



Students' Perceptions of ChatGPT Use in Essay Writing at the English Education Department of UIN STS Jambi

*Rahmadani Putri¹, Ilham Al Khoiri²

^{1,2}Universitas Islam Negeri Sulthan Thaha Saifuddin Jambi

E-Mail: rahmadaniputri@uinjambi.ac.id¹, ilhamalkhoiri@gmail.com²

Abstrak

Pemanfaatan kecerdasan buatan generatif, khususnya ChatGPT, semakin meluas dalam penulisan akademik sehingga persepsi mahasiswa terhadap manfaat dan keterbatasannya penting dikaji secara kontekstual. Penelitian ini bertujuan mendeskripsikan persepsi mahasiswa semester empat Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris UIN Sulthan Thaha Saifuddin Jambi terhadap penggunaan ChatGPT pada mata kuliah Essay Writing, mencakup bentuk penggunaan, manfaat, hambatan, dan kekhawatiran akademik. Penelitian menerapkan pendekatan kuantitatif deskriptif melalui survei terhadap 50 dari 61 mahasiswa yang telah menggunakan ChatGPT dalam aktivitas penulisan. Data dikumpulkan menggunakan kuesioner 21 pernyataan berskala Likert lima tingkat dan dianalisis dengan statistik deskriptif. Hasil menunjukkan persepsi mahasiswa berada pada kategori positif dengan rata-rata 3,78. ChatGPT dinilai membantu menghemat waktu, mengembangkan ide, memperbaiki bahasa, menerjemahkan, mencari informasi, dan memperoleh umpan balik. Namun, mahasiswa menyadari risiko informasi dan sitasi yang tidak akurat, kesalahan logis, penurunan kualitas respons, serta berkurangnya motivasi berpikir kritis. ChatGPT dipandang sebagai alat pendukung, bukan pengganti penulisan mandiri.

Kata-kata Kunci: ChatGPT; Persepsi; Esai; Mahasiswa.

Abstract

The use of generative artificial intelligence, particularly ChatGPT, has increasingly expanded in academic writing, making it important to examine students' perceptions of its benefits and limitations within specific contexts. This study aims to describe the perceptions of fourth-semester students in the English Education Study Program at UIN Sulthan Thaha Saifuddin Jambi regarding the use of ChatGPT in the Essay Writing course, including its forms of use, benefits, challenges, and academic concerns. The study employed a descriptive quantitative approach through a survey of 50 out of 61 students who had used ChatGPT in writing activities. Data were collected using a questionnaire consisting of 21 statements measured on a five-point Likert scale and analyzed using descriptive statistics. The findings indicate that students' overall perception was positive, with a mean score of 3.78. ChatGPT was perceived as helpful for saving time, developing ideas, improving language, translating, searching for information, and obtaining feedback. However, students also recognized risks related to inaccurate information and citations, logical errors, declining response quality, and reduced motivation for critical thinking. ChatGPT is therefore perceived as a supportive writing tool rather than a substitute for independent writing.

Keywords: ChatGPT; Perception; Essay; Students.

INTRODUCTION

Writing is a fundamental skill in English learning because students must communicate ideas clearly, accurately, and coherently through written texts. Essay writing requires students to develop relevant content, organize arguments, choose appropriate vocabulary, apply grammatical rules, maintain coherence, and follow academic conventions. According to Silalahi, Indonesian university students generally perceived ChatGPT as easy to use and beneficial for generating ideas, locating resources, and addressing language difficulties in English essay writing, although concerns regarding inaccurate responses, originality, and excessive dependence remained significant.¹ These demands make essay writing challenging, particularly for English Education students who are expected to develop academic competence and produce professional educational texts. Therefore, understanding students' perceptions of technological assistance is essential for designing writing instruction that supports learning while preserving independent writing development.

The emergence of generative artificial intelligence has created new opportunities for students seeking support in academic writing. ChatGPT can respond to prompts, generate ideas, explain linguistic difficulties, recommend revisions, and create draft texts, making it increasingly present in writing activities. According to Cahyani et al. and Teng, EFL learners perceived ChatGPT as a useful writing companion that could enhance feedback, motivation, self-efficacy, engagement, and collaborative writing, although concerns regarding its use were also reported.^{2,3} These functions can assist students when they encounter difficulties in developing ideas, organizing content, or improving linguistic accuracy during writing. Nevertheless, effective use requires students to evaluate generated information carefully, critically revise suggested content, and maintain responsibility for the final text rather than allowing artificial intelligence to replace their independent writing process.

Previous studies show that students utilize ChatGPT for various purposes throughout different stages of the writing process rather than relying on it for a single function. The tool can support brainstorming, idea organization, concept clarification, vocabulary development, grammar checking, sentence revision, and draft evaluation. According to Meniado et al., EFL learners in Thailand and Vietnam generally viewed ChatGPT positively

¹ Rentauli Silalahi, "Chatgpt as a Tool For English Essay Writing: Perceptions of Indonesian EFL Students," *English Language, Linguistics, and Culture International Journal* 5, no. 1 (2025): 17–37, <https://journal.uin-alauddin.ac.id/index.php/elstic/article/view/49949>.

² Gita Dwi Cahyani et al., "Students' Perception of ChatGPT as A Media for Learning Writing," *ETLiJ: English Teaching and Linguistics Journal* 7, no. 2 (2026): 198–209, <https://jurnal.umsu.ac.id/index.php/ETLiJ/article/view/30890>.

³ Mark Feng Teng, "'ChatGPT Is the Companion, Not Enemies': EFL Learners' Perceptions and Experiences in Using ChatGPT for Feedback in Writing," *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence* 7, no. 100270 (2024): 1–10, <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2666920X24000730>.

for second-language writing and frequently used it to generate ideas, structure outlines, clarify concepts, and edit drafts for accuracy and appropriateness.⁴ These findings indicate that students' perceptions are closely associated with the specific functions and benefits they attribute to ChatGPT during writing activities. Investigating these perceptions can therefore clarify how learners understand the usefulness of ChatGPT and integrate it into essay-writing practices, providing relevant insights for effective writing instruction and classroom planning.

Research further indicates that ChatGPT can shape students' writing experiences by offering rapid, accessible, and interactive support throughout the writing process. Its immediate explanations and recommendations allow students to explore ideas, identify problems, and revise their texts without depending entirely on delayed lecturer feedback. According to Mahapatra, the use of ChatGPT as a formative feedback instrument was associated with improved academic writing among undergraduate ESL students, suggesting its potential to support writing development when implemented through appropriate pedagogical strategies.⁵ However, technological assistance alone cannot guarantee meaningful learning, since students must critically evaluate the accuracy, relevance, originality, and suitability of generated content. Therefore, students' perceptions of ChatGPT's usefulness should be considered together with their awareness of its limitations to promote responsible, critical, and academically appropriate use of artificial intelligence in contemporary writing classrooms.

Responsible use has become an important concern in discussions about ChatGPT for academic writing, particularly because fluent AI-generated responses may contain inaccurate information, weak arguments, or fabricated references that require careful verification. According to Pasaribu et al., EFL students recognize several ethical challenges associated with ChatGPT in writing, including plagiarism, academic integrity, excessive dependence, biased information, and insufficient institutional guidance.⁶ These issues are especially significant in essay writing, where students are expected to demonstrate independent reasoning, develop language proficiency, and construct coherent arguments.

⁴ Joel C. Meniado et al., "Using ChatGPT for Second Language Writing: Experiences and Perceptions of EFL Learners in Thailand and Vietnam," *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence* 7, no. 100313 (2024): 1–9, <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2666920X24001164>.

⁵ Santosh Mahapatra, "Impact of ChatGPT on ESL Students' Academic Writing Skills: A Mixed Methods Intervention Study," *Smart Learning Environments* 11, no. 9 (2024): 1–18, <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s40561-024-00295-9>.

⁶ Arsen Nahum Pasaribu et al., "Efl Students' Perception of Ethical Concerns on Using Chatgpt in Academic Writing," *Journal of English Education* 13, no. 1 (2025): 39–46, <https://journal.uniku.ac.id/index.php/ERJEE/article/view/11322>.

Examining students' perceptions can reveal whether they view ChatGPT as a controlled learning resource or as a substitute for independent writing and intellectual effort. Clear academic guidance is therefore necessary to encourage responsible AI use while preserving students' authorship, critical judgment, learning autonomy, and responsibility for the written work.

Research on Indonesian English Education students indicates that perceptions of ChatGPT tend to be positive, although students do not share identical views about its use. Students value its support for grammar, sentence formation, vocabulary development, idea generation, organization, and revision, while concerns about dependence and originality remain evident. According to Hidayat and Sujarwati, English Education students perceived ChatGPT positively for improving grammar, sentence structure, paraphrasing, and expanding ideas, yet they also identified risks involving plagiarism, reduced creativity, and excessive reliance on artificial intelligence.⁷ Related findings suggest that acceptance is influenced by perceived usefulness and ease of use, alongside concerns about academic writing practices. These patterns emphasize the importance of examining perceptions within learning contexts rather than generalizing findings across institutions, courses, groups, and writing activities.

Research on Indonesian English Education students indicates that perceptions of ChatGPT tend to be positive, although students do not share identical views about its use. Students value its support for grammar, sentence formation, vocabulary development, idea generation, organization, and revision, while concerns about dependence and originality remain evident. According to Hidayat and Sujarwati, English Education students perceived ChatGPT positively for improving grammar, sentence structure, paraphrasing, and expanding ideas, yet they also identified risks involving plagiarism, reduced creativity, and excessive reliance on artificial intelligence. Related findings suggest that acceptance is influenced by perceived usefulness and ease of use, alongside concerns about academic writing practices. These patterns emphasize the importance of examining perceptions within learning contexts rather than generalizing findings across institutions, courses, groups, and writing activities.

A specific institutional context is essential because students' experiences with ChatGPT may vary according to course demands, academic culture, lecturer support, writing

⁷ Agus Hidayat and Iis Sujarwati, "Students' Attitude Toward Open AI ChatGPT in Writing Academic Articles," *English Education: English Journal for Teaching and Learning* 12, no. 1 (2024): 1–11, <https://jurnal.uinsyahada.ac.id/index.php/EEJ/article/view/10852>.

ability, and prior exposure to artificial intelligence. Although previous research has investigated Indonesian university students, English majors, EFL learners, and academic writing classes, limited evidence specifically addresses fourth-semester English Education students at UIN STS Jambi who employ ChatGPT for essay writing. According to Fatimah, Suryani, and Ugahara, these students identified both benefits and drawbacks of ChatGPT use in academic writing, including perceived improvements in writing and the continuing importance of feedback from peers and lecturers.⁸ Such findings indicate the need to investigate students' use, perceived benefits, and experienced barriers simultaneously within a specific educational environment. Therefore, this study focuses on fourth-semester English Education students at UIN STS Jambi to examine their perceptions of ChatGPT-assisted essay writing.

Building on the preceding discussion, this study examines students' perceptions of ChatGPT use in essay writing within the English Education Department at UIN STS Jambi. It explores students' experiences, perceived benefits, and barriers or concerns arising from their use of this technology when completing academic essays. The study focuses on fourth-semester students enrolled in an Essay Writing course, where learners regularly develop, organize, revise, and communicate ideas through written English. This course offers a relevant context for investigating technology-assisted writing practices and students' responses to AI-supported learning activities. Accordingly, the study addresses the following question: How do fourth-semester students in the English Education Department at UIN STS Jambi perceive ChatGPT for essay writing, particularly in terms of their usage patterns, perceived benefits, barriers, and concerns?

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study adopted a descriptive quantitative design and survey method to investigate students' perceptions of ChatGPT as a tool supporting academic writing activities. According to Waruwu et al., quantitative research relies on measurable data, systematic procedures, and statistical analysis to generate objective and empirically grounded findings.⁹ The research was conducted in June 2025 at the English Education Study Program, State Islamic University of Sulthan Thaha Saifuddin Jambi, involving 61 fourth-semester students

⁸ Siti Fatimah, Suryani, and Ugahara, "Students' Perceptions of Using ChatGPT in Completing Academic Writing Tasks," *PPSDP International Journal of Education* 4, no. 2 (2025): 1630–1641, <https://www.ejournal.ppsdp.org/index.php/pijed/article/view/660>.

⁹ Marinu Waruwu et al., "Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif: Konsep, Jenis, Tahapan Dan Kelebihan," *Jurnal Ilmiah Profesi Pendidikan* 10, no. 1 (2025): 917–932, <https://jipp.unram.ac.id/index.php/jipp/article/view/3057>.

enrolled in the Essay Writing course. These students were distributed across three classes, namely Class A with 22 students, Class B with 17 students, and Class C with 22 students, while screening through Google Forms identified students who had meaningfully used ChatGPT for generating ideas, editing, and improving academic writing. Based on these criteria, 50 eligible students participated in the main questionnaire.

Data were gathered through a structured questionnaire adapted from Ngo (2023), which investigated university students' perceptions of ChatGPT as an educational tool. According to Djollong, quantitative research involves systematic procedures for obtaining numerical data and examining measurable information to answer research questions objectively.¹⁰ The adapted questionnaire contained 21 statements covering three indicators, namely ChatGPT use (items 1–4), perceived benefits (items 5–13), and perceived barriers (items 14–21), with responses recorded on a five-point Likert scale ranging from Strongly Agree (5) to Strongly Disagree (1). According to Goenawan et al., the Likert scale provides a systematic approach for measuring respondents' perceptions through quantitative survey questionnaires.¹¹ Therefore, the adapted questionnaire served as the principal research instrument, while its validity and reliability were supported by its previous application and adaptation in studies addressing related educational contexts.

Data analysis utilized descriptive statistical techniques to summarize respondents' perceptions across the three questionnaire indicators. According to Sofya et al., survey research requires systematic data collection through standardized procedures to obtain information that corresponds with research objectives.¹² The analysis calculated frequencies, total scores, means, medians, modes, and standard deviations for each indicator and the questionnaire as a whole. Mean scores were classified into five categories: 4.21–5.00 = Very Positive, 3.41–4.20 = Positive, 2.81–3.40 = Neutral, 1.81–2.80 = Negative, and 1.00–1.80 = Very Negative. According to Sugiyono, quantitative data gathered through structured instruments must be systematically organized and analyzed to facilitate objective interpretation, while descriptive analysis was selected because the study focused on

¹⁰ Andi Fitriani Djollong, "Tehnik Pelaksanaan Penelitian Kuantitatif," *Istigra'* 2, no. 1 (2014): 86–100, <https://jurnal.umpar.ac.id/istigra/article/view/224>.

¹¹ Stephanus Ivan Goenawan et al., "Sosialisasi Pemanfaatan Aplikasi Kuesioner ATD Dan Likert Untuk Penelitian Survei Kuantitatif," *Jurnal Pengabdian Masyarakat Charitas* 4, no. 2 (2024): 89–94, <https://ejournal.atmajaya.ac.id/index.php/charitas/article/view/6014>.

¹² Ayu Sofya et al., "Metode Survey: Explanatory Survey Dan Cross Sectional Dalam Penelitian Kuantitatif," *Edu Society: Jurnal Pendidikan, Ilmu Sosial dan Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat* 4, no. 3 (2024): 1695–1708, <https://jurnal.permapendis-sumut.org/index.php/edusociety/article/view/556>.

describing students' perceptions rather than examining causal relationships among variables.¹³

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Result

The analysis examined responses from 50 fourth-semester students who completed 21 questionnaire items addressing the use of ChatGPT in essay writing. The overall mean score reached 3.78, indicating that students' perceptions fell within the Positive category according to the established interpretation criteria. Item 7 obtained the highest mean of 4.10, suggesting that students agreed ChatGPT helps reduce the time required for essay writing, whereas item 14 recorded the lowest mean of 3.24 regarding the reliability of information provided. Most questionnaire items showed a median of 4.00 and a mode of 4, demonstrating that Agree was the predominant response among participants. Across the three indicators, perceptions remained generally positive, although barriers generated more varied and cautious responses, suggesting that students considered ChatGPT useful for writing while recognizing the need to critically evaluate generated information and language.

Table 1. Summary of the reported questionnaire results

Indicator	Items	Reported Mean Pattern	Interpretation
Use of ChatGPT	1–4	3.72–3.98	Generally Positive
Benefits of ChatGPT	5–13	3.78–4.10	Generally Positive
Barriers of ChatGPT	14–21	3.24–3.78	Mixed/Critical Awareness
Overall	1–21	3.78	Positive

The first indicator examined students' perceptions of ChatGPT use during essay writing through four questionnaire statements. Item 1, focusing on ease of use, recorded 82% agreement when Agree and Strongly Agree responses were combined, while Item 2, concerning response speed, reached 84% agreement. Item 3 indicated that 68% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that ChatGPT might reduce their motivation to think critically, whereas Item 4 showed 76% agreement regarding its use for finding essay-related information. Mean scores for this indicator ranged from 3.72 to 3.98, demonstrating a positive perception among students. Overall, the findings suggest that students valued ChatGPT for accessibility, rapid responses, information retrieval, and writing support, while recognizing that its convenience may potentially reduce independent cognitive effort during essay development and revision.

¹³ Sugiyono, *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif Dan R & D* (Bandung: Alfabeta, 2022).

The first indicator examined students' perceptions of ChatGPT use during essay writing through four questionnaire statements. Item 1, focusing on ease of use, recorded 82% agreement when Agree and Strongly Agree responses were combined, while Item 2, concerning response speed, reached 84% agreement. Item 3 indicated that 68% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that ChatGPT might reduce their motivation to think critically, whereas Item 4 showed 76% agreement regarding its use for finding essay-related information. Mean scores for this indicator ranged from 3.72 to 3.98, demonstrating a positive perception among students. Overall, the findings suggest that students valued ChatGPT for accessibility, rapid responses, information retrieval, and writing support, while recognizing that its convenience may potentially reduce independent cognitive effort during essay development and revision.

The third indicator comprised eight statements examining students' perceived barriers and limitations when using ChatGPT for academic writing. Item 14, which focused on unreliable information, obtained the lowest mean score of 3.24, with 46% of respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing that reliability issues may arise. Item 15 addressed inaccurate or fabricated references, while Item 16 revealed similar concerns regarding incorrect citations generated by ChatGPT. Item 17 examined inappropriate synonyms and idiomatic expressions, producing varied responses, as 40% agreed whereas 28% remained neutral about this limitation. Item 18 further indicated that 54% of students agreed or strongly agreed that ChatGPT's response quality could decline when processing longer essay paragraphs, suggesting concerns about factual accuracy, references, language appropriateness, and sustained discourse.

The remaining barrier items further demonstrated students' critical awareness of the limitations associated with ChatGPT in academic writing. Item 19 examined concerns about source credibility, whereas Item 20 focused on logical errors and contradictions that may appear in generated responses, with 66% of respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing that such problems could occur. Item 21 assessed ChatGPT's effectiveness in explaining complex formulas required for certain essay topics, and 56% of students agreed or strongly agreed that the tool was ineffective for this purpose. Overall, the barrier responses ranged from a relatively moderate concern about information reliability, reflected by a mean of 3.24, to stronger concerns involving lengthy passages, logical consistency, source credibility, and specialized explanations. These findings suggest that students recognized a clear distinction between ChatGPT's usefulness for convenient language support and its limitations in tasks

requiring factual accuracy, sustained reasoning, technical precision, and reliable academic evidence.

Across the 21 questionnaire statements, the findings reveal a balanced pattern of perceived usefulness and critical awareness of ChatGPT's limitations. The mean score of 3.78 reflects a positive perception, particularly regarding time efficiency, accessibility, information assistance, translation, idea development, feedback, and personalized support. Nevertheless, 68% of students perceived a decline in critical motivation, while 46% noted unreliable information, 54% reported reduced effectiveness with longer paragraphs, 66% identified logical errors, and 56% questioned its ability to explain complex formulas. These descriptive results indicate that students regarded ChatGPT as a useful writing-support tool while recognizing conditions that may reduce confidence in its outputs. The findings do not demonstrate improved writing performance because the study measured perceptions rather than changes in essay quality or independent writing proficiency.

Discussion

The positive perception indicates that students consider ChatGPT a practical resource for supporting English essay writing. This perception may arise because students can quickly access assistance with ideas, vocabulary, organization, revision, and language clarification without depending entirely on immediate lecturer feedback. According to Al-Akbar, EFL undergraduate students generally perceived ChatGPT positively as a supplementary academic writing tool, although they also identified several challenges related to its use.¹⁴ The present findings extend this perspective to fourth-semester English Education students at UIN STS Jambi, suggesting that perceived usefulness is closely connected with efficiency, accessibility, and practical writing support. However, the positive category reflects students' perceptions rather than confirmed improvement in independent writing competence, as favorable acceptance remains dependent on accuracy, relevance, and responsible academic judgment.

Students' strong agreement about ChatGPT's ease of use and rapid responses suggests that accessibility contributes substantially to its appeal in essay writing. Instant interaction can minimize students' uncertainty when they struggle to initiate a topic, formulate arguments, or select appropriate expressions. According to Taufikin, Judijanto, and Nurhayati, a mixed-methods intervention involving undergraduate ESL students

¹⁴ Krisna Mukti Al-Akbar, "EFL Undergraduate Students'™ Perceptions of Using ChatGPT as a Supplementary Tool to Develop Academic Writing Skills," *JEFLE: Journal of English as a Foreign Language Education* 6, no. 1 (2025): 24–35, <https://jurnal.untan.ac.id/index.php/JEFLE/article/view/93396>.

demonstrated significant improvement in academic writing when ChatGPT functioned as a formative feedback tool, accompanied by highly positive perceptions of its usefulness.¹⁵ The present findings align with this possibility, although they cannot confirm actual writing performance improvements because the study adopted a descriptive design. Therefore, writing instruction should retain activities that require students to independently generate, compare, justify, and revise ideas before using AI tools as supplementary support during classroom writing activities.

The high benefit scores indicate that students view ChatGPT as useful for more than generating text, especially for saving time, understanding topics, developing ideas, translating information, and obtaining feedback. These perceptions portray ChatGPT as a flexible conversational resource that can support multiple stages of writing, including planning, drafting, and revision, rather than merely producing final sentences. According to Nugroho et al., EFL students reported benefits from ChatGPT in translation, writing accuracy, efficiency, idea generation, and practical assistance, while also identifying concerns about inaccurate information and academic dishonesty.¹⁶ The present findings are consistent with these observations, although they do not demonstrate actual performance gains because the study used a descriptive design. Therefore, perceived usefulness should not be interpreted as direct evidence of improved independent writing proficiency among participating students overall.

Students' awareness of inaccurate information, fabricated references, and erroneous citations demonstrates an important level of critical awareness when using ChatGPT for academic writing. Because essay writing requires verifiable evidence, fluent and well-structured responses should not automatically be regarded as reliable sources of information. According to Untari and Trisanti, EFL university students considered ChatGPT helpful for generating ideas, improving grammatical accuracy, organizing writing, and increasing efficiency, while also recognizing concerns related to accuracy, reliability, and ethical use.¹⁷ The present findings support these concerns, as respondents identified information reliability and citation errors as significant limitations. Consequently, AI literacy should emphasize

¹⁵ Taufikin, Loso Judijanto, and Sri Nurhayati, "Enhancing Undergraduate Research Writing Using ChatGPT: Effectiveness, Student Perceptions, and Ethical Implications," *Jurnal Edutech Undiksha* 13, no. 1 (2025): 148–157, <https://ejournal.undiksha.ac.id/index.php/JEU/article/view/94305>.

¹⁶ Arif Nugroho et al., "Students' Appraisals Post-ChatGPT Use: Students' Narrative after Using ChatGPT for Writing," *Innovations in Education and Teaching International* 62, no. 2 (2025): 499–511, <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14703297.2024.2319184>.

¹⁷ Maulidya Untari and Novia Trisanti, "Pedagogical Insight of University Students into ChatGPT Use in Academic Writing," *Journal of English Language and Education* 11, no. 1 (2026): 551–559, <https://jele.or.id/index.php/jele/article/view/2017>.

source verification alongside effective prompting, requiring students to examine claims, validate references through credible literature, and distinguish persuasive language from substantiated evidence before responsibly incorporating AI-assisted content into academic essays.

Concerns regarding paragraph length and logical inconsistency illuminate a discourse-level dimension of students' perceptions of ChatGPT in academic writing. Although ChatGPT can facilitate accurate sentences and polished paragraphs, scholarly composition depends on sustained coherence among claims, evidence, transitions, and conclusions across textual units. According to Tusino et al., Indonesian undergraduate English education students acknowledged gains in confidence, time efficiency, idea generation, sentence coherence, and self-editing, while identifying overreliance, diminished critical thinking, authenticity concerns, and accuracy limitations.¹⁸ These findings indicate that students distinguish between language assistance and dependable support for constructing extended, logically integrated academic discourse. Accordingly, lecturers should prioritize students' autonomous argumentation and reasoning, positioning ChatGPT as a revision instrument while preserving student agency over coherence, critical judgment, and decision-making throughout essay production and revision.

The findings endorse a pedagogical framework that positions ChatGPT as a supplementary resource requiring students' critical judgment and engagement. Instead of permitting unrestricted essay generation, writing instruction should incorporate systematic stages of brainstorming, drafting, source verification, revision, and reflective evaluation. According to Antonio and Ma'mun, Indonesian and Philippine EFL students viewed ChatGPT positively for enhancing writing quality, coherence, and confidence, while simultaneously recognizing issues of trust and skepticism.¹⁹ This evidence demonstrates that perceived usefulness and critical caution can coexist within AI-assisted academic writing practices. For English Education students, this balance is particularly important because writing competence supports future professional responsibilities; therefore, lecturers should require students to document AI use, verify references, compare suggestions with independent drafts, and justify revisions through structured reflective classroom activities.

¹⁸ Tusino et al., "ChatGPT in Academic Writing Classes: Exploring EFL Students' Perspectives," *JOLLT: Journal of Languages and Language Teaching* 13, no. 4 (2025): 2162–2172, <https://ejournal.undikma.ac.id/index.php/jollt/article/view/15293>.

¹⁹ Joemar Antonio and Nadiyah Ma'mun, "Between Trust and Skepticism: Comparative Perceptions of ChatGPT in Academic Writing among EFL Learners in Indonesia and the Philippines," *Educalingua Journal* 3, no. 2 (2025): 106–124, <https://journal2.upgris.ac.id/index.php/ECL/article/view/2858>.

This study offers an account of how fourth semester English Education students at UIN STS Jambi perceive ChatGPT in terms of usage, benefits, and barriers. The findings reveal a perception in which time efficiency, accessibility, idea generation, feedback, and language assistance coexist with concerns regarding critical engagement, unreliable information, citation accuracy, extended discourse, contradictions, and specialized explanations. Institutional evidence from an Essay Writing course therefore addresses the contextual gap identified in the introduction. The study also separates perceived usefulness from writing improvement because it involved neither intervention nor comparative testing. Its contribution is a contextual profile of student perceptions that may support responsible writing pedagogy, AI literacy, assessment design, and future research on writing performance and learning outcomes across educational settings and institutions over time.

CONCLUSION

The findings indicate that fourth-semester students in the English Education Department at UIN STS Jambi generally perceived ChatGPT positively as a support tool for academic essay writing. Of 61 students from three Essay Writing classes, 50 respondents with meaningful ChatGPT experience completed the questionnaire. Across 21 statements, the overall mean score reached 3.78, placing student perceptions within the Positive category. Students valued ChatGPT for its accessibility, rapid responses, language assistance, information support, idea generation, feedback, translation, and time-saving benefits. Item 7 obtained the highest mean score of 4.10, while 84% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that ChatGPT saves time during essay writing. Students also used ChatGPT to find information, develop ideas, understand topics, improve language, and support revision. Positive perceptions were further demonstrated by 82% agreement regarding ease of use, 84% regarding response speed, and 76% regarding information searching, confirming its practical usefulness across several stages of essay writing consistently.

Despite generally favorable perceptions, students recognized several limitations related to ChatGPT use in essay writing. The barrier indicator recorded mean scores between 3.24 and 3.78, with information reliability receiving the lowest score of 3.24. Moreover, 46% of respondents identified reliability concerns, 54% noted reduced response quality in longer essay paragraphs, and 66% acknowledged that ChatGPT could generate logical errors or contradictions. Additionally, 56% viewed ChatGPT as less effective for explaining complex formulas, while fabricated references, inaccurate citations, questionable sources,

and inappropriate language remained concerns. Notably, 68% believed that excessive dependence on ChatGPT might weaken their motivation for critical thinking and independent cognitive engagement. Therefore, students appeared to regard ChatGPT as a supplementary writing aid rather than a dependable substitute for individual authorship. Since the descriptive quantitative design measured perceptions instead of writing performance, the findings cannot establish improvements in writing proficiency. Responsible use consequently requires verification, critical evaluation, student responsibility, and lecturer supervision, while future research should investigate writing outcomes through experimental, comparative, or longitudinal approaches.

REFERENCE

- Al-Akbar, Krisna Mukti. "EFL Undergraduate Students"TM Perceptions of Using ChatGPT as a Supplementary Tool to Develop Academic Writing Skills." *JEFLE: Journal of English as a Foreign Language Education* 6, no. 1 (2025): 24–35. <https://jurnal.untan.ac.id/index.php/JEFLE/article/view/93396>.
- Antonio, Joemar, and Nadiah Ma'mun. "Between Trust and Skepticism: Comparative Perceptions of ChatGPT in Academic Writing among EFL Learners in Indonesia and the Philippines." *Educalingua Journal* 3, no. 2 (2025): 106–124. <https://journal2.upgris.ac.id/index.php/ECL/article/view/2858>.
- Cahyani, Gita Dwi, Athaya Shabrina Rizantha, Mayang Sekar Ayu, and Suci Mafa Sinha. "Students' Perception of ChatGPT as A Media for Learning Writing." *ETLiJ: English Teaching and Linguistics Journal* 7, no. 2 (2026): 198–209. <https://jurnal.umsu.ac.id/index.php/ETLiJ/article/view/30890>.
- Djollong, Andi Fitriani. "Tehnik Pelaksanaan Penelitian Kuantitatif." *Istigra'* 2, no. 1 (2014): 86–100. <https://jurnal.umpar.ac.id/istiqra/article/view/224>.
- Fatimah, Siti, Suryani, and Ugahara. "Students' Perceptions of Using ChatGPT in Completing Academic Writing Tasks." *PPSDP International Journal of Education* 4, no. 2 (2025): 1630–1641. <https://www.ejournal.ppsdp.org/index.php/pijed/article/view/660>.
- Goenawan, Stephanus Ivan, Vivi Triyanti, Hotma Antoni Hutahaeon, Wibawa Prasetya, and Agustinus Silalahi. "Sosialisasi Pemanfaatan Aplikasi Kuesioner ATD Dan Likert Untuk Penelitian Survei Kuantitatif." *Jurnal Pengabdian Masyarakat Charitas* 4, no. 2 (2024): 89–94. <https://ejournal.atmajaya.ac.id/index.php/charitas/article/view/6014>.
- Hidayat, Agus, and Iis Sujarwati. "Students' Attitude Toward Open AI ChatGPT in Writing Academic Articles." *English Education: English Journal for Teaching and Learning* 12, no. 1 (2024): 1–11. <https://jurnal.uinsyahada.ac.id/index.php/EEJ/article/view/10852>.
- Mahapatra, Santosh. "Impact of ChatGPT on ESL Students' Academic Writing Skills: A Mixed Methods Intervention Study." *Smart Learning Environments* 11, no. 9 (2024):

- 1–18. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s40561-024-00295-9>.
- Meniado, Joel C., Duong Thi Thu Huyen, Nopparat Panyadilokpong, and Pannaphatt Lertkomolwit. “Using ChatGPT for Second Language Writing: Experiences and Perceptions of EFL Learners in Thailand and Vietnam.” *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence* 7, no. 100313 (2024): 1–9. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2666920X24001164>.
- Nugroho, Arif, Erna Andriyanti, Pratomo Widodo, and Ira Mutiaraningrum. “Students’ Appraisals Post-ChatGPT Use: Students’ Narrative after Using ChatGPT for Writing.” *Innovations in Education and Teaching International* 62, no. 2 (2025): 499–511. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14703297.2024.2319184>.
- Pasaribu, Arsen Nahum, Sondang Manik, Tiara Kristina Pasaribu, Ruth Olga Sibagariang, and Yohana Insani Saragih. “Efl Students’ Perception of Ethical Concerns on Using Chatgpt in Academic Writing.” *Journal of English Education* 13, no. 1 (2025): 39–46. <https://journal.uniku.ac.id/index.php/ERJEE/article/view/11322>.
- Silalahi, Rentauli. “Chatgpt as a Tool For English Essay Writing: Perceptions of Indonesian EFL Students.” *English Language, Linguistics, and Culture International Journal* 5, no. 1 (2025): 17–37. <https://journal.uin-alauddin.ac.id/index.php/elstic/article/view/49949>.
- Sofya, Ayu, Nussyahbani Chusnul Novita, Muhammad Win Afgani, and Muhammad Isnaini. “Metode Survey: Explanatory Survey Dan Cross Sectional Dalam Penelitian Kuantitatif.” *Edu Society: Jurnal Pendidikan, Ilmu Sosial dan Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat* 4, no. 3 (2024): 1695–1708. <https://jurnal.permapendis-sumut.org/index.php/edusociety/article/view/556>.
- Sugiyono. *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif Dan R & D*. Bandung: Alfabeta, 2022.
- Taufikin, Loso Judijanto, and Sri Nurhayati. “Enhancing Undergraduate Research Writing Using ChatGPT: Effectiveness, Student Perceptions, and Ethical Implications.” *Jurnal Edutech Undiksha* 13, no. 1 (2025): 148–157. <https://ejournal.undiksha.ac.id/index.php/JEU/article/view/94305>.
- Teng, Mark Feng. ““ChatGPT Is the Companion, Not Enemies’: EFL Learners’ Perceptions and Experiences in Using ChatGPT for Feedback in Writing.” *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence* 7, no. 100270 (2024): 1–10. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2666920X24000730>.
- Tusino, Puspa Dewi, Mufid Lahiria Permata Hati, and Maria Joy C. Iglesia. “ChatGPT in Academic Writing Classes: Exploring EFL Students’ Perspectives.” *JOLLT: Journal of Languages and Language Teaching* 13, no. 4 (2025): 2162–2172. <https://ejournal.undikma.ac.id/index.php/jollt/article/view/15293>.
- Untari, Maulidya, and Novia Trisanti. “Pedagogical Insight of University Students into ChatGPT Use in Academic Writing.” *Journal of English Language and Education* 11, no. 1 (2026): 551–559. <https://jele.or.id/index.php/jele/article/view/2017>.
- Waruwu, Marinu, Siti Natijatul Pu’at, Patrisia Rahayu Utami, Elli Yanti, and Marwah Rusydiana. “Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif: Konsep, Jenis, Tahapan Dan Kelebihan.” *Jurnal Ilmiah Profesi Pendidikan* 10, no. 1 (2025): 917–932. <https://jipp.unram.ac.id/index.php/jipp/article/view/3057>.