

Exploring Students' Perceptions of Using the ChatGPT Voice Conversation Feature for Informal English-Speaking Practice

Rizki Rayana

Universitas Muhammadiyah Makassar, Makassar, Indonesia

rizkirayana@bg.unismuhmakkassar.ac.id

ABSTRACT

The rapid advancement of Artificial Intelligence (AI), especially with generative AI chatbots, is opening innovative options for autonomous language learning. This qualitative descriptive study investigates university students' impressions of utilizing the ChatGPT Voice Conversation function for informal English speaking practice. Twelve Indonesian university students of English education major who used the feature to practice speaking by themselves for four weeks were selected by purposive sampling technique and then interviewed using semi-structured interview. The data collected were examined using Braun and Clarke thematic analysis methodology. The preliminary data suggest that students view the ChatGPT Voice Conversation feature as a low-anxiety, highly accessible and interactive tool that helps them improve speaking fluency and learn vocabulary. However, several significant shortcomings were detected including technical constraints such as occasional odd prosody, conversational disconnects and the absence of non-verbal cues. The study suggests that AI speech features, while useful as scaffolding for informal conversation, should be used to supplement, not substitute for, human-human contact in language instruction.

Keywords: ChatGPT Voice Conversation, Informal Speaking Practice, Students' Perceptions, Qualitative Descriptive, AI in Language Learning

(Received 2026-07-13, Revised 2026-08-25, Accepted 2026-08-26, Available Online by 2026-08-30)

INTRODUCTION

English continues to be the world's language franca and a vital tool for academic achievement and job mobility throughout the globe in today's digital age. Speaking is arguably the most important of the four essential language abilities, yet it is also the most difficult skill to acquire [1]. For English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners, especially in the Indonesian context, the development of oral proficiency is sometimes faced with serious structural and psychological barriers. Traditional classroom environments often do not give enough opportunity for customized speaking practice due to high student-to-teacher ratios, inflexible curricula, and limited teaching time. Hence, many students graduate from university with good receptive competence (reading and listening) but poor oral communicative competence.

Besides institutional limits, psychological hurdles to speaking English in foreign language environments are well-documented. During real-time communication, students are typically paralyzed by language anxiety, fear of negative evaluation by peers and a pervasive lack of confidence [2]. In response to these issues, researchers and practitioners have increasingly turned to informal digital learning settings. The paradigm of Computer-Assisted Language Learning (CALL) and Mobile-Assisted Language Learning (MALL) has changed the focus of language acquisition from formal classrooms to autonomous, out-of-class contexts.

Students can learn English informally by experiencing the language in a low-stakes, low-stress atmosphere that lowers affective filters and promotes organic production [3].

The newest innovation transforming this space is the advent of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI). OpenAI's ChatGPT was first introduced as a text-based conversational AI model and has undergone dramatic enhancements, including the addition of the advanced "Voice Conversation" function. This feature allows users to have real-time, flowing spoken dialogues with an AI agent that has human-like prosody, various emotional inflections and near-instantaneous processing capabilities, unlike the earlier, inflexible Text-to-Speech (TTS) systems. This technology offers a unique chance for students of English as a foreign language (EFL): a virtual, infinitely patient interlocutor, available 24/7, who can debate any topic, correct grammatical faults on demand and tailor the complexity of conversation to the user's competency level.

Although research on the usefulness of text-based ChatGPT in academic writing and vocabulary learning is increasing [4,5], there is a lack of empirical studies specifically examining the Voice Conversation feature for informal speaking practice. Most studies of AI voice assistants, like Apple's Siri or Amazon's Alexa, observe that they can't conduct extensive conversations with context awareness. The speech function of ChatGPT, based on Large Language Models (LLMs), is changing this situation by providing a continuous conversation richness. Hence, it is crucial to understand how students encounter, perceive and navigate this new technological frontier.

This study aims to fill this empirical gap by addressing the following research question: How do university students assess the use of the ChatGPT Voice Conversation feature for their informal English speaking practice? The present study is a qualitative descriptive research design to explore the complex, lived experiences of language learners' interaction with AI. The knowledge acquired from this investigation will give considerable pedagogical implications for teachers creating blended learning programs and for learners seeking the best routes to autonomous oral fluency.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The advent of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in language instruction signifies a paradigm shift in how learners improve their productive skills outside the confines of the traditional classroom. The study is informed by three interconnected theoretical and empirical strands: Computer-Assisted and Mobile-Assisted Language Learning (CALL/MALL), Krashen's Affective Filter Hypothesis, and Learner Autonomy in informal digital contexts, in an attempt to gain a thorough comprehension of students' perceptions of the use of the Voice Conversation feature of the chatbot for informal speaking practice.

1. CALL, MALL and the emergence of AI for language learning

CALL (Computer-Assisted Language Learning) and its recent spin-off MALL (Mobile-Assisted Language Learning) have been working for a while to push the language exposure beyond the institutional constraints [6]. Spoken interaction in CALL contexts has traditionally been limited to Intelligent Automated Speech Recognition (ASR) systems and inflexible, pre-programmed chatbots [7]. These early systems were extensively criticized for their inability to manage pragmatic nuances, conversational corrections or open-ended dialogues which often led to user frustration and high retention rates.

The landscape has changed drastically with the emergence of Large Language Models (LLMs) and Generative AI. "OpenAI's new voice-enabled version of its popular chatbot, ChatGPT, offers a prime example of a shift from reactive technology to interactive, context-aware conversational agents" [8]. The voice element of the chatbot is not built for the short transactional inquiries that are typical of voice user interfaces (VUIs) like Apple's Siri or Google

Assistant. It is meant to replicate an ongoing conversation like a human. It can build context, vary vocabulary and deliver rapid, natural sounding output. In MALL, this ability transforms a student's smart phone into a ubiquitous two-way conversation partner and extends the limits of ubiquitous language learning.

2. Krashen's Affective Filter Hypothesis and the AI Interlocutors

One of the most difficult impediments to speaking a foreign language well is language anxiety. The Affective Filter Hypothesis according to Krashen [3] states that the lower the emotional barrier of the learner which is defined by excessive fear, low self-confidence and low motivation, the more effective would be the learning of a language. In the EFL classroom as usual, the dread of public speaking, peer assessment and quick teacher response tend to increase the emotive filter, inhibiting oral production and obstructing the intake of significant material.

Conversational AI is another psychological aspect than the practice of language. AI chatbots lack social presence, judgment call capabilities and emotional bias, thereby offering what academics refer to as a "safe space" or low-anxiety environment [9]. There is no social awkwardness or mental burden that is connected with a human-to-human discussion, such as grammatical errors, pauses, mispronunciations and repeated queries. Thus the idea that using the voice aspect of the chat bot will greatly lower the emotional filter, thus encouraging more risk taking, longer turns at speaking, and more output generation, all of which are crucial to the development of communicative fluency.

3. Learner autonomy and informal digital learning of English (IDLE)

The notion of Learner Autonomy, which is described as "the ability of the learner to take charge of his/her own learning process" [10], has become more relevant with the emergence of Informal Digital Learning of English (IDLE). IDLE (individuals' own interests as mediated by digital technology that led to out-of-class self-directed English language practices) [11] The learners are active actors in IDLE who decide when, when and how they interact with the target language.

The Voice Conversation function of the chatbot is consistent with the notions of autonomous learning. It provides a completely tailored learning experience: students decide the conversation topic, the pace of interaction, and the nature of instructional feedback (e.g. "gently correcting my grammar at the end of our chat"). It is this degree of agency that converts the student from a passive consumer of linguistic input into an active architect of his/her communication experiences. However, successful autonomous learning with AI needs high levels of digital skills and metacognitive monitoring as learners need to manage the interface without the structural scaffolding of a teacher.

4. Existing Research on Speaking Skills and Generative AI

An increasing corpus of research investigating implications of ChatGPT for English language teaching has been made publicly available. The first empirical study examined its textual utility, which found its effectiveness in boosting academic writing, vocabulary retention and reading comprehension [12,13]. Overall, the results demonstrated that the generated language input by the model, i.e., the input in context, was of excellent quality.

Already in the speech area, even the present research has begun to take generative AI into account, as voice capabilities improve. Initial research suggests that students perceive voice-enabled AI agents as very engaging, due to their quick feedback loops and human-like prosody [5]. For instance, Kim [14] discovered that university learners who engaged in AI voice chat saw notable enhancements in conversational confidence and lexical diversity. But there are huge gaps. Most of the available information is based on quantitative surveys evaluating generic acceptance or usability scores (e.g. Technology Acceptance Model). However, there is an obvious lack of qualitative research on the micro-level lived experiences, mental shifts

and communication techniques of EFL learners who engage in long-term casual chats utilizing the voice function of ChatGPT. This study contributes to this gap by presenting a rich qualitative descriptive evaluation of students' perspectives in a particular higher education scenario.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study used a Qualitative Descriptive Research design [15,16]. A qualitative descriptive approach is particularly appropriate for studies that seek to provide a complete and simple summary of an event or phenomena in the ordinary words of individuals experiencing it. Qualitative descriptive research differs from highly interpretive approaches, such as phenomenology, or grounded theory, that require abstract theoretical modelling or deep psychological interpretation, respectively, in that qualitative descriptive research seeks to remain close to the data and to describe the participants' experiences with minimal conceptual distortion. This design offers a clear, realistic and nuanced representation of the pedagogical and psychological reality of students interacting with generative AI.

Sampling Procedure and Participants

The participants for this study were 12 university students (7 females and 5 males) who were studying in an undergraduate English Education Department at a state institution in Indonesia. The participants were selected using a purposive sampling strategy based on certain criteria that matched the aims of the study [17]. The following were the inclusion criteria:

1. Active undergraduate students majoring in English Education (with baseline ability to hold a conversation in English).
2. Actively participates in independent, informal English-speaking practice outside the classroom.
3. Used the ChatGPT Voice Conversation function for at least 30 minutes per week in a given four-week period prior to the interview phase.
4. Willing to speak openly about their experience through a deep dive interview approach.

Given the qualitative descriptive design, we found the sample size (N=12) sufficient to reach data saturation, since repeating patterns and themes started to emerge consistently across the interviews.

Instrument of Research.

A semi-structured interview guide designed by the researcher was the main method for data gathering. We used semi-structured interviews since they allow a clear topic structure while providing the flexibility to explore unexpected distinctive ideas shared by participants [18].

The interview guide was designed on four basic dimensions:

1. First observations and usage of the ChatGPT Voice Conversation functionality.
2. Perceived language benefits (impacting vocabulary, pronunciation, fluency and grammar).
3. Psychological and affective characteristics (anxiety, confidence and motivation levels).
4. Practical technical and conversational restrictions as perceived.

To ensure validity and clarity, the interview guide was evaluated by two senior specialists in language educational technology and was pilot-tested with two students who did not participate in the actual data collection.

Procedure of Data Collection

The study said data was collected over a two-week period after the subjects had a four-week trial period using the speech feature of the chatbot. Individual interviews were carried out in a

hybrid style, some face-to-face and some using Zoom Video Communications, depending on participant availability and preference.

Interviews were carried out in English and in Indonesian (bahasa Indonesia) to allow participants to comfortably communicate their complex thoughts and emotional experiences without linguistic limits. The duration of each interview was about 45-60 minutes. Each session was audio recorded with the written and explicit informed consent of the participants, pseudonymised (e.g. Participant 1 to Participant 12) and transcribed verbatim for further analysis.

Data Analytics

The transcribed data were analysed using the Thematic Analysis methodology by Braun and Clarke [19]. It offers a methodical, but flexible, technique to detecting, analysing and reporting patterns (themes) within qualitative data. The analysis followed rigorously the following six successive phases:

1. Familiarization with the Data: The researcher regularly read the transcripts while listening to the audio recordings to confirm semantic accuracy and to have a full comprehension of the datasets.
2. Coding initial codes: Manual coding line by line was done. Descriptive labels were assigned to semantic and latent aspects of text that answered the research topic (e.g., lowered-anxiety, latency-issues, vocabulary-scaffolding).
3. Searching for Themes: Initial codes were sorted and organized into bigger, overarching candidate themes that clustered comparable experiences together.
4. Reviewing Themes: Candidate themes were checked against the collated codes and the complete data set to guarantee internal homogeneity (everything within a theme should fit together) and exterior heterogeneity (themes should be clearly distinguishable).
5. Identifying and Naming Themes: The researcher theorized the structural essence of each theme, assigning precise, descriptive titles and outlining the exact scope of each result.
6. Producing the Report: The final analysis was created, using illustrative, typical instances of extracts that connected the empirical findings back to the original research questions and related literature.

FINDINGS

Major Theme	Sub-themes Identified
1. Mitigation of Affective Barriers	• Liberation from Judgement & Social Anxiety • The "Safe Space" for Linguistic Risk-Taking
2. Scaffolding Conversational Fluency & Vocabulary	• Exposure to Idiomatic Expressions & Contextual Vocabulary • Self-Paced Pacing and Conversational Repair
3. Limitations in Human Pragmatics & Prosody	• The Absence of Non-Verbal Cues • Occasional Conversational Disconnects & Latency
4. The Dichotomy of Autonomy vs. Structure	• Freedom of Topic Selection • The Need for Learner Self-Regulation

Theme 1: Reducing Affective Barriers and Anxiety

All twelve participants indicated that the most salient topic was the considerable decrease in language anxiety when conversing with ChatGPT compared to human interlocutors. Students could overcome psychological barriers without a physical, judging presence.

Freedom From Judgment and Social Anxiety

Participants consistently noted that interactions in English with a human peer or a native speaker frequently elicited a strong dread of negative evaluation. That fear disappeared using ChatGPT.

Participant 3:

"When I speak English in class I often worry about what my instructor or friends will say if I make a grammar error. My mind just goes blank. But with the voice feature of ChatGPT, that anxiety is gone 100 percent. I realize it's only an A.I. It won't laugh at me or ridicule me or lose patience if I trip over my words."

The "Safe Space" for Language Risk Taking

The low stakes of the interaction allowed students to play around with complicated sentence patterns and new vocabulary phrases that they would not ordinarily employ in a formal classroom context.

Participant 7 observed:

"It feels like a safe sandbox. I can test idioms I can adjust my pronunciation, or pause in the middle of a statement to correct myself without embarrassment. That psychological comfort is a rarity I get in real life talks".

Theme 2: Scaffolding for Conversational Fluency and Vocabulary Development

Participants regarded the Voice Conversation aspect of the ChatGPT as a useful dynamic scaffolding tool that directly enhanced their spoken vocabulary and operational fluency in conversation.

Exposure to Idioms and Contextual Vocabulary

ChatGPT was not a static textbook, but constantly altered the vocabulary output depending on the topic chosen by the user, delivering immediate, contextualised language information. "I remember this experience, participant 11, said:

"I was practicing how to negotiate a job interview with the voice feature. It didn't just sound like formal textbook responses. It used real language from the corporate world, such as 'exploit my skills' or 'fast-paced atmosphere'. Being able to utilize these phrases fluently in an actual spoken conversation helped me learn them so much faster than reading them on a list".

Pacing and Conversational Repair Self-Paced

The feature's capacity to manage user-initiated conversational corrections was appreciated by many users. Students may ask the AI to grade their responses or propose different wording for the same idea. As participant 5 mentioned:

"If I thought my statement was clunky, I could simply remark, 'Hey, does that seem natural?' and ChatGPT would quickly answer with a voice explanation on how a native speaker would phrase it. 'It's like having a private tutor who pays attention to me and lets me set the pace of the lesson.'"

Theme 3: Technical Nuances, Human Pragmatics & Prosody Limitations

There was a strong favourable response on linguistic and affective gains, but participants were very critical on technical and pragmatic drawbacks of current generative AI speech systems.

No non-verbal cues

A frequent criticism cited by participants was the artificiality of communication due to the absence of physical presence, body language, facial expressions and eye contact. Participant 2 said:

The voice sounds wonderfully human, it even has genuine breathing noises, yet it is still only audio. In real life, speaking English is reading the other person's face, gestures, and nods.

"ChatGPT is perfect practice for talking into a void, but it doesn't prepare you for the visual pressure of human interactions in person."

Intermittent Conversational Latency and Disconnects

Conversational flow was also affected for participants, with disruptions in turn-taking behavior and internet latency. Participant 8 reported technical friction regularly:

"Sometimes if I took a two second break to think about what the next English word I intended to use was, ChatGPT would cut me off and start responding since it thought that I was done with my speech. This interruption interrupted my stream of thinking and the conversation became mechanical instead of flowing"

Theme 4 The Autonomy-Structure Divide

The final theme concerned the structural aspect of informal learning. The freedom of the tool was exhilarating, but took a great deal of self-discipline from the user.

Freedom of Choice of Topic

The participants appreciated the endless flexibility of ChatGPT, which could easily move from playful pop culture conversations to deep philosophical dialogues. Participant 9 said:

"I can chat about K-pop for ten minutes and then flip to talking about climate change or quantum physics in English. This independence kept my drive high, because I was only talking about things I genuinely cared about."

The Need for Self-Regulation in Learners

However, many students had difficulty keeping a consistent learning schedule or tracking their real progress without a teacher to provide explicit *instructions or a set of learning goals*. Participant 12 stated:

"Because it's casual and totally up to me, it's easy to grow lazy. If I don't put a reminder on my phone to practice using ChatGPT every day I just forget. It takes a lot of self-control. If you don't know what to ask, or how to steer the conversation, it can get repetitious and trivial very fast."

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study offer empirical insights into the pedagogical realities of using generative AI voice features for autonomous language development. The results can be analysed in respect to existing CALL/MALL theories and some debate topics highlighted.

1. Reconceptualizing the Affective Filter in the GenAI Age

The results strongly validate the Affective Filter Hypothesis by Krashen [3]. They demonstrate how an AI interlocutor can successfully lower psychological barriers such as language anxiety and fear of negative judgment. The classic EFL literature has characterized the classroom as an anxiety generating site of oral production [2].

The results show that ChatGPT's voice element is a helpful psychological springboard. The replacement of a human peer by a non-judgmental, emotionless AI agent allows the

learners to achieve the condition of maximal cognitive receptivity and maximizes the output generation while avoiding the communication paralysis which is normally induced by peer pressure. Fryer and Coniam [9] make a similar point in their discussion of older chatbots, but the stakes are raised considerably by the sophisticated contextual intelligence and human-like speech synthesis of ChatGPT.

2. Text Based Interactions and Dynamic Scaffolding.

Existing literature. [8,12] has already studied the capacity of ChatGPT to enhance writing abilities via text interaction; this study adds to the body of research by demonstrating its possibilities in oral scaffolding. The ability of participants to engage in real-time conversational repair demonstrates that the Voice Conversation feature is working successfully within Vygotsky's [20] Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD).

The AI provides just-in-time, personalized language input at the level slightly above the learner's current competence ($i+1$) and vocabulary corrections and idiomatic alternatives just when the learner needs them. This self-produced verbal feedback loop bridges passive vocabulary knowledge and active oral use.

3. The Pragmatic Gap: Man vs. Machine Communication

The findings are a significant warning against over-relying on AI for full language training. The limitations of the participants, such as the absence of non-verbal cues, unrealistic constraints on turn-taking and the impossibility to practice pragmatic negotiation, clearly illustrate a gap between AI interaction and genuine human communication.

According to Canale and Swain [21], Communicative Competence involves not just grammatical and lexical knowledge but also sociolinguistic and strategic competence. Real human connection is chaotic, unexpected, visual clues (nodding, squinting, micro expressions) This is how the voice component of ChatGPT produces a simplified, cleaned up version of the conversation without these actual world constraints. It is therefore very useful for building confidence and lexical fluency, but it cannot simulate the socio-pragmatic necessities of human-human interaction.

4. Self-Regulation: Autonomy and the Digital Divide

The study emphasizes that the success of this AI tool is highly connected with the level of self-regulation and autonomy of the learner [10,11]. Outside the classroom, informally, without an educational syllabus, learners need a high level of metacognitive control - understanding how to start topics, how to ask the AI for particular types of feedback, and how to practice a lot.

ChatGPT gives the highly independent student a huge, custom-made laboratory The open-ended nature of the tool could result in superficial and unconnected interactions, especially for learners lacking self-regulation abilities or computer literacy skills. Thus, the use of AI tools in informal practices requires specific strategy training by educators to teach students how to deliver appropriate suggestions and how to regulate their independent AI interactions.

CONCLUSION, PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS AND LIMITATIONS

1. Conclusion

The objective of this qualitative descriptive study was to investigate university students' perceptions of casually using the Voice Conversation function of the Chatbot, Chat-GP, to practice English speaking outside the classroom. Empirical investigation demonstrates that this generative AI tool is an extremely transformational and low-anxiety instructional tool for EFL learners. Therefore, ChatGPT, as an engaging, patient, and infinitely adjustable virtual interlocutor, lowers the affective filter and creates a safe atmosphere for students to take language risks and acquire verbal confidence. It also provides dynamic vocabulary scaffolding

and real-time conversational corrections which are useful in the development of lexical diversity and oral fluency.

The report also points to important practical and technological limits. The communication context of AI contacts does not have the social and pragmatic nuances of true human-human interactions, such as the lack of non-verbal signs, occasional pauses owing to the inflexibility of turn-taking algorithms, and a sterile environment. In the end, the Voice Conversation feature in ChatGPT should be seen as a powerful additional instrument for fluency development and confidence building, but not as a full replacement for genuine social interaction.

2. Teaching implications of

These findings have some pedagogical implication for language teachers and curriculum developers:

- **Embedded Autonomous Practice.** AI voice features should be embedded within the curriculum as a homework tool for autonomous preparation. They can use chat gpT to rehearse a topic at home, ease their nervousness, and increase vocabulary before a presentation or discussion with their human classmates in class.
- **AI Prompt Literacy Education:** Prompt engineering should be included in language learning curricula. Students will need to learn to explicitly instruct the AI to take on certain personas (e.g., “Act as a demanding job interviewer”) or provide structured linguistic feedback (e.g., “At the end of every three turns, correct my pronunciation errors”) so that they can get the most out of autonomous sessions.
- **Striking the Right Balance between Fluency and Pragmatics:** Teachers need to build classroom activities around what artificial intelligence cannot do, such as sociolinguistic negotiation, reading body language, emotional empathy and conversational interjections in the real world.

3. Limitations and Future Directions

This study contains rich qualitative information but is constrained by a number of issues. First, the sample was obtained from one English Education undergraduate program from an Indonesian university, which can affect the transferability of the findings to other non-English major cohorts or in a different cultural environment. Secondly, the data has been primarily acquired from semi-structured interviews (self-reported).

Future study should employ multi-methods, such as qualitative interviews along with longitudinal pre- and post-tests, to objectively measure progress in fluency and lexical correctness. Moreover, a comparison of how learners with different levels of beginning ability (basic vs. advanced) navigate AI voice systems would significantly contribute to our grasp of the function of generative AI in contemporary language education.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The author declares that there is no conflict of interest in the conduct of this research.

REFERENCES

- [1] Richards JC. Key issues in language teaching. Cambridge University Press; 2015.
- [2] MacIntyre PD, Gardner RC. The subtle effects of language anxiety on cognitive processing in the second language. *Language Learning* 1994;44:283–305. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1994.tb01103.x>.
- [3] Krashen SD. Principles and practice in second language acquisition. Pergamon Press; 1982.

- [4] Bin Hentasmaka M. Utilizing ChatGPT as an autonomous vocabulary learning tool for EFL university students. *Journal of Digital Learning and Education* 2023;3:89–98. <https://doi.org/10.53623/jdle.v3i2.245>.
- [5] Kohnke L, Moorhouse BL, Zou D. ChatGPT for language teaching and learning. *RELC Journal* 2023;54:537–50. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882231162868>.
- [6] Stockwell G. *Mobile-assisted language learning: Concepts, contexts and challenges*. Cambridge University Press; 2022.
- [7] Kukulska-Hulme A, Shield L. An overview of mobile assisted language learning: From content delivery to supported collaboration and interaction. *ReCALL* 2008;20:271–89. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0958344008000335>.
- [8] Kohnke L. *Artificial intelligence in language education: Leveraging large language models for autonomous growth*. Routledge; 2024.
- [9] Fryer LK, Coniam D. Bot talks back: Auditing learner motivation and trust over a year-long chatbot intervention. *Computer Assisted Language Learning* 2014;27:545–60. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2013.771844>.
- [10] Holec H. *Autonomy and foreign language learning*. Pergamon Press; 1981.
- [11] Dressman M, Sadler RW, editors. *The handbook of informal language learning*. Wiley-Blackwell; 2020.
- [12] Jeon J, Lee S. Large language models in education: A focus on the complementary relationship between human teachers and ChatGPT. *Education and Information Technologies* 2023;28:15873–92. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-11834-1>.
- [13] Yan D. Impact of ChatGPT on learners in a L2 writing practicum: An exploratory investigation. *Education and Information Technologies* 2023;28:13943–67. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-11742-4>.
- [14] Kim HJ. Conversational AI as an autonomous interlocutor: Evaluating the voice capabilities of generative models in improving EFL speaking fluency. *Language Learning & Technology* 2025;29:45–63.
- [15] Sandelowski M. Whatever happened to qualitative description? *Research in Nursing & Health* 2000;23:334–40. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-240X\(200008\)23:4<334::AID-NUR9>3.0.CO;2-G](https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-240X(200008)23:4<334::AID-NUR9>3.0.CO;2-G).
- [16] Sandelowski M. What's in a name? Qualitative description revisited. *Research in Nursing & Health* 2010;33:77–84. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nur.20362>.
- [17] Palinkas LA, Horwitz SM, Green CA, Wisdom JP, Duan N, Hoagwood K. Purposeful sampling for qualitative data collection and analysis in mixed method implementation research. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research* 2015;42:533–44. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10488-013-0528-y>.
- [18] Galletta A. *Mastering the semi-structured interview and beyond: From research design to analysis and publication*. New York University Press; 2013.
- [19] Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 2006;3:77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>.
- [20] Vygotsky LS. *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press; 1978.
- [21] Canale M, Swain M. Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics* 1980;1:1–47. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/1.1.1>.