

## **The Usage And Attitudes Towards Chatgpt Among The English Department Students In Samarinda**

Selly Nur Maya Sari<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Weningtyas Parama Iswari<sup>2</sup>, Dra. Ida Wardani<sup>3</sup>, Dr. Istanti Hermagustiana, MA.<sup>4</sup>

1,2,3,4) English Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and  
Education Mulawarman University, telp: (0541) 743641

e-mail: 1) [sellynurmayasari@gmail.com](mailto:sellynurmayasari@gmail.com); 2) [weningtyasparamas@fkip.unmul.ac.id](mailto:weningtyasparamas@fkip.unmul.ac.id);  
3) [wardaniida63@gmail.com](mailto:wardaniida63@gmail.com); 4) [istantihermagustiana@fkip.unmul.ac.id](mailto:istantihermagustiana@fkip.unmul.ac.id)

### **Abstract**

This research aims to examine the level of ChatGPT usage and the attitudes of English Department students in Samarinda toward its role in academic learning. The research is grounded in the rapid integration of artificial intelligence (AI) in higher education, particularly the increasing use of ChatGPT. A descriptive quantitative method was employed, using a validated questionnaire adapted from Sallam et al. (2024) which was distributed to 192 students from A University, B University, and C University in Samarinda. The data were analyzed using mean score calculations to determine the students' level of usage and attitudes. The results showed that the majority of students (64.58%) used ChatGPT at a moderate level, indicating regular but not intensive engagement with the tool. In terms of attitudes, the majority of students (55.21%) demonstrated a neutral stance. Students generally found ChatGPT accessible and useful, although some expressed concerns related to academic integrity, data privacy, and overreliance on AI tools. In conclusion, English Department students in Samarinda are incorporating ChatGPT into their academic routines with both interest and caution. While they acknowledge its practical benefits, they also maintain a balanced perspective on its potential risks. These findings highlight the importance of promoting digital literacy and ethical awareness in the use of AI-based educational tools.

**Keywords:** ChatGPT, Artificial Intelligence, ChatGPT Usage Level, Student Attitudes

### **1. Introduction**

Nowadays, technology is advancing rapidly, particularly in the realm of Artificial Intelligence (AI). AI is experiencing rapid growth worldwide, which can be attributed to the many positive outcomes achieved from its development. Kaplan and Haenlein (2019) describes AI as a system's capacity to accurately understand external data because this AI capacity is essential for making accurate decisions or predictions, learn from that data and apply those insights to accomplish specific objectives and activities through adaptive methods. It also makes several attempts to reduce errors. In addition, AI is capable of making more objective and professional decisions because it lacks the influence of human emotions (Nalbant, 2021).

The presence of AI in education facilitates effective and comprehensive learning. AI technology is employed in all domains of education. Wang (2019) said that students

have to fully integrate and engage effectively between AI and English teaching and learning activities, maximize the effect and technique of English teaching, and support development and reform of English education. Firat (2023) said that the use of AI based Chabot's in educational activities offers a significant field for improving student engagement and the learning process. These artificially intelligent Chabot's may do activities typically associated with human intelligence in academics. Generative Chat Pre-Trained Transformer commonly referred to as ChatGPT, is the most popular AI based technology nowadays.

The rapid growth in the use of ChatGPT is due to its abilities to imitate human intelligence and the wide range of references. However, the growth of ChatGPT may have negative outcomes if its users engage with it excessively and unwisely. The potential overreliance on ChatGPT in academic language learning is a significant concern, particularly as AI tools increasingly influence educational contexts. Although ChatGPT offers significant potential to facilitate language learning, excessive dependence on it may present various risks and challenges, raising concerns regarding its negative effects on the development of academic language learning.

## **2. Literature Review**

According to Selwyn (2022) technology is defined as the method by which humans change nature to fulfil their needs and desires. According to Akgun and Greenhow (2022) AI is simply defined as the field of computer science focused on simulating intelligent behaviour in computers and its ability to replicate, and potentially enhance human-like intelligence. One of the significant AI technologies is ChatGPT. ChatGPT is an AI application that is now popular. ChatGPT is a generative pre-trained transformer developed by the Microsoft-supported start up OpenAI and launched in November 2022, one of the most advanced AI-powered chatbots available worldwide. ChatGPT produces and delivers original material during a real-time interaction with the user. Moreover, ChatGPT can reliably sustain a conversational style that captivates the user in a more authentic manner, rather than delivering irrelevant responses to each inquiry (Rahman & Watanobe, 2023).

### **2.2 Students Attitudes toward ChatGPT in Education**

According to Marangunić and Granić (2015) the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), developed by Fred Davis over 25 years ago, has become a leading framework for examining the factors that influence users' acceptance of technology. According to the theory proposed by Sallam et al. (2024) two scales are designed to assess ChatGPT usage and attitudes towards ChatGPT. According to the TAM framework, a newly developed and validated instrument known as "TAME-ChatGPT" identifies various factors that influence university students' attitudes toward ChatGPT and their patterns of usage. The following are the four key aspects of students' use of ChatGPT:

- a. Perceived usefulness

Perceived usefulness refers to the degree to which students believe that using ChatGPT enhances their academic performance or efficiency. To assess the extent to which students believe that ChatGPT is beneficial and supportive in their academic tasks, such as saving time, providing accurate information, and enhancing learning efficiency.

b. Behavior Factors

This characterizes students' actual usage patterns of ChatGPT, encompassing the frequency of use and their spontaneous inclination to employ the technology for academic assignments. Behavioral factors refer to students past interactions with AI technologies, their regular use of ChatGPT, and their drive to employ it for academic tasks. Cognitive factors encompass attitudes formed by underlying beliefs as well as the individual's proactive engagement in embracing new technologies.

c. Perceived risk of use

Identifying students' concerns over the risks associated with ChatGPT, including potential plagiarism, safety risks, and its influence on critical thinking abilities.

The following are the three key aspects of students' attitudes of ChatGPT:

a. Perceived Risk

Evaluate the extent of students' concerns related to the potential risks of using ChatGPT, including issues of information accuracy, plagiarism and breaches of academic regulations, security threats, and privacy.

b. Anxiety

This describes students' anxieties regarding the use of ChatGPT, including fears of developing dependency, diminished critical thinking skills, and a loss of originality in academic assignments.

c. Technology/social Influence

To see students' positive attitudes toward technology, including their enthusiasm, perceptions of the educational benefits of technologies like ChatGPT, the attractiveness of its use, willingness to adopt new technologies, and the social influence of peers or colleagues.

### 3. Methods

The researcher opted for a quantitative research approach, utilizing a quantitative research method. Quantitative research is a method used to test objective theories by examining the relationships between variables. In this research, the researcher employed the survey method as a primary means of data collection. According to Scheuren (2014) the term "survey" is commonly used to refer to a method of collecting data from a selected group of individuals. This method was chosen because it allows for the systematic gathering of information from a representative sample of participants. A questionnaire was used in this research as the

instrument. A questionnaire is a widely used and useful instrument for collecting survey information because it provides structured, often numerical data that can be administered without the presence of the researcher, and is often relatively simple to analyze (Cohen et al., 2007). A set of ChatGPT usage and attitudes Scale Questionnaire was taken from Sallam et al. (2024) for the purpose of this research. The questionnaire for ChatGPT usage scale consists of 14 Likert Scale questions and the questionnaire for ChatGPT attitude scale consists of 13 Likert Scale questions. The researcher analyzed the research as follows: First, the researcher collected the data from Google Form, Second, the data was analyzed by using Microsoft Excel to know the frequency, mean score and the trends.

## 4. Result

In the process of distributing the questionnaires, out of a total of 202 respondents from the English department students, there were 192 students participated in this research.

### 4.1 ChatGPT Usage

#### 4.1.1 Level of ChatGPT usage

To examine the usage of ChatGPT among students, the researcher created a table containing range, category, frequency, and percentage. This table helps to classify and quantify how students use ChatGPT. The research involved three universities in Samarinda: A University, B University, and C University. The results are as follows:

Table 4.1 Result of Using ChatGPT

RANGE	CATEGORY	FREQUENCY				PERCENTAGE			
		A	B	C	Total	A	B	C	Total
52-70	High	50	10	3	63	34.48	34.48	16.67	32.82
33-51	Moderate	92	18	14	124	63.45	62.07	77.78	64.58
14-32	Low	3	1	1	5	2.07	3.45	5.55	2.60
	Highest Score	66	59	61	66				
	Lowest Score	27	32	31	27				
	Mean Score	47.46	48.62	45.22	47.42				

Based on the data presented, the majority of respondents (64.58%) fall into the moderate category of ChatGPT usage, indicating a balanced level of engagement with the tool. A smaller portion of students (32.82%) exhibit high usage, while only a minimum number (2.60%) are classified in the low usage category. The highest recorded score was 66, and the lowest was 27, with an average (mean) score of 47.42. These findings suggest that most students have a moderate familiarity and interaction with ChatGPT, with some actively using it at a higher level. These findings imply that students tend to use ChatGPT

at a moderate to high level overall, though their usage varies depending on the context or purpose measured by each item.

#### 4.1.2 Mean Score of ChatGPT Usage at Three Universities

The following were the mean score for each item ChatGPT level at three university: A University, B University, and C University. The analysis of ChatGPT usage was divided into four key aspects: Perceived Usefulness, Behavior/Cognitive Factors, Perceived Risk of Use, and Perceived Ease of Use and the mean score is converted into a percentage based on the method proposed by (Chakrabartty, 2021).

Table 4.2 Aspects of Using ChatGPT

FOUR ASPECTS OF CHAT GPT USAGE	MEAN SCORE				PERCENTAGE
	A	B	C	TOTAL	
a. Perceived Usefulness	3.46	3.47	3.40	3.45	61.25
b. Behavior/Cognitive Factors	3.39	3.40	3.17	3.37	59.25
c. Perceived Risk of Use	2.91	3.40	2.70	2.97	49.25
d. Perceived Ease of Use	3.91	3.69	3.61	3.85	71.25

Perceived Ease of Use received the highest mean score of 3.85 (71.25%), indicating that students generally found ChatGPT easy to operate. The second highest mean was observed in the Perceived Usefulness aspect, with a score of 3.45 (61.25%), suggesting that students consider ChatGPT to be beneficial in supporting their academic activities. Behaviour/cognitive factors followed with a mean score of 3.37 (59.25%), showing that this behavioral engagement is less prominent compared to other factors such as perceived usefulness and ease of use. The last, Perceived risk of use had the lowest mean score of 2.97 (49.25%), which implies that students did not perceive significant risk or concern in using ChatGPT.

#### 4.1.3 Level of Usage by Universities

Table 4.3 Usage by Universities

A University	B University	C University
47.46	48.62	45.22

Among the three universities, B University showed the highest mean score of ChatGPT usage, with an average of 48.62. This indicated a relatively high frequency of use among its students. A University recorded a mean score of 47.46, also reflecting a high level of engagement with ChatGPT. In comparison, C University had the lowest mean score of 45.22, which, although slightly lower, still suggested a moderate to high level of usage.

## 4.2 Students' Attitude Toward ChatGPT

### 4.2.1 Frequency and Percentage of Students Attitude

To examine students' attitudes, the researcher constructed a table that included the range, category, frequency, and percentage. This table was used to classify and quantify the students' attitudes. The research involved students from three universities in Samarinda: A University, B University, and C University. The results were as follows:

Table 4.4 Frequency & Percentage of Students Attitude

RANGE	CATEGORY	FREQUENCY				PERCENTAGE			
		A	B	C	Total	A	B	C	Total
3.68 to 5.00	Positive	39	10	5	54	26.9	34.49	27.8	28.13
3.68 to 3.67	Neutral	80	16	10	106	55.17	55.17	55.6	55.211
1.00 to 2.33	Negative	26	3	3	32	17.93	10.34	16.7	15.67
	Highest Score	4.85	5.00	4.23	5.00				
	Lowest Score	1.62	1.38	1.54	1.38				
	Mean Score	3.08	3.27	2.98	3.10				

The results of the questionnaire on students' attitudes toward ChatGPT showed most students (55.21%) fell into the moderate category (Neutral), while 28.13% showed high (positive) attitudes and only 16.67% demonstrated low (negative) attitudes. Mean score 3.10, indicating a generally moderate attitude with a slightly positive tendency. This suggests that negative perceptions were present but less dominant compared to neutral or positive views. The data on students' attitudes toward ChatGPT showed that the majority of students, representing 55.21%, had a moderate attitude toward the tool. A smaller group, 28.13%, showed a high or positive attitude, suggesting a favorable perception of ChatGPT in academic or personal use. Meanwhile, 16.67% of the students had a negative attitude, indicating some level of hesitation, discomfort, or negative perception. Overall, the findings suggested that while most students maintained a neutral stance, a significant portion responded positively, and only a minority held negative attitudes.

### 4.2.2 Mean Score of Students Attitude

Table 4.5 Mean Score of Students Attitude

THREE ASPECTS OF STUDENTS ATTITUDE	MEAN SCORE				PERCENTAGE
	A	B	C	TOTAL	
e. Perceived Risk	2.78	3.06	2.63	2.81	45.25
f. Anxiety	2.69	3.17	2.76	2.77	44.25
g. Technology/social influence	3.61	3.55	3.46	3.59	64.75

The analysis of the three aspects of students' attitudes toward ChatGPT revealed varying levels of agreement and the mean score is converted into a percentage based on the method proposed by (Chakrabartty, 2021). The Technology/Social Influence aspect had the highest mean score of 3.59 (64.75%), indicating that students were generally influenced by external factors such as peers, technological trends, or academic environments in forming their attitudes. The Perceived Risk aspect had a mean of 2.81 (45.25%), suggesting that students moderately recognized potential risks associated with using ChatGPT. Meanwhile, the Anxiety aspect recorded the lowest mean score of 2.77 (44.25%), indicating that students experienced relatively low levels of anxiety or discomfort when interacting with the tool. These findings suggest that social and technological factors played a stronger role in shaping attitudes compared to perceived risks or emotional concerns.

#### 4.2.3 Students Attitude Level

Students' overall attitude scores were then classified into three levels: Positive (3.68 to 5.00), Neutral (2.34 to 3.67), and Negative (1.00 to 2.33), based on the cumulative average of all 13 attitude items. Table presented the average scores of ChatGPT usage and attitudes among students from three different universities:

A University	B University	C University
3.08	3.27	2.98

The table showed the mean scores of students' attitudes toward ChatGPT across three universities. The results indicated that B University had the highest average attitude score of 3.27, which reflected a relatively more positive perception among its students. A University followed with a mean score of 3.08, while C University had the lowest average score of 2.98. These findings suggest that, overall, students from B University exhibited a slightly more favourable attitude toward ChatGPT compared to the other two institutions. This classification confirms that a majority of English Department students in Samarinda have a neutral perception of ChatGPT. They recognize its value as an educational tool while remaining moderately cautious about its risks. The presence of a notable neutral group indicates that students are still in the process of fully adapting to or critically evaluating the role of ChatGPT in academic contexts.

## 5. Discussion

The usage of ChatGPT among English Department students in Samarinda reflects a balanced integration of artificial intelligence into academic activities. Based on the framework proposed by Sallam et al. (2024) ChatGPT usage is examined across four key dimensions: perceived usefulness, behavioral/cognitive factors, perceived risk, and perceived ease of use. The quantitative findings show that the majority of students demonstrate moderate usage, with about 32.82% of them classified as high users. This pattern suggests that while students are familiar with ChatGPT and engage with it regularly, their usage is selective and situational, likely influenced by their academic needs and institutional expectations. High levels of agreement were found in indicators related to perceived usefulness and ease of use, such as "ChatGPT helps me to save time when searching for information" and "It does not take a long time to learn how to use ChatGPT." These results imply that students view ChatGPT not as a replacement for traditional learning methods, but as a supportive tool that enhances the efficiency and effectiveness of their academic work.

Further analysis of the usage indicators reveals interesting nuances. For example, while the behavioural aspect of usage such as how often students spontaneously use ChatGPT showed fairly high mean scores, certain items under perceived risk had notably lower values. Items like "I am concerned that using ChatGPT would get me accused of plagiarism" and "I think that relying on technology like ChatGPT can disrupt my critical thinking skills" indicate that some students are cautious about the potential academic consequences of using AI tools. This aligns with the theoretical concern highlighted by Sallam et al. (2024) regarding the balance between technological convenience and academic integrity. It also resonates with the findings of Farhi et al. (2023) who warned that excessive use of ChatGPT might diminish students' original thinking and problem-solving capabilities. Therefore, while usage patterns suggest practical and frequent engagement with ChatGPT, the underlying attitude is not entirely uncritical or blindly accepting.

In terms of students' attitudes, the classification results showed that the highest percentage fell into the neutral category (55.21%), followed by positive (28.13%), and negative (16.67%). The predominance of neutral responses indicates that more than half of the students



are still uncertain or in the process of forming opinions regarding the role of ChatGPT in academic contexts. This indecision may reflect hesitation rooted in ethical considerations, such as concerns about plagiarism or the perceived risk of diminishing students' critical thinking skills. Such concerns are reflected in previous studies, including Sallam et al. (2024) who noted that students often struggle to fully trust AI-based tools due to doubts about their reliability and potential to disrupt original thinking. Similarly, Farhi et al. (2023) emphasized that students are wary of overreliance on ChatGPT, fearing that it may hinder cognitive development. These studies support the view that neutral attitudes may emerge not from rejection but from cautious engagement.

Meanwhile, 28.13% of the students demonstrated a positive attitude toward ChatGPT. This group showed strong agreement with statements such as "I am enthusiastic about using technology such as ChatGPT for learning and research" and "I believe technology such as ChatGPT is an important tool for academic success." These findings suggest that a portion of the student population is not only open to innovation but also confident in the benefits AI can bring to their academic work. Studies such as Baqir and Nayab (2024) support this by highlighting how ChatGPT fosters motivation and engagement through its interactive features. In contrast, 16.67% of respondents showed a negative attitude toward ChatGPT. This group may reflect those who are more sceptical or resistant to the integration of AI in education. Their concerns likely stem from issues such as academic integrity, data privacy, or a strong preference for traditional learning models. Ajlouni et al. (2023) similarly found that some students expressed anxiety over ChatGPT's potential to promote academic dishonesty and reduce originality in academic submissions.

Based on the data obtained, B University showed the highest level of ChatGPT usage compared to the other two universities. The results indicated that students from B University Chat usedGPT more frequently or were more engaged with the platform in their academic activities. This higher level of usage might have been influenced by several factors, such as greater exposure to digital tools, institutional encouragement, or a more proactive approach to integrating technology in learning. In contrast, students from C University demonstrated the lowest usage, which may suggest limited access to the tool, lower awareness, or possibly a more cautious attitude toward ChatGPT in education. These findings highlighted the variations in ChatGPT usage across different academic environments and suggested that institutional context played a key role in shaping students' engagement with emerging technologies.

Overall, the findings indicate that English Department students in Samarinda incorporate ChatGPT into their academic activities in a measured and thoughtful way. Most students use the tool moderately and selectively, valuing its practicality and user-friendliness. However, their attitudes tend to be mostly neutral, reflecting uncertainty and careful consideration of potential ethical and intellectual challenges. A notable portion of students express positive attitudes, welcoming the benefits ChatGPT offers for learning and research, while a smaller group remains cautious or critical due to concerns about academic honesty and reliance on technology. These findings highlight the need for guided and responsible implementation of AI tools in education, emphasizing the importance of promoting informed and critical use. Such an approach ensures that technological advancements complement and maximizing learning benefits for students.

## 6. Conclusion

This research aimed to explore the usage and attitudes toward ChatGPT among English Department students in Samarinda. The analysis was based on a quantitative approach, using a questionnaire adapted from Sallam et al. (2024) which evaluated students engagement with ChatGPT through multiple indicators, including perceived usefulness, behavioral factors, perceived risk, ease of use, anxiety, and social influence.

The results showed that students generally use ChatGPT at a moderate level, with a significant portion demonstrating high usage. ChatGPT is mainly utilized to support academic tasks, especially in searching for ideas, simplifying writing, and managing time efficiently. Students find the tool helpful and reliable, though some still express concerns about issues such as plagiarism and diminished critical thinking. These concerns reflect the students' critical awareness of the ethical and educational implications of integrating AI into academic work.

In terms of attitude, the majority of students displayed a positive perspective toward ChatGPT. They expressed enthusiasm for technology and recognized ChatGPT's potential to enhance learning experiences. However, concerns related to dependency, originality, and academic policy violations remain, particularly among students who responded more cautiously. This indicates that while ChatGPT is widely accepted, students are still aware of its limitations and possible negative consequences.

In sum, English Department students in Samarinda show a balanced approach to using ChatGPT they appreciate its benefits but maintain a level of caution. The results confirm that the integration of AI tools like ChatGPT into academic practices is growing, but it requires ethical awareness, critical use, and proper guidance to ensure it supports, rather than replaces, genuine learning.

## References

- Ajlouni, A. O., Abd-Alkareem, W., & Almajaireh, A. S. (2023). Students' Attitudes Towards Using ChatGPT as a Learning Tool: The Case of the University of Jordan. *International Journal of Interactive Mobile Technologies(IJIM)*, 17(18), 99–117.
- Akgun, S., & Greenhow, C. (2022). Artificial intelligence in education: Addressing ethical challenges in K-12 settings. *AI and Ethics*, 2, 431–440. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-021-00096-7>
- Baqir, M., & Nayab, D. (2024). Exploring Students ' Attitudes towards Using ChatGPT in English Language Classroom at University Level. *Pakistan Social Sciences Review*, 8(3), 389–399. [https://doi.org/10.35484/pssr.2024\(8-III\)29](https://doi.org/10.35484/pssr.2024(8-III)29)
- Chakrabartty, S. N. (2021). Integration of various scales for measurement of insomnia. *Research Methods in Medicine & Health Sciences*, 2(3), 102–111. <https://doi.org/10.1177/26320843211010044>
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). Research Methods in Education. In *Research Methods in Education* (Sixth Eddi). Taylor & Francis e-Library.
- Farhi, F., Jeljeli, R., Aburezeq, I., Dweikat, F. F., Al-shami, S. A., & Slamene, R. (2023). Analyzing the students' views, concerns, and perceived ethics about ChatGPT usage. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 5, 100–180.

- <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2023.100180>
- Firat, M. (2023). What ChatGPT means for universities: Perceptions of scholars and students. *Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching*, 6(1), 57–63. <https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2023.6.1.22>
- Marangunić, N., & Granić, A. (2015). Technology acceptance model: a literature review from 1986 to 2013. *Universal Access in the Information Society*, 14(1), 81–95. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10209-014-0348-1>
- Nalbant, K. G. (2021). The Importance of Artificial Intelligence in Education: A short review Journal of Review. *Journal of Review in Science and Engineering*, 1–15.
- Rahman, M. M., & Watanobe, Y. (2023). ChatGPT for Education and Research: Opportunities, Threats, and Strategies. *Applied Sciences (Switzerland)*.
- Sallam, M., Elsayed, W., Al-Shorbagy, M., Barakat, M., Khatib, S. El, Ghach, W., Alwan, N., Hallit, S., & Malaeb, D. (2024). ChatGPT Usage and Attitudes are Driven by Perceptions of Usefulness, Ease of Use, Risks, and Psycho-Social Impact: A Study among University Students in the UAE. *Frontiers in Education*, 9, 1414758. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2024.1414758>
- Scheuren, F. (2014). What is a Survey. *Www.Qualtrics.Com*, 9. <https://www.qualtrics.com/uk/experiencemanagement/research/surveys/?rid=ip&prevsite=en&newsite=uk&geo=AE&geomatch=uk%0Ahttps://www.qualtrics.com/experience-management/research/survey-basics/>
- Selwyn, N. (2022). *Education and Technology : Key Issues and Debates*.
- Wang, R. (2019). Research on Artificial Intelligence Promoting English Learning Change. *Education and Humanities Research*, 325, 392–395.