Journal of English Language and Education
ISSN 2597- 6850 (Online), 2502-4132 (Print)
Journal Homepage: https://jele.or.id/index.php/jele/index

OPEN ACCESS Article

ChatGPT in English Academic Writing: Perceptions, Uses, and Challenges of English Education Students

https://doi.org/10.31004/jele.v11i6.3104

*Sarina Londa Mukin, Yanto, Nur Syamsiyah Ekhsan [abcd]
[1]Universitas Muhammadiyah Maumere, Indonesia
Corresponding Author: sarinalonda@gmail.com

A B S T R A C T

The increasing use of ChatGPT in higher education has transformed how students complete English academic writing. However, while previous studies have explored general AI use, specific evidence regarding students' perceptions, patterns of use across writing stages, and challenges within English education contexts remains limited. Therefore, this study aimed to explore English education students' perceptions of ChatGPT, describe how they used it in completing English academic writing, and identify the practical and ethical challenges they encountered. Employing a qualitative descriptive approach, the study involved 27 third- and fifth-semester students who completed a questionnaire. From this group, 10 participants were selected through purposive sampling for semi-structured interviews. Data were analysed using Miles and Huberman's stages, where interview transcripts were analysed thematically and compared with questionnaire responses for data verification. The findings showed that students perceived ChatGPT as useful for generating ideas, creating outlines, developing arguments, improving grammar and vocabulary, paraphrasing, and revising texts. However, they reported inaccurate or irrelevant responses, prompt difficulties, dependence, reduced creativity, plagiarism risks, and ethical concerns. ChatGPT can effectively support English academic writing when used critically, responsibly, and with information verification.

Keywords: *Chatgpt, Students' Perceptions, Writing Assignments, Academic Writing, Qualitative Research*
Article History:
Received 25th July 2026
Accepted 25th November 2026
Published 17th November 2026

INTRODUCTION

The rapid development of digital technology has influenced various aspects of higher education, including how students access information, participate in learning activities, and complete academic assignments. One of the most significant developments is Artificial Intelligence (AI), which enables computer-based systems to perform tasks that typically require human intelligence, such as language processing, reasoning, and problem-solving (Supriyadi & Asih, 2021). Among the available AI-based technologies, ChatGPT has gained considerable attention because it can understand written prompts and generate human-like responses. In educational contexts, ChatGPT is increasingly used to provide explanations, generate ideas, answer questions, and assist students in completing learning tasks. Its ability to respond quickly and produce coherent text has made it particularly relevant to writing activities in higher education (Alberth, 2023).

Writing is an essential academic skill because it allows students to communicate ideas, construct arguments, demonstrate understanding, and complete various academic requirements. Writing also involves more than arranging words into sentences; students must develop ideas, organize information logically, use appropriate vocabulary, maintain grammatical accuracy, and ensure coherence between paragraphs. Dalman (2014) explains that writing is a process of expressing thoughts, feelings, and imagination through meaningful written language. In higher education, students are expected to produce different forms of writing, including essays, reports, article reviews, research papers, and scientific articles. However, completing these assignments can be challenging, particularly for students who

OPEN ACCESS
© 2021 The Author.This article is licensed CC BY SA 4.0.
visit Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Copyright (c) 2026 Sarina Londa Mukin, et al.

experience difficulties in generating ideas, organizing arguments, selecting academic vocabulary, and using correct grammar.

The writing process generally consists of several interconnected stages. Bray (2025) identifies these stages as prewriting, organizing, drafting, revising, and editing. During prewriting, students determine topics and generate relevant ideas. They then organize those ideas into an outline before developing them into a draft. The draft is subsequently revised to improve its content and organization and edited to correct grammatical, lexical, and mechanical errors. Difficulties may occur at any of these stages. For example, students may experience a lack of ideas during prewriting, difficulty arranging arguments during organizing, or problems with grammar and vocabulary during revising and editing. These difficulties encourage students to use digital technologies, including ChatGPT, as supporting tools in the writing process.

ChatGPT can assist students at different stages of writing. Students may use it to generate ideas, brainstorm topics, create outlines, develop arguments, explain academic concepts, improve vocabulary, correct grammar, paraphrase sentences, and revise written texts. Alberth (2023) argues that ChatGPT can support academic writing activities from the initial planning stage to the final revision stage. Similarly, Rachbini and Evi (2023) state that ChatGPT offers efficiency, flexibility, and quick access to information. These functions may help students overcome writer's block, understand writing structures, and complete assignments more efficiently. ChatGPT may also provide examples that enable students to compare their original writing with suggested revisions and learn from changes in sentence structure, word choice, and paragraph organization.

To systematically understand this phenomenon, this study establishes a clear conceptual distinction between three dimensions of students' engagement with ChatGPT: perceptions, uses, and challenges. Perceptions concern students' evaluations and beliefs regarding the tool's usefulness, accuracy, and impact on their learning (Walgito, 2017). Uses refer to the specific writing tasks, stages, and purposes for which students employ ChatGPT in practice. Meanwhile, challenges encompass the technical, academic, and ethical difficulties or risks they experience during its use. Students who receive useful suggestions may perceive ChatGPT as an effective writing aid, whereas those who encounter inaccurate or irrelevant responses may develop more cautious perceptions.

Despite its potential benefits, using ChatGPT in writing assignments also presents considerable limitations and challenges. AI-generated responses are not always accurate, relevant, or supported by reliable academic sources. Students may accept convincing but incorrect information when they lack the ability to verify ChatGPT's output. Bannert et al. (2023) emphasize several challenges associated with large language models in education, including inaccurate information, inappropriate suggestions, limited AI literacy, overreliance, plagiarism, and academic integrity. Excessive dependence on ChatGPT may also reduce students' opportunities to develop independent writing, creativity, and critical thinking. Romero-Rodríguez et al. (2023) similarly highlight the need for students to evaluate AI-generated information critically rather than accepting it without verification.

Ethical concerns are particularly important because ChatGPT can generate complete paragraphs and texts that may be directly included in academic assignments, blurring the lines of true authorship. The use of ChatGPT may be considered acceptable when students employ it to obtain explanations, generate initial ideas, check grammar, or revise their own writing. However, ethical problems arise when students directly copy AI-generated content, claim it as their own work, or use information without checking its original source. Paraphrasing AI-generated content does not automatically guarantee originality or accuracy, especially when students do not understand the material being paraphrased. Therefore, responsible use requires students to evaluate the output, verify information through credible sources, modify the generated text, and remain accountable for the final content of their assignments.

Previous studies published in recent years have investigated the integration of ChatGPT and other AI technologies into academic writing. Wahid and Hikamudin (2023) found that university students generally demonstrated positive attitudes toward the use of

OPEN ACCESS
© 2021 The Author.This article is licensed CC BY SA 4.0.
visit Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Copyright (c) 2026 Sarina Londa Mukin, et al.

ChatGPT in learning activities. Rahmawati (2025) examined students' perceptions of several AI technologies, including ChatGPT, Grammarly, and Turnitin, and reported that these technologies helped students improve grammar, organize ideas, and increase writing efficiency. Sonyati (2024) investigated the influence of ChatGPT on students' thesis-writing processes and found that it assisted them in generating ideas, finding references, and improving sentence structure. While these empirical studies demonstrate that AI technologies can support students' writing activities, they mainly offer broad quantitative overviews across general disciplines rather than examining the specific qualitative nuances of AI-assisted writing processes.

Several research gaps therefore remain. First, limited attention has been given to students' experiences of using ChatGPT in specific classroom writing assignments. Second, previous studies have not sufficiently examined how ChatGPT is used throughout the entire writing process, including brainstorming, organizing, drafting, revising, and editing. Third, few studies have simultaneously investigated students' perceptions, actual reported uses, and challenges through a qualitative approach. Crucially, research concerning ChatGPT use specifically among English as a Foreign Language (EFL) or English education students remains inadequate. This population constitutes a highly meaningful context for investigation because EFL students face unique, dual cognitive demands: they must construct complex academic arguments while simultaneously managing foreign language accuracy, including grammar, advanced vocabulary, and sentence organization. Consequently, their patterns of ChatGPT use and the specific challenges they encounter differ significantly from those of students in other disciplines writing in their native language.

A preliminary questionnaire was distributed to 82 students from the English Education and Literature Study Program at the University of Muhammadiyah Maumere during the 2025/2026 academic year. The preliminary findings showed that the students had used ChatGPT to support academic activities, particularly writing assignments. However, their responses indicated different views regarding its usefulness, accuracy, influence on creativity, and compatibility with academic ethics. This preliminary condition demonstrated the need for a more focused investigation involving students who were completing writing-related courses. Therefore, the present study focused on third-semester students enrolled in Essay Writing and fifth-semester students enrolled in Scientific Writing Technique. Their assignments included narrative essays, writing outlines, article reviews, and scientific article writing.

To address the identified gaps, this study employed a qualitative approach in which semi-structured interviews served as the primary data source and questionnaire responses served as supporting data. To ensure a comprehensive analysis, this study was guided by the following three research questions:1. What are English education students' perceptions of using ChatGPT in academic writing assignments?2. How do these students use ChatGPT across different stages of completing their writing assignments?3. What practical and ethical challenges do students encounter when using ChatGPT in these assignments?

By systematically answering these questions, this study provides a more comprehensive understanding of ChatGPT-assisted writing. Its findings are expected to support the development of guidance for using ChatGPT critically, responsibly, and ethically while preserving students' independence, creativity, and academic integrity.

METHOD

This study employed a qualitative descriptive field research design to obtain an in-depth description of students' perceptions, experiences, and challenges in using ChatGPT for writing assignments. A qualitative approach was selected because it enables researchers to understand a phenomenon through participants' explanations and experiences in a natural educational context (Sugiyono, 2021). Specifically, a descriptive qualitative design was highly suitable for this investigation because it allowed the researchers to capture the depth of students' subjective interpretations, their specific practical uses of the tool, and the complex

OPEN ACCESS
© 2021 The Author.This article is licensed CC BY SA 4.0.
visit Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Copyright (c) 2026 Sarina Londa Mukin, et al.

ethical dilemmas they faced, which cannot be fully understood through quantitative metrics alone. The study was conducted at the University of Muhammadiyah Maumere, Sikka Regency, East Nusa Tenggara, Indonesia. The field data were collected from February 21 to March 7, 2026.

Respondents

The study involved 27 students from the English Education and Literature Study Program at the University of Muhammadiyah Maumere during the 2025/2026 academic year. These participants were recruited through purposive sampling. The participants consisted of 11 third-semester students enrolled in the Essay Writing course and 16 fifth-semester students enrolled in the Scientific Writing Technique course. These students were selected because they had actively engaged in writing-intensive courses and possessed prior experience using ChatGPT to complete writing assignments. The inclusion of students from two different semesters was not intended for a comparative analysis between the groups. Rather, it aimed to capture a broader and more comprehensive range of writing experiences—from basic narrative essays and outlining in the third semester to advanced article reviews and scientific article writing in the fifth semester.

All 27 students completed the questionnaire. Subsequently, 10 students were selected as interview informants, consisting of five third-semester and five fifth-semester students. The interview informants were selected through purposive sampling based on their experience using ChatGPT, the relevance and completeness of their questionnaire responses, their representation of the two semester groups, and their willingness to participate in the interviews. These 10 participants were specifically chosen because their initial responses indicated that they could provide sufficiently rich, detailed, and reflective information regarding the research questions.

Instruments

The data were collected using a questionnaire and a semi-structured interview guide. The questionnaire consisted of 31 closed-ended questions with "Yes" and "No" response options. It was organized according to three main indicators: students' perceptions of using ChatGPT, how students used ChatGPT in completing writing assignments, and the challenges they encountered. The questionnaire included items related to usefulness, ease of use, writing development, creativity, academic ethics, brainstorming, outlining, grammar correction, paraphrasing, revision, prompt construction, information accuracy, dependence, plagiarism, and user responsibility. Closed-ended questions enable researchers to obtain structured responses based on predetermined options (Dillman et al., 2014).

The semi-structured interview guide was developed based on the same three research focuses. The questions explored students' understanding and evaluation of ChatGPT, their purposes and procedures for using it during different stages of writing, and their experiences with technical, academic, and ethical challenges. The semi-structured format enabled the researcher to ask follow-up questions and obtain clarification when participants' responses required further explanation (Kallio et al., 2016). Both the questionnaire and the interview protocol were developed directly from the research objectives and literature review. Prior to data collection, the instruments were reviewed by an academic supervisor to ensure content validity, clarity, and appropriateness for the target respondents, following recommendations for instrument development and validation (Boateng et al., 2018).

Procedures

The questionnaire was distributed to the 27 students through Google Forms. After the responses were collected, the researcher reviewed them to obtain a general overview of students' perceptions, usage practices, and challenges. The responses were also considered when selecting the interview informants. Following the questionnaire, semi-structured interviews were conducted with the 10 selected informants. The interviews were used to clarify and deepen the information obtained from the questionnaire. Students were asked to

OPEN ACCESS
© 2021 The Author.This article is licensed CC BY SA 4.0.
visit Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Copyright (c) 2026 Sarina Londa Mukin, et al.

describe their experiences of using ChatGPT for generating ideas, creating outlines, developing arguments, drafting, correcting grammar, paraphrasing, revising, and editing their writing. They were also asked about prompt difficulties, inaccurate information, dependence, creativity, plagiarism, and academic ethics. The interview responses were transcribed and identified using the codes I1 to I10 to protect the informants' identities and facilitate data analysis.

Data Analysis

The data were analysed using Miles and Huberman's (2014) qualitative analysis model, which consists of data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing and verification. During data reduction, the interview transcripts were reviewed, selected, categorized, and organized according to the three research questions. Irrelevant information was excluded, while relevant statements were grouped into themes concerning students' perceptions, their use of ChatGPT in writing assignments, and the challenges they encountered.

During data display, the interview findings were presented in narrative form and supported by representative quotations from the informants. The questionnaire responses were summarized using frequencies and percentages to provide supporting evidence for the interview findings. The percentage of each response was calculated using the following formula:

$$P = \frac{F}{N} \times 100\%$$

Where P represents the percentage, F represents the frequency of responses, and N represents the total number of questionnaire respondents. In this study, $N$was 27. Finally, conclusions were drawn by interpreting the interview themes and comparing them with the questionnaire results. Verification was conducted by examining the consistency between the two data sources. The questionnaire findings were used to strengthen, clarify, or reveal variations in the interview findings. This process allowed the researcher to formulate conclusions regarding students' perceptions of ChatGPT, their ways of using it in completing writing assignments, and the challenges associated with its use.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The findings of this study are organized into three main subsections that correspond directly to the research questions: students' perceptions of ChatGPT, their patterns of use across different writing stages, and the practical and ethical challenges they encountered. In each subsection, the broad quantitative trends identified through the questionnaire are integrated with and expanded upon by the in-depth qualitative insights gathered from the semi-structured interviews.

Students' Perceptions of Using ChatGPT in Writing Assignments

The interview findings showed that students perceived ChatGPT as a useful and practical tool for supporting writing assignments. They understood ChatGPT as an artificial intelligence-based application that could provide information, answer questions, generate ideas, create writing outlines, and improve language. Students emphasized that ChatGPT should function as a supporting tool rather than replace their thinking processes. This perception was represented by Informant 1:

> *"In my opinion, ChatGPT is an efficient tool for finding sources of information, discussing, and getting answers from various topics. In the context of learning to write, I understand that ChatGPT is not a replacement for the human brain, but rather a tool that helps overcome the lack of ideas, develop a writing framework, and improve language in writing assignments." (I1)*

Nine informants expressed similar opinions regarding the usefulness of ChatGPT. They reported that it helped them when they experienced difficulties in generating ideas, organizing writing, correcting grammar, or developing arguments. Students in Essay Writing used ChatGPT to find ideas for narrative essays, organize storylines, and construct outlines.

OPEN ACCESS
© 2021 The Author.This article is licensed CC BY SA 4.0.
visit Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Copyright (c) 2026 Sarina Londa Mukin, et al.

Students in Scientific Writing Technique used it to understand academic concepts, identify important points from articles, develop arguments, and improve academic language. Students also considered ChatGPT relatively easy to use because they only needed to enter questions or instructions to obtain responses. However, three informants explained that the quality of the results depended on the clarity of the prompt. General or unclear prompts frequently produced broad responses that did not match the assignment requirements.

These interview narratives closely converged with the questionnaire findings. As shown in Table 1, 96.3% of the students stated that ChatGPT helped them understand good writing structure, while the same percentage reported that it helped them save time. Moreover, 77.8% perceived that ChatGPT improved the quality of their writing, and 74.1% believed that it was effective in developing writing skills. These results indicate that students' positive perceptions were mainly associated with practical benefits experienced while completing assignments.

Table 1. Students' perceptions of using ChatGPT

Questionnaire item	F	%
Knew ChatGPT before using it in writing assignments	25	92.6%
ChatGPT improved the quality of writing	21	77.8%
ChatGPT helped students understand good writing structure	26	96.3%
ChatGPT was effective in developing writing skills	20	74.1%
Students felt comfortable using ChatGPT	22	81.5%
ChatGPT helped students save time	26	96.3%
Students' writing skills improved after using ChatGPT	17	63.0%
ChatGPT use was consistent with academic ethics	10	37.0%
ChatGPT could reduce creativity	19	70.4%
Concern that ChatGPT could violate academic ethics	24	88.9%

Note. N = 27.

This finding supports Walgito's (2017) explanation that perception is influenced by individuals' experiences, knowledge, expectations, and conditions when interacting with an object. Students' direct experiences of using ChatGPT to generate ideas, create outlines, and improve grammar contributed to their positive perceptions. The finding is also consistent with Rachbini and Evi (2023), who identify efficiency, flexibility, and access to information as important benefits of ChatGPT, and with Rahmawati (2025), who reported that AI technologies helped students improve grammar, organize ideas, and increase writing efficiency.

Although students generally recognized the practical benefits of ChatGPT, their perceptions concerning creativity were more cautious. Some stated that ChatGPT supported creativity by offering initial ideas and alternative perspectives, while others believed that creativity could decrease when students relied heavily on AI-generated content. Informant 6 explained:

> *"In my opinion, the use of ChatGPT can reduce creativity if you only copy the results directly. However, if it is used to find ideas or develop initial concepts, it can actually encourage creativity because it provides basic materials that can be developed on your own." (I6)*

This statement demonstrates that students did not perceive ChatGPT's influence on creativity as entirely positive or negative. Its influence depended on how the technology was

OPEN ACCESS
© 2021 The Author.This article is licensed CC BY SA 4.0.
visit Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Copyright (c) 2026 Sarina Londa Mukin, et al.

used. This interpretation is supported by the questionnaire results: 70.4% believed that ChatGPT could reduce creativity, while 74.1% considered it effective for developing writing skills. Students thus perceived ChatGPT as helpful for technical and organizational aspects of writing but remained concerned about its effect on independent thinking. Their perceptions can be characterized as instrumentally positive but critically cautious.

Academic ethics also influenced students' perceptions. They considered ChatGPT acceptable when it was used to generate ideas, explain material, correct grammar, or revise writing, but unethical when students directly copied the output or claimed it as their own work. Informant 2 stated:

> *"In my opinion, the use of ChatGPT depends on how it is used. If it is used as a tool to find ideas, understand material, or improve writing, then it is acceptable. However, if it is used to cheat or claim the results as one's own work without effort, it can be considered fraud. So, whether it is ethical or not is determined by the intention and how it is used." (I2)*

Only 37% of the students believed that using ChatGPT was consistent with academic ethics, whereas 88.9% were worried that it could violate academic ethics. These findings reveal uncertainty concerning the boundary between legitimate assistance and academic dishonesty. They align with Bannert et al. (2023), who explain that AI-generated text can create challenges related to academic integrity and plagiarism.

Patterns of ChatGPT Use Across Different Stages of Writing

The data from both the questionnaire and interviews revealed that students utilized ChatGPT not merely as a basic language corrector, but as a more comprehensive writing partner engaged in both lower-order editing and higher-order cognitive tasks. The interview findings indicated that students used ChatGPT for several purposes throughout the writing process. These purposes included generating ideas, creating outlines, developing arguments, searching for references, correcting grammar, improving vocabulary, paraphrasing sentences, and revising texts. Informant 1 explained:

> *"I use ChatGPT in writing assignments to help make outlines so that the writing is more structured, look for ideas or topics, organize important points, and help improve background and research questions to make them more coherent. In addition, I also use ChatGPT to clarify sentences that are too long or ambiguous, paraphrase, choose more academic words, and most often check grammar." (I1)*

Table 2. Students' use of ChatGPT in writing assignments

Questionnaire item	F	%
Generating or developing ideas through brainstorming	21	77.8%
Improving grammar	25	92.6%
Paraphrasing sentences	17	63.0%
Creating writing outlines	24	88.9%
Developing arguments	25	92.6%
Searching for references	26	96.3%
Revising and editing writing	23	85.2%
Checking paragraph structure	23	85.2%
Improving vocabulary	24	88.9%
Using ChatGPT during prewriting or drafting	23	85.2%
Using ChatGPT during revision	23	85.2%

OPEN ACCESS
© 2021 The Author.This article is licensed CC BY SA 4.0.
visit Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Questionnaire item	F	%
Directly copying ChatGPT output without modification	8	29.6%

Note. N = 27.

When examining these uses through the lens of the writing process (Bray, 2025), the findings show a strategic deployment of AI at different stages. During the prewriting stage, students used ChatGPT to brainstorm topics and generate initial ideas (reported by 77.8% in the questionnaire). During the organizing stage, 88.9% requested outlines and suggestions for arranging arguments. At the drafting stage, students engaged ChatGPT for higher-order tasks, such as developing complex arguments (92.6%) and searching for supporting references (96.3%). Finally, during the revision and editing stages, ChatGPT functioned as a language assistant, used by 92.6% to improve grammar, 88.9% for vocabulary enhancement, and 85.2% for checking paragraph structure and coherence.

The interviews further revealed a relatively systematic procedure that demonstrates students' active engagement with the AI output. Students generally determined their purpose, created a prompt, reviewed the response, selected relevant information, and modified the output. Informant 6 described this process:

> *"My steps usually start from determining the purpose of use, creating a clear and specific prompt, reading the results, selecting relevant sections, modifying them according to my own ideas and writing style, and then checking the correctness of the information through other sources." (I6)*

Most students attempted to write independently before consulting ChatGPT. They generally used it after developing an initial idea or draft, particularly when they encountered difficulty continuing their writing. Informant 1 stated:

> *"At the drafting stage, I usually write first based on my own understanding. I do not directly ask ChatGPT from the beginning because I want the writing to come from my ideas. I use ChatGPT when I have an idea deadlock or when I need additional information to enrich the content." (I1)*

This practice indicates that ChatGPT functioned primarily as a supporting and revising tool rather than entirely replacing students' writing. It was also used extensively during revision and editing, particularly for tenses, prepositions, sentence structure, word choice, paragraph organization, argument clarity, and relationships between paragraphs. This finding explains why 92.6% reported using ChatGPT to improve grammar and 85.2% used it for revision and editing.

Paraphrasing was reported by 63% of the students. They used it to produce more academic language, clarify complicated sentences, and create linguistic variations. However, changing sentence structure does not remove the obligation to acknowledge the original source. ChatGPT-assisted paraphrasing should not replace accurate citation. Similarly, although searching for references was the most frequently reported use, ChatGPT may produce incomplete, inaccurate, or non-existent references. Its suggestions should be verified through journal databases, Google Scholar, academic books, or official websites before being cited.

Students generally modified ChatGPT output before including it in assignments. They reread the responses, selected important points, adjusted the wording, and combined the output with their ideas. Informant 1 explained:

> *"After getting the output from ChatGPT, I did not use it immediately. I reread the results, took the key points, and then modified them to fit the context of my writing and language style. I also combined them with ideas, analysis, or opinions based on my understanding so that the writing still reflected my own thoughts." (I1)*

OPEN ACCESS
© 2021 The Author.This article is licensed CC BY SA 4.0.
visit Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

This statement was consistent with the finding that 70.4% did not directly copy ChatGPT output without modification. Nevertheless, 29.6% admitted that they had directly used its output. Responsible practices were therefore not applied by all students.

Practical and Ethical Challenges Encountered by Students

Students encountered technical, informational, intellectual, and ethical challenges when using ChatGPT. To provide a meaningful interpretation, the evidence gathered from the questionnaire and interviews can be grouped into three distinct categories: (1) technical and informational challenges, (2) intellectual and cognitive challenges, and (3) ethical challenges.

Table 3. Challenges encountered when using ChatGPT

Questionnaire item	F	%
Difficulty accessing ChatGPT	10	37.0%
Difficulty creating effective prompts	15	55.6%
Output was not always relevant to students' needs	14	51.9%
Students had doubted the accuracy of information	24	88.9%
Students felt overly dependent on ChatGPT	20	74.1%
Concern about plagiarism	26	96.3%
Difficulty distinguishing personal writing from ChatGPT assistance	18	66.7%
Concern about violations of academic ethics	24	88.9%
Students felt responsible for the final content	22	81.5%

Note. N = 27.

Technical and Informational Challenges

Technical problems included slow internet connections and system errors; however, technical access was not the most prominent problem, as only 37% reported access difficulties. A more substantial informational challenge was prompt construction and information accuracy. The questionnaire showed that 55.6% experienced difficulty creating effective prompts, 51.9% indicated that the output was not always relevant, and 88.9% doubted the accuracy of the information provided by the AI. These problems were particularly apparent when students requested theories, current information, academic data, or references. Informant 1 stated:

> *"I have experienced technical difficulties when using ChatGPT, such as errors or missing text. I have also found ChatGPT answers that are not precise, especially those related to certain theories or academic data. To overcome this, I double-check scientific journals or trusted sources before using them in writing." (I1)*

This finding supports Bannert et al. (2023), who explain that language models can produce convincing information that is not necessarily accurate or scientifically reliable. In academic writing, incorrect information can affect the validity of arguments, theories, and conclusions.

Intellectual and Cognitive Challenges

Dependence and a potential reduction in original thought emerged as significant cognitive challenges. The questionnaire showed that 74.1% felt overly dependent on ChatGPT when writing. Students explained in the interviews that the tool's speed and convenience encouraged them to consult it whenever they experienced difficulty, rather than persevering through writer's block independently. Informant 2 stated:

OPEN ACCESS
© 2021 The Author.This article is licensed CC BY SA 4.0.
visit Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

> *"Sometimes I feel a little dependent because ChatGPT is very helpful and easy to use, especially when working on multiple assignments. I also sometimes feel confused when verifying the information provided. The difficulty is determining the most valid and reliable source to use. I usually check through Google Scholar, scientific journals, or reference books." (I2)*

Dependence may occur when students repeatedly ask ChatGPT to generate ideas, organize arguments, or produce sentences without attempting these processes independently. In Essay Writing, dependence could reduce opportunities to develop personal experiences and imagination, while in Scientific Writing, it could discourage students from reading complete articles and constructing arguments from original sources. In Scientific Writing Technique, it could discourage students from reading complete articles and constructing arguments from original sources.

Ethical Challenges

Plagiarism and authorship concerns represented the most critical ethical challenges. Plagiarism was the most widely reported concern overall, with 96.3% of students indicating worry about it. Furthermore, 66.7% experienced difficulty distinguishing their own writing from ChatGPT-assisted writing, raising fundamental questions about academic authorship. Informant 6 explained:

> *"In my opinion, the use of ChatGPT has the potential to cause plagiarism if the results are copied directly without changing anything and without mentioning the source. Therefore, its use must be careful and clear as an aid, not as a substitute for one's own work." (I6)*

While the finding that 81.5% felt responsible for the final content is encouraging, it must be interpreted alongside the 29.6% who reported directly copying ChatGPT output and the 88.9% who worried about violations of academic ethics. Students attempted to reduce plagiarism risks by paraphrasing, editing, and adding personal ideas; however, modification alone does not resolve ethical concerns regarding originality and the proper acknowledgment of AI assistance. Overall, ChatGPT provided meaningful support across different stages of writing, but its benefits were accompanied by substantial risks. Its effectiveness therefore depended not only on technical capabilities but also on students' AI literacy and academic responsibility.

CONCLUSIONS

This study concludes that English education students perceive ChatGPT as a beneficial yet complex tool for academic writing. Students utilize it as a writing partner to support prewriting, outlining, drafting, and revising vocabulary and sentence structures. However, its effectiveness depends on their ability to formulate specific prompts and critically evaluate generated responses. Students recognize that AI should complement rather than replace independent thinking. Despite its benefits, several challenges emerge, particularly concerning the accuracy of AI-generated references, overreliance, plagiarism, and academic authorship. These concerns highlight the tension between improved writing efficiency and the potential loss of creative independence and academic integrity. Since this study relies on students' perceptions and self-reported practices, future research should examine actual interactions with ChatGPT and compare reported experiences with students' writing samples. Further investigations could also explore how AI literacy instruction influences information verification and independent revision. Ultimately, responsible ChatGPT integration requires critical evaluation, proper verification, and continuous human involvement to preserve students' authentic academic voices.

OPEN ACCESS
© 2021 The Author.This article is licensed CC BY SA 4.0.
visit Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

DECLARATION

Author Contributions: All authors contributed to the development and completion of this study. Each author participated in the research process, including conceptualization, methodology, data collection, data analysis, interpretation of findings, and manuscript preparation. All authors reviewed and approved the final version of the manuscript.

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest related to the research, authorship, or publication of this article.

Funding: This research was independently funded by the authors without financial support from external institutions, organizations, or funding agencies.

Ethical Approval and Consent: This study was conducted in accordance with the ethical principles and research guidelines established by the university. All research procedures followed the applicable institutional regulations to ensure the ethical conduct of the study and the protection of participants.

Use of Generative AI: Generative AI tools were used solely to assist with English grammar checking and language refinement. The tools did not replace the authors' intellectual contributions, data analysis, interpretation of findings, or academic decision-making. The authors take full responsibility for the accuracy and integrity of the final manuscript.

REFERENCES

Alberth. (2023). The use of ChatGPT in academic writing: A blessing or a curse in dis*guise? TEFLIN Jo*urnal, 34(2), 337–352.

Bannert, M., Kasneci, E., Sessler, K., Stefan, K., Fischer, F., Gasser, U., Groh, G., Stephan, G., Poquet, O., Sailer, M., Schmidt, A., & Seidel, T. (2023). ChatGPT for good? *On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. EdArXiv.* https://doi.org/xxxxx

Boateng, G. O., Neilands, T. B., Frongillo, E. A., Melgar-Quiñonez, H. R., & Young, S. L. (2018). Best practices for developing and validating scales for health, social, and behavioral research: A primer. Frontie*rs in Public Health, 6, Ar*ticle 149. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2018.00149

Bray, N. (2025). Introduction to academic writing. Univers*ity of Alberta Open Educational Reso*urces. https://doi.org/10.29173/oer/a1ia9upy

Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2014). In*ternet, phone, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: The tailored design method* (4th ed.). Wiley.

Dalman, H. (2014). Keterampilan *menulis. Raja Grafindo Per*sada.

Kallio, H., Pietilä, A.-M., Johnson, M., & Kangasniemi, M. (2016). Systematic methodological review: Developing a framework for a qualitative semi-structured interview guide. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, *72*(12), 2954–2965. https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.13031

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, *A. M. (2014). Analisis data kualitatif. UI* Press.

Wahid, R., Hikamudin, E., & H., A. (2023). Analisis penggunaan C*hat-GPT oleh mahasiswa terhadap proses pendidikan di perguruan tinggi. Nama Jurnal, volume(nomor), halaman.* https://doi.org/xxxxx

Rahmawati, E. (2025). Students' p*erceptions of using artificial intelligence technology in academic writing at an Islamic university in Pekanbaru. Nama Jurnal/Repositori, volume(nomor), halaman.* https://doi.org/xxxxx

Sonyati, V. (2024). *Pengaruh Penggunaan Chatgpt Terhadap Optimalisasi Proses Penulisan Skripsi Mahasiswa Pai Angkatan 2020 Di Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Intan Lampung*.

Sugiyono. (2021). Metode penelitian komunikasi. In *Simbiosa Rekatama Media* (Vol. 1).

Supriyadi, E. I., & Asih, D. B. (2021). Implementasi artificial intelligence (AI) di bidang administrasi publik pada era revolusi industri 4.0. J*urnal RASI,* 2(2 SE-Artikel), 12–22. https://doi.org/10.52496/rasi.v2i2.62

Walgito, B. (2017). Pengantar psikologi umum. *Yogyakarta: Andi Offset*.

Widarto Rachbini, Tiolina Evi, S. (2023). Pengenalan ChatGPT tips dan trik bagi pemula. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, *11*(1), 1–140.

OPEN ACCESS
© 2021 The Author.This article is licensed CC BY SA 4.0.
visit Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.