

EFL UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS' PERCEPTION OF USING CHATGPT TO DEVELOP WRITING SKILLS

Dina Mustika¹, Alfian², Wahyuni Fitria³
Universitas Islam Negeri Sulthan Thaha Saifuddin Jambi
dinamustika8899@gmail.com¹, alfian@uinjambi.ac.id²
wahyunifitria@uinjambi.ac.id³

ABSTRACT

Writing is recognized as one of the most challenging skills in EFL contexts, requiring simultaneous management of grammar, vocabulary, and idea organization. The emergence of AI tools such as ChatGPT offers new possibilities for writing support. This study investigates EFL undergraduate students' perceptions of using ChatGPT as a learning tool for writing development, employing a mixed-method design. Quantitative data were collected through a 10-item questionnaire administered to 100 participants, and qualitative data were gathered via semi-structured interviews with 10 respondents. Guided by the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), the study examined perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, attitude toward use, and behavioral intention to use. Findings reveal strong positive perceptions across all TAM constructs, with students reporting benefits in grammar improvement, idea generation, writing organization, and quick feedback. Challenges include over-reliance, difficulty interpreting complex responses, and occasional inaccuracies. ChatGPT is best positioned as a supplementary writing aid under guided and critical conditions.

Keywords: ChatGPT, EFL writing, perception, Technology Acceptance Model, AI-assisted learning

ABSTRAK

Writing diakui sebagai salah satu keterampilan yang paling menantang dalam konteks English Foreign Language (EFL), karena menuntut kemampuan untuk mengelola tata bahasa, kosakata, dan pengorganisasian ide secara bersamaan. Munculnya alat berbasis kecerdasan buatan (AI) seperti ChatGPT menawarkan berbagai kemungkinan baru dalam mendukung proses writing. Penelitian ini menyelidiki persepsi mahasiswa sarjana EFL terhadap penggunaan ChatGPT sebagai alat pembelajaran untuk pengembangan keterampilan writing dengan menggunakan desain mixed method. Data kuantitatif dikumpulkan melalui kuesioner yang terdiri atas 10 butir pertanyaan yang diberikan kepada 100 partisipan, sedangkan data kualitatif diperoleh melalui wawancara semi terstruktur dengan 10 responden. Dengan berpedoman pada Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), penelitian ini mengkaji persepsi kemanfaatan, persepsi kemudahan penggunaan, sikap terhadap penggunaan, dan niat perilaku untuk menggunakan. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan persepsi positif yang kuat pada seluruh konstruk TAM, dengan mahasiswa melaporkan manfaat dalam peningkatan tata bahasa, pengembangan ide, pengorganisasian tulisan, serta pemberian umpan balik yang cepat. Namun, beberapa tantangan juga ditemukan, seperti ketergantungan yang

berlebihan, kesulitan dalam menafsirkan respons yang kompleks, dan adanya ketidakakuratan sesekali. Oleh karena itu, ChatGPT lebih tepat diposisikan sebagai alat bantu menulis yang bersifat pelengkap dengan penggunaan yang terarah dan kritis.

Kata Kunci: ChatGPT, penulisan EFL, persepsi, Technology Acceptance Model, pembelajaran berbantuan AI

A. INTRODUCTION

Writing is widely regarded as one of the most cognitively demanding language skills in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context. As Hyland (2003) explains, writing requires the simultaneous integration of linguistic knowledge, cognitive processing, and discourse organization, making it particularly difficult for non-native speakers. In the Indonesian higher education context, EFL undergraduates continue to face persistent challenges in academic writing, including limited grammatical accuracy, restricted vocabulary, and difficulties in coherent idea development (Fitria, Faizah, & Saijun, 2024). These challenges are further compounded by large class sizes and time-limited teacher feedback, which constrain the individualized writing support students need.

Parallel to these challenges, the rapid advancement of artificial intelligence (AI) in education has opened new possibilities for

supplementary writing support.

Among the AI tools that have gained considerable attention in academic contexts is ChatGPT, a large language model developed by OpenAI. Brown, Mann, and Thomas (2020) describe ChatGPT as a powerful AI capable of generating human-like text for drafting, revising, and improving written output. Its interactive nature and accessibility make it a potentially valuable resource for EFL learners who need immediate and flexible writing assistance beyond the classroom.

The theoretical lens guiding this study is the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) proposed by Davis (1989), which posits that perceived usefulness (PU) and perceived ease of use (PEOU) are the two primary determinants of technology acceptance. Kasneci et al. (2023) extend this framework to AI in education, arguing that the acceptance of large language models such as ChatGPT depends on how

learners perceive their functional value and operational simplicity. Dörnyei (2005) further contextualizes this within language learning, arguing that positive perceptions toward learning tools are closely linked to motivation, persistence, and sustained academic engagement. These frameworks collectively suggest that understanding how students perceive ChatGPT is essential for evaluating its pedagogical potential.

Existing research has begun to document the role of ChatGPT in EFL writing. Kasim and Khalid (2023) found that ChatGPT positively influences grammar accuracy and self-editing practices among EFL students. Similarly, Liu and Xu (2023) reported that students appreciated ChatGPT for idea generation, paraphrasing, and vocabulary refinement, while noting concerns about the quality and specificity of its outputs. Zhai (2022) found that AI-assisted writing tools reduce writing anxiety by providing scaffolded, immediate feedback. However, Bennett, Maton, and Kervin (2008) caution that over-reliance on technology may undermine independent thinking and critical engagement with writing. These

findings collectively highlight the dual nature of ChatGPT as both a productive support tool and a potential source of dependency.

Despite this growing body of literature, empirical research specifically targeting Indonesian EFL undergraduates' perceptions of ChatGPT in the context of writing skill development remains limited. Most existing studies focus on academic writing in non-Indonesian EFL settings, and few have simultaneously examined usefulness, ease of use, attitudes, and behavioral intention within a mixed-method framework. This study therefore addresses this gap by investigating the perceptions of EFL undergraduate students toward ChatGPT as a writing learning tool, with particular attention to benefits experienced and challenges encountered. Three research questions guided the study: (1) What are EFL undergraduate students' perceptions of using ChatGPT to develop writing skills? (2) What benefits do students experience when using ChatGPT for writing? (3) What challenges do students face when using ChatGPT for writing?

B. METHODS

This study employed a mixed-method research design, integrating quantitative and qualitative approaches to generate a comprehensive picture of students' perceptions of ChatGPT in EFL writing (Creswell, 2014). The quantitative strand provided breadth through statistical analysis, while the qualitative strand offered depth through thematic exploration of individual experiences. The study involved 100 EFL undergraduate students enrolled in an English Education study program at a state Islamic university in Indonesia as questionnaire respondents. From this group, 10 participants were purposively selected for semi-structured interviews based on their prior experience using ChatGPT and their willingness to discuss their perceptions in detail. The selection ensured variation in frequency of ChatGPT use, from daily to occasional users, to capture a broad range of experiences.

Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, computing frequency distributions, percentages, and mean scores for each item. Mean scores were interpreted using the

following scale: 1.00–1.75 (very negative perception), 1.76–2.50 (negative perception), 2.51–3.25 (positive perception), and 3.26–4.00 (very positive perception). This scale enabled classification of students' overall perceptual tendencies for each TAM construct.

Qualitative data from the interviews were transcribed, coded, and analyzed using Thematic Analysis following the six-phase procedure outlined by Braun and Clarke (2006): data familiarization, generating initial codes, searching for themes, reviewing themes, defining and naming themes, and producing the thematic report. Two overarching themes emerged: perceived benefits and perceived challenges, each comprising multiple sub-themes.

C. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The findings are organized around the three research questions: (1) students' overall perceptions of ChatGPT through the TAM lens; (2) perceived benefits from the qualitative interview analysis; and (3) perceived challenges and limitations. Each finding is discussed in relation to relevant literature.

2.1. Students' Perceptions of ChatGPT for Writing Development (RQ1)

The quantitative data reveal that students generally hold strong positive

perceptions of ChatGPT across all four TAM constructs. Table 1 presents the complete summary of questionnaire responses across all 10 items.

Table 1. Summary of Questionnaire Responses (N = 100)

No	Construct	Mean	Interpretation
1	Perceived Usefulness (PU)	3,04	Positive
2	Perceived Ease of Use (PEOU)	3,16	Positive
3	Attitude Toward Use (ATU)	3,12	Positive
4	Behavioral Intention to Use (BI)	3,27	Strongly Positive

Perceived Usefulness

Table 2. Perceived Usefulness (PU) – Construct Summary

Variable	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
X1 – ChatGPT helps me to generate ideas when writing	3.07	.355	100
X2 – ChatGPT helps me to correct grammar and vocabulary	3.20	.586	100
X3 – ChatGPT helps me complete writing tasks more effectively	2.70	.704	100
X4 – Using ChatGPT improves the overall quality of writing	3.17	.570	100
Average (PU)	3.04		100

These findings are consistent with the TAM framework, in which perceived usefulness is a strong predictor of technology acceptance (Davis, 1989). The particularly high ratings for grammar support align with Kasim and Khalid (2023), who found that ChatGPT substantially benefits EFL students' linguistic accuracy. The strong endorsement of idea generation reflects Liu and Xu's (2023)

observation that students valued ChatGPT most at the pre-writing stage. The relatively lower mean for task completion effectiveness suggests nuanced perceptions: students benefit from ChatGPT's support but do not uniformly regard it as a complete solution for writing efficiency, indicating awareness that effort and judgment remain necessary.

Perceived Ease of Use

Table 3. Perceived Ease of Use (PEOU) – Construct Summary

Variable	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
X5 – ChatGPT is easy to use to support my writing activities	3.10	.414	100
X6 – I can use ChatGPT for writing without much effort	3.20	.550	100

Variable	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
X7 – ChatGPT is easy to access whenever I need help with writing	3.18	.479	100
Average (PEOU)	3.16		100

This finding aligns with Mishra and Koehler's (2006) argument that technology tools perceived as easy to operate are more likely to be integrated into learning practices. The perception of ease is further linked to self-efficacy (Bandura, 1986): students who believe they can use a tool without difficulty are more likely to engage with it actively and persistently. However, several

interview respondents clarified that ease of access does not eliminate the need for prompt literacy — effective use still requires the ability to formulate specific, clear questions to obtain relevant outputs. This nuance underscores that accessibility is a necessary but not sufficient condition for pedagogical effectiveness.

Attitude Toward Use

Table 4. Attitude Toward Use (ATU) – Construct Summary

Variable	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
X8 – Using ChatGPT increases my motivation to write in English	3.15	.592	100
X9 – I feel more confident in my writing after using ChatGPT	3.08	.545	100
Average (ATU)	3.12		100

These findings are consistent with Hwang, Chen, and Hong (2023), who found that AI-assisted language learning reduces writing anxiety and strengthens cognitive engagement. From a motivational perspective, Dörnyei (2005) argues that tools perceived as supportive and effective sustain learner persistence in challenging academic tasks. The positive attitudinal impact observed here confirms that ChatGPT may play

a role in mitigating the affective barriers commonly associated with EFL writing. Nevertheless, the presence of a small proportion of negative responses (7%) suggests that not all students experience the same motivational or confidence boost, which may relate to individual differences in language proficiency, prior AI experience, or writing self-concept.

Behavioral Intention to Use

Table 5. Behavioral Intention to Use (BIU) – Construct Summary

Variable	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
X10 – I intend to continue using ChatGPT to support my English writing in the future	3.27	.649	100
Average (BIU)	3.27		100

Kasneji et al. (2023) caution, however, that high acceptance rates must be considered alongside awareness of responsible use. The data suggest that students view ChatGPT as part of their regular writing repertoire rather than a temporary novelty. While this indicates successful integration, it simultaneously raises concerns about the potential for habitual dependency

if students do not maintain critical engagement with AI-generated content.

2.2. Benefits of Using ChatGPT for Writing (RQ2)

The qualitative analysis of interview data identified six key benefit themes. Table 6 presents the complete qualitative coding scheme for both benefits and challenges.

Table 6. Qualitative Coding Scheme for Interview Data (Thematic Analysis)

Aspect	Positive Codes (Benefits)	Negative Codes (Challenges)
Perceived Benefits	1. Improving grammar and sentence accuracy 2. Expanding vocabulary use 3. Supporting idea generation and brainstorming 4. Helping organize and structure writing 5. Providing quick and practical feedback 6. Easy and user-friendly to use 7. Accessible for different users 8. Saving time in writing tasks 9. Supporting various writing tasks 10. Encouraging continued use in the future	(None in this category)
Perceived Challenges / Limitations	(See negative codes)	1. Difficulty understanding or applying suggestions 2. Over-reliance on AI assistance 3. Limitation in creativity development 4. Insufficient or non-interactive explanations 5. Incorrect or irrelevant content generated 6. Misunderstanding or misuse of suggestions

Grammar and Vocabulary Support

The most frequently reported benefit was ChatGPT's assistance in improving grammatical accuracy and vocabulary enrichment. Participants consistently used ChatGPT to identify sentence-level errors and refine word choices. Student 1 stated that ChatGPT helps check grammatical and structural errors in academic writing, while Student 10 reported that it increases understanding of unfamiliar English words. Student 2 described how ChatGPT helped improve sentence structure and expand vocabulary. These accounts align with Kasim and Khalid (2023), who found that AI-assisted tools can measurably enhance grammatical precision and lexical diversity in EFL writing. The grammar support function is also consistent with the quantitative finding that X2 (grammar and vocabulary correction) received the highest mean score (3.20) among all PU items.

Idea Generation and Brainstorming

ChatGPT played a significant role in supporting students during the pre-writing stage, particularly when they experienced difficulty initiating writing. Student 3 noted that ChatGPT provides initial ideas when unsure how

to begin, and Student 8 used it to brainstorm and create drafts. Student 10 explained that having clear ideas from ChatGPT makes the writing process easier. This scaffolding function is consistent with Zhai's (2022) finding that AI writing tools can reduce writing anxiety by providing a cognitive starting point. However, the data also raise a pedagogical concern: if idea generation is consistently outsourced to ChatGPT, students may develop less practice in generating and defending their own arguments, potentially limiting deeper intellectual engagement.

Writing Organization

Several participants reported using ChatGPT to structure their compositions. Student 2 typically requested an outline from ChatGPT and then developed it independently. Student 7 used it to organize ideas into coherent paragraphs, and Student 9 followed essay structures suggested by the tool. These organizational benefits align with Mishra and Koehler's (2006) argument that technology can accommodate diverse learning needs by supporting structural planning. The key pedagogical distinction here is whether students use suggested

outlines as cognitive scaffolds — temporary supports that help them develop their own structural awareness — or as fixed templates reproduced without rhetorical understanding. Teacher guidance is therefore critical in helping students leverage structural support without bypassing learning.

Quick Feedback and Accessibility

The immediacy of ChatGPT's feedback was frequently highlighted. Student 6 described the tool as very easy and fast, while Student 10 appreciated receiving answers immediately after typing a question. This real-time feedback function reduces the waiting time inherent in traditional teacher feedback cycles and provides students with immediate assistance during independent writing sessions. Hwang et al. (2023) identify immediate AI feedback as a key factor in reducing learning anxiety and sustaining writing momentum. Students also widely perceived ChatGPT as accessible for diverse users. Student 1 observed that it lacks complicated features, making it usable by a wide range of learners. However, Student 10 added that effective use requires understanding how to evaluate the generated responses,

indicating that accessibility in the technical sense does not remove the need for critical judgment.

Efficiency and Versatility

Students reported that ChatGPT helped them complete writing tasks more efficiently and flexibly. Student 5 described it as efficient, and Student 2 noted using it almost daily for essays and assignments. Student 4 used it every day for writing practice, and Student 10 employed it for paragraphs, translation, and grammar checking. This versatility across writing task types explains the consistently high behavioral intention scores observed in the quantitative data. Nevertheless, efficiency must be interpreted with caution: completing tasks quickly is only educationally valuable if the process also builds transferable competence. When efficiency becomes the primary motivation, students risk using ChatGPT as a shortcut rather than as a learning scaffold.

2.3. Challenges in Using ChatGPT for Writing (RQ3)

Difficulty Understanding Complex Responses

The most frequently reported challenge was difficulty comprehending ChatGPT's outputs,

particularly when responses were lengthy, used complex terminology, or were not contextually aligned with students' needs. Student 4 found it difficult when responses contained advanced vocabulary, and Student 10 noted having to re-read long answers multiple times. Student 8 described some responses as too complicated to follow directly. This comprehension gap is significant because it reveals that the pedagogical value of AI feedback is mediated by the learner's language proficiency. A technically accurate response may be pedagogically ineffective if the student cannot understand or apply it. This supports Liu and Xu's (2023) observation that AI-generated feedback may lack the context-specific insight necessary for learners at varying proficiency levels.

Over-Reliance on AI Assistance

A significant concern emerging from the data was students' tendency toward excessive dependence on ChatGPT. Student 4 explicitly acknowledged sometimes becoming too dependent on the tool, and Student 8 admitted relying on it too much at times. Student 2 noted that frequent ChatGPT use can make one lazy to think, while Student 10 warned

that overuse leads to dependency and reduces the effort to think independently. These accounts are consistent with Bennett et al. (2008), who caution that over-reliance on technology may undermine independent learning capacities and critical engagement. In writing instruction, where independent idea formation is a core learning objective, the risk of dependency is particularly acute. Several students also admitted directly using ChatGPT-generated responses when they judged the output sufficient, reducing the critical re-processing that deepens learning.

Creativity and Independent Thinking

Closely related to over-reliance, several students raised concerns about reduced creativity. Student 3 warned that ChatGPT can reduce creativity if misused, and Student 4 noted it can make one less motivated to think critically. Student 7 mentioned that it can reduce personal effort in thinking, while Student 9 observed that overuse reduces creativity. These findings suggest that when ChatGPT is used as a cognitive substitute rather than a cognitive scaffold, students exercise their own idea formation less frequently. Dörnyei (2005)

emphasizes that sustained academic motivation depends on learners' sense of agency and authorship in their work. When ChatGPT consistently generates ideas, outlines, and corrections, students may experience a gradual erosion of writing self-efficacy and creative ownership, which could counteract the motivational benefits observed in the quantitative findings.

Inaccurate or Insufficient Outputs

Students also reported that ChatGPT's responses were sometimes general, insufficient, or factually inaccurate. Student 3 noted that results are not always relevant to the task, and Student 2 found that answers can be too general. Multiple students independently verified ChatGPT's outputs using Google, textbooks, or other references — a positive sign of emerging critical literacy, but also an indicator that ChatGPT alone is insufficient as a sole writing support resource. These findings support Liu and Xu's (2023) broader argument that AI feedback may lack the contextual specificity required for academic writing tasks, and highlight the continued necessity of teacher guidance and cross-referencing with reliable sources.

Misuse of Language Suggestions

The data also reveal instances where students misapplied ChatGPT's language suggestions. Student 2 recalled using the wrong tense from a ChatGPT suggestion, Student 3 misunderstood a suggested word's meaning, and Student 4 used a word in an inappropriate context. Student 7 misunderstood a structural suggestion, and Student 10 reported that a sentence taken from ChatGPT was contextually unsuitable. These incidents are pedagogically significant because they demonstrate that the problem is not solely the quality of AI output, but also the learner's capacity to evaluate and contextualize that output. Effective use of ChatGPT therefore requires a level of metalinguistic awareness and language proficiency that goes beyond passive reception. Students who lack these competencies may inadvertently incorporate errors into their writing, reinforcing rather than correcting linguistic difficulties.

Discussion

The findings of this study show that EFL undergraduate students generally have a positive perception of ChatGPT as a tool for writing development. This can be seen from

the questionnaire results, which show high agreement across the main indicators, and from the interview data, where students described ChatGPT as practical, helpful, and useful for academic writing. This positive perception is consistent with Dörnyei (2005), who explains that favorable perceptions toward learning resources can support motivation and academic achievement. It also aligns with Davis (1989), whose Technology Acceptance Model states that perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use shape technology acceptance. In this study, students not only felt satisfied with ChatGPT, but also showed willingness to continue using it, although they still evaluated its output critically and did not see it as a full replacement for their own writing effort.

The findings also indicate that students perceive ChatGPT as useful for idea generation, grammar correction, vocabulary improvement, and overall writing quality. Both the questionnaire and interviews show that ChatGPT helps students brainstorm ideas, make outlines, and refine language accuracy. This supports previous studies by Liu and Xu (2023), Zhai (2022), and Kasim

and Khalid (2023), which found that AI tools can improve writing through feedback and revision support. However, the data also suggest that ChatGPT is most effective when students actively evaluate and adapt its suggestions rather than depend on them completely. In other words, ChatGPT can improve productivity and writing performance, but it does not automatically build independent idea generation or deeper understanding.

In terms of perceived ease of use, most students reported that ChatGPT is simple, fast, and accessible whenever needed. This reduces the technical barrier that often limits digital learning tools. The interview data also showed that although ChatGPT is user friendly, effective use still depends on students' ability to make clear prompts and apply digital literacy skills. This is in line with Bandura's (1986) concept of self efficacy, because confident learners are more likely to use technology as support rather than rely on it excessively. The findings also show that students felt more confident and less anxious when writing because ChatGPT helped them with grammar and sentence structure,

which supports Hwang et al. (2023) and Dörnyei (2005).

Another important finding is students' strong intention to continue using ChatGPT. This suggests that they see it as a valuable and sustainable writing aid. Interview data show that some students use it regularly, while others only use it when needed, which reflects the flexible role of technology in learner centered writing practices as noted by Warschauer and Healey (1998). At the same time, continued use should be interpreted as acceptance, not proof of learning effectiveness, because too much dependence on AI may reduce independent writing practice.

The interviews further show that students mainly use ChatGPT to improve grammar, sentence construction, and writing clarity. This suggests that ChatGPT functions more as a revision partner than a final authority. It helps learners notice and correct errors, but deeper language development still depends on how well students understand the corrections and reflect on them. Vocabulary development is another benefit. Students said that ChatGPT helps them learn new words and choose more appropriate expressions, which

is important because vocabulary limitation often makes it difficult for EFL learners to express ideas clearly. This agrees with earlier studies that found AI can expand lexical choices and support paraphrasing. However, the interviews also suggest that vocabulary gains are not always permanent, because some students use new words only to make the draft sound better, not necessarily because they have fully mastered them.

The data also show that ChatGPT helps students in the early stage of writing, especially when they have difficulty starting. Many participants used it to generate ideas, which suggests that ChatGPT reduces writer's block and lowers the burden of beginning a text. This matches the literature on technology as a scaffold in the writing process. However, it also raises a concern, because if idea generation is always outsourced to ChatGPT, students may lose practice in forming their own arguments. Therefore, its value depends on whether students use it as a trigger for thinking or as a substitute for thinking. In addition, students reported using ChatGPT to organize ideas and create outlines, which means it supports both content development and logical

structure. Even so, strong dependence on suggested outlines may reduce rhetorical awareness, so teacher guidance remains necessary.

Another strength found in this study is the immediate feedback provided by ChatGPT. Students appreciated the speed and convenience of receiving responses during the writing process, which makes the learning experience more efficient. At the same time, quick feedback is useful only when students are able to judge whether the response is relevant and accurate. If the answer is vague or incomplete, the benefit becomes limited. Efficiency was also mentioned frequently, since students felt that ChatGPT helped them finish tasks faster and with less effort. Yet this efficiency is double edged, because it can encourage shortcuts if students prioritize convenience over learning. The tool is also used for many writing tasks, such as essays, assignments, reports, and general practice, which explains why students continue to rely on it. Still, broad use also increases the risk of habitual dependence.

Despite these advantages, the findings reveal several challenges. One major challenge is that some

students struggle to understand or apply ChatGPT's explanations, especially when the responses are too long, too complex, or difficult to interpret. This shows that a technically correct answer may still be ineffective if the learner cannot understand it. This concern supports Liu and Xu's (2023) observation that AI feedback may lack context specific insight. Another issue is overreliance. Several students admitted that they depend too much on ChatGPT, and this can reduce active thinking. In line with Bennett et al. (2008), such overreliance may weaken independent learning and critical thinking. The findings also suggest that excessive use may limit creativity and independent idea generation, because students may rely on external suggestions instead of developing their own thoughts.

The study also found that ChatGPT sometimes gives inaccurate, irrelevant, or overly general responses. Because of this, students often check information again using Google, books, or other sources. This shows that AI output cannot be accepted uncritically and must be verified. It also suggests that students are beginning to practice

source comparison, which is positive for critical literacy. However, some students still misunderstand or misuse ChatGPT's suggestions, especially in grammar, vocabulary, and context. This means that the effectiveness of ChatGPT does not depend only on the quality of the tool, but also on the learner's ability to interpret it properly. For this reason, ChatGPT should be viewed as a supportive tool rather than a replacement for teacher explanation.

D. CONCLUSION

This study investigated EFL undergraduate students' perceptions of using ChatGPT as a learning tool for writing development, drawing on quantitative questionnaire data from 100 participants and qualitative interview data from 10 respondents. Guided by the Technology Acceptance Model, the findings consistently reveal strong positive perceptions across all four TAM constructs — perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, attitude toward use, and behavioral intention — indicating broad acceptance of and satisfaction with ChatGPT as a writing support tool.

The qualitative findings confirm and enrich the quantitative picture.

Students benefit from ChatGPT in grammar correction, vocabulary enrichment, idea generation, writing organization, and quick feedback. The tool also contributes positively to motivation and writing confidence, consistent with the attitudinal findings. However, the study also surfaces meaningful challenges: students struggle with complex or lengthy responses, show tendencies toward over-reliance that may diminish independent thinking, express concerns about reduced creativity, and report instances of misapplying AI-generated suggestions due to limited linguistic proficiency or contextual awareness. Additionally, the occasional inaccuracy of ChatGPT' outputs underscores the necessity of critical verification.

These findings lead to the conclusion that ChatGPT is most educationally valuable when used as a supplementary writing aid — a scaffold that supports the writing process without replacing independent learning, critical thinking, or teacher guidance. For this potential to be realized effectively, students need to develop prompt literacy, critical evaluation skills, and the habit of verifying AI-generated content

against reliable sources. Educators should incorporate explicit instruction on responsible and reflective AI use within writing pedagogy, guiding students to engage critically rather than passively with ChatGPT's outputs.

Future research should examine the long-term impact of ChatGPT on writing development across different proficiency levels and educational contexts, including comparisons between AI-assisted and non-AI-assisted writing instruction. Longitudinal studies would be particularly valuable for determining whether the benefits observed in this study are sustained over time and whether over-reliance risks are mitigated through structured pedagogical intervention.

Acknowledgments: The author expresses sincere gratitude to Prof. Dr. Alfian, S.Pd., M.Ed., Ed.D. and Dr. Wahyuni Fitria, M.Pd. for their guidance and supervision throughout the research process, and to all participants who generously contributed their time and perspectives to this study.

REFERENCES

- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice Hall.
- Bennett, S., Maton, K., & Kervin, L. (2008). The 'digital natives' debate: A critical review of the evidence. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 39(5), 775–786.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8535.2007.00793.x>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
<https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Brown, T., Mann, S., & Thomas, J. (2020). The role of AI in education: Emerging trends and challenges. *AI and Education Journal*, 12(3), 45–56.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly*, 13(3), 319–340.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/249008>
- Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Fitria, W., Faizah, N., & Saijun. (2024). Reflections on practicum teaching: Insights from pre-service English teachers. *Journal of English Education*, 4(4), 798–815.
- Hwang, W. Y., Chen, N. S., & Hong, J. C. (2023). AI-assisted language learning: Student perceptions and cognitive engagement.

- Computers & Education, 187, 104583.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2022.104583>
- Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kasim, U., & Khalid, R. (2023). Artificial intelligence and writing fluency: The impact of ChatGPT on EFL students' writing skills. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 19(2), 122–138.
- Kasneci, E., Sessler, K., Betsch, T., et al. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 103, 102274.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274>
- Liu, Q., & Xu, Q. (2023). AI-assisted writing and its impact on critical thinking in EFL students. *Asian Journal of Education and e-Learning*, 11(4), 67–82.
- Liu, X., & Xu, J. (2023). ChatGPT as a writing assistant: Chinese university students' perceptions and challenges. *Computer-Assisted Language Learning*, 36(5), 899–920.
- Mishra, P., & Koehler, M. J. (2006). Technological pedagogical content knowledge: A framework for teacher knowledge. *Teachers College Record*, 108(6), 1017–1054.
- Zhai, C. (2022). AI-assisted writing and learner autonomy: A case study of ChatGPT in academic writing. *Computer-Assisted Language Learning*, 35(6), 1012–1030.