

Korean University Students' Prompt Literacy Training with ChatGPT: Investigating Language Learning Strategies*

Thomas Dillon**

Dillon, Thomas. (2024). Korean University Students' Prompt Literacy Training with ChatGPT: Investigating Language Learning Strategies. *English Teaching*, 79(3), 123-157.

This study explores the integration of ChatGPT, OpenAI's conversational AI, into English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms at Korean universities, focusing on student interactions and language learning strategy preferences. It categorises interactions using the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) and Strategic Self-Regulation (S2R) frameworks to evaluate the pedagogical effectiveness of AI-assisted learning. Ninety-nine university students participated in training sessions with ChatGPT prompts tailored to different learning strategies. Data were collected through surveys, chat transcripts, and qualitative feedback. Results indicate frequent student interactions with ChatGPT, averaging 4.49 strategies in initial training chats. Compensatory strategies like error correction and adaptive difficulty received high ratings, while social strategies were rated lowest. Metacognitive strategies, especially planning and summarising, were also well-received. The study concludes that ChatGPT supports diverse learning strategies, enhancing linguistic competence and promoting self-regulated learning. However, limitations such as AI accuracy and authenticity issues highlight the need for continued human interaction in language education.

Key words: ChatGPT, Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL), Strategic Self-Regulation (S2R), Korean EFL students, AI in education, student interaction, language learning strategies

*This work was supported by Daegu Catholic University.

**Author: Thomas Dillon, Professor, Foreign Language Education Centre, Daegu Catholic University; 13-13, Hayang-ro, Hayang-eup, Gyeongsan-si, Gyeongsangbuk-do, 38430, Korea; Email: dillon@cu.ac.kr

Received 30 June 2024; Reviewed 17 July 2024; Accepted 10 September 2024



1. INTRODUCTION

Smartphone use is ubiquitous among South Korean university students, and Mobile Assisted Language Learning (MALL) methods, such as Automatic Speech Recognition and translation applications, have been shown to improve language acquisition (Dillon & Wells, 2023). The pace of innovation in this field is rapid, with the integration of Large Language Models (LLM) into educational contexts widely regarded as the next significant step. LLM use has received considerable attention from researchers in recent years due to its potential to transform the language learning classroom despite a risk of compromising academic integrity (Kasneci et al., 2023; Muñoz et al., 2023).

One area of focus is the implementation of collaborative learning strategies, where students work together to solve problems, complete tasks, or create projects. These strategies have been shown to enhance motivation, communication skills, and deepen understanding of subject matter (Ebadijalal & Moradkhani, 2023; Wang, Pang, Wallace, Wang, & Chen, 2022). In English as a Foreign Language (EFL) settings, collaborative learning is particularly effective in developing linguistic competence. AI programs, such as chatbots, present new opportunities for language practice by functioning as virtual collaborators (Jung, 2019; Young & Shishido, 2022; Vyawahare & Chakradeo, 2020).

Studies like the Training by Highly Ontology-oriented Tutoring Host (THOTH) have suggested that enhanced chatbot interactivity can improve learning outcomes (de Medeiros, Junior, & Moser, 2019; Lee, Chen, Wang, Huang, & Wu, 2024). Incorporating ChatGPT, OpenAI's conversational AI, into the Korean university EFL classroom could potentially expand these collaborative efforts. This raises important questions about how users will interact with this new "collaborator" and how training in prompt literacy, a skill allowing effective communication between humans and generative AI, (Maloy & Gattupalli, 2024) can be effectively integrated into the curriculum.

To address these questions, this study aims to categorise collaborations with ChatGPT using Oxford's (1990) Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL). Strategy training is highly effective because it allows for individualised study plans tailored to each student's needs. By analysing the frequency and depth of ChatGPT use, the types of prompts considered useful, and the preferences for different SILL and Strategic Self-Regulation (S2R) strategies (Oxford, 2016) we can provide a comprehensive picture of how this technology may be adapted for use in the Korean university EFL classroom.

This research encompasses a detailed investigation of the experiences of students interacting with ChatGPT. It aims to provide insights from basic numeric data to in-depth analyses of individual learning strategy preferences, thereby offering a valuable model for assessing the educational impact of AI collaborators in language learning.

In the investigation into how ChatGPT might be integrated into the Korean EFL context. The study focused on one quantitative and two qualitative research questions. These questions aim at exploring how Korean L2 college students respond to the use of ChatGPT in the classroom.

RQ1. How frequently did participants interact with ChatGPT, how many strategy types did they initially use?

RQ2. How do participants perceive the advantages and limitations of ChatGPT?

RQ3. Which language learning strategy types were considered most useful?

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Computer-Assisted Language Learning and Chatbots

Thanks to considerable popular and commercial interest in recent years, research on the pedagogical use of chatbots such as ChatGPT has multiplied. This research forms part of the evolving landscape of studies within the field of Computer-Assisted Language Learning (CALL). A pivotal study in this field was Chapelle's (2001), which proposed six criteria for evaluating computer-assisted language learning projects. Chapelle's criteria were: language learning potential, learner fit, meaning focus, authenticity, impact, and practicality, and these have all been studied within the context of AI chatbots. For example, Mahmoud (2022) addresses the language learning potential of chatbots, finding that they promoted learner engagement and fostered the acquisition of linguistic knowledge. 97% of participants enjoyed a friendly chatbot user interface, although 72% of participants were worried about inaccuracy of automated responses. Other studies, such as Bibauw, François, and Desmet (2019) found that learners experienced confidence and a sense of relaxation when interacting with chatbot systems, allowing for enhanced engagement, especially at the university level.

When Belda-Medina and Calvo-Ferrer (2022) studied three chatbots, Replika, Kuki and Wysa, they arrived at three main conclusions. Firstly, the awareness of chatbots amongst language educators is low. Secondly, they highlight the need for chatbots to adapt to changing conditions and offer personalised features especially to adapt their language to the proficiency level of the user. Finally, they proposed that learners may want more than just chat, and will expect a collaborator that can discuss, entertain and provide useful information. These criteria align with the idea popular in the CALL environment of providing realistic and meaningful settings for practising second languages.

The criterion of impact, which is a measure of the effect of the use of AI on language learning, is discussed extensively in the work of Hew, Hwang, Du, and Jia (2022) and Chuah

and Kabilan (2021). Hew et al. (2022) for example, focused on the positive learner experience, designing goal setting and learning buddy chatbots showing that they can be useful sources of guidance and raise awareness of goal setting strategies promoting self regulated learning. They detailed chatbot abilities to provide feedback, and employ strategies to project social presence, by using emoji, asking questions or making positive comments. They also acknowledge the limited intelligence of the chatbots, in one case only three options were offered for continuing conversation while in another case the chatbot responses were not varied and became predictable.

Chuah and Kabilan surveyed 142 language teachers and found that while chatbot integration was considered to have high impact and authenticity with the advantage of personalising learning experiences, however there were some reservations about accuracy of responses. Chatbots were seen to have a high social presence but low cognitive presence, and that teachers were positive about teaching presence at times when they were unavailable. They wished that chatbots could be improved so that continuous communication would feel more natural, and that they would support a variety of tasks. Importantly this study only considered teachers perspectives while our study examines learner viewpoints.

2.2. Theoretical Opportunities and Considerations for ChatGPT Use

The current implementation of large language model chatbots may address some of the limitations described in the previous studies, Baidoo-Anu and Ansah (2023) propose that the interactive and adaptive learning systems facilitated by ChatGPT should produce a strong positive impact on learning outcomes. The practicality of using ChatGPT in a language education setting involves considering its role in automating tasks and providing feedback. A speculative paper from Zhai (2022) suggests use cases, for example, adapting difficulty levels in real time, personalised recommendation of topics, and individualised one to one instruction which provide a basis for experimental examination. Herft (2023) authored a similar but more practical paper that suggested a large number of useful prompts for teachers to type into ChatGPT, for example “Create a list of 5 teaching strategies that could be used to engage and challenge students ... in a lesson on...” (p. 4). Suggesting that teachers should understand “prompt literacy” and start teaching students to effectively interact with AI chatbots by formulating clear and precise questions or commands.

Pavlik (2023) and García-Peñalvo (2023) both discuss the risks and necessary considerations of integrating AI tools in education. Pavlik (2023) highlights the potential impacts on critical thinking and problem-solving skills due to overreliance on AI tools, emphasising the importance of encouraging experimentation to discover the limitations of such models. García-Peñalvo (2023) discusses possible resistance to the changing role of teachers and the necessity for them to understand both the benefits and weaknesses of AI

tools. He advocates for a balanced approach to integrating these tools, emphasising the importance of enhancing critical analysis, source comparison, and formulating appropriate questions.

Similarly, Cotton, Cotton, and Shipway (2024) and Yang (2023) both stress the need for thoughtful implementation of AI in higher education. Cotton et al. (2024) emphasise the importance of plagiarism awareness and the establishment of clear guidelines for the use of large language models (LLMs) in educational settings. Their study suggests designing assessments that foster creativity and problem-solving, particularly through group discussions and interactive knowledge demonstrations rather than traditional written essays. Yang (2023) echoes this sentiment, reiterating the need for diversifying assessments. Furthermore, Yang (2023) underscores Herft's (2023) point about the necessity of teachers learning to create effective LLM prompts and continuously refining their use of AI tools to mitigate risks such as perpetuating biases and undermining diversity in academic environments.

Tate, Doroudi, Ritchie, and Xu (2023) highlight potential benefits for non-native speakers of English and combine common themes into a pedagogical framework consisting of five elements: understanding capabilities and limitations of AI models, accessing and navigating AI writing tools, formulating prompts AI for desired content, corroborating the accuracy of AI-generated content, and ethically citing AI-generated texts in writing.

Two theoretical studies discussing the opportunities for using ChatGPT in light of established pedagogy stand out. The first study by Cong-Lem and Daneshfar (2024) integrates Vygotskian principles with the use of ChatGPT for second language (L2) learning. Firstly, ChatGPT provides rich linguistic input and authentic language exposure essential for language development, taking the role of "more knowledgeable other" in the learning process. Secondly, it simulates "Perezhivanie", offering realistic and engaging dialogues on various topics, reducing interaction anxiety and increasing exposure to the target language. Additionally, ChatGPT can offer personalised feedback, aiding in scaffolding learning within the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) and providing continuous support.

The second study by Chang, Lin, Hajian, and Wang (2023) outlines principles for using AI chatbots to support self-regulated learning and discusses "prompt literacy" training in detail. Effective prompt training improves the quality of interaction between the learner and the AI, which develops critical thinking and problem-solving skills. Cognitive, metacognitive and reverse prompting are emphasised. Cognitive prompts stimulate learners' thinking processes, deepen understanding and ensure active engagement with the subject matter, guiding them in applying strategies such as summarising information and analysing data. Metacognitive prompts encourage learners to reflect on their own thinking and learning processes, fostering self-awareness and self-regulation. Reverse prompting involves the AI chatbot prompting students with questions or tasks that require active engagement and

critical thinking, and ensures that students are not passively receiving information.

2.3. Key Studies of ChatGPT Use in Language Learning

More recently there have been a number of studies on the use of ChatGPT for language learning which provide evidence for supporting the theoretical suggestions detailed above. Monika and Suganthan (2024) explored the role of ChatGPT in English acquisition among ESL learners. The study did not provide information on the training methods used to introduce learners to ChatGPT and the findings highlighted several neutral or negative aspects, including feedback accuracy and helpfulness, motivation enhancement, understanding of learning needs, engagement, critical thinking improvement, creativity and originality, learning enjoyment, mistake addressing, consistency and reliability, and c. Positive aspects were also noted, such as enhanced interaction, immediate feedback, writing improvement, reading comprehension, cultural insights, and teacher support. and concluded that integrating ChatGPT with human instruction maximises benefits while maintaining the essential role of teachers.

Several other studies have further examined the impact of ChatGPT on language learning, focusing on aspects such as learner satisfaction, perceptions, critical thinking enhancement, and task design. Shao and Xia (2023) and Vo and Nguyen (2024) both explored ChatGPT from the perspective of student satisfaction and perception. Shao and Xia (2023) investigated the learning satisfaction of foreign language learners using ChatGPT, finding that only 53.6% of participants used the tool, with a moderate satisfaction score of 3.3. The limited use was primarily due to a lack of awareness or training and technical issues. They found a positive correlation between the duration and depth of usage and learning satisfaction, recommending strategies to increase usage and develop personalised teaching plans. Vo and Nguyen (2024) focused on EFL students' perceptions of ChatGPT, noting that higher-year students used and appreciated ChatGPT more than lower-year students. This study also highlighted the lack of effective training in ChatGPT use, recommending the development of teaching strategies that integrate the tool, monitoring its usage to avoid over-reliance, and providing formal training for effective use.

Yıldız (2023) and Jiang, Li, and Chen (2024) focused on the benefits of ChatGPT in enhancing specific skills in language learning. Yıldız (2023) found that ChatGPT enhanced motivation and academic performance in vocabulary learning, with the best results occurring when students interacted freely with the AI after lessons. The study recommended integrating ChatGPT into curricula and providing teacher training to ensure balanced use with appropriate pedagogical methods. Similarly, Jiang, Li, and Chen (2024) explored the enhancement of critical thinking (CT) skills in Chinese language classrooms through ChatGPT. The study emphasised that ChatGPT could significantly enhance CT skills when

used for tasks like providing feedback on grammar, brainstorming, and reflective analysis. The effectiveness of these outcomes was linked to the design of the tasks, with the study recommending careful attention to task design in educational settings.

Kim, Shim, and Shim (2023) examined the application of ChatGPT in designing Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) activities. While the study found that ChatGPT could generate well-designed tasks, it noted a lack of interactive engagement and a tendency for tasks to be overly simplistic. The study recommended improving ChatGPT's interactive content and assessment capabilities, as well as developing competencies for effective AI use in education.

Songsingchai, Sereerat, and Watananimitgul (2023) studied ChatGPT for English language learning among Thai students. The findings indicated significant improvement in English skills for the experimental group taking advantage of real-time feedback, and interactive exercises. Results also showed enhanced motivation, confidence, and positive attitudes towards learning. The study concluded that AI tools like ChatGPT significantly enhance learning outcomes. Recommendations included integrating AI tools into language curricula, providing teacher training, and designing culturally sensitive AI platforms.

Another relevant study was conducted by Kim (2023) with twenty advanced English students who used ChatGPT and Google Bard for project based language learning over six weeks. LLMs were used to engage with information, translate, draft and revise reports. Participants reported positive outcomes for their knowledge construction and reflective thinking, and enjoyed LLM use. On the other hand, participants did not receive specific training in creating prompts and appropriate AI tool use. They expressed challenges such as a steep learning curve and also that relying on LLMs too much lowered their social interaction with peers. The conclusion of the study suggested a need for guidelines and possibly a preparatory class in "prompt literacy."

Lee et al. (2024) explored the impact of the Guidance-Based ChatGPT-Assisted Learning Aid (GCLA) on educational outcomes in blended learning environments. GCLA encourages students to solve problems independently before seeking AI assistance, providing hints rather than direct answers. The study found that GCLA significantly improved self-regulated learning, higher-order thinking skills, and knowledge construction among 61 undergraduate chemistry students. It concluded that guided AI tools can enhance critical skills and engagement, promoting more effective learning experiences.

2.4. Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) and Strategic Self Regulation (S2R) Model

The call for development of teaching and learning strategies is a recurring theme throughout the investigations into ChatGPT use in Language learning and Oxford's 1990

Strategy Inventory for Language learning and later 2016 Strategic Self regulation model lend themselves to a coherent approach to ChatGPT training.

The Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL), developed by Oxford in 1990, categorises language learning strategies into six groups: memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective, and social. In parallel, Oxford's 2016 Strategic Self-Regulation (S2R) Model integrates self-regulation theory into the SILL to include emergent meta-strategies which manage and control strategy use; metacognitive, meta-affective, and meta-sociocultural-interactive (SI). These frameworks are employed in the present study to train "prompt literacy" creating interactive S2R meta-strategic environments by applying SILL strategies.

Cognitive strategies in the SILL and S2R Model involve mental processes that aid in understanding and producing language, such as summarising and organising information transforming, and applying L2 knowledge. Compensation strategies, according to the SILL, are techniques to overcome language limitations, like using context clues or rephrasing. Metacognitive strategies, which are crucial for self-regulation, involve planning, monitoring, and evaluating learning. The S2R Model expands on this with meta-strategies that guide the overall learning process, for example planning and orchestrating strategy use. Affective strategies create positive emotions, motivations, and attitudes with and are managed through S2R meta-affective strategies. Social strategies as managed by the S2R meta-SI dimension involve interacting with others to enhance learning, such as seeking conversational opportunities and cooperating with peers.

Pei-Shi (2012) and Santihastuti and Wahjuningsih (2019) correlate higher frequencies of strategy use with language learning proficiency; they suggest a broad instructional approach that covers a range of teaching methods. They are joined by Lethaby and Mayne (2020) in suggesting that fostering personalised learning strategies is a highly effective method.

Two studies in particular stand out as describing a wealth of strategy use across all categories. Halim, Ariffin, and Darus (2021) studied strategy use during online learning. They identify the use of memory sub-strategies such as rehearsal, and point to social strategies suggesting that peer and tutor support are critical resources. They also emphasise affective strategies, anxiety reduction, establishing a positive attitude and learning motivation. Additionally, they detail metacognitive sub-strategies like self-regulation, time management, and self-evaluation, as well as cognitive sub-strategies involving elaboration, organisation, and critical thinking.

In a similarly informative article, Odena and Burgess (2017) studied the writing strategies of doctoral students. They describe metacognitive strategies, particularly personal organisation and methodology planning, social strategies that involve using support networks and obtaining supervisor feedback and also affective strategies, notably maintaining motivation and the role of peer feedback. They detail compensatory strategies

for non-native English speakers, such as training and ESL strategies in academic writing, and highlight memory strategies that involve collecting expressions and effective word use in academic writing.

In general, digital tools have proven useful for learners, whatever their preferred learning strategy (Gargallo-Camarillas, 2021), and Hwang and Chang's (2023) review of 29 articles studying chatbots suggests that most research is focused on language education. However many studies shared the common strategy of "guided learning" which involved using chatbots to search for information to perform teacher-led learning tasks. Exploration of diverse learning strategies and behaviours was sparse, which highlights the gap in research integrating a range learning strategies with technology. Kim and Bae (2020) and Joo and Bae (2021), have identified three SILL categories as common to a digital English learning environment. The three strategies were: memory, cognitive, and compensation. These studies were, however, a passive examination of strategies naturally in use, so the authors discuss the need for proactive strategy teaching. Chanderan and Hashim (2022) also encourage educators to develop programs that allow students to use their preferred strategies. One of the alleged benefits of AI chatbots is the ability to be adapted to a variety of learning strategies (Ali, Shamsan, Hezam, & Mohammed, 2023). The present study is an attempt to provide training across a range of strategy groups and assess how useful students found them to be.

2.5. Collaborative Writing

Collaborative writing is another concept which can be applied to text based ChatGPT use as it is closely linked to affective and social strategic learning. Students may be seen as generating dialogues with the ChatGPT algorithm acting as a kind of collaborative writer. One of the most accessible web-based collaborative writing tools is Google Documents. It not only provides a convenient system for creation, editing and sharing of documents but also allows real-time discussion, interaction and assignment writing (Hsu, 2020). Ebadijalal and Moradkhani (2023) affirm Google Docs as a scaffolding tool for cognitive development and argue that collaborative writing which involves two or more writers during idea generation, negotiation and planning offers considerable benefits to student writing skills, engagement, motivation, confidence, and focus.

ChatGPT seems to offer the opportunity of becoming an active participant in the learning process (in a way that Google Docs is not), thereby fostering emotional engagement among EFL learners. The need for such engagement is emphasised, for example, by Alwaleedi (2022) who notes that collaborative writing fostered emotional, but not behavioural engagement, citing corrective feedback as a disengaging factor.

We also see consistency within the findings of Miftah and Cahyono (2022) where EFL

learners demonstrated creativity, reduced stress and increased confidence during Edmodo learning management system-assisted collaborative writing sessions. Learners provided feedback by identifying errors in peer drafts during ELMS-assisted sessions. The authors call for additional research into the practical use of collaborative writing methods. This study aims to leverage ChatGPT as a tool for real-time feedback and guidance, however, Wang et al. (2022) indicated that a strong teaching presence in AI-supported learning might be perceived as less approachable, which could affect learner-AI interactions and language acquisition gains. It is important to note that this study focused on Year 1 primary school students, whereas the present study involved university students.

2.6. Synthesis of Recommendations

Integrating ChatGPT into a language learning context can enhance self-regulated learning and higher-order thinking skills and requires well-structured task design to ensure effective learning outcomes. (Jiang et al., 2024; Kim et al., 2023; Lee et al., 2024; Shao & Xia, 2023) Integrating collaborative writing exercises which reduce anxiety and boost confidence (Alwaleedi, 2022; Baidoo-Anu & Ansah, 2023; Bibauw et al., 2019; Ebadijalal & Moradkhani, 2023; Miftah & Cahyono, 2022; Songsiengchai et al., 2023) can also be effective. On the other hand, Yıldız (2023) found that free interactions are also beneficial.

Cong-Lem and Daneshfar (2024) emphasise the pedagogical benefits that ChatGPT offers, which can be harnessed by teaching students “prompt literacy” (Chang et al., 2023; Herft, 2023; Kim, 2023; Vo & Nguyen, 2024) Contextualising prompt training according to the SILL and S2R frameworks Oxford (1990, 2016), is supported by a number of studies (Ali et al., 2023; Chandaran & Hashim, 2022; Joo & Bae, 2021; Kim & Bae, 2020). At the same time, encouraging experimentation and critical evaluation of AI content mitigates possible risks of overreliance (Cotton et al., 2024; Pavlik, 2023; Tate et al., 2023; Yang, 2023).

By considering these converging perspectives, our study aims to contribute to the development of effective, responsible pedagogical models that leverage AI tools like ChatGPT in language learning, particularly in Korean university classrooms. This endeavour requires a balanced approach that combines technological tools, traditional teaching methods, and individualised learning strategies.

Our study builds on a solid foundation of theoretical and speculative articles that provide a rationale for applying strategic frameworks to new learning resources. We have applied suggestions from various speculative articles, especially Bibauw et al. (2019) to design goal-oriented systems with contextualised dialogues, corrective feedback, and scaffolding, and followed recommendations synthesised from a wide range of studies into the use of ChatGPT in language learning.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Design and Participants

This study was designed as a mixed-methods investigation, combining quantitative and qualitative data to explore student perceptions of AI in EFL learning. Participants consisted of 99 university students aged 18-25, with a gender distribution of 61 males (62%) and 38 females (38%). The majority of participants were university freshmen (80%) majoring in a variety of subjects, and were selected to examine the responses of students from a diverse range of backgrounds. All participants were enrolled at CEFR A1 level, owned or had access to a smartphone and they were proficient in using them for note taking and research purposes. The demographic information is summarised in Table 1 below.

TABLE 1
Participant Demographics

Demographic Variable	Description	<i>N</i>	%
Age Range	18-25 years	99	100
Gender	Male	61	62
	Female	38	38
Year of Study	1st Year	42	42.4
	2nd Year	26	26.3
	3rd Year	13	13.1
	4th Year	18	18.2
Field of Study	STEM	36	36.36
	Health Sciences	20	20.20
	Media and Communications	7	7.07
	Social Sciences	12	12.12
	Arts and Humanities	12	12.12
	Business and Management	6	6.06
	Culinary Arts	2	2.02
	Natural Sciences	4	4.04

3.2. Study Timeline and Sessions

Research was conducted over a period of twelve weeks. The first six weeks included weekly training sessions to ensure a progressive and immersive learning experience for participants. For the final six weeks, participants were encouraged to use ChatGPT on their own, using the techniques which they had practised in class. The pivotal assessments of the study were strategically planned for the eighth and twelfth weeks to allow time for students to complete their in-class assessments and achieve familiarity with the use of ChatGPT.

After the twelfth week, a comprehensive follow-up survey was administered to gather participants' feedback and insights.

3.3. Procedures and Assignments

The initial phase of the study focused on acquainting participants with ChatGPT and Google Documents. In the first week, we introduced the basics of these tools, including the process of account creation and a demonstration of key features such as document sharing, basic navigation in Google Documents, an initial interaction with ChatGPT and its transcript sharing function. In subsequent weeks, the training sessions delved deeper into the conversational capabilities of ChatGPT.

During the training sessions our goal was to introduce students to various aspects of ChatGPT use which aligned with different learning strategies (as identified by the SILL and S2R). It should be noted that the participants were not directly introduced to the models, but they were introduced to a variety of prompts, by which their experience with ChatGPT could be moulded to suit their individual needs. Suggested prompts can be seen in Table 2.

TABLE 2
Example Prompt Types

SILL/S2R Dimensions	Example
Affective	Make a 10 sentence script
Cognitive	Explain the meaning of...
Cognitive	Give me an example conversation about
Cognitive	Generate some topics
Cognitive	Ask me questions
Cognitive	Answer my questions
Compensatory	Use (basic/beginner) English
Compensatory	Short sentences
Compensatory	Correct my sentences / correct all my sentences
Compensatory	Give me feedback about grammar
Metacognitive	Summarise- our chat
Social	Chat with me about
Social	Act in character as ...
Social	Give me suggestions to make longer chats

In the first supervised training session students were given opportunities to construct and test effective prompts. The first aim was to create a prompt to generate a choice of suitable conversation topics, and then to initiate a five-turn reverse prompting activity where learners answered a series of follow-on questions posed by the AI about a preferred topic. For example, "What ingredients do you like to use when making your sushi rolls?" This exercise was designed as a supplementary activity for writing a role play script. ChatGPT modelled an interview style, guiding a brainstorming session so the learner could prepare their personal

answers for a role play. Some example transcripts showcasing prompt use during this activity can be seen in appendix 2.

The second supervised training required students to practise asking follow-on questions (as modelled in the first session.) To set up the activity the teacher demonstrated ways of combining requests into an effective metastrategic prompt. For example, “Play a game for basic English language study. Act as a classmate. Generate some likes and dislikes on a range of topics. Do not tell me the likes and dislikes. I will choose a topic then ask questions about your preferences. Use short sentences and basic vocabulary. Correct my mistakes.” This was intended to set up a one to one, personalised, adaptive learning environment with a clear goal and context, and obtain feedback and get scaffolding examples. Students were also made aware of some of the AI’s known limitations, for example the inability to provide contextually relevant responses and the risk that this could negatively impact user interest. For example, when instructed to “act in character” it would frequently lose track of the character and announce its inability to continue in character (i.e., “As an AI language model, I do not have any preferences.”) In this case students were instructed to experiment by changing their prompts or simply restarting the activity.

Participants were asked to submit a transcript from each of the two training conversations in a google document to provide a data log. However, it was suggested that participants repeat each training activity and prepare transcripts of three or four topics of personal interest to them and before pairing up with a real classmate and combining resources to plan a role play test. Later reinforcement sessions put an emphasis on cognitive engagement and critical thinking. Participants were encouraged to supply their own plans and ideas initially before experimenting. For example, by making solo presentation notes before asking for error correction and grammar feedback.

3.4. Instrument

Following week twelve, participants completed a survey designed to answer the research questions. The survey included demographic items, items offering a choice of common advantages, limitations and suggestions and an open ended question for comments. 30 Likert scale items (5 groups of 6 items) examining constructs from the SILL and S2R (Oxford 1990, 2016) Instrument questions were designed to reflect specific prompts from the training sessions and to cover perceptions of meta-strategies resulting from the overall experience of interacting with ChatGPT. The questionnaire items were adapted from Monika and Suganthan’s 2024 ChatGPT in English Acquisition Questionnaire with changes to ensure comprehension from participants of varying English proficiency. This approach aimed to gather a comprehensive understanding of participants’ perceptions and strategy use experiences. Questionnaire items can be seen in Appendix 1.

Additionally, we paid careful attention to the internal consistency of the items making up each Likert scale. Internal consistency refers to how well the items that are supposed to measure the same construct actually do so in a reliable manner. We utilised statistical measures such as Cronbach's Alpha to evaluate this consistency.

To further assess the validity of the constructs, we conducted bivariate analysis using Spearman's rank correlation, as the Likert scale data and highly positive responses indicated that assumptions of normality might not hold. Spearman's rank correlation is a non-parametric measure that assesses the strength and direction of association between two ranked variables. Unlike Pearson's correlation, Spearman's rank correlation does not assume a normal distribution and is suitable for ordinal data. The reliability and validity results for the questionnaire can be seen in table 3.

TABLE 3
Questionnaire Reliability and Validity

Dimension	<i>N</i>	Alpha	Spearman Correlation	<i>p</i>
Affective	6	0.75	0.76 - 0.83	<0.05
Cognitive	6	0.74	0.79 - 0.82	<0.05
Metacognitive	6	0.76	0.76 - 0.89	<0.05
Compensatory	6	0.75	0.78 - 0.85	<0.05
Social/SI	6	0.74	0.71 - 0.84	<0.05

As can be seen from the table Alpha values above 0.7 indicate that the items within the scale are reliably measuring the same underlying concept, which bolsters the reliability of the conclusions drawn from these scales. By aggregating Likert-type items into well-constructed Likert scales and ensuring their internal consistency, we were able to derive meaningful and reliable insights from our quantitative data.

The Spearman correlation results demonstrate strong positive correlations of above 0.7 for each dimension. These correlations indicate that as participants' ratings on individual items increase, their overall scores within each dimension also tend to increase consistently. All *p*-values were found to be statistically significant ($p < 0.05$), confirming the robustness of these associations. This non-parametric approach reinforces the validity of our findings.

3.5. Data Analysis

In our quantitative data analysis for RQ1 we categorised the number of chats into different frequency ranges to offer insights into user engagement patterns, we analysed transcripts of chats from the first two training sessions and calculated the average number of messages per chat to provide an insight into the depth of interaction. The transcripts from the first training activity also provided data on how many of the suggested prompt types were used during

the chats and specific details about which prompts were used during the initial training session. For RQ2 we conducted qualitative analysis, by exploring the results of the multiple choice questions and also themes and patterns from open-ended survey responses. For the analysis of RQ3 the data analysis process entailed averaging the responses to multiple related Likert-type questions to form a cohesive scale, providing a more robust measure of specific constructs. For example, several questions collectively assessed attitudes towards a particular dimension, and their aggregated scores constituted the scale for that construct. Scales were analysed using descriptive statistics in which mean and standard deviation values were computed and tabulated. Our analysis closely follows the method of Chuah and Kabilan (2021). Finally, we analysed the preferences for each specific strategy type. With only two questionnaire items for each strategy type, Cronbach's alpha could not be computed. Spearman's correlation, however, provides a direct measure of the association between the items so we were able to understand how consistently our items measured the same strategy type.

3.6. Ethical Considerations

Ethical approval was obtained prior to the study, and participants were informed of their rights, including confidentiality and the voluntary nature of their participation, they understood that we would not have access to their google documents or chat transcripts other than those voluntarily shared. All assignments and grades were based on performance in oral tests to maintain academic integrity and mitigate any potential ethical concerns related to the use of AI for text creation.

4. RESULTS

4.1. Strategy Types in Participants' Initial Interaction with ChatGPT

Table 4 presents the distribution of interaction frequency with ChatGPT among Korean EFL students. It categorises users by how many separate chat conversations they had during the study period. This table sets the stage for analysing the relationship between usage patterns and perceived efficacy of ChatGPT in language learning.

TABLE 4
Students Reported ChatGPT Conversation Count

Number of Chats	<i>N</i>	%
1-5	14	14
5-10	20	20
10-15	18	18
15-20	26	26
20+	22	22

The table presents the frequency of interactions learners had with ChatGPT. A majority of learners had more than 10 chats, with 20% having 5-10 chats and 18% having 10-15 chats. A significant number of learners also engaged more extensively, with 22% having more than 20 chats. However, 14% of learners had fewer interactions, between 1-5 chats. It is important to note that the supervised training only required participants to use ChatGPT three times so 86% of participants engaged with the tool more than was required.

Table 5 presents the average length of the chat conversations as gathered from the transcripts of the two recorded assignments. It should be noted that the assignments each required a 5 turn conversation which equates to 10 messages in total.

TABLE 5
Conversation Length During the Recorded Chat Interactions

	Prompt Training Session		Reverse Prompting Assignment	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Average Number of Messages	10.59	3.77	10.53	3.60

These results show that participants were able to carry on a chat conversation that contained the required number of turns ($M = 10.53-10.59$). The *SD* values give a reasonable approximation of the minimum and maximum chat lengths. We were satisfied that the participants engaged with ChatGPT and achieved the goals of the training sessions. However due to ethical and privacy concerns we did not gather chat transcripts of any other conversations that users had so we were unable to make any conclusions about depth of usage for participants' ongoing use of ChatGPT.

4.1.1. Frequency and type of strategies used

We analysed the google documents containing chat transcripts of the prompt training assignment to see how many of the suggested prompt types were used and the results are shown in Table 6 shown below.

TABLE 6
Strategic Prompts Used

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Number of strategy prompts	4.49	1.47

The mean number of prompts used in the initial training exercise was 4.49 with a *SD* of 1.47, which suggests that a majority of the participants were able to understand how to interface with ChatGPT and apply some of the suggested prompts together in a single chat to create a metastrategic personalised learning environment. The *SD* value also suggests that the results were reasonably mixed which may attest to the initial high learning curve reported by some participants. We also investigated the specific prompt types used in detail and the breakdown can be seen below in Table 7.

TABLE 7
Specific Prompts Used

Prompt Type	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Used ≥ 1	%
Topic Generation	1.37	0.78	95	95.92
Inquiry Initiation	2.55	1.89	85	85.71
Difficulty Compensation	1.20	0.79	76	79.59
Error Correction	0.71	0.61	62	63.27
Feedback Provision	0.59	0.57	54	55.10
Response Brevity	0.57	0.61	50	51.02
Definition Request	0.16	0.43	14	14.29
Role-playing Simulation	0.12	0.33	12	12.24
Summarization	0.12	0.33	12	12.24
Script Creation	0.08	0.28	8	8.16

From this data we saw that the specific goals of the initial training exercise, asking ChatGPT to generate some topics ($M = 1.37$, $SD = 0.78$, ~96%) and start a conversation (Inquiry initiation, $M = 2.55$, $SD = 1.89$, ~86%) were achieved by a large majority of participants. With a high mean for Inquiry initiation showing that some participants started multiple conversations within one chat. We also saw that suggested strategies such as language simplification (~80%) proofreading (~63%) feedback (~55%) and response brevity (~51%) were used by roughly half of the participants at the first try. This encouraging data suggests that the participants were able to understand the training and experiment with prompts during the first session. The remaining Prompt types saw low uptake during the first session, however it was possible that a larger number of students applied these prompts (for example script creation for a presentation assignment) during their later unsupervised interactions with ChatGPT as they reported a high degree of acceptance of the strategy types during the final questionnaire.

4.2. Participants' Perceptions of the Advantages and Limitations of ChatGPT

4.2.1. Advantages of ChatGPT

In Table 8, we explore the advantages of using ChatGPT as reported by the participants. The data is organised into themes that represent the most common perceived benefits, shedding light on the platform's role in enhancing the language learning experience.

TABLE 8
Most Useful Features for Language Learning

Item	<i>N</i>	%
Feedback on writing	52	52.53
Generating ideas and topics	47	47.47
Personalised responses to questions	41	41.41
Alter the difficulty and length of responses	40	40.40
Error correction	37	37.37
Writing scripts	33	33.33
Customise learning based on interests	27	27.27
Summarising conversations	20	20.20
Grammar explanations	18	18.18
Having a conversational partner	11	11.11

The table showcases the features participants found most useful. The top three features, as per the respondents, are “Feedback on my writing and conversation” (~52%), “Generating ideas and topics” and (~47%) “Personalised responses” (~41%). Other features like error correction, script writing, and customising learning based on interests also received considerable attention. However, “Summarising Conversations” (~20%), and “Grammar Explanations” (~18%) were less valued. “Having a conversational partner”, was chosen by only 11% of respondents, indicating that this feature was not seen as essential.

4.2.2. Limitations of ChatGPT

Table 9 details the limitations of ChatGPT as perceived by the users. The table organises these drawbacks into thematic categories, providing a critical perspective on the areas where ChatGPT may require further development or adaptation to better serve EFL learners.

TABLE 9
Limitations or Drawbacks of Using ChatGPT for Language Learning

Limitation	<i>N</i>	%
Inaccurate or unclear responses	58	58.59
Initially difficult to use	30	30.3
Conversations feel fake	29	29.29
Steep learning curve	9	9.09
Replies were too formal	2	2.02
Sometimes gave false information	2	2.02
Unable to learn	1	1.01

The table presents feedback from participants about limitations of using ChatGPT for language learning. Most common concerns included unclear responses, initial usability issues, and artificiality of the conversations. Fewer respondents reported a steep learning curve and issues with formality or incorrect information. Notably, only one participant reported being unable to learn with ChatGPT.

4.2.3. Improvement suggestions

The suggestions for improvement made by the participants are summarised in table 10. This table compiles the feedback into actionable insights, highlighting the potential enhancements that could increase the platform's effectiveness and user satisfaction.

TABLE 10
Suggested Improvements to ChatGPT for Language Learning

Improvement Suggestion	<i>N</i>	%
Improving accuracy and naturalness	62	62.63
Help to practise listening and speaking	26	26.26
Feedback from humans/teachers	24	24.24
More games or quizzes	18	18.18
A special version for English learners	9	9.09

The table outlines participants' suggestions to improve ChatGPT's effectiveness for language learning. The majority of the suggestions focus on enhancing the accuracy and naturalness of the tool, followed by assistance in practising listening and speaking skills, and requests for more human or teacher feedback.

4.2.4. Open ended question

Table 11 compiles the qualitative responses to the open-ended questions, providing a thematic analysis of the students' perspectives on using ChatGPT for language learning. This

table offers direct insight into the learners' views and experiences, enriching the quantitative findings with personal narratives and suggestions for the platform's use in EFL education.

TABLE 11
Open Ended Responses

Category	N	%	Examples
Positive Feedback	23	38	"gpt is good" "It was nice to be able to get help while using ChatGPT in the lecture" "Very useful as a teaching tool" "ChatGPT is good" "I think ChatGPT is very useful." "It's good because it's easy to use once you know how to use it."
Specific Uses and Benefits	19	31	"It was useful to use ChatGP to decide on the topic of the assignment." "I can understand the meaning of English" "I think my English skills have improved while using GPT." "I think it will be helpful for beginners in English." "I like it when you give me feedback on grammatical functions" "I can effectively summarize the report or script I wrote." "ChatGPT not only helps you with the task, but it also has the advantage of being able to correct difficult words into easy words. Through GPT, I was able to know about various topics that I am curious about." "It helps in scripting the play" "It is useful when presenting English sentences in a slightly easier way."
Constructive Feedback	16	26	"This is a very positive opinion about using ChatGPT. It is still perfect, but I think it will become a more perfect program if it develops a little more for the inexperienced points." "Chat gpt is useful, but if you know how to use it more accurately, it can be used endlessly, so you need more diverse guidance on how to use it" "It's good to answer questions, but it's a shame that sometimes it's not the answer you want" "I think ChatGPT sometimes makes incorrect answers, but it is very useful for studying." "I keep relying on ChatGPT." "There may be cases where the grammar is not accurate."
Suggestions for Future Use	3	5	"More diverse guidance on how to use it" "It's hard to fully utilize the ChatGPT program because I'm not familiar with how to command it. I think it would be a more perfect program if we developed a little bit more about our experience."

The open-ended responses from students reveal a range of perceptions about ChatGPT as a language learning tool. The majority of responses were positive (42 out of 61) with 23 being generally positive, with students praising ChatGPT's usefulness and effectiveness in class. More usefully 19 respondents provided specific details of their positive use cases which aligned with the prompts that they were trained to use such as difficulty adjustment, scripting, summarization and feedback. 16 students expressed constructive views, citing issues such as the need for more problem-solving capabilities, a preference for real interaction over AI, a tendency to rely on the tool or confusion when the information provided by ChatGPT differed from search results, or just continued endlessly. A small number of students provided some suggestions which can be summed up as requests for additional training.

4.3. Most Useful Language Learning Strategy Types

4.3.1. General SILL/S2R dimension preferences

The survey questions were categorised according to the SILL/S2R in order to assess how participants actually used ChatGPT as a learning tool - i.e., which learning type of strategies they found most useful. The results are given in Table 12 below.

TABLE 12
SILL/S2R Results

Dimension	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Affective	6	4.09	0.84
Cognitive	6	4.08	0.84
Metacognitive	6	4.13	0.81
Compensatory	6	4.15	0.82
Social/SI	6	4.02	0.84

Overall, the SILL/S2R results were generally positive, with ratings for Compensatory and Metacognitive strategies being the most well-attested ($M = 4.15$ and 4.13 , respectively). These results suggest that students were most impressed by ChatGPT's ability to adapt to their specific needs - for example, by altering its English output to suit their requested level. They also indicate that ChatGPT was also perceived as effective at supporting metacognitive learning strategies - that is, to strategies related to how one learns. Because ChatGPT was perceived as adaptable to individual needs of each student, it seemed to score well on questions related to this particular strategy. Affective strategies also seemed to stand out, with a mean of 4.09. indicate that learning strategies related to an emotionally enjoyable or at least stress-free environment were well-supported by ChatGPT. The lowest mean of 4.02 for Social/SI strategies seems in line with some of the more notable limitations of ChatGPT that students reported in their open-ended question responses. ChatGPT does not always act as a perfect chat partner, for instance, if it occasionally drops out of character to remind students that it is an AI language model and therefore unable to answer their questions in an authentic way. These results suggest that students by and large perceive ChatGPT as an effective tool for language learning and capable of supporting a variety of learning strategies as identified by the SILL.

4.3.2. Specific strategy preferences

Table 13 reflects an average of Likert scale responses for specific prompts that were suggested during the training sessions according to their SILL category and also a number

of meta-strategies that are more closely aligned with the S2R. These strategies cannot be summed up using a single prompt but can be considered to be a result of participants' overall use of ChatGPT. As we saw in Table 13 an average of 4.59 prompts were used together in the initial chat, interlinked prompting can be considered use of Metacognitive, Meta Affective and Meta-Sociocultural Interactive usage patterns. The findings reveal that most strategies were positively received, with average scores around 4, indicating general agreement.

TABLE 13
Specific Strategy Preferences

Dimension	Strategy	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Correlation	<i>p</i>
Affective	Stress relief	4.15	0.87	0.61	<0.05
	Scripting	4.07	0.87	0.54	<0.05
	Satisfaction	4.00	0.81	0.76	<0.05
Cognitive	Explaining	4.13	0.81	0.62	<0.05
	Connections	4.06	0.86	0.55	<0.05
	Topic	4.09	0.83	0.56	<0.05
Metacognitive	Planning	4.11	0.82	0.71	<0.05
	Summarising	4.15	0.82	0.63	<0.05
	Reflective	4.14	0.82	0.68	<0.05
Compensation	Difficulty	4.12	0.83	0.57	<0.05
	Brevity	4.17	0.85	0.61	<0.05
	Error Correction	4.18	0.80	0.70	<0.05
Social/SI	Peer Feedback	4.07	0.82	0.66	<0.05
	Interaction	4.03	0.84	0.50	<0.05
	Authenticity	3.96	0.87	0.44	<0.05

The most well-received strategies were compensatory, particularly error correction ($M = 4.18$, $SD = 0.80$), brevity ($M = 4.17$, $SD = 0.85$), and difficulty adjustment ($M = 4.12$, $SD = 0.83$). Among affective strategies, stress relief was highly rated ($M = 4.15$, $SD = 0.87$), though scripting ($M = 4.07$, $SD = 0.87$) and satisfaction ($M = 4.00$, $SD = 0.81$) received more mixed responses. Metacognitive strategies, such as summarizing ($M = 4.15$, $SD = 0.82$), reflective thinking ($M = 4.14$, $SD = 0.82$), and planning ($M = 4.11$, $SD = 0.82$), showed consistent support. Cognitive strategies like explaining ($M = 4.13$, $SD = 0.81$) were well-received, whereas topic generation ($M = 4.09$, $SD = 0.83$) and knowledge connections ($M = 4.06$, $SD = 0.86$) had slightly lower ratings. Social and interactive strategies received the lowest scores, with peer feedback ($M = 4.07$, $SD = 0.82$), interaction ($M = 4.03$, $SD = 0.84$), and authenticity ($M = 3.96$, $SD = 0.87$) being moderately well-received. These results indicate that compensatory and metacognitive strategies were the most favored, while cognitive and affective strategies also garnered strong support. Social and interactive strategies, though rated lower, still achieved moderate agreement.

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The study's first research question focuses on the frequency of user interactions and their perceptions of the platform's advantages and disadvantages. The data indicates that students engaged with ChatGPT frequently, with 86% exceeding the expected minimum interaction rate (3 times per participant), suggesting it is a compelling tool for language learning. Notably, 22% of participants interacted more than 20 times with ChatGPT, highlighting the platform's role in fostering a proactive learning environment. Given the twelve-week timeframe of the study, a significant proportion of participants used ChatGPT at least once a week. Participants averaged 10.5 chat messages per task, showing they quickly adapted to using ChatGPT, likely due to their familiarity with text messaging. These tasks established ChatGPT as an interactive experience rather than a one-time information request similar to a web search. Our findings can be considered a response to Shao and Xia's (2023) call for teaching plans that encourage usage and depth duration. In analysing the initial experimentation session, participants used an average of 4.49 different prompts indicating that most participants understood that multiple instructions could be used to alter the chat environment at any time, for example requesting responses to be repeated using easier language. The second task, which had a pre-formed prompt, was not analysed. The initial task set the precedent for use of multiple prompts and we were satisfied that participants achieved this goal quickly. Examining the exact prompts used in the initial session, almost all participants followed instructions well. Excluding the top two directly required prompts, about 80% of the chats involved adaptive difficulty, 63% used error correction, 55% sought feedback, and 51% appreciated briefer responses.

Regarding the platform's advantages and limitations, participants valued feedback on writing, personalised responses, and idea generation. However, they noted interactions were not natural, clear, or accurate. Despite concerns about accuracy, feedback and error correction were major advantages, suggesting students may separate language accuracy from conversational accuracy and naturalness. Few students valued ChatGPT as a social conversation partner, but there was interest in speaking and listening practice. Training participants on the recently added voice-to-text interface could enhance ChatGPT's role as a conversational partner. Open-ended responses were positive, but some highlighted mistrust of AI-generated information. These criticisms reflect engaged critical thinking and should be viewed positively for fostering critical thinking awareness. There was also a clear call for more training and competency development in language learning. Despite improvements in chatbot technology these suggestions still align with those detailed in research into earlier generations of chatbots (Chuah & Kabilan, 2021; Hew et al., 2022; Mahmoud, 2022) the demand for an authentic, interactive language learning experience has still not been fully satisfied, leaving participants feeling keen to continue their AI enabled education.

In summary, students interact frequently with ChatGPT, recognizing its potential benefits for language learning. Their interaction frequency allowed them to experiment and discover limitations. Despite initial difficulties, participants quickly adapted to compensatory strategies using an average of 4.49 different prompts in their first session. Only one respondent reported failing to learn using the interface, but overall intention to use the platform remains strong, as indicated by positive feedback. This positive result answers Vo and Nguyen's (2024) call suggesting specialised training for lower proficiency students.

The investigation of RQ3 scrutinises the qualitative evaluation of ChatGPT as a language learning tool correlating learners' assessments with the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) and Strategic Self Regulation S2R dimensions. The important part of the training was the creation of prompts as suggested by, Tate et al. (2023), Yang (2023), Herft (2023), and Chang et al., (2023) and the selection of different learning strategies as suggested by Pei-Shi (2012), Santihastuti and Wahjuningsih (2019), and Lethaby and Mayne (2020).

Our SILL results suggest that students were able to implement a variety of learning strategies within ChatGPT and also perceived ChatGPT to be supportive of their preferred learning strategies, most notably those related to Compensatory, Affective, and Metacognitive means. This implies that ChatGPT may be most effective when used to consciously direct one's own learning and to address specific gaps in one's language learning. Kim and Bae (2020) and Joo and Bae (2021) both note a prevalence of Compensatory and Cognitive strategies among language learners.

Compensatory strategy use was a clear favourite. Questionnaire responses about adapting the difficulty, response length and getting real time error correction were in the range of ($M = 4.12-4.18$) and showed moderate to strong correlation. This is a reflection of the experimental design which facilitates adaptive learning according to the suggestions of Bibauw et al. (2019), Belda-Medina and Calvo-Ferrer (2022), Cong-Lem and Daneshfar (2024), and Zhai (2022). Training compensatory prompts was straightforward with participants understanding the cause and effect of their use on the learning environment, and using many of them in their initial training session.

Cognitive strategies ($M = 4.08$) suffered from mixed responses. Explaining and showing examples correlated strongly ($M = 4.13$), with moderate correlation for topic generation ($M = 4.09$) and making knowledge connections ($M = 4.06$). General mistrust in factual information provided by AI may have affected Cognitive scores.

Metacognitive strategies, including planning, summarising, and reflective thinking, were all strongly correlated within the range of ($M = 4.11-4.15$). However, only summarising was directly taught as part of the prompt training. Planning and Reflective thinking can be considered emergent S2R meta-strategies. High acceptance in this dimension suggests that participants used interlinked strategies to support their learning.

Affective strategy use was very mixed, with strong correlation for highly preferred stress

relief items ($M = 4.15$) but only moderate correlation for scripting ($M = 4.07$). Stress relief for writing assignments and script writing were valued, but participants may not have fully relied on ChatGPT to write their complete assignments. The relatively high rating for Affective Strategies ($M = 4.09$) contrasts with the prior research of Alwaleedi (2022), whose results showed higher emotional than behavioural engagement, citing corrective feedback as a disengaging factor. Our affective results showed good emotional engagement; however, corrective feedback was popular in our study. Our mitigating factor was seen in the S2R meta-affective strategy of satisfaction ($M = 4.00$). This result may be linked to criticisms of ChatGPT's accuracy and authenticity, and the need for more training. With a correlation of 0.76, participants strongly agreed that there was room for improvement.

Social/SI strategies were the lowest overall ($M = 3.96-4.07$). Peer feedback correlated strongly ($M = 4.07$), suggesting real-time suggestions were valued, and the prompt training directly enabled this strategy. However, meta-SI strategies such as interaction as a chat partner ($M = 4.03$) and real-world authenticity ($M = 3.96$) also showed moderate correlation, consistent with criticisms of interaction naturalness.

Our results can be compared to the findings of Chuah and Kabilan (2021), who noted that teachers felt that chatbots had a strong social presence but lacked accuracy for correction. In our study, the students displayed a high appreciation for error correction and feedback but relatively low appreciation for Sociocultural interaction in general, with only 11% reporting use as a conversational partner. Perhaps this difference can be explained by improvement in chatbot correction technology suggested by the teachers in the 2021 study, and also perhaps because students are more sensitive to insincere social media interactions.

Monika and Suganthan's (2024) ChatGPT English acquisition questionnaire results showed some similarities: affective qualities of confidence ($M = 4.1$), believed proficiency improvement ($M = 3.75$), and motivation ($M = 3.2$) were positive. Low scoring results for speaking skill ($M = 2.2$) also match our qualitative feedback. Facilitating Communication ($M = 2.8$) and participation in discussions ($M = 2.8$) similarly match our dimension of social authenticity. On the other hand, the scores for enjoyment ($M = 2.47$) and engagement ($M = 2.89$) were lower. Compensatory dimensions such as feedback ($M = 2.86$) and understanding complex grammar ($M = 2.85$) also contrasted our results. No training was detailed in the CEAQ study, and negative responses (1 and 2 on the Likert scale) to each item were in the range of 42-243 of 359, so our focus on familiarising participants with ChatGPT through prompt training may have contributed to the differences.

Our study has delivered some of the practical work suggested by other authors and applied hypothetical ideas regarding the responsible use of Large Language Models, which were previously unsupported by experimental research. By integrating recommendations from various studies on ChatGPT use in language learning, we have contributed to an evolving understanding of AI in language education.

Our study illustrates a positive use of ChatGPT in the university EFL classroom. When students are trained in using the tool and shown specific prompts to adapt ChatGPT to various learning strategies, they employ their preferred strategies with positive results. We found that students effectively learned how to apply prompts and create suitable learning environments to achieve clear goals using a range of strategies.

Evaluations of ChatGPT within the SILL and S2R frameworks suggest a positive impact on language learning. This is demonstrated by the relatively high ratings for all SILL strategies in which students were trained, as well as S2R metacognitive strategies that were indirectly trained. The mean scores and comparisons with existing literature reveal that while social strategies are less employed, metacognitive, compensatory, and affective strategies are effectively used. The consistency in SILL dimension scores, influenced by direct prompt training, contrasts with the more varied S2R dimensions, except for Meta-affective stress relief and Metacognitive strategies.

This analysis underscores ChatGPT's potential as a beneficial tool in university-level EFL programs, supporting a variety of linguistic strategies and providing a rounded educational presence. Notably, ChatGPT did not score highly as a substitute for real-life experience, and participant feedback requested more human interaction, indicating that AI is not poised to replace teaching jobs at this stage.

Our research has also highlighted potential and ongoing limitations of ChatGPT and similar AI chatbots. In particular, student reports of inaccurate and unclear responses demonstrate the known imperfections of the technology. Some ~59% of respondents identified "inaccurate or unclear responses" as a significant limitation, with another ~29% reporting that their conversations "feel fake." Studying with ChatGPT appears not to conform to Chapelle's criteria of authenticity. These responses suggest that AI language models still have a way to go to replicate human-like dialogue capabilities. However, these observations also indicate that students are engaged in active learning and critical thinking with ChatGPT, as it takes an active learner to identify inaccuracies.

The lower social strategy assessment may result from a lack of trust in ChatGPT's responses and a sense of insincerity. Interacting with ChatGPT can feel fake because the system tends to always agree with the user. Studies have shown that pronunciation practice with AI can lower production anxiety (Dillon & Wells, 2023), so we anticipated a higher score on social strategies. However, affective strategies do well as ChatGPT offers an opportunity to discuss actual topics without fear of making mistakes. Stress relieving strategies were rated highly by participants, as the results show.

Student suggestions for improvement highlight the need for more feedback from teachers, indicating that ChatGPT is a supplement rather than a replacement for human interaction in language learning. Teachers might consider training students in various learning strategies when designing rubrics and tasks that support using large language models like ChatGPT.

For example, tasks based on Compensatory strategies and the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) could involve training students to have their grammar and vocabulary checked by a large language model, providing real-time feedback and creating a log of their learning progress. Implementing GCLA (Lee et al., 2024) by training L2 learners to make attempts at written work before seeking private and automatic corrections may also help to lower production anxiety and lead to a more efficient use of teaching time. This could encourage teachers to focus on more complex grammar forms, as students would be expected to make mistakes, rather than simply use language they know is correct. Basing tasks around SILL/S2R strategies can maintain pedagogical integrity during the AI revolution. Educators may also find it effective to engage learners in critical thinking activities and discussions about designing and refining prompts, and also criteria for recognising successful results.

The need for enhanced support in speaking and listening skills suggests further development, with ChatGPT interactions facilitated by speech-to-text or text-to-speech functionalities. Subsequent to our research, ChatGPT added these features, highlighting the evolving nature of AI technology in education. Ali et al. (2023) specifically emphasised this evolving nature of AI technology in educational settings, and researchers have many avenues for further studies.

In conclusion, ChatGPT represents a significant step forward in applying AI in language learning, offering valuable opportunities for interactive and strategic language practice. While it is not a complete solution, integrating ChatGPT into language learning programs, supplemented by human instruction and feedback, can create a robust and dynamic learning environment. The insights from this study provide a foundation for future research and development in this rapidly advancing field.

This was an exploratory study with a small sample size. The survey and feedback were anonymous, preventing conclusions based on individual differentiating factors among the participants. There was no control group, pre-test, or post-test, so it was not possible to gauge any improvements among the participants. We only collected chat transcripts from the initial supervised training sessions and did not request transcript data from users after they had experimented enough to become more proficient users. If ethical issues around chat transcript collection can be resolved, a longitudinal study analysing the chat strategies employed by new learners and tracking progress via changes in usage frequency, message and chat length as they become seasoned users may yield valuable insights. Teaching such learning analytic strategies during prompt training and using them in data analysis would also provide valuable repeated measures data, now that we have shown that using LLMs for strategy training within a university language setting is a viable proposition.

Applicable levels: Tertiary

REFERENCES

- Ali, J. K. M., Shamsan, M. A. A., Hezam, T. A., & Mohammed, A. A. (2023). Impact of ChatGPT on learning motivation: teachers and students' voices. *Journal of English Studies in Arabia Felix*, 2(1), 41-49.
- Alwaleedi, M. (2022). Students' emotional and behavioral engagement: Cloud based collaborative writing and learning analytics. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 23(1), 374-400.
- Baidoo-Anu, D., & Ansah, L. O. (2023). Education in the era of generative artificial intelligence (AI): Understanding the potential benefits of ChatGPT in promoting teaching and learning. *Journal of AI*, 7(1), 52-62.
- Belda-Medina, J., & Calvo-Ferrer, J. R. (2022). Using chatbots as AI conversational partners in language learning. *Applied Sciences*, 12(7), 1-16.
- Bibauw, S., François, T., & Desmet, P. (2019). Discussing with a computer to practice a foreign language: Research synthesis and conceptual framework of dialogue-based CALL. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 32(8), 827-877.
- Chapelle, C. (2001). *Computer applications in second language acquisition: Foundations for teaching, testing, and research*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Chanderan, V., & Hashim, H. (2022). Language learning strategies used by ESL undergraduate students. *Creative Education*, 13(3), 768-779.
- Chang, D. H., Lin, M. P. C., Hajian, S., & Wang, Q. Q. (2023). Educational design principles of using AI chatbot that supports self-regulated learning in education: Goal setting, feedback, and personalization. *Sustainability*, 15(17), Article 12921.
- Chuah, K. M., & Kabilan, M. (2021). Teachers' views on the use of chatbots to support English language teaching in a mobile environment. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning*, 16(20), 223-237.
- Cotton, D. R., Cotton, P. A., & Shipway, J. R. (2024). Chatting and cheating: Ensuring academic integrity in the era of ChatGPT. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 61(2), 228-239.
- Cong-Lem, N., & Daneshfar, S. (2024). Generative AI and second/foreign language education from Vygotsky's cultural-historical perspective. In H. P. Bui & E. Namaziandost (Eds.), *Innovations in technologies for language teaching and*

- learning. *Studies in computational intelligence*, vol 1159 (pp. 175-188). Cham, Switzerland: Springer.
- de Medeiros, L. F., Junior, A. K., & Moser, A. (2019). A cognitive assistant that uses small talk in tutoring conversation. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (Online)*, 14(11), 138.
- Dillon, T., & Wells, D. (2023). Effects of pronunciation training using automatic speech recognition on pronunciation accuracy of Korean English language learners. *English Teaching*, 78(1), 3-23.
- Ebadijalal, M., & Moradkhani, S. (2023). Impacts of computer-assisted collaborative writing, collaborative prewriting, and individual writing on EFL learners' performance and motivation. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 25(1), 1-25.
- García-Peñalvo, F. J. (2023). The perception of Artificial Intelligence in educational contexts after the launch of ChatGPT: Disruption or panic? *Education in the Knowledge Society*, 24, e31279.
- Gargallo-Camarillas, N. (2021). Learning styles and Generation Z at university: Perceptual learning preferences and digital media in the EFL classroom. In P. Salazar-Campillo & F. J. Vellón Lahoz (Eds.), *Les societats diverses. Mirades interdisciplinàries des de les ciències humanes i socials* (pp. 49-62). Castellón de la Plana, Spain: Servei de Comunicació i Publicacions.
- Halim, N. A., Ariffin, K., & Darus, N. A. (2021). Discovering students' strategies in learning English online. *Asian Journal of University Education*, 17(1), 261-268.
- Hew, K. F., Huang, W., Du, J., & Jia, C. (2022). Using chatbots to support student goal setting and social presence in fully online activities: Learner engagement and perceptions. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*, 35, 40-68.
- Herft, A. (2023). A teacher's prompt guide to chatGPT: aligned with "what works best". Retrieved on July 30, 2023, from <https://usergeneratededucation.files.wordpress.com/2023/01/a-teachers-prompt-guide-to-chatgpt-aligned-with-what-works-best.pdf>
- Hsu, H. C. (2020). The impact of task complexity on patterns of interaction during web-based asynchronous collaborative writing tasks. *System*, 93, 102328.
- Hwang, G. J., & Chang, C. Y. (2023). A review of opportunities and challenges of chatbots in education. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 31(7), 4099-4112.
- Jiang, X., Li, J., & Chen, C. H. (2024). Enhancing critical thinking Skills with ChatGPT-powered activities in Chinese language classrooms. *International Journal of Chinese Language Teaching*, 5(1), 47-73.
- Joo, H., & Bae, J. (2021). A study of Korean middle school students' use of English learning strategies in a digital learning environment. *Korea Journal of English Language and Linguistics*, 21, 1105-1127.

- Jung, S. K. (2019). Introduction to popular mobile chatbot platforms for English learning: Trends and issues. *STEM Journal*, 20(2), 67-90.
- Kasneci, E., Seßler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., ... & Kasneci, G. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 103, 102274.
- Kim, G., & Bae, J. (2020). A study into students' use of digital English learning strategies in tertiary education. *Teaching English with Technology*, 20(1), 21-42.
- Kim, M. K. (2023). Towards a Critical-PBLL utilizing ChatGPT and Google Bard within college English education. *Korea Journal of English Language and Linguistics*, 23, 741-767.
- Kim, S., Shim, J., & Shim, J. (2023). A study on the utilization of OpenAI ChatGPT as a second language learning tool. *Journal of Multimedia Information System*, 10(1), 79-88.
- Lee, H. Y., Chen, P. H., Wang, W. S., Huang, Y. M., & Wu, T. T. (2024). Empowering ChatGPT with guidance mechanism in blended learning: Effect of self-regulated learning, higher-order thinking skills, and knowledge construction. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 21(1), 1-28.
- Lethaby, C., & Mayne, R. (2020). A critical examination of perceptual learning styles in English language teaching. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 58(2), 221-237.
- Mahmoud, R. H. (2022). Implementing AI-based conversational chatbots in EFL speaking classes: an evolutionary perspective. *Research Square*. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-1911791/v1>
- Maloy, R. W., & Gattupalli, S. (2024). Prompt literacy. In *EdTechnica: The open encyclopaedia of educational technology* (pp. 211–216). EdTech Books.
- Miftah, M. Z., & Cahyono, B. Y. (2022). Collaborative writing assisted with Edmodo learning management system in Indonesian EFL classes: Learners' attitudes and learning engagement. *Computer-Assisted Language Learning Electronic Journal*, 23(2), 108-131.
- Monika, M., & Suganthan, C. (2024). A study on analyzing the role of ChatGPT in English acquisition among ESL learners during English language classroom. *The Bodhi International Journal of Research in Humanities, Arts and Science* 8(2), 75-84.
- Muñoz, S. A. S., Gayoso, G. G., Huambo, A. C., Tapia, R. D. C., Incaluque, J. L., Aguila, O. E. P., ... & Arias-González, J. L. (2023). Examining the impacts of ChatGPT on student motivation and engagement. *Social Space*, 23(1), 1-27.
- Odena, O., & Burgess, H. (2017). How doctoral students and graduates describe facilitating experiences and strategies for their thesis writing learning process: A qualitative approach. *Studies in Higher Education*, 42(3), 572-590.

- Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. New York: Newbury House.
- Oxford, R. L. (2016). *Teaching and researching language learning strategies: Self-regulation in context*. New York: Routledge.
- Pavlik, J. V. (2023). Collaborating with ChatGPT: Considering the implications of generative Artificial Intelligence for journalism and media education. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, 78(1), 84–93.
- Pei-Shi, W. (2012). The effect of learning styles on learning strategy use by EFL learners. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 8(2), 230.
- Santihastuti, A., & Wahjuningsih, E. (2019). The learning strategies used by EFL students in learning English. *Indonesian Journal of English Education*, 6(1), 10-20.
- Shao, K., & Xia, N. (2023). The impact of ChatGPT on the learning satisfaction of foreign language learners: A study. *Journal of Education, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 24, 216-221.
- Songsingchai, S., Sereerat, B. O., & Watananimitgul, W. (2023). Leveraging Artificial Intelligence (AI): Chat GPT for effective English language learning among Thai students. *English Language Teaching*, 16(11), 1-68.
- Tate, T., Doroudi, S., Ritchie, D., & Xu, Y. (2023). Educational research and AI-generated writing: Confronting the coming tsunami. *EdArXiv*. January, 10.
- Vo, T. K. A., & Nguyen, H. (2024). Generative Artificial Intelligence and ChatGPT in language learning: EFL students' perceptions of technology acceptance. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice*, 21(06), 1-19.
- Vyawahare, S., & Chakradeo, K. (2020, February). Chatbot assistant for English as a second language learners. *Proceedings of 2020 International Conference on Convergence to Digital World-Quo Vadis (ICCDW)* (pp. 1-5). Mumbai, India: IEEE
- Wang, X., Pang, H., Wallace, M. P., Wang, Q., & Chen, W. (2022). Learners' perceived AI presences in AI-supported language learning: A study of AI as a humanized agent from community of inquiry. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 37(4), 814-840.
- Yang, H. (2023). How I use ChatGPT responsibly in my teaching. *Nature*. Retrieved on June 30, 2023, from <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-023-01026-9>
- Yıldız, T. A. (2023). The impact of ChatGPT on language learners' motivation. *Journal of Teacher Education & Lifelong Learning*, 5(2), 582-597.
- Young, J. C., & Shishido, M. (2022) *Natural language processing technologies in English as second language learning applications: A review*. Retrieved on June 23, 2024, from https://www.anlp.jp/proceedings/annual_meeting/2022/pdf_dir/D4-1.pdf
- Zhai, X. (2022, December 27). ChatGPT user experience: Implications for education. *SSRN*. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4312418>

APPENDIX A

Questionnaire Items

N	Dimension	Strategy	Item
1	Affective	Stress Relief	ChatGPT is useful for relieving stress when writing long assignments.
2			ChatGPT helps me manage stress when writing long assignments.
3		Scripting	It was easy to get ChatGPT to generate scripts from my notes.
4			It's useful to have ChatGPT write out our chat as a script.
5		Satisfaction	I felt satisfied using ChatGPT for language learning.
6			I feel like ChatGPT has helped my language learning.
7	Cognitive	Explanation	It is helpful when ChatGPT explains difficult words in simple language.
8			I can easily see language examples and explanations when using ChatGPT.
9		Knowledge	ChatGPT makes it easier to understand difficult topics.
10			ChatGPT provides useful answers to my questions.
11		Topic Generation	ChatGPT generates useful ideas when I am brainstorming.
12			ChatGPT shows me helpful conversation questions about my topic choices.
13	Metacognitive	Planning	I feel that ChatGPT provides a supportive and engaging learning environment.
14			It was easy to adapt ChatGPT to my individual needs and learning style.
15		Organisation	It is useful to have ChatGPT summarise a long chat.
16			ChatGPT makes it easy to structure and organise my thoughts and ideas.
17		Reflection	I could apply my language learning knowledge practically using ChatGPT.
18			Using ChatGPT for language learning helps me develop useful problem-solving skills.
19	Compensation	Difficulty	It is easy to ask ChatGPT for basic vocabulary and grammar output.
20			It is useful to adjust the difficulty level of ChatGPT language output.
21		Brevity	It is useful to get a shorter reply from ChatGPT
22	It is easy to make ChatGPT's answers shorter, saving reading time.		

23		Error Correction	ChatGPT is useful for correcting spelling and grammar mistakes.
24			It is easy to get feedback on spelling and grammar errors.
25	Social	Peer Feedback	ChatGPT suggestions are useful for expanding my conversation answers.
26			It is easy to get suggestions to improve my writing.
27		Interaction	It was easy to discuss topics with ChatGPT as a friend.
28			It was useful to have meaningful discussions with ChatGPT.
29		Authenticity	It was easy to practise real-life situations with ChatGPT.
30			ChatGPT provides useful real-world language learning experiences.

APPENDIX B

Example strategy uses

1. Language Simplification

User: recomend for me chatgpt for 5 topics.

AI: Sure, I'd be happy to recommend some topics for us to discuss! Here are five topics you might find interesting:

- The benefits and drawbacks of remote work.
- The ethics of artificial intelligence and machine learning.
- Strategies for overcoming procrastination and increasing productivity.
- The impact of social media on mental health.
- The future of renewable energy and its potential to mitigate climate change.
- Let me know which topic you'd like to discuss first, and we can dive into it!

User: use easy words.

AI: Sure, I apologize for not using simpler language earlier. Let me rephrase those topics in simpler terms:

- Working from home - good or bad?
- Is it right to use robots and smart computers that learn on their own?
- How can you stop delaying and get more things done?
- How does social media affect how people feel?
- Can we use energy that won't run out and help the Earth's environment in the future?

User: recomend for me chatgpt for 5 topics. use easy topics.

AI: Of course, I'm sorry for any confusion earlier. Here are five simple topics we can discuss:

- Your favorite hobby or activity and why you enjoy it.
- Your favorite food and the best way to prepare it.
- A place you would love to travel to and why.
- A book or movie that you would recommend and why.
- A personal accomplishment you are proud of and how you achieved it.
- Let me know which topic you'd like to discuss first and we can start our conversation!

2. Brevity, Grammar Feedback, Topic Generation, and Inquiry Initiation

User: I am english beginner. can you give me 5 topic?

AI: Of course! Here are five topics that may be helpful for beginner-level English learners:

- Basic introductions and greetings.

Daily routines.
 Ordering food and drinks.
 Giving and following directions.

User: i want to talk about daily routines. Please ask me some question

AI: Great! Here are some questions to help you talk about your daily routine:

What time do you usually wake up in the morning?
 What's the first thing you do when you wake up?
 Do you have breakfast every day? If so, what do you usually have?
 What do you do for work or school? What time do you start?
 Do you have any hobbies or activities that you do regularly?
 Do you exercise or do any physical activity? If so, when do you do it?
 What time do you usually have dinner? What do you like to eat?
 What do you like to do in the evenings before bed?
 What time do you usually go to bed?

I hope these questions help you practice talking about your daily routine in English!

User: too many. Please give me 3 question

AI: Sure, here are three questions about daily routines:

What time do you usually wake up in the morning?
 Do you have any daily rituals or habits that you follow?
 What do you like to do in the evenings before bed?

User: I wake up on 7:30 AM. Please check my sentence and give me feedback

AI: Great! Your sentence "I wake up at 7:30 AM" is a correct and clear statement about your waking time. Well done!

If you would like to add more detail, you could also say "I usually wake up at 7:30 AM" to indicate that this is a typical occurrence for you. Additionally, if you want to express that this time is earlier or later than what is typical for you, you could say something like "I'm not a morning person, but I still wake up at 7:30 AM every day" or "I usually sleep in on the weekends and wake up later than 7:30 AM." Keep up the good work!

User: So long... please simple sentence

AI: Sure, here's a simpler sentence: "I wake up at 7:30 in the morning." This sentence uses simpler vocabulary and grammar, and may be easier for beginner English learners to understand.

3. Vocabulary Explanation

AI: What is your favorite type of cuisine?

User: What does cuisine means?

AI: "Cuisine" is a fancy word for "style of cooking". So when we talk about different types of cuisine, we're talking about the different ways that food is prepared and cooked in different regions or countries. For example, Italian cuisine might include dishes like pizza and pasta, while Japanese cuisine might include sushi and ramen.

4. Summary and scripting

User: Please summarize my answers.

AI: Certainly! Here is a summary of your answers: Topic: Sports

You don't like to play sports except for racket ball.
 You enjoy watching soccer, particularly during the World Cup.
 You don't have a specific soccer team that you support.
 You like the World Cup for the excitement of seeing different countries compete against each other.
 You also appreciate the skill and athleticism of the players.
 You don't have any specific favorite World Cup moments or matches.

User: Please make a script of our chat.

AI: Sure, here is a script of our chat: Topic: Sports

Me: Do you enjoy watching or playing sports?
 You: I don't really like to play sports except racket ball. And I like to watch soccer.
 Me: That's interesting! Racket ball can be a fun and intense sport, and soccer is a very popular sport around the world. Do you have a favorite soccer team or player that you like to watch?

You: I don't have a soccer team that I like. I just like watching World Cup soccer games.

Me: That's understandable. The World Cup is one of the biggest and most exciting soccer events in the world, and it brings together some of the best teams and players from different countries. What is it about the World Cup that you enjoy the most?

You: I enjoy seeing different countries compete against each other. I also appreciate the skill and athleticism of the players.

Me: That's great! Do you have any favorite World Cup moments or matches that you remember watching?

You: No, I don't have any specific favorite World Cup moments or matches.

Me: Okay, that's fine. It's exciting to watch the games regardless. Thanks for chatting with me!

5. Brevity

User: give me feedback to help my conversation.

AI: Your English looks good so far! Here are a few suggestions to help improve your skills:

Practice speaking English out loud as much as possible, even if you are alone. This will help you become more comfortable with the language and improve your pronunciation.

Try to use new vocabulary words and phrases that you learn in your conversations. This will help you expand your vocabulary and express yourself more clearly.

Listen carefully to native English speakers and pay attention to their pronunciation, intonation, and sentence structure. This will help you improve your comprehension and learn how to speak more naturally.

Don't be afraid to make mistakes! Making mistakes is a natural part of the learning process and can actually help you improve more quickly. Just keep practicing and learning from your mistakes.

Overall, keep practicing and seeking out opportunities to practice your English, whether it's through conversations with native speakers, watching English-language TV shows and movies, or reading English-language books and articles. Good luck!

User: It's too long. Tell me in a short sentence.

AI: Practice speaking English out loud, use new vocabulary, listen to native speakers, and don't be afraid to make mistakes!

6. Spelling and Grammar Correction

User: i enjoy listenting k-pop, popsong and anything else. i just played a piano at elementry school when i listen to music it makes me comfortable and stress go away. i don't have a favorite band. love music developed increasingly.

AI: You're welcome! Here are some corrections to your sentences to help improve your English:

"I enjoy listening to K-pop, pop songs, and anything else." (When listing multiple items, it's important to use commas to separate them.)

"I played the piano in elementary school." (When talking about playing a musical instrument, it's important to use the definite article "the" before the name of the instrument.)

"When I listen to music, it makes me feel comfortable and helps relieve my stress." (Great sentence, just a minor correction with the placement of "and".)

"I don't have a favorite band." (Perfect sentence!)

"My love for music has developed increasingly over time." (To express a gradual increase in something, it's more natural to use "increasingly" instead of "developed".)

Keep up the good work!