JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching
https://e-journal.undikma.ac.id/index.php/jollt
Email: jollt@undikma.ac.id
DOI: https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v13i3.13484

July 2025. Vol. 13, No. 3
p-ISSN: 2338-0810
e-ISSN: 2621-1378
pp. 1367-1379

EFL STUDENTS' USE, PERCEPTIONS, AND RELIANCE ON CHATGPT FOR EDITING AND PROOFREADING: A TECHNOLOGY ACCEPTANCE MODEL PERSPECTIVE

[1]*Endang Setyaningsih, [2]Hasan Zainnuri, [1]Dewi Sri Wahyuni, [3]Yuni Hariyanti
[1]English Teacher Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia
[2]School of Education, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Leeds, United Kingdom
[3]International Relations, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, UPN Veteran, Jakarta

*Corresponding Author Email: endang_setyaningsih@staff.uns.ac.id

Article Info
Article History
Received: November 2024
Revised: April 2025
Published: July 2025

Keywords
Artificial intelligence;
Chat-GPT;
Editing;
EFL writing;
Technology acceptance model;

Abstract

Rapid growth of studies on Chat-GPT acceptance within the broader context of AI in education (AIEd) has provided valuable insights into how participants across settings perceive and use this tool for teaching and learning. This study replicates earlier investigations on AI acceptance but narrows the focus to a specific task: editing and proofreading. It also expands the inquiry to address ethical concerns and overreliance—two recurring themes in AIEd research. A modified extended TAM questionnaire covering seven aspects was distributed to 71 first-year EFL university students enrolled in a writing course that permitted Chat-GPT only for editing and proofreading, with clear restrictions. Group interviews were also conducted. Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics; qualitative data were examined thematically. Findings reveal a consistent three-step use of Chat-GPT: prompting, pasting the manuscript, and reviewing. Students treated AI output as a draft for enhancement, not as final work. Variation emerged in how much students revised AI-suggested edits, suggesting differing levels of reliance. The study confirms that perceived usefulness and ease of use contribute to students' attitudes and intentions, moderated by self-image and subjective norms. While long-term dependency remains unclear, students appeared cautious when boundaries were set. This study suggests that when lecturers provide clear guidelines, students tend to view Chat-GPT as a learning aid and show awareness of academic integrity and authorship. The findings underline the need for well-defined institutional policies on AI use in writing instruction, while acknowledging the study's contextual limitations and the need for further research.

How to cite: Setyaningsih, E., Wahyuni, D.S., & Hariyanti, Y. (2025). EFL Students' Use, Perceptions, and Reliance on Chat-GPT for Editing and Proofreading: A Technology Acceptance Model Perspective, *JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, 13(3), 1367-1379. Doi: https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v13i3.13484

INTRODUCTION

AI in education (AIEd) has been a major topic of investigation in the past decade as the number of studies observably grown exponentially. And one of the most studied AIEd and one of the most used AIEd is Chat-GPT. Chat-GPT utilization and acceptance have been two dominant topics of studies since the fast surge of Chat-GPT users. Studies on its utilization have pinned out issues on academic integrity and overreliance (e.g. Floris, 2024, Floris et al., 2024; Teng, 2023) urging the discussion on policy to regulate the use of Chat-GPT and follow-up research to seek the 'accepted' extent of 'human-machine' collaboration. Meanwhile, studies on acceptance have generally reported positive perceptions regarding the adoption of Chat-GPT by users, mostly students, (e.g. Liu et al, 2023; Malinka et al., 2023; Strzelecki, et al. 2024;

Teng, 2024, Zoe, 2023) and teachers (e.g. Al-Hattami, 2023, Kehoe, 2023, Van Der Berg and Du Plessis, 2023) regardless the issues and challenges in its utilization.

This study replicates earlier investigations on Chat-GPT acceptance using the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) as the framework. For this current study, six factors were explored: Perceived Usefulness (PU), Perceived Ease of Use (PEU), Attitude, Behavioral Intention (BI), Subjective Norms (SN), and Self-Image (SI). These variables are defined in following table 1.

Table 1
TAM for the current study

Variables	Definition
PU	The degree to which a user believes that a technology/ system will enhance their performance
PEOU	The degree to which users believe that the technology/ system is easy to use or requires less effort in using it.
Attitude	The beliefs, feelings or emotions associated with the technology.
Subjective Norms	The view of the individual that other people who are relevant/ important to him/ her believe that a certain action should or should not be done (Venkatesh et al., 2003).
Image	The degree to which the use of a technology/ system/ innovation is perceived to enhance one's status in one's social system.
Behavioral Intention to Use	Actions/ behavior that shows a tendency to use the technology in the future

(adapted from Venkatesh and Bala, 2008; Venkatesh and Davis, 2000; Davis.1989)

The key factors in TAM shape technology adoption. (Davis, 1989, Venkatesh and Bala, 2008; Venkatesh and Davis, 2000). The belief in the technology's benefits (PU) and how simple the technology is to use (PEU), both positively influence a person's attitude toward the technology, which then strengthens their behavioral intention to use it. According to Venkatesh and Bala (2008), self-image and subjective norms are closely related to influencing an individual's intention to use technology. Subjective norms—beliefs about the expectations of important others—can impact a person's intention to adopt a technology, partly because people are often motivated to align with the expectations of those they respect or feel socially influenced by. Self-image, or the desire to enhance one's social status, can reinforce this effect; individuals may adopt technology not only because others think they should but also to improve how they are perceived within their social circles. This dual influence helps shape positive attitudes toward technology use in TAM, particularly in environments where social approval and self-enhancement are valued. Together, all elements explain how TAM predicts technology acceptance and use.

Considering the existing research findings, this study examines students' acceptance of Chat-GPT specifically for editing and proofreading in an EFL writing class. Given that Chat-GPT is not free from bias and may provide incorrect information, its use here is limited to its natural language processing (NLP) functions. Additionally, Chat-GPT's role is restricted to editing and proofreading after students have generated their own ideas and drafted their paragraphs. Proofreading and editing are two final steps in writing. Both can be done by the author, peers, or professionals. In EFL classrooms, self-, peer-, and teacher-assisted editing/proofreading are common. Research (Conrad, 2020; Buell & Park, 2008) supports their role in improving writing and fostering learning. However, some scholars (Howard, 2022) challenge their educative value, arguing students may struggle to apply feedback or rely too heavily on editors to fix errors. Ultimately, perspectives on the role of editing and proofreading vary, especially when done by someone other than the author.

In this particular study, the students were not specifically obliged to use or to revise the GPT-edited version but they were made aware of the issue of academic integrity and ownership.

This specific context and limitation differentiate this current research from other investigations that include the use of Chat-GPT as a generator of assignments and exam responses (Malinka et al., 2023), lesson plans (e.g: Kehoe, 2023, Van Der Berg and Du Plessis, 2023) and EFL/ ESL writing (Ibrahim and Kirkpatrick, 2024, Wang, 2024).

RESEARCH METHOD

The foci of the study were approached pragmatically. This means we incorporate operational decisions based on 'what will work best' in finding answers for the questions under investigation: (1) How do EFL students utilize Chat-GPT for editing and proofreading? (2) What are the students' perceptions within the frame of TAM toward using Chat-GPT for editing and proofreading? (3) How do students' perceptions and attitudes towards Chat-GPT as an editing and proofreading tool change over time with repeated use? Do they become more reliant on Chat-GPT or do they develop better self-editing and proofreading skills through using Chat-GPT?

Research Design

Following the pragmatism paradigm, this study employs a mixed method of data collection that collected both quantitative and qualitative data for analysis. The quantitative component includes ordinal data of students' perceptions and beliefs, attitudes, and actual use of Chat-GPT as a proofreading and editing tool that represents their technology acceptance as framed in the TAM Model. The qualitative component includes data that are obtained from semi-structured interviews to gain a deeper understanding of the student's experiences and perspectives towards using Chat-GPT for proofreading.

Research Participants

The study involved 71 EFL University students who were purposefully sampled. The criteria of inclusion are (1) be an EFL student who is currently taking/ has taken a Writing course (2) be relatively familiar with or have experience using ChatGPT (3) representing different categories of gender and proficiency in writing and (4) be willing to voluntarily take part in the study. A variation in participants' gender and proficiency levels was ensured to achieve demographic representation. Familiarity with ChatGPT was required to minimize potential technical challenges. The study was conducted during an early wave of AI adoption at the university, resulting in participants having a relatively similar duration of exposure to AI and contributing to a relatively uniform user profile. However, differences in individual usage frequency may still exist, potentially introducing bias in participants' perceptions. The recruited participants were first year students and consist of 56 female (79%) and 15 male (21%) students. They came from four different classes but join the same course of Paragraph Writing with the same lecturer. A sub-sample of 3 participants were chosen as focal respondents. They were selected based on their responses to the questionnaire and their ability to articulate their ideas and thinking.

Instruments

The instruments used in this study are a questionnaire and interview protocol. The questionnaire was developed based on the extended TAM Model and was distributed online via Google Forms to the respondents. The questionnaire was distributed near the end of a Writing course to ensure that the students already have ample experience of using Chat-GPT. The timing of the distribution also considers the students' memory retention. Since the Writing class was still ongoing, it was presumed that the students had fresh memory to recount their editing and proofreading experiences. The questionnaire is divided into four sections with a total of 28 close-ended questions and 4 open-ended questions.

Table 2
Questions Distribution

Sections	Aspect/ dimension	Number of items	Form
Section 1	Perceived usefulness	4	Close-ended 4-Scale Likert
	Perceived ease of use	4	Close-ended 4-Scale Likert
Section 2	Behavioral intention to use	4	Close-ended 4-Scale Likert
	Attitudes toward using	4	Close-ended 4-Scale Likert
Section 3	Subjective norms	3	Close-ended 4-Scale Likert
	Image and Voluntariness	5	Close-ended 4-Scale Likert
Section 4	Experience: Frequency	1	Close-ended-Multiple choice
	Experience: Treatment to result	1	Close-ended-4 scale Likert
	Experience: Growth of Reliance	1	Close-ended-4 scale Likert
	Experience: Growth of dependency	1	Close-ended-4 scale Likert
	Experience: Helpfulness in developing editing skills	1	Open-ended
	Experience: Process and treatment to result	1	Open-ended
	Experience: Benefits and limitations	1	Open-ended
	Experience: Influence on language learning and writing skill	1	Open-ended
	Experience: General attitude	1	Open-ended
Total		33	

Internal reliability of the 24 TAM close-ended questions was measured using Cronbach Alpha that is computed in SPSS 22 pack. The result of the computation shows that the alpha value is 0.7 which means that the items' reliability is accepted.

Table 3
Results of Reliability Statistics: Cronbach Alpha

Reliability Statistics: Cronbach Alpha		
Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.700	.734	24

In addition to the questionnaire, an interview protocol was developed to guide the semi-structured interview. There are five key questions that clarify and confirm the students' acceptance (e.g. perception and attitude) and experience when using Chat-GPT for editing and proofreading. For time efficiency, the interview was conducted in person in the form of a focus group interview. Interview notes were kept instead of audio recording to minimize anxiety and the Hawthorne effect.

Data Analysis

Data analysis was carried out based on the type of the collected data. Data from the Likert scale was quantified by assigning a number to each of the options. Numerical data were then tabulated and analyzed descriptively to obtain the mode, median, and average. Qualitative interpretation was made based on this data. Meanwhile, the qualitative data collected through open-ended questionnaires and semi-structured interviews were analyzed thematically following the coding cycles from Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014). At the initial stage the data were read and re-read several times before the first cycle coding was assigned. In vivo coding was chosen to be used in the first cycle coding then followed with second cycle coding

i.e. identifying patterns and building categories. From these patterns and categories, themes are drawn.

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Research Findings

Before presenting the findings regarding the Chat-GPT utilization, it is important to clarify the context of the study. The respondents in this study were first-year students who took a compulsory writing course that forbade using any AI for planning (outlining, mind mapping) and writing the initial draft. The students developed planning either individually or collaboratively on the assigned topic manually. Based on the results of brainstorming/ planning, the students individually write the development based on their purpose of writing. The drafting was carried out by hand during the class session. Once the initial draft was completed, AI was allowed for proofreading and editing.

Chat-GPT utilization for proofreading and editing: The 3-step procedure and treatment to AI edited text.

The questionnaire and interview data revealed the generic steps of Chat-GPT utilization as recounted by the respondents. The student-respondents engaged in structured AI interactions and treated AI suggestions critically rather than using them verbatim. They follow three generic stages of prompting-copy and pasting manuscript-reviewing when utilizing Chat-GPT for editing and proofreading. The result of the thematic analysis of students' utilization is presented in Table 4.

Table 4
Students' utilization of Chat-GPT

Theme	Data from the field	Insight
Prompt Engineering	"I first instructed the AI to act as a proofreader. Then, I provided details about my text, including its type, target reader, and writing style (casual/formal). Next, I pasted the text and asked for feedback on clarity, requesting an ordered list rather than a paragraph. After revising for clarity, I asked GPT to take on the perspective of the target reader (e.g., an intermediate English learner) to assess readability. I then adjusted vocabulary difficulty based on frequency of use. Finally, I asked GPT to list grammar and sometimes punctuation errors." (Zul, Questionnaire)	Students demonstrated creativity in crafting prompts to get structured and effective feedback.
Manual review and revisions of AI-edited text	"After getting the edited text from GPT, I read the result and re-edit the result using my own words." (Faiz, Questionnaire)	Most students refined AI-generated edits to align with their own writing style.
Returning to the initial draft after the AI review	"GPT revises grammar and other aspects, but I use the result just as a reference that I use to revise my original paper. I just read the result and then put it away. I just feel like I am cheating if I just give a minor touch to the edit because often GPT makes my writing too perfect but not mine." (Irene, Questionnaire)	Some students prioritized academic integrity and personal writing voice.
Iterative review process	"While using ChatGPT to improve my writing, I give commands as accurately as possible to maximize the results. After receiving suggestions from this AI, I will sort out the good ones and paraphrase them in my own words. Then, I will revise my writing by combining some ideas from the AI with my own language. After that, I will review my writing and input it back into the AI to receive even better suggestions. I will revise my writing again. I can repeat this process up to 6-7 times until I feel satisfied with the results. Then, I will revise the entire piece by rewriting it in my own language, adding new ideas, and so on." (Maya, Questionnaire)	Students actively engaged in AI-assisted self-revision, demonstrating a blended approach to technology use in writing.

The findings indicate that all students did not use Chat-GPT's editing as a final product but rather as a tool for enhancement. Differences emerged in how much students altered AI-generated revisions, with some making minor adjustments and others fully rewriting their drafts. This suggests varying levels of reliance on AI, with many students maintaining a strong commitment to originality while still benefiting from AI-assisted proofreading and editing.

Students perception, attitude, and intention

Data from the TAM Likert item are computed in SPSS 22 pack and analyzed descriptively and interpretation is developed based on the frequency measure. The following are the results of survey on seven dimensions of extended TAM that are highlighted in this study: Perceived Usefulness (PU), Perceived Ease of Use (PEU), Attitude (A), Norms (N) and Image (I), and Behavioral Intention to Use (BI).

Perceived Usefulness (PU)

Table 5
PU Responses Frequency (%)

PU	strongly agree (4)	Agree (3)	Disagree (2)	strongly disagree (1)	N valid	Mode
Editing and proofreading time is generally more time efficient with Chat-GPT	35.2	64.8	0	0	71	3
I feel confident with the editing and proofreading accuracy derived from Chat-GPT	4.2	70.4	22.5	2.8	71	3
Editing and proofreading are more effective with Chat-GPT	0	74.6	5.6	19.7	71	3
The overall writing quality is improved after editing and proofreading using Chat-GPT	14.1	80.3	5.6	0	71	3

The computation reveals that most students hold positive perceptions of the usefulness of Chat-GPT for editing and proofreading across four areas: time efficiency, accuracy, effectiveness, and improvement of overall quality. This questionnaire result is consistent with the findings from the interview in which the respondents collectively came up with similar themes. They mentioned that the editing and proofreading using Chat-GPT is easy and effective compared with their previous self and peer editing and proofreading experiences.

"Well of course, after getting edited by Chat-GPT, my paragraph is way much better; it's clearer. Prompting must be very detailed and it takes time but overall it gives much better results and faster than if I do it myself or have my friends proofread and edit it." (Nia, Interview)

The follow-up interview also revealed that the majority of students feel that their writing improved in terms of quality after being proofread and edited using Chat-GPT regardless of their treatment of the GPT editing result. (see finding 1). A minority of the students; however, reported a negative perception of the usefulness of Chat-GPT for editing and proofreading. These students noted that their revised drafts were not improved as expected and they were unable to learn and apply the input they obtained from GPT-edited draft. As such, their original draft did not improve well.

Perceived Ease of Use (PEU)

Table 6
PEU Response Frequency (%)

PEU	Strongly agree (4)	Agree (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly disagree (1)	N valid	Mode
It is easy to use ChatGPT for editing and proofreading.	29.1	66.2	4.2	0	71	3
It is flexible to use ChatGPT for editing and proofreading	26.8	69	4.2	0	71	3
It is easy to learn using ChatGPT for editing and proofreading	0	80.3	2.8	16.9	71	3
It is quick to become skillful at using ChatGPT for editing and proofreading	12.7	62	25.4	0	71	3

The computation shows that the majority of students find Chat-GPT easy to use. Nonetheless, closer examination of those who perceive the opposite reveals at least three interesting findings. First, while the majority of students agree that Chat-GPT is easy and flexible to use, at least 20-25 percent of the respondents think that it is not easy to learn from Chat-GPT and be skillful at using it. Exploration through interviews provided some explanations. (1) The results of Chat-GPT proofreading and editing were often not specified or localized. Although some students reported that they prompt Chat-GPT to list the revisions, it is often unclear for the students to follow and learn from it. (2) Prompting is viewed as a challenge. Some students recounted that were struggling to provide the prompt that suited their needs. This leads to the opinion that to be good at prompting is a skill that needs practice and time to master. One of them describes prompt engineering as a 'complex' and 'delicate' task.

Attitude

Table 7
Attitude Response Frequency (% and mode)

ATTITUDE	Extremely positive (4)	Positive (3)	Negative (2)	Extremely negative (1)	N valid	Mode
My overall attitude towards using ChatGPT for editing and proofreading	0	88.7	4.7	7	71	3
My attitude towards other students who are using ChatGPT for editing and proofreading	0	90.1	2.8	7	71	3
Your feeling as a student when you use ChatGPT for editing	0	69	22.5	8.5	71	3
Your feeling as a student when you use ChatGPT for proofreading	0	78.9	8.5	12.7	71	3

The data presentation shows a positive attitude toward the use of Chat-GPT of the majority of the student-respondents. The interview confirms that this positive attitude is shaped from the perceived usefulness and ease of use. However, approximately 10-30 percent of respondents expressed negative attitude in each of the four questions, mostly because of other people's opinions about the use of Chat-GPT and fear that using the technology will negatively impact their image. Together, these confirm the interplay of the components of TAM (Venketesh and Bala, 2008)

Behavioral Intention to Use (BI)

Table 8
BI Frequency (% and mode)

Behavioral Intention to Use	Strongly Agree (4)	Agree (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	N Valid	Mode
I will definitely use ChatGPT for editing and proofreading future writing assignment	7	69	23.9	0	71	3
I will use ChatGPT for purposes other than editing and proofreading	19.7	62	18.3	0	71	3
I will recomend using ChatGPT for editing and proofreading to my friends	23.9	67.6	8.5	0	71	3
I will use ChatGPT for editing and proofreading more frequently in the future	9.9	59.2	31	0	71	3

The data computation indicates that the students' intention to use Chat-GPT is relatively strong not only for editing and proofreading but also for other purposes. This intention to use as pointed out by Davis (1998), Venkatesh and Bala (2008), and Venkatesh and Davis (2000) is likely shaped by users' positive perception of the technology's benefits (usefulness), the ease of using the technology, and the positive attitude of users. While the majority of the respondents expressed that they will use Chat-GPT more frequently in the future, more than 30 percent stated disagreement and that could be a signal for non-reliance on the tool.

Subjective Norms and Self-image

In this study, data from the two dimensions of the extended TAM Model: subjective norms and self-image are considered as the moderating factors for students' intention to use (BI). Subjective norms are an individual's perception of what important people in their life think about whether they should or shouldn't take a particular action.

Table 9
SN and SI frequency (% and mode)

Subjective Norms (SN) and Image	Extremely Positive (4)	Positive (3)	Negative (2)	Extremely Negative (1)	N	Mode
Overall, how do you think other people think about you using Chat-GPT?	8.5	63.4	28.2	0	71	3
Generally, how do you think your lecturers' acceptance of the use of Chat-GPT?	4.2	66.2	26.8	2.8	71	3
How is your lecturer's acceptance of using Chat-GPT for editing and proofreading purposes?	14.1	74.6	9.9	1.4	71	3
Image	**Stongly Agree (4)**	**Agree (3)**	**Disagree (2)**	**Strongly disagree (1)**	**N**	**Mode**
Using Chat-GPT for editing and proofreading negatively impacts your image in terms of your writing competence	5.6	42.3	52.1	0	71	2
I will stop using Chat-GPT for editing and proofreading when other people say negative things about it.	2.8	28.2	63.4	5.6	71	2

I think being able to utilize Chat-GPT to improve my writing makes me feel/ look cool	11.3	47.9	39.4	1.4	71	3
In general, I use Chat-GPT subtly (secretly) because I am worried about what other people think when they know I use Chat-GPT for editing and proofreading	2.8	35.2	52.1	9.9	71	2
My decision in using or not using Chat-GPT is influenced by what other people think about using Chat-GPT for academic purposes	5.6	59.2	32.4	2.8	71	3

Compared to other components of the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), the results regarding subjective norms and self-image show a smaller gap between respondents with positive and negative perceptions or agreement and disagreement with the statements in the survey. In this study's context, respondents believe that lecturers generally hold a positive view of Chat-GPT, which may contribute to students' own positive attitudes and intentions toward using the technology. However, the nearly even split in responses regarding self-image suggests that respondents might reconsider their decision to use the technology if they feel it could harm their personal image.

Dependency and reliance on Chat-GPT for editing and proofreading

Regarding the dependency and reliance on Chat-GPT, the students' responses were obscure. It is unclear whether, over time, they become more dependent on the AI. This uncertainty is based on the responses to questions that tend to show contrast. For example, table 10 shows that 63 percent or the majority of the students reported that they frequently use Chat-GPT. However, only 39 percent reported a moderate increase in dependency. Additionally, 59 percent of students reported no to occasional reliance on Chat-GPT.

Table 10
Frequency of use, Reliance, and Dependency

FREQUENCY		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Currently, how often do you use Chat-GPT for proofreading your writing?	Rarely	26	36.6	36.6	36.6
	Frequently	45	63.4	63.4	100.0
	Total	71	100.0	100.0	
RELIANCE		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Over time, how much do you rely on Chat-GPT to correct errors in your writing?	Heavily	4	5.6	5.6	5.6
	Moderately	25	35.2	35.2	40.8
	Occasionally	40	56.3	56.3	97.2
	Not at all	2	2.8	2.8	100.0
	Total	71	100.0	100.0	
DEPENDENCY		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
To what extent has your dependency on Chat-GPT for editing and proofreading your writing changed over time?	Moderately Increased	28	39.4	39.4	39.4
	Remain the same	37	52.1	52.1	91.5
	Decreased	6	8.5	8.5	100.0
	Total	71	100.0	100.0	

The data reveals contradictory insights and it appears that the students' dependency on Chat- cannot be fully determined based on their responses. The mixed findings imply that while students regularly use Chat-GPT, many do not view their usage as dependency or increasing reliance. This could be due to a perception of Chat-GPT as a supplementary tool rather than a primary learning resource. This finding matches the usage profile of the respondent. As indicated in the previous section, all respondents did follow-up reviews and revisions of the GPT-edited text.

Discussion

This subsection attempts to discuss the findings of this study with the existing or previous investigations on the use of AI in education (AIEd), particularly that focus on Chat-GPT. The discussion is presented in three parts which are linkable to the findings of this study. The first part of the discussion focuses on the use of Chat-GPT as AIEd (and its challenges), the second part is on the students' acceptance of Chat GPT as AIEd, and the third discusses the reliance and dependency of Chat-GPT users.

The utilization of Chat-GPT

In this study, the focus is on how students used Chat-GPT as a tool specifically for editing and proofreading their writing. This restriction may have encouraged students to view Chat-GPT as a feedback tool rather than a primary source for content development. After crafting their prompt, copying and pasting the initial draft, and receiving AI-assisted feedback on their drafts, all students engaged in a follow-up review, examining and refining their work further thus maintaining their control over their work. This additional step of self-review indicates that students used Chat-GPT not just as a way to finalize their drafts but as an opportunity to reflect on and improve their writing skills actively by reinforcing students' control over their work and at once their authorship. Strong students indicate an effort to maintain their image and highly consider what their lecturers think of Chat-GPT. Moreover, they avoid reliance by neither using the edited text nor editing the edited text. Instead, they would study the output and work on their initial draft. This finding resounds that of Chang et al. (2024) which will be discussed in the next point.

The specific and limited context of this study differs from other studies on the utilization of Chat-GPT in writing courses such as Teng's (2024) and Wang's (2024). These studies explored a broader scope of Chat-GPT utilization, where students (both native and non-native English speakers) incorporated Chat-GPT into various stages of the writing process from inception to the final revision —not only for editing and proofreading. As such and dilemma regarding authenticity or academic integrity that has been pointed out by other studies as well (e.g. Floris et al., 2024, Teng, 2023, 2024) become more eminent. However, since this study is limited Chat-GPT's use to editing, this concern may have been less prevalent but not absent.

The acceptance of Chat-GPT

The findings on the students' acceptance of Chat-GPT confirm the interplay among the TAM components for understanding technology adoption. Perceived ease of use and perceived usefulness influence attitude, with ease of use also enhancing perceived usefulness by making the technology seem more accessible and effective. Attitude, in turn, positively affects behavioral intention, and the individual's motivation to use the technology. Subjective norms add a social element, as the expectations of important others can increase the likelihood of adoption, particularly when individuals feel social pressure to conform. Self-image further amplifies this effect, encouraging individuals to adopt the technology if it enhances their social status. Together, these components interact to shape a person's intention and actual use of

technology, reflecting both personal and social influences in the adoption process. (Venketesh and Bala, 2008).

Earlier investigations within the same framework have also reinforced the interconnectedness of the components. Almorgen et al. (2024), for example, reported that the acceptance of Chat-GPT in higher education is influenced by perceived ease of use, perceived usefulness, feedback quality, assessment quality, and subject norms, which positively affect users' attitudes and behavioral intentions towards its adoption for smart educational purposes. A particular data from a respondent, Irene, in this study, matches the insight from Chang et al. (2024). Chang found that competent users of Chat-GPT are influenced by subjective norms and attitudes. Irene is relatively a strong writer who signals great concern over ownership of her writing. She used Chat-GPT carefully and attempted to regain control of her writing after being edited with Chat-GPT.

The reliance and dependency of Chat-GPT users.

The mixed findings in this study suggest a nuanced relationship between students and their use of Chat-GPT. Although the tool is frequently utilized, many students do not perceive their usage as constituting dependence or overreliance. One explanation may be their perception of Chat-GPT as an auxiliary aid rather than a central resource in their academic work. This interpretation aligns with the study's efforts to emphasize the supplementary nature of the tool. Students were encouraged to use Chat-GPT mainly for editing and proofreading while being guided to independently develop ideas and write their initial drafts. The educational setting, therefore, significantly influenced the way Chat-GPT was integrated into students' learning processes. The controlled context in which the tool was introduced—alongside explicit instruction and awareness of ethical considerations—likely played a critical role in curbing unreflective or excessive reliance.

Moreover, this study contributes to the broader discourse on the ethical and pedagogical implications of Artificial Intelligence in Education (AIEd). The findings serve as a foundation for further exploration into how academic institutions can responsibly incorporate AI tools while minimizing potential pitfalls. Previous research, including studies by Chouduri and Shamszare (2023), Zhang et al. (2024), and Mennella (2024), have raised concerns about students' increasing dependence on Chat-GPT. For instance, Mennella's (2024) study revealed that over 90% of students expressed willingness to use Chat-GPT in future writing tasks—an indicator of potential overreliance. Additionally, many students misunderstood Chat-GPT as a search engine or factual source, which raises questions about digital literacy and the accurate understanding of AI capabilities. Although this study also reported a high intent for future use, factors such as the tool's image, peer influence (subjective norms), and the limited contextual application, coupled with active discussion on academic integrity, appear to mitigate the risk of dependency. These insights open avenues for refining pedagogical strategies surrounding AI use in education.

CONCLUSION

As discussed, the findings contribute to understanding how the students utilized and accepted Chat-GPT for editing and proofreading. Beyond the observable and measurable results, this study suggests that when a lecturer or teacher sets clear perimeters for using Chat-GPT, the students potentially view Chat-GPT as a learning tool and tend to be cautious with the issues of overreliance, academic integrity, and authorship. From TAM perspectives, this study confirms that perceived usefulness, and perceived ease of use, contribute to attitude and behavioral intention to use Chat-GPT and that this intention tends to be moderated by self-image and subjective norms. This reinforces the role of teacher/ lecturer's policy on Chat-GPT use may be a key factor in optimizing learning with Chat-GPT and at once minimize the unwanted side effects. As such, it is suggested that a clear policy should be set for the use of AI

in teaching and learning, especially for students' writing. Considering the limited number of participants and the context of this study, the findings are subjects for further investigation.

REFERENCES

Al-Hattami, H. M. (2023). Understanding perceptions of academics toward technology acceptance in accounting education. Heliyon, 9(1), e13141. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e13141

Buell, M.Z and Park, S.J., (2008). "Positioning expertise: The shared journey of a South Korean and a North American doctoral student" In C.P. Casanave, X. Li (Eds.), Learning the literacy practices of graduate school: Insiders' reflections on academic enculturation, University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, MI, pp. 201-217

Chang, H., Liu, B., Zhao, Y., Li, Y., & He, F. (2024). Research on the acceptance of ChatGPT among different college student groups based on latent class analysis. Interactive Learning Environments, 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2024.2331646

Choudhury, A., & Shamszare, H. (2023). Investigating the Impact of User Trust on the Adoption and Use of ChatGPT: Survey Analysis. Journal of Medical Internet Research, 25, e47184. https://doi.org/10.2196/47184

Conrad, N.L. (2020). Proofreading revisited: Interrogating assumptions about postsecondary student users of proofreading. Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 46 (2020)

Davis, F.D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. MIS Q. 13(3), 319–339

Floris, F.D. (2024). AI ethics 101: Pedagogical. Modern English Teacher, Vol. 33 (2). Available online at https://www.modernenglishteacher.com/ai-ethics-101-pedagogical

Floris, F.D., Widiati, U., Renandya, W.A., Busthomi, Y. (2024). Artificial intelligence in English language teaching: Fostering joint enterprise in online communities. Journal of English Educators Society, 9(1).12-21. https://jees.umsida.ac.id/index.php/jees/article/view/1825

Harwood, N. (2022). Teaching the writer to fish so they can fish for the rest of their lives': Lecturer, English language tutor, and student views on the educative role of proofreading. English for Specific Purposes. Vol. 68, October 2022, pp. 116-130

Ibrahim, K., & Kirkpatrick, R. (2024). Potentials and implications of ChatGPT for ESL writing instruction. The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning, 25(3), 394–409. https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v25i3.7820

Liu, G. L., Darvin, R., & Ma, C. (2024). Exploring AI-mediated informal digital learning of English (AI-IDLE): A mixed-method investigation of Chinese EFL learners' AI adoption and experiences. Computer Assisted Language Learning, 1–29. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2024.2310288

Malinka, K., Perešíni, M., Firc, A., Hujňák, O., & Januš, F. (2023). On the Educational Impact of ChatGPT: Is Artificial Intelligence Ready to Obtain a University Degree? arXiv (Cornell University). https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2303.11146

Mennella, T. (2024). Student usage and perceptions of ChatGPT: The good, the bad, and the ugly. Biophysical Journal, 123(3), 334a. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bpj.2023.11.2035

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (1988). Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook. http://cds.cern.ch/record/2261864

Strzelecki, A., Cicha, K., Rizun, M., & Rutecka, P. (2024). Acceptance and use of ChatGPT in the academic community. Education and Information Technologies. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-12765-1

Teng, M. F. (2023). Scientific writing, reviewing, and editing for open-access TESOL journals: The role of ChatGPT. International Journal of TESOL Studies, 5, 87-91

Teng, M. F. (2024). "ChatGPT is the companion, not enemies": EFL learners' perceptions and experiences in using ChatGPT for feedback in writing. Computers and Education Artificial Intelligence, 7, 100270. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100270

Van Den Berg, G., & Du Plessis, E. (2023). ChatGPT and Generative AI: Possibilities for its contribution to lesson planning, critical thinking and openness in teacher education. Education Sciences, 13(10), 998. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13100998

Venkatesh, V & Bala, H. (2008). Technology Acceptance Model 3 and a Research Agenda on Interventions. Decision Sciences - DECISION SCI. 39. 273-315. 10.1111/j.1540-5915.2008.00192.x.

Zhang, X., Jiang, H., Qiao, Z., & Li, P. (2024). Students' Response to ChatGPT: An Adaptive Technology-To-Performance Model. Journal of Computer Information Systems, 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/08874417.2024.2386546