the assumptions that the teacher feedback and automated feedback in Vietnam may be affected by such cultural dimensions. Six major findings include greater trust in the teacher feedback than the automated feedback; students' need for feedback confirmation from external sources and greater individualization of the teacher feedback compared to the automated feedback; greater support for achieving high writing score by the teacher feedback in comparison to the automated feedback; more clarity from the teacher feedback than the automated feedback; students' need for combining the automated feedback and teacher feedback for long-term English writing improvement; and students' concern about over-dependence on the automated feedback but less dependence on the teacher feedback. These findings provide insights into six cultural dimensions underlying Vietnamese non-English-majored students' perceptions of feedback practices, which suggests that automated feedback can be combined with teacher feedback to support students' English writing skills.

Key words: automated feedback, English writing skills, Hofstede's cultural dimensions, students' perceptions, teacher feedback

INTRODUCTION

Background to the study

English writing skills are one of the most necessary skills that are helpful to facilitate communication and collaboration in the international workplace¹ and for English language learners in Vietnam². During their English writing instruction, Vietnamese students often encounter numerous errors in their writing, including mechanics, grammar, vocabulary, ideas, and organization³.

To support students in their English writing, feedback is a crucial element of the writing process, providing guidance, correction, and encouraging students to revise and improve their drafts⁴. Specifically, teacher feedback helps students to improve

both lower-level and higher-level concerns in students' writings⁵. However, this type of feedback is limited in providing timely information on students' writing performance, especially in large-size classes⁶. To address this, automated feedback can be immediate, which helps teachers save time in giving feedback on students' writings⁷. This feedback type is suggested to be used complementarily with the teacher feedback in teaching English writing, especially when Artificial Intelligence is integrated into modern education⁸.

Statement of the problem

Giving feedback is one of the significant steps in teaching English writing. With the emergence of technological advancements in education, the automated

Cite this article : Ho T H, Le D H. **An Analysis of Vietnamese Non-English-Majored Students' Perceptions of the Teacher Feedback and ChatGPT-Based Automated Feedback in Learning English Writing Skills through Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions.** *VNUHCMJ. Soc. Sci. Humanit*2026; 10(3):4228-4238.

feedback has increasingly become popular. Different perspectives and arguments around the issue of using the automated feedback against the teacher feedback in teaching English have been proposed in the literature and practices, both in Vietnam and other countries. Moreover, existing research has explored the effectiveness of the teacher feedback and automated feedback in improving students' English writing. However, little is known about how Vietnamese students perceive the automated feedback in relation to the teacher feedback in learning English writing from a cultural perspective. Furthermore, limited attention is paid to Vietnamese learners, particularly non-English majors. More importantly, the role of Hofstede's cultural dimensions in shaping Vietnamese learners' feedback preferences and attitudes remains underexplored. Therefore, to fill in these gaps, the present study aims to investigate Vietnamese non-English-majored students' perceptions of the automated feedback and teacher feedback in learning English writing through an analysis of Hofstede's cultural dimensions. To achieve this aim, the following research question needs to be answered: "To what extent do Vietnamese non-English-majored students perceive the teacher feedback and automated feedback in learning English writing through Hofstede's cultural dimensions?"

LITERATURE REVIEW

Hofstede's cultural dimensions of Vietnamese culture

Hofstede's cultural dimensions theory

National culture is 'the collective programming of the mind which distinguishes the members of one group or category of people from another' [9, p.5]. Geert Hofstede et al.¹⁰ offer a six-cultural-dimensions framework which explains differences in national culture across countries, consisting of six cultural dimensions, namely individualism/collectivism, uncertainty avoidance, power distance, masculinity/femininity, short-term/long-term orientation, and indulgence/restraint. First, relating to individualism-collectivism, collectivism refers to the power of a group over the individuals, stressing harmony and cooperation among members in a learning environment^{10,11}. In contrast, individualism refers to loose ties between individuals, focusing on the single social unit, independence, individual achievement, and uniqueness^{10,11}. The second dimension, uncertainty avoidance, refers to the extent of tolerance of ambiguous or unknown situations¹⁰. High uncertainty avoidance cultures show intolerance of deviant ideas,

behaviors, resisting change, and adhering to traditional social protocols¹⁰. On the contrary, low uncertainty avoidance people tend to be tolerant of unknown situations, being flexible and willing to take risks, as opposed to rules¹⁰. Thirdly, power distance is defined as 'the extent to which the less powerful members of institutions and organizations within a country expect and accept that power is distributed unequally'^{10,11}. High power distance people tend to show respect to and dependence on authoritative people; conversely, a low power distance culture suggests minimizing inequality and consensus decision making. Fourthly, Hofstede¹⁰ characterizes masculine culture as displaying assertive, tough and competitive traits, whereas feminine culture tends to be more modest, tender, and concerned with the quality of life. Next, 'long-term orientation stands for the fostering of virtues oriented toward future rewards - in particular, perseverance and thrift' [10, p.239]. The contrasting dimension, short-term orientation, emphasizes the fostering of virtues related to the past and present - specifically, respect for tradition, preservation of "face," and fulfilling social obligations [10, p.239]. Finally, the sixth dimension, indulgence-restraints, is conceptualized as follows: Indulgence stands for a tendency to allow relatively free gratification of basic and natural human desires related to enjoying life and having fun. Its opposite pole, restraint, reflects a conviction that such gratification needs to be curbed and regulated by strict social norms [10, p.281]. In short, these six cultural dimensions were useful for understanding differences between cultures around the world, especially Vietnam and other countries' cultures.

Hofstede's cultural dimensions of Vietnamese culture

According to *Geerthofstede.com*¹² and Culture Factor Group¹³, Vietnam scored 70 points for power distance, 20 points for individualism in 2015 and 30 points in 2023, 40 points for motivation towards achievement and success, 30 points for uncertainty avoidance, 57 points for long-term orientation, and 35 points for indulgence. These scores are synonymous with the fact that Vietnam is a culture with high power distance, high collectivism, high femininity, high certainty avoidance, high long-term orientation, and high restraint. These cultural dimensions can shape students' perception of the feedback they receive¹⁴, thereby affecting how they interpret and respond to it because a person's perception is described as the process of interpreting the world¹⁵ so that the

person can form a mental representation of the world and respond to it¹⁶. Therefore, students' perceptions of feedback can be affected by cultural dimensions; hence, it needs to be understood not only in terms of its linguistic accuracy but also in relation to the cultural context in which it is delivered.

Vietnamese students' perception of feedback practices

The teacher feedback and Vietnamese students' perception of the teacher feedback in learning English writing

The teacher feedback has traditionally played an essential role in improving students' English writing skills in the Vietnamese context. Students' perception of this feedback type can be influenced by Vietnamese culture. Specifically, in a Vietnamese educational context where teachers are positioned as knowledge holders, students are overly dependent on the teacher feedback as a reliable source to improve their writing¹⁷⁻¹⁹, and they could apply corrections in their direct teachers' feedback straightaway¹⁷. Similarly, Indonesian students who live in a high power distance and collectivist culture value the teacher feedback more than peer feedback, but are willing to disagree with their peers' comments¹⁴. Additionally, Vietnamese students prefer individualized feedback sessions with teachers so that they can develop stronger teacher-student relationships, which boost their confidence and motivation²⁰. Moreover, constructive comments in the teacher feedback can be interesting to students²¹. Likewise, teachers' praise in the feedback can boost their confidence²¹ and motivation^{8,17,18,21}. Correspondingly, a preferable teacher feedback should identify all writing errors¹⁸, and have detailed explanations or direct correction forms^{8,21} so that they can know to revise their drafts¹⁹. Otherwise, students could feel stress and demotivation when spending a great deal of time on their feedback, but do not understand the teacher's feedback¹⁷. In addition, feedback from instructors helps students to avoid the same mistakes, and revise their drafts more accurately¹⁷ and improve more complex aspects of writing beyond grammar²⁰. In short, the teacher feedback is trustworthy to Vietnamese students, to improve student-teacher relationships, and should be supportive, encouraging, clear, and detailed enough for students to revise their writing, avoid the same mistakes, and develop higher-level concerns of English writing skills in the future. These perceptions could be represented by Hofstede's five cultural dimensions, including high power distance, high collectivism, high femininity, high certainty avoidance, and

high long-term orientation in Vietnamese culture.

The automated feedback and Vietnamese students' perception of the automated feedback in learning English writing

Despite its effectiveness in improving students' writing skills, the teacher feedback has some limitations regarding its delay and teachers' heavy workload, especially in big classes⁶. Hence, recent advances in educational technology have introduced the automated feedback, which is information given on students' performance generated by the computer based on techniques such as artificial intelligence and natural language processing²². This feedback type can be immediately provided, so it may be an alternative or complementary feedback source to the teacher feedback. This raises concerns about how culture can shape Vietnamese students' perception of non-human feedback, particularly in contexts where teachers have traditionally been the primary source of instruction in Vietnam.

Moreover, while traditional automated writing evaluation tools such as Grammarly primarily provide rule-based or fixed-rubric-based feedback, ChatGPT, as a generative AI model, is capable of producing interactive feedback which can respond to users' questions or instructions²³. Despite their differences, literature on automated writing evaluation tools like Grammarly remains relevant and applicable to the present study since it provides a foundational understanding of how the automated feedback influences learners' writing processes and perceptions. Therefore, the current study extends research on the automated feedback by examining a more advanced and recent form of AI-based feedback using generative AI feedback from ChatGPT which may address limitations of traditional automated writing evaluation systems.

Notably, the literature revealed that the automated feedback tools such as *Grammarly* and generative AI tools are not perceived as reliable as teachers^{24,25}, peers^{24,26}, or self-judgement²⁴. Additionally, it lacks human interaction, guidance²⁶, less contextualized or individualized^{24,27}. Moreover, the automated feedback can boost students' confidence and improve writing motivation²¹ and be less risky²⁴. Furthermore, some students consider the automated feedback straightforward, while others find it difficult to understand²⁵, and it can lead them to frustration when there are several grammatical faults²¹. Additionally, the automated feedback can lack thorough explanations of the students' writing errors²⁷. In addition, using the automated feedback encourages students to learn from their mistakes²⁸ but can hinder

their grammar competency if they rely on the automated feedback tools²⁹. Overall, the automated feedback can be non-threatening, convenient, develop learner autonomy, boost students' writing confidence, and help them avoid repeated errors. However, it can be impersonalized and unreliable compared to human feedback, lack explanations and cause students' frustration with errors. Further compounding this limitation, its clarity and ability to improve students' English writing skills in the long term are limited to some extent. These students' perceptions could be explained by six Vietnamese cultural dimensions regarding high power distance, high collectivism, high femininity, high certainty avoidance, high long-term orientation, and high restraint.

Summary of key themes of students' perceptions of the teacher feedback and automated feedback in the literature

From the literature review, how students perceived the teacher feedback and automated feedback regarding Hofstede's cultural dimensions were shown in Table 1 which is synthesized by the present authors from the previous studies conducted by Nguyen⁸, Fithriani¹⁴, Nguyen¹⁷, Nguyen and Nguyen¹⁸, Pham and Du¹⁹, Nguyen²⁰, Nguyen²¹, Henderson et al.²⁴, Le et al.²⁵, Ha and Ho²⁶, Luu et al.²⁷, Aruna and Sarosa²⁹.

The table 1 summarizing students' perceptions aligned with Hofstede's cultural dimension in literature review is not used as a conceptual framework to design research tools in the current study but as a useful theoretical guide which can be used as an interpretive framework applied to interpret the research data in the analysis.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Research design

The current study employs an exploratory qualitative research design to understand Vietnamese students' perception of the teacher feedback and automated feedback in learning English writing. To conduct the study, 22 non-English-majored first-year student-participants at the A2 level according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages were selected via purposive sampling from the English language center in the University of Social Sciences and Humanities – Viet Nam National University Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. These participants were chosen as an outcome of the intervention or part of the study design in which both the automated feedback and teacher feedback were used for their writing revisions to improve students' English

writing skills rather than a pre-existing selection criterion. This ensured that all participants had sufficient familiarity with both the teacher feedback and ChatGPT-based automated feedback, thereby providing valuable insights into their perceptions of the two feedback types.

Before the data collection process, these participants were invited to write 120-word paragraphs. Then, they were trained to use ChatGPT to receive the automated feedback on their first paragraphs. After that, they received the teacher feedback to revise their first paragraphs and produce their final drafts. To collect data, the study uses two research tools, namely students' reflection papers and interviews. Specifically, after experiencing the two types of feedback, they write reflection papers about the benefits or limitations of the two feedback types. Later, 10 participants were invited to be interviewed to collect in-depth information about Vietnamese students' perception of the automated feedback and teacher feedback in learning English writing. The interview audio was then transcribed and then checked by the researcher.

Data analysis procedure

To achieve the research aim, the qualitative data underwent thematic analysis following Braun and Clarke (2006)'s four-step approach³⁰. Firstly, both students' reflections and interviews transcriptions regarding the automated feedback and teacher feedback in learning English writing skills were read multiple times to familiarize the researchers with data familiarization and initial understanding of data depth and patterns. Following this, the significant categories related to the research question were noted and coded line-by-line. After this, similar or related codes were clustered into meaningful themes. In the four step, the iterative evaluation of the themes regarding benefits and limitations of the teacher feedback and ChatGPT-based automated feedback helped the researchers assess their internal coherence, consistency, and distinctiveness. Later, the themes which represented the benefits and limitations of both the feedback types were finalized. Finally, the themes and categories of data were reported with quotations.

During the analysis procedure, initial coding was conducted inductively, which enabled themes to emerge from the data. Subsequently, a deductive approach was employed to map the identified themes onto Hofstede's cultural dimensions. The mapping was guided by predefined indicators for each dimension in Table 1 in the literature. Particularly, the level of stu-

Table 1: Summary of key themes of students' perceptions of the teacher feedback and automated feedback in previous studies [Source: authors]

Hofstede's cultural dimensions	Students' perception of the teacher feedback	Students' perception of the automated feedback
Power distance	Passive acceptance of the teacher feedback ^{14,17-19}	Limited trust in the automated feedback ²⁴⁻²⁶ Trust in the teacher feedback ^{24,25}
Individualism – Collectivism	Preference for personalized teacher–student interaction ²⁰	Reliance on teachers and peers to confirm the automated feedback ²⁴⁻²⁶ Belief in self-judgement ²⁹ Perceived lack of human interaction ²⁷ Perceived lack of individualized feedback ^{24,27}
Masculinity – Femininity	Preference for supportive feedback ^{8,17,18,21} Encouragement and motivation from the teacher feedback ^{17,21}	Perceived motivational support from the automated feedback ²¹ Non-threatening feedback ²⁴
Uncertainty avoidance	Preference for clear feedback ^{20,21} Perceived stress due to unclear the teacher feedback ¹⁸	Perceived error overload ²¹ Preference for straightforward feedback ^{25,27} Limited thorough explanations ²⁵
Long-term orientation	Perceived support students in avoiding repeated errors ^{17,19} Perceived support students' development of higher-order concerns ²⁰	Support students in avoiding repeated errors ²¹
Indulgence – Restraint	(none)	Concern about over-dependence on the automated feedback ²⁹

students' acceptance of or trust in feedback were related for power distance. Next, the level of students' preference for external sources were connected to collectivism-individualism. Thirdly, whether students' preference for feedback's role in arousing students' emotions concerns masculinity-femininity dimension. Moreover, codes reflecting feedback clarity or ambiguity were categorized under uncertainty avoidance. Furthermore, students' future use of and their level of dependence on the feedback related to long-term orientation and indulgence–restraint dimensions respectively. Each discovered theme was examined and compared against these indicators to determine its alignment with the corresponding cultural dimension, which helped to answer how culture affects Vietnamese students' perceptions of the automated and teacher feedback in English writing. After all, to enhance the trustworthiness of the analysis, peer debriefing was conducted with a disinterested researcher to review the coding scheme and themes regarding the students' perceptions. Discrepancies were discussed until consensus was reached.

RESULTS

The analysis of interviews with 10 participants and 22 students' reflections regarding students' perception

of the automated feedback and teacher feedback in learning English writing revealed that six Hofstede's cultural dimensions affected their perceptions as follows.

Power distance: Greater trust in the teacher feedback than in the automated feedback

The first finding through qualitative data is that non-English-major Vietnamese students trust the teacher feedback more than the automated feedback, especially for higher-level concerns. In particular, 8 in 10 interviewed students (Is) expressed their greater trust in the teacher feedback than in the automated feedback. For example, two interviewed students expressed:

'I believe in teacher feedback most because teachers have academic knowledge and experience in teaching English writing, feedback giving, or writing assessment' (I10).

'Although ChatGPT-based automated feedback comes from various sources of information, it does need confirmation from teachers' (I8).

Simultaneously, 8 interviewed students revealed that the automated feedback from ChatGPT does not provide useful information regarding the content and organization of students' writing in comparison with the

teacher feedback. For instance, interviewed student 5 stated:

‘Feedback on writing content is ensured by teachers rather than automated feedback, despite its effectiveness in identifying spelling errors’ (I5).

Likewise, interviewed student 3 clarified:

‘ChatGPT-based automated feedback can address errors regarding mechanics and grammar, but it does not provide sufficient and useful information about expanding ideas like teacher feedback’ (I3).

This was corroborated by 9 in 22 students’ reflections. For example, reflection student 16 expressed her trust in the teacher feedback, which is more comprehensive and reliable than the automated feedback. Overall, high power distance in Vietnam can make non-English-majored Vietnamese students credit the teacher feedback more than the automated feedback, with particular regard to writing content and organization.

Individualism – Collectivism: Students’ need for feedback confirmation from external sources except peers, and greater individualization of the teacher feedback compared to the automated feedback.

Vietnamese students showed their reluctance to peer feedback or confirmation compared to other sources such as teachers, self, other AI tools, and the internet. Specifically, 5 out of 10 interviewed students agreed with this idea, as one student said:

‘Peer feedback is quite time-consuming and not as important as teacher feedback’ (I3).

This is further explained by interviewed student 4:

‘My friends are shy and hesitate to give comments on my writings’ (I4).

Similarly, 10 in 22 students’ reflection showed students doubt their peers’ feedback quality, as illustrated by two reflection students (Rs):

‘Peers are only learners like me and they have the same language proficiency as me or even lower’ (R15).

‘Peers were reserved in giving feedback, giving indirect feedback or merely praise because they do not want to hurt others’ feelings’ (R22).

Additionally, interviewed student 6 expressed her belief in self:

‘When I receive feedback on my writings, I often check the appropriateness of the feedback, self-correct or revise them first before submitting them to teachers for confirmation’ (I6).

Echoing this approach, student 2 reported utilizing other AI tools or the internet as alternative reference sources whenever the automated feedback seemed

unreliable. Moreover, the qualitative data showed that teacher feedback is more individualized to their needs than the automated feedback. In particular, interviewed student 9 said:

‘Teachers understand which information is suitable to me while ChatGPT-based automated feedback is too general’ (I9).

In the same way, 7 out of 22 students’ reflections showed:

‘Teachers have a deeper understanding of the errors the students made’ (R19).

In short, as a result of the high power distance of Vietnamese culture, non-English-majored Vietnamese students tend to rely on various sources of information as reference, excluding peers, when they are suspicious of the feedback they receive, and they prefer teachers’ understanding of their students’ needs in their feedback.

Masculinity – Femininity: Greater support for achieving a high writing score from the teacher feedback compared to the automated feedback

Thirdly, the students’ interviews and reflections showed that the teacher feedback is better at helping students to gain higher scores in English writing. This idea is expressed by interviewed student 4, one of the three interviewed students who shared that the teacher feedback is more necessary for improving writing scores,

‘Teacher feedback helps me to improve writing scores better than automated feedback because the automated feedback flattered my writings too much and did not provide detailed information’ (I4).

This is supported by reflection student 17 who highlighted:

‘ChatGPT-based automated feedback cannot provide feedback that is suitable for the writing criteria of the exams’ (R17).

In addition, only one interviewed student shared, ‘teacher feedback made me feel safer to revise my writing in comparison to automated feedback’ (I2), which may be evidence of femininity, but needs more data for confirmation. Briefly, masculinity encourages the students to believe in the teacher feedback for achieving higher writing scores rather than the automated feedback, and the teacher feedback is potentially safer.

Uncertainty avoidance: More clarity from the teacher feedback than the automated feedback

3 in 10 interviews with students and 2 students' reflections indicated that interviewed students expressed the specificity and clarity of the teacher feedback in comparison with the automated feedback. To be precise, interviewed student 9 said:

'Automated feedback provides high-level vocabulary which makes it difficult for me to understand. Moreover, it does not provide any explanations or just non-specific explanations' (I9).

This is supported by reflection students 12 and 14 which indicated:

'Automated feedback is quite mechanical and general, lacking individualization' (R12, R14).

In brief, students expected clarity in the feedback they received, which contradicts the low uncertainty avoidance of Vietnamese culture, and they consider the teacher feedback clearer than the automated feedback.

Long-term orientation: A combination of the automated feedback and teacher feedback for improving English writing skills in the long term

The qualitative data from interviews revealed that all the students preferred the combination of the automated feedback and teacher feedback in learning English writing. Particularly, two interviewed students shared,

'Automated feedback is convenient in time, which helps the learners to receive immediate feedback and self-revise their English writings to a certain extent at any time rather than waiting for the teachers' comments' (I2).

'Lower-level concerns of writing can be addressed by automated feedback, which helps reduce teachers' workload and helps teachers' feedback focus more on higher-level concerns of English writing skills, such as content and organization' (I8).

This is aligned with 20 out of 22 students' reflections, showing the significant role of combining both the automated feedback and teacher feedback. For example, reflection student 16 expressed:

'The combination helped to improve my writing much better if the two types of feedback were used properly. The automated feedback could aid the teacher feedback because the frequency of teacher feedback cannot be lower than that of ChatGPT-based automated feedback' (R16).

In general, the long-term orientation of Vietnamese culture shapes non-English-majored Vietnamese students' willingness to combine traditional teacher feedback with innovative AI-based automated feedback to improve their English writing skills in the future.

Indulgence – Restraint: Students' concern about over-dependence on the automated feedback, but less dependence on teachers

Finally, students were worried about the misuse of automated feedback, but learner autonomy can be developed with the combination mode. In particular, despite its effectiveness in improving students' English writing, the automated feedback type can be risky if used improperly, as agreed by 3 reflection students. For instance, reflection student 17 said:

'If the learners overuse ChatGPT-based automated feedback, they can be reliant on the AI tool, leading them to copy and correct the errors mechanically but do not understand how to write in English' (R17).

Meanwhile, the teacher feedback can make students dependent if there is only the teacher feedback. For example, participant 2 reported:

'I relied on my teacher for feedback before this course' (I2).

However, the combination mode can develop students' autonomy in learning English writing skills. For instance, student 1, among 7 interviewed students, said:

'The combination made me less dependent on the teacher compared to using only teacher feedback' (I7). Correspondingly, reflection student 17 agreed with this idea,

'The use of ChatGPT-based automated feedback helps learners become more autonomous and not overly dependent on the teachers for feedback' (R17).

In brief, despite their concerns about over-dependence on the automated feedback, the students believe that they can develop more autonomy and be less reliant on the teachers in learning English writing skills.

DISCUSSION

Power distance: Greater trust in the teacher feedback than in the automated feedback

The present study found that the high power distance in Vietnamese culture led non-English-majored Vietnamese students to trust the teacher feedback with authority in the classroom more than the automated feedback. In the same way, Henderson et al.²⁴, Le et al.²⁵, and Ha and Ho²⁶ revealed that students have

less belief in the automated feedback than the teacher feedback. This aligns with the findings of Nguyen¹⁷, Nguyen and Nguyen¹⁸, Pham and Du¹⁹, and Fithriani¹⁴, who reported students' passive acceptance of the teacher feedback. This may be because the teacher feedback has long been used and respected, while AI-based automated feedback is still new to Vietnamese students.

Individualism – Collectivism: Students' need for feedback confirmation from external sources except peers, and greater individualization of the teacher feedback compared to the automated feedback.

Secondly, living in a collectivist culture made non-English-majored Vietnamese students find external sources of references, including teachers, self, other AI tools, and the internet, but excluding peers, when they encounter confusion in the feedback. This corroborates the findings of Henderson et al.²⁴, Le et al.²⁵, and Ha and Ho²⁶, revealing that teachers can serve as a reference, but diverges from these studies, which suggest that peers can be referred to when the automated feedback is vague to students. Moreover, the current study's findings are confirmed by Aruna and Sarosa²⁹, who found that an Indonesian student chose to self-correct errors rather than accept Grammarly's feedback, which did not match the context. This finding contrasts with the Vietnamese collectivist culture, where the interrelationships among members of a society are emphasized.

Additionally, the collectivist culture of Vietnamese culture is connected with non-English-majored Vietnamese students' preference for individualization from the teacher feedback, which is confirmed by Nguyen²⁰ who discovered students wanted personalized interaction with teachers but diverges from the one by Henderson et al.²⁴ and Luu et al.²⁷ who found the automated feedback lack individualization but can be less risky and motivating.

Masculinity – Femininity: Greater support for achieving a high writing score from the teacher feedback compared to the automated feedback

Moreover, only one interviewed student reported the teacher feedback's role in making the student feel safer to revise my writing than the automated feedback, which contradicts the finding by Henderson et al.²⁴ and Luu et al.²⁷ who found the automated feedback can be less risky and motivating. Similarly, this result can be supported by Nguyen¹⁷, Nguyen

and Nguyen¹⁸, Nguyen²⁰ and Nguyen²¹ who indicate students' preference for praise in the teacher feedback. Meanwhile, the masculinist culture induces the participants to use the teacher feedback to achieve better writing scores compared to the automated feedback, which is not discussed in previous studies and can be further explored if the automated feedback and teacher feedback are combined.

Uncertainty avoidance: More clarity from the teacher feedback than the automated feedback

Fourthly, non-English-majored Vietnamese students would like to receive clear, detailed feedback, which is somewhat at odds with the low uncertainty avoidance in Vietnamese culture. Simultaneously, the teacher feedback and automated feedback can be clear to a certain extent, while some parts are vague. This strengthens the findings by Nguyen²⁰ and Nguyen²¹ on the teacher feedback's clarity, and those by Le et al.²⁵ and Luu et al.²⁷ on the automated feedback's clarity. Furthermore, the present study found that the teacher feedback is clearer than the automated feedback, a finding not reported in previous studies and warranting future confirmation and exploration.

Long-term orientation: A combination of the automated feedback and teacher feedback for improving English writing skills in the long term

Finally, the long-term orientation encouraged non-English-majored Vietnamese students to combine the automated feedback with the teacher feedback to improve their English writing skills over time. This is similar to the finding by Nguyen¹⁷ and Pham and Du¹⁹, who revealed that the teacher feedback helps students to avoid repeated errors, and supports Nguyen²¹'s discovery of the role of automated feedback in helping students to avoid the same errors in their English writings. Furthermore, the automated feedback aids the teacher feedback in addressing lower-level concerns, which helps teachers focus more on higher-level issues such as content and organization of English writing skills. This corresponds with the finding by Nguyen²⁰, who indicated that the teacher feedback aids in the development of higher-order concerns of writing skills.

Indulgence – Restraint: Students' concern about over-dependence on the automated feedback, but less dependence on teachers

In addition, the study found that students were worried about over-reliance on automated feedback tools,

and combining the automated feedback with the teacher feedback helped the students feel less dependent on teachers and develop their autonomy in learning English writing skills. This finding aligns with Aruna and Sarosa²⁹, who found that students expressed concern about reliance on the automated feedback tool. Simultaneously, the finding that students develop their autonomy is quite contradictory to the high level of restraint in Vietnamese culture. There, the role of the combination in reducing students' reliance on a single source of feedback needs further confirmation.

CONCLUSION

Summary of main findings

Non-English-majored Vietnamese students of the teacher feedback and automated feedback in learning English writing were identified according to six Hofstede's cultural dimensions. Firstly, in a high power distance culture, non-English-majored Vietnamese students perceive ChatGPT-based automated feedback as useful in revising their writings at lower-order concerns like mechanics, grammar, and vocabulary, but the teacher feedback is more comprehensive and better in addressing greater concerns of writing, such as content and organization. Next, the students prefer external sources for reference, such as teachers, self, other AI tools, and the internet, except for peers. Moreover, individualization of the teacher feedback is greater than that of the automated feedback regarding collectivism. With respect to the third dimension - masculinity/femininity, the students believe the teacher feedback helps them gain a higher writing score compared to the automated feedback. Regarding uncertainty avoidance, students expect clarity in the feedback they receive and consider that the teacher feedback is clearer than the automated feedback. Furthermore, Non-English-majored Vietnamese students suggested the integration of automated feedback and teacher feedback in addressing both lower-level and high-level concerns of English writing in the long term. Finally, the students were cautious in using the automated feedback to avoid over-reliance on the tool and perceived that the combination of automated feedback and teacher feedback made them less dependent on teachers and developed their learner autonomy in learning English writing skills.

Research significance and implications

The present study significantly contributes to the literature by providing more insights into how Hofstede's cultural dimensions affect Vietnamese students'

perception of the automated feedback and teacher feedback in learning English writing skills. Practically, the research helps English teachers to understand students' perceptions of the automated feedback and teacher feedback. Moreover, Vietnamese students can have a better understanding of an innovative ChatGPT-based automated feedback to support their learning English writing skills. Last but not least, from a pedagogical perspective, AI-based automated feedback should be positioned as a complementary tool rather than a replacement for teacher feedback, as Vietnamese learners still value teacher feedback for its contextualized guidance, emotional support, and reliability in the world, with the increasing development of AI tools. Therefore, the study strengthens the idea that English teachers should be encouraged to integrate AI-based automated feedback confidently rather than fear it.

Limitations and suggestions for further studies

The study is limited by its lack of quantitative data to support qualitative data and by the need for more qualitative data to confirm some potential findings. From a methodological standpoint, this study uses Hofstede's cultural framework to understand students' perceptions; hence, other cultural dimension frameworks by other authors could be further explored. Finally, the study's duration is limited, which could be expanded. In addition, future studies can re-examine students' perception of combining the automated feedback and teacher feedback, their benefits and limitations, explore teachers' perceptions, and focus on other language skills or aspects.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank the previous authors for their foundational concepts, meaningful findings, and inspiration for the present study to further investigate the issue. The authors also wish to thank the participants for their valuable support and information.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AI: Artificial intelligence

I: Interviewed student

R: Reflection student

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

This manuscript has no conflicts of interest.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION

Tin Hoang Ho and Dung Hoang Le both conceptualized the article and decided on research methodology and instruments. Tin Hoang Ho collected data, checked the database, ran data analyses when Dung Hoang Le supervised and led the research procedure. After that, Tin Hoang Ho and Dung Hoang Le both wrote the draft article and revised the article until it was finished.

REFERENCES

- Lee S, Schmidgall J. The importance of English writing skills in the international workplace [Internet]; 2020. Available from: <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED614404>.
- Huy PNN. The use of ChatGPT in EFL students as a learning assistant in their writing skills: A literature review. *ijaile*. 2025;2(1):38–45. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.54855/ijaile.25213>.
- Nguyen TN, Thach PN. Thực trạng kĩ năng viết tiếng Anh của sinh viên không chuyên tiếng Anh năm thứ hai, Trường Đại học Đồng Tháp; 2023. Available from: <https://scholar.dlu.edu.vn/thuvienso/bitstream/DLU123456789/209144/1/CVv326S2912023017.pdf>.
- Hyland K, Hyland F. Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language Teaching*. 2006;39(2):83–101. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0261444806003399>.
- Phuong HT, Phung VD. The effects of teacher interactive feedback on EFL students' paragraph writing performance. *EJEL* [Internet]; 2023. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.46827/ejel.v8i4.5014>; <https://oapub.org/edu/index.php/ejel/article/view/5014>.
- Loan NT, undefined Nguyen Thi Thuy Loan. A case study of combined peer-teacher feedback on paragraph writing at a university in Thailand. *Indonesian J Appl Linguist*. 2017;7(2):15. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v7i2.8345>.
- Kerr P. Philip Kerr's 30 Trends in ELT. S T, editor. Cambridge University Press; 2023. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009072564>.
- Ngân NT, undefined Nguyen Thi Ngan. Effective feedback in writing instruction from EFL students' perspectives. *TNU Journal of Science and Technology*. 2025;230(03):95–100. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.34238/tnu-jst.11891>.
- Hofstede G. Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind. London: McGraw-Hill; 1991.
- Hofstede GH, Hofstede GJ, Minkov M. Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind. New York: McGraw-Hill; 2010.
- Samovar LA, Porter RE, McDaniel ER, Roy CS. Communication between cultures. Australia Brazil Mexico Singapore United Kingdom United States Boston, Massachusetts: Cengage Learning; 2017.
- Hofstede G. Country comparison graphs [Internet]. Geert Hofstede; 2015. Available from: <https://geerthofstede.com/country-comparison-graphs/>.
- The Culture Factor Group. Country Comparison Tool [Internet]. The Culture Factor Group; 2025. Available from: <https://www.theculturefactor.com/country-comparison-tool>.
- Fithriani R. Cultural influences on students' perceptions of written feedback in L2 writing. *ftl* [Internet]; 2018. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.18196/ftl.3124>; <http://journal.umy.ac.id/index.php/FTL/article/view/3811>.
- McDonald SM. Perception: a concept analysis. *International Journal of Nursing Knowledge*. 2012;23(1):2–9. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2047-3095.2011.01198.x>.
- Ward MO, Grinstein G, Keim D. Interactive data visualization: Foundations, techniques, and applications [Internet]. A K Peters/CRC Press; 2015. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1201/b18379>; <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/9781482257380>.
- Anh NP. Written feedback in second language writing: perceptions of Vietnamese teachers and students. Open Access Te Herenga Waka-Victoria University of Wellington; 2020. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.26686/wgtn.17151842>.
- Nguyen NT, Nguyen TB. Vietnamese EFL students' perceptions and preferences for teachers' written feedback. *American Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Research*. 2024;8(3):23–9.
- Pham TT, Vinh DP. Students' perceptions of teachers' feedback on their writing skills at Tra Vinh University, Vietnam. *Tra Vinh University Journal of Science*. 2024;14:27–35. Available from: <https://journal.tvu.edu.vn/index.php/journal/article/view/33>.
- Nga NTL. Artificial intelligence in English writing feedback: A systematic review (2020 – 2025). *Vietnam Journal of Educational Sciences* [Internet]. 2025;21(11).
- Nguyen TL, undefined Nguyen Thi Lan. Analysis of teachers' written feedback on writing skills of third-year English-major students at a Vietnamese university. *JFS*. 2024;40(1):103–23. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.63023/2525-2445/jfs.ulis.5188>.
- Stevenson M, Phakiti A. The effects of computer-generated feedback on the quality of writing. *Assessing Writing*. 2014;19:51–65. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2013.11.007>.
- Fitria TN. Artificial intelligence (AI) technology in OpenAI ChatGPT application: A review of ChatGPT in writing English essay. *ELT Forum. Journal of English Language Teaching*. 2023;12(1):44–58. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.15294/elt.v12i1.64069>.
- Henderson M, Bearman M, Chung J, Fawns T, Shum SB, Matthews KE. Comparing Generative AI and teacher feedback: student perceptions of usefulness and trustworthiness. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*. 2025;p. 1–16. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2025.2502582>.
- Thi TPL, Nguyen LA, Thu PT, Mai DH, Hong NX. Automated writing evaluation (AWE) in Vietnamese EFL classrooms: enhancing skills and understanding student perception. *Journal of Science and Technology*. 2025;73(1):145–56.
- Nhi HY, Phuong HN. EFL postgraduate students' perceptions on the use of Grammarly and peer feedback to improve their academic writing skills. *ijte*. 2025;5(1):25–49. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.54855/ijte.25512>.
- Luu TM, Tran VN, Hieu NM, Tran TH. Perspectives of Vietnamese students and teachers on the effectiveness of Grammarly in English writing development. *Journal of English Teaching and Research*; 2025. Available from: <https://ojs.unpkediri.ac.id/index.php/inggris/article/view/23743>.
- Phi NH. Non majored students' perceptions of using Grammarly application to assist their English writing practice. *JS*; 2024. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.59266/houjs.2024.375>.
- Aruna HM, Sarosa T. Students' perception of automated written corrective feedback provided by Grammarly in enhancing writing skills. *ELER*. 2025;5(1):56–78. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.22515/elereviews.v5i1.11605>.
- Braun V, Clarke V. Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*. 2006;3(2):77–101. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>.

Nhận thức của sinh viên Việt Nam không chuyên tiếng Anh về nhận xét bài viết từ giảng viên và nhận xét bài viết tự động từ ChatGPT trong việc học kỹ năng viết tiếng Anh thông qua các chiều kích văn hóa của Hofstede

Tin Hoang Ho*, Dung Hoang Le



Use your smartphone to scan this QR code and download this article

Trường Đại học Khoa học Xã hội và Nhân văn, ĐHQG-HCM, Việt Nam

Liên hệ

Tin Hoang Ho, Trường Đại học Khoa học Xã hội và Nhân văn, ĐHQG-HCM, Việt Nam

Email: us.hoangtin@gmail.com

Lịch sử

- Ngày nhận: 24-02-2026
- Ngày sửa đổi: 23-07-2026
- Ngày chấp nhận: 31-08-2026
- Ngày đăng: 28-09-2026

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.32508/vnuhcmjssh.v10i3.1323>



Bản quyền

© Tạp chí ĐHQG-HCM. Đây là bài báo công bố mở được phát hành theo các điều khoản của the Creative Commons Attribution4.0 International license.

TÓM TẮT

Mặc dù đóng vai trò quan trọng, việc sử dụng nhận xét từ giảng viên và nhận xét tự động đã được tranh luận rộng rãi trên toàn cầu và tại Việt Nam. Hơn thế nữa, có ít nghiên cứu xem xét nhận thức của sinh viên Việt Nam về nhận xét từ giảng viên so với nhận xét tự động thông qua góc nhìn văn hoá. Bài nghiên cứu này nhằm tìm hiểu cách sinh viên Việt Nam không chuyên tiếng Anh nhận thức về nhận xét từ giảng viên và nhận xét tự động mà dựa trên trí tuệ nhân tạo tạo sinh trong quá trình học kỹ năng viết tiếng Anh, thông qua sáu chiều kích văn hoá của Hofstede. Bài nghiên cứu khám phá định tính này được tiến hành ở một trung tâm ngoại ngữ của trường đại học ở Thành phố Hồ Chí Minh, đã thu thập bài viết phản ánh từ 22 sinh viên không chuyên tiếng Anh ở trình độ A2 theo khung tham chiếu trình độ ngôn ngữ chung của Châu Âu và tiến hành phỏng vấn với 10 sinh viên. Dữ liệu từ 2 nguồn trên được phân tích theo chủ đề và các chủ đề sẽ được so sánh với nhau theo các chiều văn hoá của Hofstede. Sáu kết quả chính bao gồm: niềm tin vào nhận xét từ giảng viên lớn hơn nhận xét tự động; nhu cầu của sinh viên để xác nhận nhận xét từ nguồn bên ngoài, ngoại trừ bạn bè và tính cá nhân hoá của nhận xét từ giảng viên cao hơn nhận xét tự động; hỗ trợ cải thiện điểm số nhờ nhận xét từ giảng viên nhiều hơn nhận xét tự động; độ rõ ràng của nhận xét từ giảng viên cao hơn nhận xét tự động; nhu cầu kết hợp nhận xét tự động và nhận xét từ giảng viên để cải thiện kỹ năng viết tiếng Anh lâu dài; và sự e ngại của sinh viên nếu phụ thuộc vào nhận xét tự động và sinh viên trở nên ít phụ thuộc vào giảng viên. Những phát hiện này cung cấp thông tin về 6 chiều văn hoá ảnh hưởng đến nhận thức sinh viên về sử dụng nhận xét. Vì vậy, nhận xét tự động có thể kết hợp với nhận xét giáo viên để giúp sinh viên cải thiện kỹ năng viết tiếng Anh.

Từ khoá: nhận xét bài viết tự động, kỹ năng viết tiếng Anh, chiều kích văn hoá của Hofstede, nhận thức của sinh viên Việt Nam không chuyên tiếng Anh, nhận xét bài viết từ giảng viên

Trích dẫn bài báo này: Ho T H, Le D H. Nhận thức của sinh viên Việt Nam không chuyên tiếng Anh về nhận xét bài viết từ giảng viên và nhận xét bài viết tự động từ ChatGPT trong việc học kỹ năng viết tiếng Anh thông qua các chiều kích văn hoá của Hofstede. *VNUHCMJ. Soc. Sci. Humanit.*

10(3):4228-4238