INTEGRATING ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE TOOLS IN TEACHING ENGLISH WRITING TO UNIVERSITY STUDENTS: A REVIEW-BASED STUDY AND PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

Lê Minh Trang, Phan Thị Hường
Khoa Ngoại ngữ, Trường Đại học Hải Phòng
Email: tranglm@dhhp.edu.vn

Ngày nhận bài: 24/12/2025
Ngày nhận bài sửa: 02/3/2026
Ngày duyệt đăng: 10/3/2026

Abstract: The emergence of generative artificial intelligence (AI), particularly ChatGPT, is transforming English writing instruction in higher education. This paper synthesizes and critically reviews recent empirical studies (2023 - 2025) on the use of generative AI tools in teaching university-level English writing, with a focus on to the Vietnamese context and Hai Phong University. Using a secondary data analysis approach, six peer-reviewed studies from Asian countries were analyzed to identify key trends, benefits, and challenges. The findings indicate that AI tools enhance grammatical accuracy, academic vocabulary, coherence, idea development, and learner motivation by providing timely and personalized feedback. However, concerns regarding over-reliance, reduced creativity, and academic ethics remain. The paper argues that generative AI should be integrated as a pedagogical support and proposes context-sensitive strategies for responsible and effective implementation in English writing instruction.

Keywords: Artificial intelligence (AI), English writing skills, higher education, pedagogical innovation.

TÍCH HỢP CÁC CÔNG CỤ TRÍ TUỆ NHÂN TẠO TRONG GIẢNG DẠY KỸ NĂNG VIẾT TIẾNG ANH CHO SINH VIÊN ĐẠI HỌC: TIẾP CẬN TỔNG QUAN VÀ HÀM Ý ĐỐI VỚI CÔNG TÁC GIẢNG DẠY

Tóm tắt: Sự xuất hiện của trí tuệ nhân tạo (AI) tạo sinh, đặc biệt là ChatGPT, đang làm thay đổi mạnh mẽ hoạt động giảng dạy kỹ năng viết tiếng Anh trong giáo dục đại học. Bài viết này tổng hợp và đánh giá một cách phê phán các nghiên cứu thực nghiệm gần đây (giai đoạn 2023-2025) về việc ứng dụng các công cụ AI tạo sinh trong giảng dạy kỹ năng viết tiếng Anh ở bậc đại học, với trọng tâm là bối cảnh Việt Nam và Trường Đại học Hải Phòng. Trên cơ sở phương pháp phân tích dữ liệu thứ cấp, sáu nghiên cứu được bình duyệt từ các quốc gia châu Á đã được phân tích nhằm xác định các xu hướng chủ đạo, lợi ích và thách thức. Kết quả cho thấy các công cụ AI góp phần nâng cao độ chính xác ngữ pháp, vốn từ vựng học thuật, tính mạch lạc, khả năng phát triển ý tưởng và động lực học tập của người học thông qua việc cung cấp phản hồi kịp thời và mang

tính cá nhân hóa. Tuy nhiên, vẫn tồn tại những lo ngại liên quan đến sự phụ thuộc quá mức, suy giảm tính sáng tạo và các vấn đề về đạo đức học thuật. Bài viết cho rằng AI tạo sinh cần được tích hợp như một công cụ hỗ trợ sư phạm, đồng thời đề xuất các giải pháp triển khai phù hợp với bối cảnh nhằm bảo đảm việc ứng dụng AI một cách có trách nhiệm và hiệu quả trong giảng dạy kỹ năng viết tiếng Anh.

Từ khoá: Trí tuệ nhân tạo, kỹ năng viết tiếng Anh, giảng dạy đại học, đổi mới phương pháp.

1. Introduction

The rapid advancement of artificial intelligence (AI) is transforming higher education worldwide, reshaping knowledge access, learning processes, and the roles of teachers and students. Generative AI tools such as ChatGPT, Gemini, and Claude have emerged as prominent symbols of this shift, influencing not only information processing but also creative language learning, particularly academic English writing. Pham et al. (2024) note that AI has significantly impacted higher education, with writing skills becoming a key area of transformation.

English writing, a complex skill requiring logical reasoning, organization, and persuasive expression, has been notably affected by AI integration. In contexts characterized by large classes and diverse proficiency levels, lecturers often struggle to provide individualized feedback (Nguyen, 2024). Generative AI, especially ChatGPT, offers potential support by simulating teacher-like feedback, assisting with grammar, vocabulary, structure, and argumentation, thereby enabling interactive and immediate learning support.

Nevertheless, its classroom use raises pedagogical and ethical concerns. Excessive reliance may weaken critical thinking and creativity, prompting questions about whether AI truly develops writing competence or merely accelerates production, and how to define boundaries between instructional support and substitution.

In response, this paper synthesizes recent studies on generative AI in university-level English writing instruction using a secondary data analysis approach. Drawing on research from the past three years, it examines trends in AI application, associated benefits and challenges, and context-appropriate implementation strategies for Vietnamese universities, particularly Hai Phong University, where strengthening writing instruction has become a pressing priority.

2. Literature Review

2.1. English writing instruction in higher education

Writing is widely regarded as a core component of university language education, functioning not only as a linguistic skill but also as a cognitive practice through which students construct knowledge and engage in disciplinary discourse. Writing is also believed to be a process of critical engagement rather than merely a product, enabling learners to reorganize knowledge and position themselves within academic communities (Farhan, 2025; Nguyen, 2024).

In the Vietnamese higher education context, empirical studies (Nguyen, 2024; Nguyen et al., 2025) highlight recurring challenges, particularly among non-English majors, including limited academic vocabulary,

weak idea development, and poor paragraph organization. Large class sizes further restrict individualized feedback, often resulting in surface-level correction instead of deeper cognitive growth.

To address these constraints, recent research has examined technological interventions such as automated feedback systems and digital writing assistants. However, most studies focus on traditional correction tools rather than generative AI capable of contextualized language production. Consequently, despite documenting institutional limitations, existing literature has yet to systematically assess how generative AI may transform feedback practices, learner autonomy, and teacher–student interaction, underscoring the need to reconsider writing pedagogy in the era of large language models.

2.2. Generative AI in Writing Instruction

Contemporary generative AI, powered by large language models (LLMs), can produce coherent and context-sensitive text based on extensive training data (Alfredo et al., 2024). Tools such as ChatGPT, Gemini, and Bing Copilot have rapidly entered educational settings, marking a qualitative shift from earlier AI applications focused mainly on grammar checking and speech recognition (Pham et al., 2024). Unlike traditional automated tools, LLMs simulate dialogue, generate outlines, suggest argument structures, and provide revision feedback across multiple stages of the writing process.

Empirical research has increasingly examined the pedagogical effects of these tools. Wang (2025) shows that AI can support learners in pre-writing, drafting, and revision, contributing to improved grammatical accuracy and organization. In the Vietnamese context, Cung et al. (2024) found that generative AI enhanced lexical diversity, idea development, and learner confidence, though some students relied uncritically on AI-generated revisions. Similarly, Ozfidan et al. (2024), in a quantitative study in Saudi Arabia, reported positive correlations between AI usage and perceived writing improvement, but the reliance on self-reported data leaves long-term competence development unclear.

Overall, the literature consistently indicates that generative AI improves surface-level linguistic accuracy, increases motivation, and reduces writing anxiety, while also raising ethical concerns and risks of over-reliance. However, many studies are limited by short-term designs and perception-based measures, and few integrate pedagogical and ethical dimensions within a unified framework. Consequently, although short-term writing quality appears to improve, it remains uncertain whether generative AI fosters sustainable writing competence or primarily accelerates text production, and whether it can meaningfully substitute for teacher feedback in higher education contexts.

2.3. Research gap and positioning of the present study

The existing body of research on generative AI in writing instruction is expanding but remains fragmented across contexts, methodologies, and analytical perspectives. Studies differ in research design (quantitative surveys, mixed-method approaches), geographical focus (Vietnam, broader Asian contexts), and evaluative criteria (perceived usefulness versus measured performance outcomes).

While current scholarship provides valuable evidence of immediate linguistic benefits, it does not adequately clarify three central issues: ***(i)*** Whether AI-supported writing leads to sustainable competence development or primarily enhances production speed; ***(ii)*** Whether AI can meaningfully substitute for teacher feedback in higher education settings; ***(iii)*** How the boundary between AI as pedagogical support and AI as functional substitution should be defined within institutional contexts.

Furthermore, there is limited integrative review research that synthesizes recent empirical findings while situating them within the Vietnamese higher education environment. Therefore, the present study addresses these gaps by conducting a critical secondary data analysis of recent empirical research (2023 - 2025), with particular attention to pedagogical effectiveness, ethical considerations, and implementation feasibility within the context of Hai Phong University. By synthesizing diverse empirical findings through a unified analytical framework, this study clarifies both the potential and the limitations of generative AI in university-level English writing instruction, thereby establishing the scholarly and practical relevance of the current research.

3. Research methodology

This study adopts a secondary data analysis with a critical review orientation, aiming to synthesize, compare, and critically evaluate empirical research on the integration of generative AI tools in teaching English writing at the university level. The analysis focuses on studies published between 2023 and 2025 to capture recent pedagogical responses to the rapid emergence of generative AI technologies in language education.

Data were collected from reputable journals in the field of foreign language teaching, including Computers & Education, Journal of English for Academic Purposes, Language Learning & Technology, Asian EFL Journal, as well as Vietnamese sources such as Journal of Foreign Language Studies (Tạp chí Khoa học Ngoại ngữ) and Journal of Education (Tạp chí Giáo dục).

This study prioritizes analytical depth rather than statistical representativeness. The materials were selected based on three criteria: ***(i)*** a focus on the application of generative AI in teaching or learning English writing; ***(ii)*** the use of empirical research designs with clearly reported qualitative, quantitative, or mixed-methods data; and ***(iii)*** publication in reputable academic outlets within the last three years. Six studies met all criteria and were included for analysis. Emphasizing rigor over breadth, the selected studies were systematically coded according to themes aligned with the research objectives, including trends in AI use in writing instruction, pedagogical benefits and challenges, stakeholder perspectives, and context-sensitive implementation strategies.

Content analysis was employed to identify patterns and key trends in the literature, enabling a structured synthesis of findings relevant to the Vietnamese context. With an applied orientation, the paper further examines factors affecting the integration of ChatGPT into writing instruction and explores its potential implementation at Hai Phong University, where developing English writing proficiency is a strategic priority.

4. Findings and Discussion

Table 1. Summary of empirical studies on the application of AI tools in enhancing English writing skills for university students in selected Asian countries

Author (Year)	Country	Participants	AI Tool	Method	Key Findings	Limitations	Recommendations
Wang (2025)	China	68 University Students	ChatGPT-4	Quantitative: Experimental design	Improved skills, positive changes in acceptance, calmness, and comfort	Limited sample size; short-term intervention	Further research needed on AI integration in education
Farhan (2025)	Iraq	EFL Students (number unspecified, essay analysis)	ChatGPT, Grammarly, QuillBot, Hemingway Editor	Qualitative: Content analysis	Improved grammar, vocabulary, and coherence but reduced creativity, excessive dependence	Risk of losing independent skills	Prospects for personalized AI and critical thinking development
Tajik (2024)	Iran	10 University Students	ChatGPT	Qualitative: Semi-structured interviews	Use of prompt engineering, self-adjustment, critical reflection; emphasis on ethics	Small sample size limitation	Recommend an AI ethics framework and learner-centered approach
Ozfidan et al. (2024)	Saudi Arabia	189 undergraduates	ChatGPT, Grammarly, QuillBot	Mixed-method: Survey, EFA	Improved idea generation, outlining, grammar accuracy, time efficiency	Self-reported data; single institutional context	Need for AI literacy training and ethical guidelines
Lai & Trinh (2025)	Vietnam	310 University Students	ChatGPT	Quantitative: Questionnaire, SPSS analysis	Improved academic vocabulary, grammar, ideas, and motivation	Unclear response numbers	Long-term multi-disciplinary research needed
Cung et al. (2024)	Vietnam	Not applicable (Review of 3 studies)	Mainly ChatGPT	Systematic literature review	Improved vocabulary, grammar, and writing quality	Very limited number of Vietnamese studies	Calls for broader samples and longitudinal research

The integration of AI tools, particularly ChatGPT and its variants, into English as a Foreign Language (EFL) and academic writing has produced consistent evidence of improved linguistic proficiency across Asian higher education contexts. Studies from China (Wang, 2025), Iraq (Farhan, 2025), Iran (Tajik, 2024), Vietnam (Lai & Trinh, 2025; Cung et al., 2024), and Saudi Arabia (Ozfidan et al., 2024) report measurable gains in writing performance, vocabulary growth, grammatical accuracy, idea development, communication skills, and learner motivation. At the same time, these findings highlight key pedagogical implications while cautioning against over-reliance on AI feedback and emphasizing the need for theoretical development and longitudinal research in AI-assisted language learning.

Key findings on AI's impact on language skills

Across the studies, AI tools demonstrated significant positive effects on technical aspects of language proficiency. In Wang's (2025) experimental design with 68 Chinese undergraduates, ChatGPT-4 significantly enhanced English communication skills, with the experimental group achieving a posttest mean score of 4.12 (SD = 0.52) compared to the control group's 3.52 (SD = 0.52; t = 7.98; p = 0.000). Questionnaire data further revealed improvements in perceived usefulness, ease of use, attitude, and intention to adopt the tool, fostering a sense of calm and comfort among learners. Similarly, Lai & Trinh (2025) reported robust enhancements in academic writing among 310 Vietnamese English-majored students, with exploratory factor analysis (EFA) explaining 73.84% of variance across four factors: academic vocabulary (M = 3.78), grammar accuracy (M = 3.54; SD = 1.064), idea development (M > 3.60, highest at 3.85 for generating diverse ideas), and motivation (M > 3.5, though lower at 3.2 for anxiety reduction). Cronbach's Alpha values exceeded 0.8, confirming scale reliability.

Farhan's (2025) content analysis of Iraqi EFL students' essays complemented these quantitative insights by showing qualitative improvements in grammatical accuracy (reduced error rates in verb tense and structure), lexical complexity (advanced synonyms and phrasing), and coherence (better logical flow) when using tools like ChatGPT, Grammarly, QuillBot, and Hemingway Editor. However, creativity declined in AI-assisted outputs, indicating a homogenization of style. Tajik's (2024) qualitative interviews with 10 Iranian undergraduates echoed these benefits, identifying ChatGPT as a learning partner for personalized tutoring, language proficiency enhancer (e.g., pronunciation and IELTS preparation), and idea generator for tasks like translation research. Participants employed prompt engineering, self-regulation, and critical reflection to optimize outputs, emphasizing ethical verification to maintain academic integrity.

Cung et al. (2024) reported statistically significant gains in writing quality and learner confidence in a Vietnamese university context, but also noted risks of uncritical acceptance of AI suggestions. Similarly, Ozfidan et al. (2024) found positive correlations between AI usage

and perceived writing improvement among Saudi students, although reliance on self-reported data limited conclusions about long-term competence development.

Discussion of benefits and pedagogical implications

The aggregated findings highlight AI's potential to address persistent EFL challenges, including limited speaking practice and writing anxiety. Wang (2025) showed that ChatGPT-4 can simulate low-pressure, authentic conversations, while Tajik (2024) reported reduced anxiety through adaptive interactions, particularly in resource-constrained contexts such as Iran and China. This is consistent with Athanassopoulos et al. (2023), who found that AI tools benefit disadvantaged learners by increasing word count and lexical diversity.

In writing contexts, Lai et al.'s (2025) and Farhan's (2025) findings highlight AI's capacity to refine academic output. The EFA results from Lai et al. (2025) suggest that ChatGPT acts as a supplementary brain, generating diverse ideas (M = 3.85) without full replacement, as only a minority of students relied on it for all assignments. This positions AI as a bridge to higher-order skills, fostering autonomy as seen in Tajik's (2024) prompt engineering practices.

Moreover, findings from Cung et al. (2024) indicate that AI-assisted drafting may function as an initial cognitive scaffold that lowers entry barriers to writing, particularly for students with limited confidence. However, without guided reflection, such scaffolding may risk becoming substitution rather than support.

Pedagogically, these findings support learner-centered approaches (Kasneci et al., 2023), in which AI fosters critical engagement rather than passive dependence. In Asian EFL contexts marked by large classes and exam-oriented systems, tools such as ChatGPT-4 can expand access to personalized feedback, as reflected in Wang's (2025) reduced learner anxiety and Farhan's (2025) improvements in coherence. Nevertheless, ethical guidance is essential to safeguard originality, echoing Tajik's (2024) call for integrating AI ethics into curricula. Overall, evidence from Vietnam, Saudi Arabia, China, Iran, and Iraq indicates that although AI provides scalable feedback in resource-constrained settings, effective institutional regulation and pedagogical mediation are vital to avoid mechanistic adoption.

Limitations and Challenges

Despite the reported benefits, the reviewed studies reveal several important limitations. Farhan (2025) notes reduced originality in AI-assisted essays, suggesting a tendency toward stylistic homogenization. Similarly, Cung et al. (2024) observe that some students adopted AI-generated revisions without sufficient critical evaluation, raising concerns about cognitive dependency. Tajik (2024) also highlights the need for ethical awareness and self-regulation when using ChatGPT, indicating that improved linguistic accuracy does not automatically translate into deeper writing competence.

Methodological constraints further limit the strength of current conclusions. Tajik's (2024) small qualitative sample (n = 10) and Wang's (2025) relatively limited experimental group (n = 68) restrict generalizability. Lai & Trinh (2025) and Ozfidan et al. (2024) rely

heavily on perception-based measures, while Cung et al. (2024) are confined to a single institutional context. Moreover, differences in research design and national settings complicate cross-study comparison. Overall, although short-term gains in writing quality are evident, evidence regarding long-term competence development and independent critical thinking remains insufficient.

5. Recommendations for teaching English writing to students

The recommendations proposed in this section are grounded in three interrelated foundations: ***(i)*** empirical findings synthesized in this study, which demonstrate measurable improvements in grammar accuracy, vocabulary range, idea development, and learner confidence through AI-supported writing; ***(ii)*** the identified limitations across previous studies, particularly risks of over-reliance, reduced creativity, and insufficient long-term competence validation; ***(iii)*** the specific institutional context of Hai Phong University, characterized by increasing digital transformation initiatives and growing interest in AI integration in foreign language education (Hai Phong University 2025). Together, these factors suggest that AI should neither be rejected nor uncritically adopted, but strategically embedded within a structured pedagogical framework that maximizes learning benefits while minimizing dependency risks.

Although AI integration represents an inevitable trend in educational innovation, the literature suggests that short-term linguistic gains do not automatically translate into independent writing competence or critical thinking. Therefore, implementation must be pedagogically guided. Hai Phong University's recent organization of international conferences on AI in foreign language teaching demonstrates institutional readiness and provides a practical foundation for piloting structured AI-assisted writing models aligned with both research evidence and institutional capacity (Hai Phong University 2024).

Building upon these empirical findings and institutional considerations, several pedagogical implications can be drawn for enhancing the effectiveness of English writing instruction among students with the assistance of AI tools.

First, the English Writing curriculum should be redesigned to integrate AI with a clear pedagogical framework. Each course module could be divided into three stages: ***(i)*** Pre-writing - students use ChatGPT to gather ideas and create outlines, guided by instructors on evaluating accuracy; ***(ii)*** Drafting - students submit both AI-feedback-enhanced drafts and original versions, allowing instructors to highlight differences; ***(iii)*** Revising - students analyze AI feedback, reflect, and rewrite based on pedagogical guidance. This approach positions AI as a "reflective-support" tool rather than a replacement.

Second, instructors need training in digital pedagogical skills, including crafting effective "academic prompts," assessing AI feedback, and designing hybrid human-machine learning activities. Hai Phong University could establish a digital pedagogy research group to share experiences in this field.

Third, a framework and code of academic ethics for AI use should be developed. The university should issue clear guidelines:

students may use ChatGPT for idea exploration and language refinement but must not allow it to write entire essays. Additionally, learners should be required to disclose AI-assisted content in submitted academic work to ensure transparency and accountability.

Fourth, action research in AI-supported writing instruction should be encouraged. Faculty groups in the Foreign Languages Department could pilot an "AI-assisted writing classroom" model, tracking changes in students' reasoning skills, vocabulary, critical thinking across semesters. These outcomes will help the university adjust training methods to suit the needs of learners.

Finally, a culture of responsible AI use in learning should be fostered. Instructors should help students understand that AI tools do not replace human creativity but support the reflection process. Activities such as "analyzing AI feedback inaccuracies" or "rewriting paragraphs in a personal style after consulting ChatGPT" could be incorporated into assignments to promote independent thinking.

6. Conclusion

Based on a synthesis of recent empirical research on generative AI in university-level English writing instruction, this paper provides clear responses to the initial research questions. The findings show that AI tools contribute substantively to writing development, not merely writing speed. They support improvements in grammatical accuracy, academic vocabulary, coherence, and idea development across drafting stages, while also enhancing learner motivation and confidence through timely, personalized feedback—particularly valuable in large or resource-constrained classrooms.

At the same time, the studies affirm that AI cannot replace teachers' pedagogical roles. Excessive or unguided reliance may weaken creativity and critical thinking, making it essential to define clear boundaries between AI as support and AI as substitution through sound instructional design and academic ethics frameworks.

In the context of Hai Phong University, AI integration holds promise if accompanied by clear guidance, appropriate regulation, and active instructor mediation. Rather than a stand-alone solution, AI should function as a supplementary resource embedded within institutional and pedagogical structures. While controlled and reflective use may enhance writing instruction, further longitudinal research is needed to assess its long-term effects on writing development, critical thinking, and academic integrity in Vietnamese higher education.

REFERENCES

I. English

1. Alfredo, R., Echeverria, V., Jin, Y., Yan, L., Swiecki, Z., Gašević, D., & Martinez-Maldonado, R. (2024), Human-centred learning analytics and AI in education: A systematic literature review, *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 6*, Article 100215, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100215.

2. Cung, L. T., Duong, H. M., & Truong, T. T. T. (2024), The impacts of artificial intelligence on English academic writing: A systematic review in Vietnam, *Vietnam Journal of Education,* 8(3), 191-202, https://doi.org/10.52296/vje.2024.343.

3. Farhan, H. (2025), The impact of AI-powered writing tools on students' writing performance: A content analysis and future prospects, *ResearchGate,* https://www.researchgate.net/publication/389458566.

4. Flowerdew, J. (2016), English for specific academic purposes (ESAP) writing, *Writing & Pedagogy,* 8(1), 1-4, https://doi.org/10.1558/wap.v8i1.30077.

5. Lai, T. K. L., & Trinh, H. L. (2025), The effects of ChatGPT on academic writing proficiency among English-majored undergraduates at a university, *VNU Journal of Foreign Studies,* 41(3), 92-109, https://doi.org/10.63023/2525-2445/jfs.ulis.5514.

6. Nguyen, H. N., Nguyen, H. M., & Do, T. P. M. (2025), EFL lecturers' experiences and perceptions towards using ChatGPT in teaching writing: A case study in Vietnam, *International Journal of Education and Practice,* 13(3), 857-869, https://doi.org/10.18488/61.v13i3.4291.

7. Nguyen, T. L. P. (2024), Sử dụng trí tuệ nhân tạo vào việc học tiếng Anh của sinh viên Trường Đại học Sư phạm Kỹ thuật Vinh: Khó khăn và giải pháp, *Journal of Educational Equipment: Applied Research,* 2(319), 28-30.

8. Ozfidan, B., El-Dakhs, D. A. S., & Alsalim, L. A. (2024), The use of AI tools in English academic writing by Saudi undergraduates, *Contemporary Educational Technology,* 16(4), ep527, https://doi.org/10.30935/cedtech/15013.

9. Pham, T. K., Nguyen, D. C., & Dinh, T. D. (2024), Ứng dụng trí tuệ nhân tạo trong dạy học và nghiên cứu khoa học tại các trường đại học, *Tạp chí Giáo dục,* 24(24), 14-19.

10. Srithep, S. (2025), The integration of ChatGPT in EFL writing instruction: Pedagogical merits and potential concerns, *Pasa Paritat Journal,* 40, 82-98.

11. Tajik, A. (2024), *Exploring the potential of ChatGPT in EFL language learning: Learners' reflections and practices*[Unpublished manuscript].

12. Wang, Y. (2025), A study on the efficacy of ChatGPT-4 in enhancing students' English communication skills, *SAGE Open*, 15(1), 1-17, https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241310644\.

II. Vietnamese

1. Hai Phong University (2024), *Hội thảo khoa học quốc tế "Đổi mới và sáng tạo trong nghiên cứu và giảng dạy ngoại ngữ" diễn ra thành công tốt đẹp*, https://dhhp.edu.vn/post/hoi-thao-khoa-hoc-quoc-te-doi-moi-va-sang-tao-trong-nghien-cuu-va-giang-day-ngoai-ngu-dien-ra-thanh-cong-tot-dep-49086.html.

2. Hai Phong University (2025), *Trường Đại học Hải Phòng đồng tổ chức thành công hội thảo khoa học quốc tế, chủ đề "Giảng dạy và Nghiên cứu Ngoại ngữ trong Kỷ nguyên Số: Hội nhập và Phát triển"*, https://dhhp.edu.vn/post/truong-dai-hoc-hai-phong-dong-to-chuc-thanh-cong-hoi-thao-khoa-hoc-quoc-te-chu-de-giang-day-va-nghien-cuu-ngoai-ngu-trong-ky-nguyen-so-hoi-nhap-va-phat-trien-51396.html

.