A Peer-Led Artificial Intelligence Literacy Course For First-Year Language Students

□ E-mail for the corresponding author:

Abstract:

This institutional case study evaluates AI Companion, a peer-led AI literacy course for first-year language students at a Vietnamese university. It draws on a third-party course-evaluation survey and a separate end-session attendance and reflection form. After duplicate submissions were removed and malformed student identifiers set aside, 1,597 survey records were analyzed; 2,260 end-session records informed thematic analysis. Mean ratings ranged from 4.05 to 4.17 on a five-point scale. Ratings were strongly intercorrelated and moderately associated with future interest. Thematic coding of 36,131 response segments produced six themes, including practical learning, post-course support and future development. Because the course was mandatory and there was no control or pre/post design, findings describe perceptions and reflections, not causal gains in AI competence. The case points to the value of practical peer-led provision and the need for transparent assessment and research safeguards.

Keywords: *artificial intelligence literacy, peer-led learning, language education, learner agency*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction **2**
2. Research Purpose and Research Questions **3**
3. Literature review **3**
3.1 AI Literacy in higher education 3
3.2 AI literacy for language students 3
3.3 Peer-led learning 3
4. Methodology **4**
4.1 Design and context 4
4.2 Participants and data sources 4
4.3 Instruments and data preparation 4
4.4 Analysis 5
5. Findings **5**
5.1 Course evaluation ratings 5
5.2 Associations among evaluations and future interest 6
5.3 Themes in end-session reflections 6
6. Discussion **7**
6.1 Peer-led AI literacy as an accessible entry point 7
6.2 Course value and future interest 7
6.3 Contextual and post-course support 7
6.4 Assessment and future evaluation 7
7. Limitations and ethics **7**
8. Conclusion 8

1. Introduction

Artificial intelligence (AI), especially generative AI, is increasingly part of higher education and language-related work, including translation, interpreting, writing, content creation, and language teaching. These opportunities also raise concerns about inaccurate output, privacy, authorship, academic integrity, and overreliance. Students therefore need opportunities to use AI tools while evaluating their limitations and making responsible decisions about their use (Long & Magerko, 2020; Ng et al., 2021; UNESCO, 2024).

At the University of Languages and International Studies, Vietnam National University, Hanoi (ULIS-VNU), the course "AI Companion: Exploring Artificial Intelligence with ULIS Freshmen" was delivered to first-year students as an introductory, peer-led program. Its activities connected AI tools with academic and language-learning tasks. The present paper reports a course-evaluation case using student ratings and written reflections. Some authors were involved in course development or delivery; this position is disclosed and considered when interpreting the findings.

2. Research Purpose and Research Questions

This study describes how participating students evaluated the course, what they reported in an end-session form and which course features they identified as useful or in need of improvement. It does not test whether the course caused gains in AI literacy.

The study explores three primary questions:

1. How did students rate the course content, delivery, presenters and perceived usefulness, and how were these ratings associated with interest in similar future programs?

2. What experiences, perceived learning and suggestions did students describe in the end-session form?

3. What implementation considerations can be drawn from these evaluations and reflections for future peer-led AI literacy provision?

3. Literature review

3.1 AI Literacy in higher education

AI literacy has been described as a combination of understanding AI, using it, evaluating its outputs and limitations, and engaging with it ethically (Long & Magerko, 2020; Ng et al., 2021; Chiu et al., 2024). UNESCO's student competency framework similarly emphasizes human-centred understanding, ethics, techniques and applications, and system design (UNESCO, 2024). This broader framing is relevant to programs for non-computing students, who may need informed use and evaluation more than specialist technical training.

3.2 AI literacy for language students

Language students encounter AI in writing support, translation, vocabulary learning, pronunciation practice, searching, summarization, and content creation. These applications can support learning, but fluent output is not necessarily accurate or appropriate. AI literacy therefore includes evaluating outputs, recognizing limitations, protecting information, and making decisions about authorship and human judgment. Research on digital competence and language learning also points to the importance of connecting tool use with learner agency and responsible practice (Nguyen, 2025; Quang & Phi, 2025).

3.3 Peer-led learning

Peer-led learning may make emerging technologies more approachable by connecting instruction to learners' questions and academic contexts. A student-led workshop on embodied AI and robotics reported increased interest and a more nuanced understanding of AI's possibilities and limitations (Nath et al., 2026). Student-led virtual workshops have also been discussed as a way to lower barriers to undergraduate research when learners receive structure, guidance and concrete tasks (Amelung & Helmke, 2024). These studies provide a rationale for examining peer-led AI literacy in a language-education context, while their different settings limit direct comparison.

4. Methodology

4.1 Design and context

The study is an institutional course-evaluation case using a quantitative evaluation survey and a separate end-session attendance and reflection form. The course was an institutionally authorized, mandatory program for first-year students. There was no control group or pre-course measure; consequently, the design supports descriptive and associative conclusions, not causal claims about competence development.

4.2 Participants and data sources

The course-evaluation dataset contained 1,611 submitted records across ten faculties. Data screening identified two duplicate student identifiers and 12 records whose identifiers did not match the expected eight-digit format. The two duplicate records were excluded from the analysis sample; the 12 malformed-ID records were set aside without attempting to infer corrected identifiers. The resulting analytic sample comprised 1,597 records with unique, correctly formatted identifiers and complete valid Likert responses. The 12 set-aside records had valid scale responses but were excluded from analyses requiring a confidently deduplicated participant record.

A second source was the end-session attendance and reflection form, which yielded 2,260 records. It was used for thematic analysis of open-ended and other text responses and was not the same instrument or respondent count as the 1,611-record course-evaluation survey. The thematic workbook contains 36,131 coded response segments. Segments, rather than unique students, are the denominator for the theme counts reported below.

Table 1. *Data sources and purposes*

Data source	N/count	Analytical purpose
Other course-evaluation survey	1,611 submitted; 1,597 analyzed	Twenty Likert items, four course-evaluation constructs, and one future-interest item
End-session attendance and reflection form	2,260 records; 36,131 coded segments	Thematic analysis of written responses; separate from the evaluation survey

The course ran six sessions from 10 to 24 November 2025. The course-evaluation survey was administered by faculty members who were not involved in teaching; workbook timestamps place submissions between 5 and 14 March 2026. The separate end-session attendance and reflection form was a required component of the final course assignment and yielded 2,260 records. These rows were

assigned sequential pseudonyms for thematic analysis, but the available records do not establish whether form submissions were deduplicated by student identifier; the paper therefore reports 2,260 form records rather than a count of unique students.

4.3 Instruments and data preparation

The course-evaluation survey contained 20 five-point Likert items: five each for Content Quality, Program Delivery, Presenter Quality, and Perceived Usefulness/Application. It also contained one ordered response item on interest in similar future programs. Composite scores were calculated as the mean of each five-item set. For data cleaning, duplicate identifiers were screened and only the earliest record was retained where duplicate records had equivalent completeness; records with malformed identifiers were preserved separately for verification and omitted from the analytic sample. All 20 Likert items in the retained sample were complete and within the 1-5 range.

The thematic analysis followed the phases described by Braun and Clarke (2006): familiarization with responses, initial coding, grouping codes into subthemes and main themes, reviewing and naming themes and producing analytic summaries. A member from our research group conducted the initial manual processing in Google Sheets. The working codebook was built iteratively from recurring response content and prominent keywords: similar answers were grouped into initial codes, then clustered into subthemes and six main themes. AI assistance through Antigravity using Codex (GPT-6) was then used to refine code labels, organize related categories and draft concise summaries. She reviewed the AI-assisted suggestions against source responses and made final coding decisions. Each non-empty response to one of 16 open-ended or multi-select prompts counted as one coded segment; responses were not split further. This produced 36,131 coded segments, each assigned one main-theme code. No independent second coder or inter-coder agreement statistic was used, so coding consistency could not be quantified.

4.4 Analysis

Descriptive means, standard deviations, medians and Cronbach's alpha were calculated for the four evaluation constructs. Spearman rank correlations were used to examine associations among the four constructs and the future-interest item. Analyses reported here use the 1,597-record analytic sample. No ordinal-regression estimates are retained because the available records did not include the coefficient estimates, odds ratios, uncertainty intervals, or model diagnostics required for auditable reporting. No faculty-specific inferential comparisons are retained because the corresponding tests were not recalculated on the cleaned analytic sample.

5. Findings

5.1 Course evaluation ratings

Students rated all four course-evaluation dimensions positively. Mean composite scores ranged from 4.05 to 4.17 on the five-point scale. Presenter Quality had the highest mean; Program Delivery had the lowest. The differences among the means were modest.

Table 2. *Descriptive statistics for survey constructs*

Construct	M	SD	Median	Cronbach's α

Content Quality	4.11	0.79	4.00	0.961
Program Delivery	4.05	0.79	4.00	0.947
Presenter Quality	4.17	0.77	4.00	0.962
Perceived Usefulness	4.11	0.78	4.00	0.961
Future Interest (single item)	3.65	0.91	4.00	—

Note: Analytic N = 1,597. Alpha is reported for the four five-item scales; it is not applicable to the single future-interest item.

5.2 Associations among evaluations and future interest

The four course-evaluation constructs were strongly intercorrelated (Spearman's ρ = .806-.863). Their associations with future interest were moderate (ρ = .430-.455). Because the course-evaluation measures overlap substantially, these bivariate associations should not be interpreted as showing that any one construct independently predicts future interest.

Table 3. *Spearman correlations among evaluation constructs and future interest*

	Content	Delivery	Presenter	Usefulness	Interest
Content	—	.851	.806	.833	.455
Delivery	.851	—	.863	.824	.437
Presenter	.806	.863	—	.839	.430
Usefulness	.833	.824	.839	—	.450
Interest	.455	.437	.430	.450	—

Note. Spearman rank correlations, N = 1,597; all reported correlations were $p < .001$ in the recalculated data. High intercorrelations among the four evaluation constructs indicate substantial overlap.

5.3 Themes in end-session reflections

The thematic workbook groups 36,131 coded response segments into six main themes. The proportions are shares of coded segments, not respondents. Their relatively close values partly reflect the form structure: each non-empty response in 16 open-ended or multi-select prompts counted once, and several prompts were grouped under each theme. Themes represented by about three full response fields contribute roughly 6,800 segments (about 18.8%), while those represented by about two contribute roughly 4,200-4,500 (about 11.7-12.5%). The percentages therefore describe the distribution of coded material across the instrument, not the share of students endorsing a theme or its relative importance.

Table 4. *Main themes and coded segments of reflections*

Main theme	Coded segments	Share of coded segments
Competencies and learning transformation	7,083	19.6%
Learning through practice and creativity	6,778	18.8%

Post-course support ecosystem	6,776	18.8%
Directions for future development	6,774	18.7%
AI awareness and positioning	4,504	12.5%
Training experience design	4,216	11.7%
Total	36,131	100.0%

The coded responses described practical learning, including improved prompt writing and creating a personal assistant, alongside mixed confidence: some students reported feeling newly motivated while still being at an early stage of AI learning. Other responses identified a need for more detailed guidance and preparation time to support participation in the course competition. To protect confidentiality, the manuscript paraphrases rather than reproduces Vietnamese responses and omits participant codes; the authors translated the paraphrases into English and checked them against the source responses. These examples illustrate coded themes but do not imply that all students shared the same experience.

6. Discussion

6.1 Peer-led AI literacy as an accessible entry point

The positive evaluation ratings and written reflections suggest that students found the peer-led course useful and approachable. Reflections described practical uses such as prompt writing and creating an assistant, alongside positive comments about organization and motivation. The evidence concerns students' reported experience; it does not demonstrate measured gains in AI competence. The distinction matters because favorable course ratings and perceived learning are meaningful outcomes of course evaluation but are not substitutes for validated learning measures.

6.2 Course value and future interest

Each evaluation dimension was moderately associated with interest in similar future programs. The four evaluation constructs were also strongly intercorrelated, which limits interpretation of their unique contributions. The present analysis therefore supports an association between positive evaluations and future interest but it does not support ranking course dimensions as independent predictors. Future analysis could test a preregistered model with appropriate diagnostics and uncertainty estimates if the underlying data and assumptions are available.

6.3 Contextual and post-course support

The reflection themes point to practical learning, creative application, chatbot and community support, and suggestions for future development. These themes offer implementation directions for a language-focused course: use discipline-relevant tasks, provide opportunities to practice and evaluate AI outputs, and maintain accessible support after formal sessions. Because theme counts refer to coded segments rather than students, they describe the composition of the coded material rather than how many students endorsed each idea.

6.4 Assessment and future evaluation

Product-quality and post-course assessment scores are not interpreted in this paper because the task requirements, rubric, raters and scoring procedure could not be documented from the available records. The paper therefore makes no claim that product counts or the reported 15.51/17 score demonstrate specified AI-literacy outcomes. Future course evaluations should define learning outcomes in advance and use transparent tasks and scoring criteria; a pre/post design or another appropriate comparison would be needed to assess change.

7. Limitations and ethics

This is a single institutional case based on mandatory course participation, a post-course evaluation survey and an end-session attendance/reflection form. There was no control group or pre/post measure, so the findings do not establish causal effects or changes in AI competence. The evaluation responses were collected after course delivery and may reflect recall and response biases. The survey sample was cleaned *Page* 5 using student identifiers; 12 records with malformed identifiers were excluded from quantitative analysis despite valid scale responses, so the analytic sample may differ from the full set of submissions. The qualitative theme counts are coded-segment counts, not respondent-level prevalence. The correlation analysis is bivariate; the strong correlations among evaluation constructs indicate overlap and do not support independent-predictor claims. The thematic analysis was not independently double-coded, so inter-coder consistency could not be estimated.

The course was institutionally authorized as a mandatory program for the relevant student cohort; this authorization covered course delivery only. No separate institutional ethics review, exemption determination or data-protection permission for research use was obtained. The end-session form was a required component of the final course assignment. Students were informed that their submissions could be used for research and future course improvement, but no separate research-consent or opt-out process is documented; this disclosure alone does not establish voluntary research consent. The thematic analysis matrix omitted names and student numbers and used sequential pseudonyms. Two of the five researchers retained access to the code key and identifiable source records, so the data were pseudonymized rather than fully anonymized. The manuscript reports aggregate theme counts and paraphrases rather than verbatim student quotations.

Some authors contributed to course development or delivery, while others were not involved in teaching. This involvement may shape interpretation and was considered during analysis; it should not be described as evidence that the dataset was skewed.

8. Conclusion

This case study describes positive course evaluations and varied written reflections from a peer-led AI literacy course for first-year language students. In the cleaned evaluation sample (N = 1,597), ratings were positive across content, delivery, presenter quality, and perceived usefulness. These ratings were strongly intercorrelated and moderately associated with future interest. The end-session reflections, summarized as coded segments, emphasized practical learning, creative use, post-course support, and future development. Because the course was mandatory and the study had no pre/post or comparison design, the findings concern student perceptions and reported experiences rather than causal improvement in AI literacy. Future implementations should document consent and confidentiality procedures, clarify learning outcomes, and use transparent assessment methods.

References

Amelung, C., & Helmke, B. P. (2024). Lowering barriers to entry in undergraduate research through student-led virtual workshops. Biomedical Engineering Education. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43683-024-00157-3

Chiu, T. K. F., Ahmad, Z., Ismailov, M., & Sanusi, I. T. (2024). What are artificial intelligence literacy and competency? A comprehensive framework to support them. Computers and Education Open, 6, 100171. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeo.2024.100171

Long, D., & Magerko, B. (2020). What is AI literacy? Competencies and design considerations. Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, 1–16.

Nath, S., Basu, D., Gajjala, R., & Verma, R. (2026, June). A student-led workshop for building AI literacy through embodied AI and robotics. 2026 ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition. https://doi.org/10.18260/1-2--59179

Ng, D. T. K., Leung, J. K. L., Chu, S. K. W., & Qiao, M. S. (2021). Conceptualizing AI literacy: An exploratory review. Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 2, 100041.

Nguyen, Q. H. (2025). Tác động của các ứng dụng trí tuệ nhân tạo (AI) đến động lực, phương pháp và kết quả học ngoại ngữ của sinh viên. VNU Journal of Foreign Studies, 41(5), 102–116. https://doi.org/10.63023/2525-2445/jfs.ulis.5547

Quảng, L. Đ., & Phi, L. A. (2025). Phát triển năng lực số và kỹ năng học tập suốt đời cho người học trong kỷ nguyên số. Tạp chí Khoa học Trường Đại học Mở Hà Nội, 644. https://doi.org/10.59266/houjs.2025.820

Southworth, J., Migliaccio, K., Glover, J., Glover, J. N., Reed, D., McCarty, C., Brendemuhl, J., & Thomas, A. (2023). Developing a model for AI across the curriculum: Transforming the higher education landscape via innovation in AI literacy. Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 4(1), 100127. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2023.100127

UNESCO. (2024). AI competency framework for students. UNESCO.

Appendices

Appendix A. Other course-evaluation survey

The source instrument was administered in Vietnamese by faculty members who were not involved in teaching the course. The export timestamps run from 5 to 14 March 2026. The table below reproduces the 20 item statements from the original questionnaire and supplies working English translations. C1–C5, D1–D5, P1–P5, and U1–U5 are the analysis codes used in the cleaned workbook.

Code	Construct	Original Vietnamese item	Working English translation
C1	Content Quality	Nội dung chuyên đề phù hợp với nhu cầu học tập của sinh viên	The course content was relevant to students' learning needs.
C2	Content Quality	Nội dung cung cấp kiến thức cơ bản về AI rõ ràng và dễ hiểu.	The content introduced basic AI knowledge clearly and understandably.
C3	Content Quality	Nội dung cập nhật các công cụ AI phổ biến và xu hướng hiện nay.	The content covered popular AI tools and current trends.
C4	Content Quality	Nội dung có tính thực tiễn và gắn với học tập/nghiên cứu của sinh viên.	The content was practical and connected to students' learning and research.
C5	Content Quality	Khối lượng nội dung được thiết kế hợp lý trong thời lượng chương trình.	The amount of content was appropriate for the program duration.
D1	Program Delivery	Hình thức tổ chức chương trình qua Zoom phù hợp	Delivering the program via Zoom was appropriate.
D2	Program Delivery	Phương pháp trình bày và minh họa trong chương trình dễ tiếp cận.	The presentation and demonstrations were accessible.
D3	Program Delivery	Hoạt động thực hành/trải nghiệm công cụ AI giúp người học dễ hiểu bài hơn.	Hands-on activities with AI tools helped learners understand the material.
D4	Program Delivery	Thời lượng chương trình được phân bổ hợp lý.	The program duration was allocated appropriately.
D5	Program Delivery	Công tác tổ chức, điều phối chương trình diễn ra thuận lợi.	The program was organized and coordinated smoothly.
P1	Presenter Quality	Báo cáo viên có kiến thức chuyên môn vững về AI.	The presenters had strong subject knowledge of AI.
P2	Presenter Quality	Báo cáo viên truyền đạt nội dung rõ ràng, dễ hiểu.	The presenters communicated the content clearly and understandably.
P3	Presenter Quality	Báo cáo viên sử dụng nhiều ví dụ minh họa thực tế.	The presenters used practical examples.
P4	Presenter Quality	Báo cáo viên tương tác tốt với sinh viên trong quá trình học.	The presenters interacted well with students during the program.
P5	Presenter Quality	Báo cáo viên giải đáp thắc mắc của sinh viên đầy đủ và hữu ích.	The presenters answered students' questions fully and helpfully.

U1	Perceived Usefulness/Application	Chuyên đề giúp bạn hiểu rõ hơn về các ứng dụng của AI.	The program helped me better understand AI applications.
U2	Perceived Usefulness/Application	Bạn có thể áp dụng các công cụ AI đã học vào việc học tập.	I can apply the AI tools covered in the program to my studies.
U3	Perceived Usefulness/Application	Chuyên đề giúp bạn nâng cao kỹ năng sử dụng công nghệ trong học tập/nghiên cứu.	The program improved my ability to use technology for learning and research.
U4	Perceived Usefulness/Application	Nội dung chương trình giúp bạn nhận thức rõ hơn về cơ hội và thách thức của AI.	The program helped me better understand the opportunities and challenges of AI.
U5	Perceived Usefulness/Application	Sau chương trình, bạn tự tin hơn khi sử dụng các công cụ AI.	After the program, I felt more confident using AI tools.

A1. Future-interest item and open-ended prompts

Original future-interest item: “Mức độ quan tâm đối với các chương trình tương tự.” Observed response categories in the source workbook: Rất không mong muốn; Không mong muốn; Bình thường; Mong muốn; Rất mong muốn. Working English gloss: very unwilling; unwilling; neutral; willing; very willing.

The survey also included two open-ended prompts: “Nội dung nào của chương trình bạn thấy hữu ích nhất?” (Which part/content of the program did you find most useful?) and “Các đề xuất khác để cải thiện chương trình trong tương lai.” (What other suggestions do you have for improving the program in the future?). These responses were not included in the thematic analysis reported in the manuscript; the reported thematic analysis uses the separate end-session form.

A2. Quantitative sample accounting

Screening step	**Records**	**Treatment**
Submitted evaluation-survey records	1,611	Source workbook records across ten faculties.
Duplicate identifier excess records removed	2	Two duplicate-ID groups were identified; one record per group was retained. Where completeness was tied, the earlier submission was retained.
Malformed identifiers set aside	12	Responses were retained in a separate verification sheet but excluded from the analytic sample; identifiers were not guessed or corrected.
Final quantitative analytic sample	1,597	Unique, correctly formatted identifiers; all 20 Likert responses complete and in the 1–5 range.

Appendix B. Complete Final-Session Attendance and Reflection Form

The source form contains four administrative fields (timestamp, name, student identifier, and class/faculty) followed by 25 substantive questions. The administrative fields are not reproduced here. The form served as the final-session attendance check. Its 2,260 rows were coded with sequential pseudonyms P0001-P2260 in the thematic workbook; this does not establish that the rows represent 2,260 unique students.

The following table lists all 25 substantive questions. "Coded segments" refers to non-empty coded entries in the thematic matrix, not unique students or necessarily unique response records.

Item	Original Vietnamese question	Working English translation	Observed response format/options	Coded segments
Q1	Bạn đánh giá thế nào về mức độ hữu ích của khóa học AI Companion với bản thân? (1: Không hữu ích - 5: Rất hữu ích)	How useful was the AI Companion course to you?	Five-point rating; source prompt explicitly anchors 1 = not useful and 5 = very useful.	—
Q2	Khóa học đem lại cho bạn điều gì?	What did the course bring you?	Open text.	2,259
Q3	Sau khóa học, bạn thấy mình đã…?	After the course, what did you feel you had learned or become able to do?	Multi-select learning outcomes; free-text variants also appear in the export.	2,260
Q4	Điều gì bạn thấy ấn tượng nhất trong toàn khóa học?	What impressed you most about the course as a whole?	Multi-select: teaching content; organization; instructors/guides; positive learning atmosphere; special highlights (Open Talk, competition, chatbot); other entries appear.	2,260
Q5	Trong số các buổi học, buổi nào để lại ấn tượng với bạn nhất? Vì sao?	Which session left the strongest impression on you? Why?	Open text.	2,260
Q6	Từ khóa nào miêu tả đúng nhất hành trình AI Companion của bạn? (Bạn có thể viết 1 từ hoặc 1 câu ngắn) (VD: "Khai sáng", "Bước ngoặt học tập", "Nạp siêu năng lực!"...)	What keyword best describes your AI Companion journey? (One word or short phrase.)	Short open text.	2,260

Q7	Bạn đã sử dụng Chatbot ICT ULIS chưa?	Have you used the ICT ULIS chatbot?	Yes/No.	—
Q8	Nếu có, chatbot đã hỗ trợ bạn những gì? (chọn nhiều đáp án)	If yes, what did the chatbot help you with? (Select all that apply.)	Multi-select: check class schedules; explain AI concepts; guide use of AI tools; answer questions about sessions; share materials/slides; other/no-use text.	2,260
Q9	Mức độ hài lòng của bạn về chatbot	How satisfied are you with the chatbot?	Single choice: very satisfied; acceptable; needs improvement; not used/unsure.	—
Q10	Bạn có gợi ý gì để cải tiến chatbot này trong tương lai?	What suggestions do you have for improving the chatbot?	Open text.	2,257
Q11	Bạn có biết đến cộng đồng ICT ULIS sau khóa học không?	Did you know about the ICT ULIS community after the course?	Yes/No.	—
Q12	Bạn đã tham gia cộng đồng ICT ULIS chưa?	Have you joined the ICT ULIS community?	Yes/No (source labels: “Chưa” / “Rồi nha”).	—
Q13	Theo bạn, một cộng đồng sinh viên về AI và Công nghệ nên có hoạt động nào?	What activities should a student community focused on AI and technology organize?	Multi-select: share AI resources/tips; monthly workshops; digital-content creation club; practical AI projects; mentor–student connections; other entries appear.	2,259
Q14	Bạn có muốn tiếp tục đồng hành với cộng đồng ICT ULIS không?	Would you like to continue participating in the ICT ULIS community?	Single choice: Yes; unsure; No.	—
Q15	Bạn có tham gia buổi Open Talk không?	Did you attend the Open Talk?	Yes/No.	—
Q16	Bạn ấn tượng điều gì nhất trong buổi chia sẻ đó?	What impressed you most during the talk?	Open text.	2,254
Q17	Sau buổi Open Talk, bạn có nhận thức rõ hơn về vai trò của mình trong thời đại AI không?	After the Open Talk, did you have a clearer understanding of your role in the AI era?	Single choice: Yes, very clearly; partly; not clearly.	—

Q18	Một thông điệp/bài học bạn ghi nhớ sau buổi Open Talk là gì?	What message or lesson do you remember from the Open Talk?	Open text.	2,250
Q19	Bạn có tham gia cuộc thi không?	Did you participate in the competition?	Single choice: Yes; No; intended to participate but did not have time.	—
Q20	Nếu có, đề tài bạn chọn là đề nào?	If yes, which topic did you choose?	Single choice: ULIS through My Eyes; Telling Cultural Stories; The Journey of Learning and Mastering AI.	2,260
Q21	Cuộc thi giúp bạn phát triển những năng lực nào?	What abilities did the competition help you develop?	Multi-select: digital-content creation; teamwork and critical thinking; practical AI use; presentation/persuasion; systems thinking and reflection; other entries appear.	2,259
Q22	Nếu chưa tham gia, bạn cần thêm điều kiện nào để có thể tham gia cuộc thi tương tự trong tương lai?	If you did not participate, what additional conditions would help you take part in a similar competition?	Multi-select: more preparation time; more detailed guidance; group participation; technical support; other entries appear.	2,259
Q23	Bạn mong muốn khóa học tiếp theo nên mở rộng theo hướng nào?	In what directions would you like the next course to expand?	Multi-select: AI for language disciplines; AI and creative-content design; AI for academic work/research writing; group AI projects; advanced learning assistants; other entries appear.	2,260
Q24	Bạn có muốn tham gia thêm khóa học nâng cao về AI cho sinh viên không? Nếu có thì chủ đề nào bạn hứng thú?	Would you like to take an advanced AI course for students? If so, which topics interest you?	Open text combining Yes/No interest and optional topic.	2,257
Q25	Bạn có lời nhắn/góp ý nào dành cho Ban tổ chức khóa học không?	What message or suggestions would you like to give the course organizers?	Open text.	2,257

The 16 prompts included in thematic coding are Q2-Q6, Q8, Q10, Q13, Q16, Q18, Q20-Q25. Segment counts for those prompts sum to 36,131. Questions not listed as coded have no segment count in the thematic matrix; this does not imply that they were unanswered.

Excerpts were analysed in Vietnamese; English renderings were drafted with Codex and revised and verified against the original by our authors.