



English Education Students' Perceptions of Using ChatGPT for Grammar Correction in Academic Writing at Universitas Negeri Padang

Vemi Arman^{1*}, Rizaldy Hanifa¹

¹ Universitas Negeri Padang, Indonesia

*Correspondence Email: armanveni@gmail.com

Volume 15, Number 1, 2026, 1-14

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24036/pqkaxy34>

Abstract:

This study examines English Education students' perceptions of using ChatGPT as a grammar correction tool in academic writing at Universitas Negeri Padang. Employing a descriptive quantitative design with a survey method, the study investigated students' perceptions through the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) framework, which encompasses four constructs: Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Behavioral Intention, and Actual Use. The participants were 217 undergraduate students from the class of 2022 who had completed academic writing courses and had prior experience using ChatGPT. Data were collected using a 20-item questionnaire with a four-point Likert scale and analyzed using descriptive statistical analysis with SPSS version 27. The findings revealed that students held very positive perceptions across all four TAM indicators: Perceived Usefulness (mean = 3.33), Perceived Ease of Use (mean = 3.38), Behavioral Intention (mean = 3.11), and Actual Use (mean = 3.38), with an overall mean of 3.30, categorized as very positive. Students particularly valued ChatGPT's effectiveness in correcting grammatical errors, improving writing quality, and providing immediate feedback. However, concerns emerged regarding over-reliance on AI tools, potential inaccuracies in complex academic contexts, and issues related to academic integrity. The study concludes that ChatGPT has considerable potential as a supportive tool for improving grammatical accuracy and writing efficiency among English Education students, though thoughtful integration with pedagogical guidance remains essential for maximizing its benefits while fostering independent learning and upholding academic integrity.

Keywords:

ChatGPT; Grammar Correction; Academic Writing; Technology Acceptance Model; Student Perceptions

© The Author(s). Published by Universitas Negeri Padang. This is an open-access article under the Creative Commons License <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

1. INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Grammar is widely recognized as one of the most fundamental components of language proficiency, particularly in the context of academic writing. It provides the structural foundation through which ideas are organized, arguments are constructed, and meaning is communicated with precision and clarity. According to Andleeb et al. (2025), grammatical accuracy is not merely

a technical requirement but a key indicator of language proficiency that directly influences the persuasiveness and credibility of scholarly arguments. In academic settings, the ability to write grammatically correct texts reflects a student's mastery of formal language conventions and their capacity to engage with complex subject matter at the level expected by higher education institutions. Without a solid grasp of grammar, students are likely to produce writing that is difficult to read, logically incoherent, and academically unconvincing (Tiwari, 2023). This makes grammar instruction and support a central concern for educators and researchers in the field of English as a Foreign Language (EFL). Saengboon and Panyaatisin (2022) further emphasize that grammar serves both as a descriptive system of how language works and as a prescriptive guide for appropriate language use, making it indispensable in academic contexts where clarity, accuracy, and formality are highly valued.

Despite the recognized importance of grammatical competence, a substantial number of EFL learners continue to struggle with applying grammar rules accurately in their academic writing. Research consistently shows that common errors such as tense inconsistency, subject-verb disagreement, article misuse, incorrect use of prepositions, and inappropriate use of cohesive devices remain prevalent among undergraduate students (Huyen & Khuyen, 2025). These errors are not incidental; rather, they reflect deeper challenges in second language acquisition, including interference from the learners' first language, limited exposure to authentic academic English, and insufficient grammar practice in meaningful contexts. Watcharapunyawong and Usaha (2013) found that tense and article errors are the most frequent among EFL learners, followed by word form and preposition mistakes, patterns that are similarly observed among Indonesian university students. Jaya et al. (2025) note that the gap between knowing grammar rules and applying them in authentic writing contexts remains a major challenge for EFL learners, particularly in academic genres that require formal register and syntactically complex structures. In Indonesia, where English is taught as a foreign language and students have limited opportunities to use English outside the classroom, these challenges are particularly pronounced.

At Universitas Negeri Padang (UNP), grammar-related difficulties are consistently observed in the academic writing of English Education students. Students' essays, research proposals, reports, and thesis drafts frequently exhibit grammatical errors that undermine the overall quality of their writing. While grammar instruction is formally included in the curriculum through dedicated Academic Writing courses, the feedback students receive on their grammatical performance is often inconsistent and insufficiently detailed. This is largely a consequence of structural constraints within the educational environment: large class sizes and heavy teaching workloads limit the extent to which lecturers can provide timely, individualized, and ongoing feedback to each student (Nassaji et al., 2021). As a result, students often feel inadequately supported in their efforts to identify and correct their grammatical errors, particularly when they are working on extended writing tasks outside of class hours. Hikmah (2025) reports that grammatical errors account for more than 60% of total writing errors among Indonesian undergraduate students, encompassing article misuse, verb tense confusion, and incorrect subject-verb agreement. These persistent patterns confirm that despite years of formal grammar instruction, a significant proportion of students still struggle to apply grammar rules accurately in formal academic writing.

The increasing integration of artificial intelligence (AI) tools in education has opened new possibilities for addressing this feedback gap. Among the most prominent AI-powered tools to emerge in recent years is ChatGPT, a large language model developed by OpenAI that is capable of understanding and generating human-like text across a wide range of topics and tasks. In the context of language learning and academic writing, ChatGPT has attracted particular attention

for its potential to serve as a grammar correction tool. Unlike traditional grammar checkers that rely on fixed rules and pattern matching, ChatGPT uses deep contextual understanding to detect nuanced grammatical errors, suggest structural improvements, and provide explanations for corrections (Schmid & Fajlik, 2023). According to Mahapatra (2024), ChatGPT offers faster and more accessible feedback compared to conventional grammar resources, making it especially valuable in situations where students have limited or irregular access to teacher support. Furthermore, Andrés et al. (2025) highlight that AI writing assistants like ChatGPT are increasingly seen as transformative tools that can support writing fluency, reduce students' writing anxiety, and foster greater independence in the learning process.

However, the integration of ChatGPT into academic writing practices is not without its challenges and limitations. A number of scholars have raised concerns about the accuracy of AI generated grammar feedback, particularly for complex sentences that require nuanced contextual judgment (Karagoz, 2025). Abumalik (2025) warns that excessive reliance on AI based correction tools may prevent students from internalizing grammar rules and developing autonomous error-detection skills, ultimately hindering their long-term linguistic development. Deep and Chen Yixin (2025) further caution that while AI writing assistants can enhance writing quality in the short term, overdependence may reduce learners' critical thinking engagement and self-correction capacity, which are essential for durable grammatical mastery. In addition, issues related to academic integrity such as the potential for students to submit AI corrected work as their own without sufficient engagement with the feedback have also emerged as concerns among educators and institutional policymakers (Gustilo et al., 2024).

Given both the potential benefits and the documented limitations of ChatGPT in academic writing, it is essential to understand how students perceive this tool and what factors shape their acceptance and use of it. The Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), originally developed by Davis et al. (1989) and later expanded into TAM 3 by Venkatesh and Bala (2008), provides a widely validated theoretical framework for examining technology acceptance. TAM proposes that users' perceptions of a technology's usefulness and ease of use are the primary determinants of their behavioral intention to adopt it, which in turn predicts actual usage behavior. In the context of ChatGPT for grammar correction, this framework is particularly relevant because it captures the multidimensional nature of students' acceptance decisions, accounting not only for their practical evaluations of the tool but also for the individual and contextual factors that shape those evaluations.

Preliminary observations at Universitas Negeri Padang indicate that English Education students from the class of 2022 who have completed Academic Writing courses and have had exposure to digital tools in their studies have begun to incorporate ChatGPT into their writing and editing practices. Despite this growing uptake, there is a notable absence of systematic empirical data on how these students perceive ChatGPT specifically as a grammar correction tool, and whether their perceptions align with the TAM constructs of Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Behavioral Intention, and Actual Use. This represents a significant gap in the existing literature, particularly within the Indonesian EFL context, where research on AI-powered grammar correction tools remains limited.

Several previous studies provide important context for the present research. Lubis et al. (2025) investigated students' perceptions of ChatGPT for academic writing at FKIP Universitas Riau and found generally high perceptions across all TAM indicators, with students particularly appreciating the tool's ease of use and usefulness for grammar correction and idea generation. Khider and Othman (2025) reported similarly positive perceptions among EFL students at University College of Haql, noting that students found ChatGPT effective for improving grammar, organizing content, and enhancing overall writing quality, though concerns about over-reliance

were also expressed. Mun (2024) examined Korean EFL learners' use of ChatGPT as an AI-assisted writing feedback tool and found that students in the ChatGPT condition significantly outperformed those using peer feedback in terms of grammatical accuracy and lexical quality, while also reporting more positive perceptions of the tool's convenience and anxiety-reducing effects. Dinh (2025) further found that undergraduate English majors in Vietnam perceived ChatGPT as beneficial for vocabulary enhancement, grammatical accuracy, and the development of a more formal academic writing style, though students also noted challenges related to overdependence and the difficulty of interpreting complex AI-generated feedback. Despite the valuable insights provided by these studies, none of them situate their findings within the specific context of English Education students at Universitas Negeri Padang, and few focus exclusively on grammar correction as a distinct and targeted use case. The present study therefore contributes to the literature by addressing these gaps.

The purpose of this study is to empirically describe and analyze the perceptions of English Education students from the class of 2022 at Universitas Negeri Padang toward the use of ChatGPT as a grammar correction tool in academic writing, as measured through the four constructs of the Technology Acceptance Model: Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Behavioral Intention, and Actual Use. The findings are expected to provide empirically grounded insights that can inform how AI tools are integrated into EFL writing instruction, guide students in making more intentional and effective use of ChatGPT, and contribute to the broader academic conversation on AI in language education.

2. METHOD

This study employed a descriptive quantitative research design using a survey method to examine English Education students' perceptions of ChatGPT as a grammar correction tool in academic writing. A descriptive quantitative approach was selected because it is well-suited for systematically describing and quantifying characteristics of a defined population based on structured data collection instruments (Jik Lee et al., 2024). Rather than examining causal relationships, this design aimed to provide an accurate and detailed picture of students' perceptions as they exist, using numerical data to identify patterns and trends across a large sample. The use of a survey method was appropriate for this study given the need to collect data from a substantial number of participants within a practical timeframe while maintaining consistency in how questions were presented and interpreted.

Population and Sample

The population consisted of 218 undergraduate students from the English Language Education Study Program at Universitas Negeri Padang, class of 2022, distributed across ten parallel classes (K1–K10). A total sampling technique was employed, in which all members of the population were included as participants (Giri, 2024). This approach was chosen because all students in the cohort had completed the Academic Writing course and had confirmed prior experience using ChatGPT. The questionnaire was distributed electronically via each class's WhatsApp group. Out of 218 students, 217 returned completed questionnaires (response rate: 99.5%), all of which were complete and suitable for analysis.

Research Instrument

Data were collected using a structured questionnaire adapted from Lubis et al. (2025). The questionnaire consisted of 20 statements organized according to the four TAM indicators: Perceived Usefulness (items 1–5), Perceived Ease of Use (items 6–10), Behavioral Intention

(items 11–15), and Actual Use (items 16–20). Each statement was measured using a four-point Likert scale with response options of Strongly Agree (4), Agree (3), Disagree (2), and Strongly Disagree (1). A four-point scale was deliberately chosen to avoid the neutral midpoint that characterizes five-point scales, thereby encouraging respondents to commit to either a positive or negative stance. The content validity of the questionnaire was established through expert judgment: the instrument was reviewed by a lecturer from the English Language Education Study Program at Universitas Negeri Padang, who assessed the clarity, relevance, and alignment of each item with the corresponding TAM construct and the research objectives. Revisions were made based on the validator's feedback prior to final administration.

Data Analysis

The collected data were processed and analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 27. Descriptive statistical analysis was employed to calculate the mean score for each item and for each of the four TAM indicators, as well as an overall mean for all 20 items. The mean scores were interpreted using the perception rating scale adapted from Gliem et al. (2015): Very Positive (3.26–4.00), Positive (2.51–3.25), Negative (1.76–2.50), and Very Negative (1.00–1.75). This classification enabled standardized interpretation of students' perceptions at both item and indicator levels, facilitating meaningful comparisons across the four TAM constructs.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Research Findings

This section presents the findings of the descriptive statistical analysis conducted on the questionnaire data collected from 217 English Education students at Universitas Negeri Padang. The data were organized according to the four TAM indicators: Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Behavioral Intention, and Actual Use. Table 1 provides an overview of the mean scores for each indicator and the overall mean.

Table 1. Descriptive Data of Students' Perceptions of ChatGPT

No.	Indicator	Mean
1.	Perceived Usefulness	3.33
2.	Perceived Ease of Use	3.38
3.	Behavioral Intention	3.11
4.	Actual Use	3.38
Overall Mean		3.30 (Very Positive)

As shown in Table 1, the overall mean score of 3.30 places students' perceptions in the very positive category according to the rating scale of Gliem et al. (2015). This finding indicates that, across all four dimensions of the TAM framework, English Education students at Universitas Negeri Padang have a highly favorable view of ChatGPT as a tool for grammar correction in academic writing. Among the four indicators, Perceived Ease of Use and Actual Use share the highest mean scores at 3.38, followed closely by Perceived Usefulness at 3.33, while Behavioral

Intention records the lowest mean at 3.11, which is nonetheless still categorized as positive. The consistent pattern of positive to very positive scores across all indicators suggests a broadly favorable orientation toward the adoption and continued use of ChatGPT in academic writing contexts.

Perceived Usefulness of ChatGPT

The first indicator, Perceived Usefulness, refers to the degree to which students believe that using ChatGPT improves their performance in grammar correction and academic writing tasks. Table 2 presents the item-level results for this indicator.

Table 2. Students' Perceptions of the Usefulness of ChatGPT

No.	Statement	SD (%)	D (%)	A (%)	SA (%)	Mean	Interpretation
1.	I find ChatGPT useful in my academic writing.	0.9%	1.8%	46.1%	51.2%	3.47	Very Positive
2.	ChatGPT assists me quickly in finding relevant references, thereby saving my time.	2.3%	7.8%	40.1%	49.8%	3.37	Very Positive
3.	ChatGPT is useful for correcting my grammatical errors in the academic writing process.	1.4%	7.4%	50.7%	40.6%	3.30	Very Positive
4.	ChatGPT helps me to improve my writing skills.	2.3%	12%	47.9%	37.8%	3.21	Positive
5.	ChatGPT provided useful explanations and suggestions to improve the quality of my academic writing.	1.4%	4.1%	55.3%	39.2%	3.32	Very Positive
Total Mean						3.33	Very Positive

Table 2 reveals that the Perceived Usefulness indicator obtained a total mean score of 3.33, categorized as very positive. At the item level, the highest mean was recorded for item 1 ("I find ChatGPT useful in my academic writing," mean = 3.47), reflecting a broad consensus among students that ChatGPT is a genuinely valuable tool for supporting their academic writing. Item 2 (mean = 3.37) and item 5 (mean = 3.32) also yielded very positive scores, indicating that students appreciate ChatGPT's ability to help them locate relevant references efficiently and to receive useful explanations and suggestions for improving writing quality. Item 3, which concerns the usefulness of ChatGPT for correcting grammatical errors specifically, obtained a mean score of 3.30, also falling in the very positive range. This finding is particularly significant for the purposes of the present study, as it confirms that students perceive ChatGPT as an effective grammar correction tool rather than merely a general writing aid. The lowest score in this indicator was item 4 ("ChatGPT helps me to improve my writing skills," mean = 3.21), which falls in the positive rather than very positive category, suggesting that while students value the

immediate corrective function of ChatGPT, they are slightly less certain about its role in producing long-term improvements in their overall writing competence.

Perceived Ease of Use of ChatGPT

The second indicator, Perceived Ease of Use, examines the extent to which students find ChatGPT free of effort and simple to operate in the context of grammar correction. Table 3 presents the item level results for this indicator.

Table 3. Students' Perceptions of the Ease of Use of ChatGPT

No.	Statement	SD (%)	D (%)	A (%)	SA (%)	Mean	Interpretation
6.	The features of ChatGPT are easy to use.	0.9%	4.1%	37.8%	57.1%	3.51	Very Positive
7.	ChatGPT is very flexible in its use.	1.4%	2.8%	43.8%	52.1%	3.46	Very Positive
8.	Interactions with ChatGPT are clear and easy to understand.	0.9%	5.1%	48.4%	45.6%	3.38	Very Positive
9.	I can easily become proficient in using ChatGPT.	0%	9.7%	45.2%	45.2%	3.35	Very Positive
10.	I feel comfortable using ChatGPT for academic writing.	2.3%	9.7%	51.2%	36.9%	3.22	Positive
Total Mean						3.38	Very Positive

The Perceived Ease of Use indicator yielded the highest total mean score among the four indicators at 3.38, categorized as very positive. Item 6 ("The features of ChatGPT are easy to use," mean = 3.51) recorded the highest mean score not only within this indicator but across the entire questionnaire, signaling that students find the interface and functionalities of ChatGPT highly accessible and user-friendly. Item 7, which addresses the flexibility of ChatGPT in its use, also obtained a very positive mean of 3.46, suggesting that students value the adaptability of the tool across different types of writing tasks and academic contexts. Items 8 and 9, both rated very positive with means of 3.38 and 3.35 respectively, indicate that students find it easy to understand ChatGPT's responses and to become proficient in using it over time. The lowest score in this indicator was item 10 ("I feel comfortable using ChatGPT for academic writing," mean = 3.22), which falls in the positive category. This slight drop may reflect residual hesitation among some students about fully integrating AI tools into their academic writing workflow, possibly due to concerns about appropriate use or academic integrity.

Students' Behavioral Intention to Use ChatGPT

Behavioral Intention refers to students' conscious plan or motivation to use ChatGPT for grammar correction in academic writing in the future. Table 4 presents the item-level data for this indicator.

Table 4. Students' Behavioral Intention to Use ChatGPT

No.	Statement	SD (%)	D (%)	A (%)	SA (%)	Mean	Interpretation
11.	I intend to use ChatGPT in the future.	1.4%	10.1%	46.5%	41.9%	3.29	Very Positive
12.	I will frequently continue using ChatGPT for academic writing.	0.9%	12.4%	47.5%	39.2%	3.24	Positive
13.	I am confident that I will continue using ChatGPT for academic writing.	2.8%	22.1%	45.6%	29.5%	3.01	Positive
14.	Using ChatGPT during the academic writing process is a good idea.	5.5%	26.7%	33.6%	34.1%	2.96	Positive
15.	I will recommend ChatGPT to my friends for academic writing.	3.2%	16.1%	50.7%	30%	3.07	Positive
Total Mean						3.11	Positive

The Behavioral Intention indicator obtained the lowest total mean among the four TAM constructs at 3.11, categorized as positive rather than very positive. Item 11 ("I intend to use ChatGPT in the future," mean = 3.29) was the only item in this indicator to reach the very positive threshold, indicating that most students plan to continue using the tool. Items 12 and 13, with means of 3.24 and 3.01 respectively, suggest that while students are generally inclined to use ChatGPT frequently and express a degree of confidence in continued use, this intention is somewhat tempered by uncertainty. The lowest scores were observed in item 14 ("Using ChatGPT during the academic writing process is a good idea," mean = 2.96) and item 15 ("I will recommend ChatGPT to my friends for academic writing," mean = 3.07), both categorized as positive. The relatively lower scores in this indicator, compared to Perceived Usefulness and Perceived Ease of Use, are noteworthy. They suggest that even when students perceive a tool as useful and easy to use, additional factors such as concerns about academic integrity, uncertainty about institutional policies on AI use, and the risk of overdependence may temper the strength of their intention to adopt and recommend it.

Students' Actual Use of ChatGPT

The fourth indicator, Actual Use, measures the extent to which students currently and regularly employ ChatGPT in their academic writing activities. Table 5 presents the item level findings for this indicator.

Table 5. Students' Actual Use of ChatGPT

No.	Statement	SD (%)	D (%)	A (%)	SA (%)	Mean	Interpretation
16.	I often use ChatGPT in my academic writing process, such as	0.9%	4.1%	37.8%	57.1%	3.51	Very Positive

for essays, articles, research proposals, and similar works.

17.	I often use ChatGPT to improve grammar and spelling in my academic writing.	1.4%	2.8%	43.8%	52.1%	3.46	Very Positive
18.	I often use ChatGPT for paraphrasing purposes.	0.9%	5.1%	48.4%	45.6%	3.38	Very Positive
19.	I often use ChatGPT to search for references or additional sources of information for my academic writing.	0%	9.7%	45.2%	45.2%	3.35	Very Positive
20.	I often use ChatGPT to generate ideas for my writing topics.	2.3%	9.7%	51.2%	36.9%	3.22	Positive

Total Mean						3.38	Very Positive
-------------------	--	--	--	--	--	-------------	----------------------

The Actual Use indicator obtained a total mean score of 3.38, equal to Perceived Ease of Use and the highest alongside it. Item 16 ("I often use ChatGPT in my academic writing process, such as for essays, articles, research proposals, and similar works," mean = 3.51) and item 17 ("I often use ChatGPT to improve grammar and spelling in my academic writing," mean = 3.46) both recorded very positive scores, confirming that the majority of students actively and regularly incorporate ChatGPT into their writing practices. Items 18 and 19, with means of 3.38 and 3.35 respectively, indicate that students also use ChatGPT for paraphrasing and for searching supplementary references, suggesting that their use extends beyond grammar correction to a wider range of writing support functions. Item 20 ("I often use ChatGPT to generate ideas for my writing topics," mean = 3.22) recorded the lowest score in this indicator, which is positive rather than very positive, implying that while idea generation is a recognized feature, students are slightly less likely to rely on ChatGPT for this purpose compared to grammar and structural editing tasks.

Discussion

The findings from this study reveal that English Education students at Universitas Negeri Padang hold consistently positive to very positive perceptions toward the use of ChatGPT as a grammar correction tool in academic writing, as measured across all four constructs of the Technology Acceptance Model 3 (TAM 3) proposed by Venkatesh and Bala (2008). An overall mean score of 3.30 confirms that students' collective perceptions are firmly situated in the very positive range, indicating broad acceptance of ChatGPT as a tool that is perceived to be both useful and accessible for supporting their grammatical accuracy and writing quality.

The very positive perception of Perceived Usefulness (mean = 3.33) aligns closely with the findings of previous studies conducted in comparable EFL contexts. Lubis et al. (2025) similarly found that students at FKIP Universitas Riau perceived ChatGPT as highly useful for grammar correction and academic writing tasks, while Khider and Othman (2025) reported that EFL students in Saudi Arabia valued ChatGPT's capacity to improve grammar and enhance overall writing quality. The present findings are also consistent with those of Mun (2024), who demonstrated that learners using ChatGPT as an AI-assisted feedback tool showed significant improvements in grammatical accuracy and lexical quality, and reported positive evaluations of

the tool's usefulness in their writing process. Within the TAM 3 framework, Venkatesh and Bala (2008) identify cognitive instrumental processes such as output quality and result demonstrability as key antecedents of perceived usefulness. The high scores observed in items related to grammar correction accuracy and the quality of explanations provided by ChatGPT suggest that students' perceptions of usefulness are grounded in tangible, observable benefits that the tool delivers in their day-to-day writing activities. However, the relatively lower score for item 4 ("ChatGPT helps me to improve my writing skills," mean = 3.21) warrants attention: while students clearly appreciate the immediate corrective function of ChatGPT, they appear to be somewhat less certain about whether the tool contributes to their long-term grammatical development. This is consistent with the argument advanced by Abumalik (2025), who warns that excessive reliance on AI-based correction tools may limit opportunities for deeper language processing and reflective engagement with grammar rules.

The very positive perception of Perceived Ease of Use (mean = 3.38) is similarly consistent with existing research. Alalwan et al. (2016) demonstrated that perceived ease of use directly enhances users' perceptions of an application's usefulness, a relationship that appears to be operative in the present context: students who find ChatGPT easy to navigate and interact with are more likely to view it as a productive tool for their academic writing. The high scores for items related to interface usability, flexibility, and ease of becoming proficient (items 6, 7, and 9) suggest that ChatGPT's design characteristics are well suited to the needs of undergraduate students who may not have advanced technical skills. However, the slightly lower score for item 10 ("I feel comfortable using ChatGPT for academic writing," mean = 3.22) suggests that despite finding ChatGPT technically accessible, some students harbor residual discomfort about using it in academic contexts. This discomfort may be linked to uncertainties about the appropriateness of AI use in academic settings, as flagged by Gustilo et al. (2024), who note that ambiguity surrounding institutional policies on AI use can undermine students' confidence and sense of legitimacy in using such tools. TAM 3 identifies individual-level factors such as computer anxiety and perceived enjoyment as determinants of perceived ease of use (Venkatesh & Bala, 2008); the variability observed across items in this indicator likely reflects these individual differences among students.

The positive, rather than very positive, perception of Behavioral Intention (mean = 3.11) represents the most nuanced finding of this study. While students clearly intend to continue using ChatGPT in the future and show a degree of willingness to recommend it to peers, the lower scores for items 13, 14, and 15 suggest that their intention is accompanied by reservations rather than unconditional enthusiasm. This pattern is consistent with the theoretical position of TAM 3, which holds that behavioral intention is jointly shaped by perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and attitude toward the technology, and that experience moderates the relationship between intention and actual use (Venkatesh & Bala, 2008). Kasneci et al. (2023) provide a relevant theoretical lens for interpreting these findings, emphasizing that users of large language models like ChatGPT must exercise critical judgment because such models can produce outputs that are plausible but factually or grammatically incorrect. Students' awareness of this limitation appears to moderate their behavioral intention, leading to an approach characterized by selective and reflective use rather than unqualified reliance. Deep and Chen Yixin (2025) similarly argue that the benefits of AI writing tools are maximized when learners use them strategically, maintaining their own agency in the revision process rather than delegating all corrective decisions to the AI.

The very positive perception of Actual Use (mean = 3.38) confirms that ChatGPT is already actively integrated into the academic writing practices of English Education students at Universitas Negeri Padang. The high scores for items 16 and 17 indicate that students frequently

use ChatGPT in the production of academic texts and for improving grammar and spelling, reflecting the operational reality that AI tools have become practical fixtures in students' writing workflows. These findings are consistent with Dinh (2025), who found that undergraduate English majors in Vietnam regularly utilized ChatGPT for grammatical accuracy and academic writing style development, and with Mun (2024), who observed significant actual usage of ChatGPT as a writing feedback tool among Korean EFL learners. The slightly lower score for item 20 (idea generation, mean = 3.22) suggests that students draw a distinction between using ChatGPT as a grammar editing tool a role, they embrace enthusiastically and using it as an ideation tool, a function toward which they are more cautious. This distinction may reflect concerns about originality and intellectual ownership, reinforcing the importance of clear pedagogical guidance about the appropriate scope of AI tool use in academic writing contexts. TAM 3 attributes actual use behavior not only to behavioral intention but also to facilitating conditions such as access, institutional support, and prior experience with the technology (Venkatesh & Bala, 2008); the very positive actual use scores in this study suggest that these enabling conditions are largely present for students at Universitas Negeri Padang.

Taken together, the findings of this study support the proposition that TAM 3 is a valid and productive framework for understanding EFL students' adoption of AI grammar correction tools. The consistent positive-to-very-positive pattern across all four indicators demonstrates that Perceived Usefulness and Perceived Ease of Use effectively predict both Behavioral Intention and Actual Use in this context, in alignment with the core propositions of the model. At the same time, the study reveals that students' perceptions are not uniformly uncritical: the relatively lower scores for behavioral intention items and certain ease-of-use items point to the presence of moderating concerns related to accuracy, academic integrity, and over-reliance that future pedagogical and policy interventions will need to address.

4. CONCLUSION

This study set out to describe the perceptions of English Education students from the class of 2022 at Universitas Negeri Padang toward the use of ChatGPT as a grammar correction tool in academic writing, guided by the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) as the theoretical framework. Based on the analysis of questionnaire data from 217 respondents, the study concludes that students hold positive to very positive perceptions across all four TAM indicators, with an overall mean score of 3.30 that places their collective perceptions firmly in the very positive category.

In terms of Perceived Usefulness (mean = 3.33), students believe that ChatGPT effectively supports their grammar correction needs and provides clear explanations that contribute to their understanding of grammar rules. Regarding Perceived Ease of Use (mean = 3.38), students find ChatGPT highly accessible and flexible, with minimal technical barriers to effective use. With respect to Behavioral Intention (mean = 3.11), students express a positive though cautious inclination to continue using ChatGPT, moderated by concerns about over-reliance, diminished autonomous grammar development, and academic integrity. Finally, Actual Use (mean = 3.38) confirms that ChatGPT is already actively integrated into students' academic writing activities, including grammar correction, paraphrasing, and reference searching.

These findings carry important implications for students, lecturers, and curriculum developers. For students, the results affirm the value of ChatGPT as a supplementary grammar tool while underscoring the importance of maintaining critical engagement with AI generated feedback and continuing to develop independent grammatical competence. For lecturers and academic writing instructors, the study highlights both the opportunities and the risks associated with AI tool use in the classroom, pointing to the need for explicit pedagogical guidance on

responsible and effective use of ChatGPT alongside conventional writing instruction. For curriculum developers and institutional policymakers, the findings suggest a need for clear, evidence-based policies on AI tool use in academic settings that balance innovation with academic integrity.

This study is subject to limitations that should be acknowledged. The use of a questionnaire instrument limits the depth of insight into students' perceptions, as it does not fully capture the reasoning behind their responses. Additionally, the study is confined to a single cohort at a single institution, which may limit generalizability. Future researchers are encouraged to employ mixed-methods designs combining questionnaire data with interviews or focus groups. Studies involving broader populations across multiple programs or institutions would also contribute to more generalizable conclusions about EFL students' perceptions of AI-powered grammar correction tools.

REFERENCES

- Abumalik, A. M. (2025). From assistance to over-reliance: Rethinking ChatGPT's role in grammar learning. *Bilingual Publishing Group*, 7(8), 523-539.
- Adhikari, S., & Dhakal, B. (2023). Revolutionizing natural language processing with GPT-based chatbots: A review. *Nepal Engineers' Association, Gandaki Province, Technical Journal*, 109-120.
- Alalwan, A., Dwivedi, Y., Rana, N., & Williams, M. (2016). Consumer adoption of mobile banking in Jordan. *Journal of Enterprise Information Management*, 29(1), 118-139.
- Andleeb, M., Tasra, A., Khatoon, S., & Mazhar, D. (2025). The role of English grammar in developing writing skills: A theoretical perspective. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences*, 10(1), 252-256.
- Andrés, C., Urzúa, C., Ranjan, R., Saavedra, E., Badilla-Quintana, M. G., Lepe-Martínez, N., & Philominraj, A. (2025). Effects of AI-assisted feedback via generative chat on academic writing in higher education students: A systematic review of the literature. *Education Sciences*, 1-16.
- Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly*, 13(3), 319-340.
- Deep, P. Das, & Chen Yixin. (2025). The role of AI in academic writing: Impacts on writing skills, critical thinking, and integrity in higher education. *Societies*, 15(247), 1-19.
- Dinh, C. T. (2025). Undergraduate English majors' views on ChatGPT in academic writing: Perceived vocabulary and grammar improvement. *FWU Journal of Social Sciences*, 19(1), 1-11.
- Ekizoğlu, M., & Nesil Demir, A. (2025). The role of AI-assisted writing feedback in developing secondary students' writing skills. *Discover Education*, 1-16.
- Fuchs, K. (2022). Using an extended technology acceptance model to determine students' behavioral intentions toward smartphone technology in the classroom. *Frontiers in Education*, 1-10.

- Gliem, J., & Gliem, R. R. (2015). Calculating, interpreting, and reporting Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for Likert-type scales. *Journal of Behavioural Economics, Finance, Entrepreneurship, Accounting and Transport*, 3(3), 96-109.
- Gustilo, L., Ong, E., & Lapinid, M. R. (2024). Algorithmically-driven writing and academic integrity: Exploring educators' practices, perceptions, and policies in AI era. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 20(1), 1-43.
- Hikmah. (2025). Common grammatical errors in students' writing: A qualitative error-analysis study. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 5(4), 3053-3056.
- Hinkel, E. (2004). Tense, aspect and the passive voice in L1 and L2 academic texts. *Language Teaching Research*, 1, 5-29.
- Huyen, T. T., & Khuyen, T. M. (2025). First-year English majors' perceptions of common grammatical errors in paragraph writing at Nam Can Tho University, Vietnam. *European Journal of English Language Teaching*, 10(3), 27-49.
- Jaya, N. M., Jabri, U., & Mustakim. (2025). Challenges in grammar learning among EFL students: A case study of an Indonesian university. *Scope of English Language Teaching, Literature and Linguistics*, 8(1), 16-27.
- Jaya, S., Susyla, D., & Melati. (2025). Developing syntactic complexity and accuracy in EFL students' essays through sentence combining. *Indonesian Journal of Educational Development*, 6(2), 408-421.
- Jik Lee, Y., Davis, R. O., & Lee, S. O. (2024). University students' perceptions of artificial intelligence-based tools for English writing courses. *Online Journal of Communication and Media Technologies*, 14(4).
- Karagoz, M. (2025). AI-generated feedback and learner reflective engagement in EFL writing. *Language Learning & Technology*, 29(1), 45-62.
- Kasneci, E., Seßler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., & Kasneci, G. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 103, 102274.
- Khider, A., & Othman, Z. (2025). EFL students' perceptions on using ChatGPT as an AI tool for developing academic writing skills: A case study at University College of Haql. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 16(1), 212-225.
- Li, Y. (2024). Perception and its role in language learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 116(2), 45-60.
- Lubis, A. H., Sinaga, O., & Silalahi, D. (2025). Students' perception towards ChatGPT for academic writing at English Study Program FKIP Universitas Riau. *Journal of English Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 7(1), 1-15.
- Mahapatra, S. (2024). AI in EFL writing instruction: Effectiveness of ChatGPT feedback. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 37(3), 501-524.

- Mondal, A. (2022). Perception: Psychological processes and language learning. *ELT Journal*, 76(2), 215-228.
- Mun, S. (2024). EFL learners' English writing feedback and their perception of using ChatGPT. *ReCALL*, 36(2), 150-168.
- Nassaji, H., Fotos, S., & Kartchava, E. (2021). Teaching grammar in context: New approaches and techniques. *Language Teaching Research*, 25(1), 1-20.
- Ni, Y. (2018). The use of noun phrases in academic writing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 31, 45-58.
- Roumeliotis, K. I., & Tselikas, N. D. (2023). ChatGPT and OpenAI models: A preliminary review. Department of Informatics and Telecommunications, University of Peloponnese.
- Saengboon, S., & Panyaatisin, P. (2022). Grammar in EFL contexts: Principles and practices. *TEFLIN Journal*, 33(1), 91-110.
- Schmid, E., & Fajlik, K. (2023). ChatGPT versus traditional grammar checkers: A comparative analysis. *CALICO Journal*, 40(2), 123-140.
- Swales, J. M., & Feak, C. B. (2012). *Academic writing for graduate students (3rd ed.)*. University of Michigan Press.
- Syafika, N., & Antonio, R. (2024). Technology acceptance in EFL contexts: TAM revisited. *CALL-EJ*, 25(1), 44-59.
- Taherdoost, H., Sahibuddin, S., & Jalaliyoon, N. (2016). Exploratory factor analysis: Concepts and theory. *Advances in Applied and Pure Mathematics*, 375-382.
- Tiwari, P. (2023). Grammar errors and academic writing proficiency: An analysis. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 33(4), 401-415.
- Venkatesh, V., & Bala, H. (2008). Technology acceptance model 3 and a research agenda on interventions. *Decision Sciences*, 39(2), 273-315.
- Venkatesh, V., Morris, M. G., Davis, G. B., & Davis, F. D. (2003). User acceptance of information technology: Toward a unified view. *MIS Quarterly*, 27(3), 425-478.
- Wang, J., & Fan, Y. (2025). Positive and negative perceptions in digital learning environments. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 73(1), 55-78.
- Watcharapunyawong, S., & Usaha, S. (2013). Thai EFL students' writing errors in different text types. *RELC Journal*, 44(2), 169-188.
- Zahidah, N., & Noor, M. (2025). AI writing tools and grammatical accuracy in EFL learners. *Language Learning & Technology*, 29(2), 80-98.