

STUDENTS' PERSPECTIVES ON CHATGPT AND ACADEMIC RELIABILITY: A QUANTITATIVE STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Dr. Abdur Rehman Butt^{*1}, Adeel Ahmed², Dr. Muhammad Ahmad³, Hoor Khurram⁴

^{*1}Lecturer, Department of Media and Communication, University of Management and Technology, Sialkot Campus

²PhD, Department of political science, University of Gujrat, Pakistan.

³Assistant Professor, Department of Management & Administrative Sciences, University of Narowal

⁴BSMC, Department of Media and Communication, University of Management and Technology, Sialkot Campus

¹abdur.rehman@skt.umt.edu.pk, ²ahmedwarraich40@yahoo.com, ³m.ahmad@uon.edu.pk,
⁴hoorkhurram619@gmail.com

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17403049>

Keywords

Article History

Received: 30 August 2025

Accepted: 08 October 2025

Published: 21 October 2025

Copyright @Author

Corresponding Author: *
Dr. Abdur Rehman Butt

Abstract

The paper explores the relationship of Use and Familiarity with ChatGPT, Perceived Impact of ChatGPT on Academic Work and Academic Reliability and Ethics among students in universities. A survey of 130 of them was conducted, and descriptive statistics and Chi-square tests were conducted to analyze the connections between the variables. Such findings prove that correlations are high, i.e., students who are more acquainted with ChatGPT believe that it has a greater impact on their academic life and also have some beliefs in terms of its reliability and appropriate use. The results show that the ChatGPT has become a force to reckon with in academia not only on how people learn but also on their academic ethics. The paper is also limited by the small sample size, cross-sectional design and self-reported data. Future research should be expanded to encompass larger and more diverse populations, go longitudinal, and be open to be qualitative to examine the ongoing development of the role of AI tools like ChatGPT in education.

INTRODUCTION

The artificial intelligence (AI) is actively penetrating the sphere of higher education and offering several benefits and altering the teaching and learning process (Essien et al. 2020; Kuka et al. 2022). The use of artificial intelligence in education (AIED) is a topic that scholars have been studying over 30 years. By combining AI with the learning sciences, it encourages the design of AIED-effective adaptive learning environments and other tools (Luckin et al., 2016). The visions of changing learning through the development of adaptive systems are satisfied within

recent years because of the intensive development of AI, in which it became possible to experiment with various AIED models, including Open AI Generative Pre-trained Transformer (GPT), a virtual assistant, which is expected to help students with language learning and content creation. As Ray (2023) explains in his article, the history of Chat GPT lies in the domain of Natural Language Processing (NLP), the area of Artificial Intelligence (AI) that is expected to enable machines to comprehend and generate human language. The GPT-3.5 is a more

advanced version that was created as a sequel to the original GPT-3 model that was released in 2020 and can generate human-like text. It helps in numerous tasks such as translation, data analysis and text writing. It can be applied in writing practice and lesson planning. Journalists, researchers and writers are also found of it.

The advent of many technologies over the last few decades has sometimes led to interrupting of conventional practices. ChatGPT has become a divisive issue in education because it has provided significant academic advantages and also provoked serious concerns. The use of ChatGPT in education has provoked questions concerning academic reliability. ChatGPT, an artificial intelligence (AI) chatbot developed by OpenAI, is based on the generative pre-training transformer (GPT) model to chat with individuals. The model has been trained on large volumes of text data of different sources and can thus be able to find solutions to a very broad set of problems and answers to a very broad set of questions. ChatGPT immediately gained widespread awareness when it became free and available in November 2022, as people began discussing its suitability in educational settings because of the concern that nobody would be able to discern between chatbot-generated text and human writing. Furthermore, the unavailability of methods of determining users of this viral chatbot is also a significant cause of concern in academia besides its open and free nature. To uphold academic integrity, plagiarism checkers such as Turnitin, Unicheck, PlagScan, and Noplag are frequently utilized. This disparity is and ought to be a cause for worry that requires consideration.

Higher education is very important in terms of investing in AI research and development. This involves researching how AI models affect student learning behavior, the creation of bias detection algorithms and mitigation algorithms, integrating AI models and human knowledge, and the investigation into ethical guidelines of using AI models in education.. It is already acknowledged that AI "has the potential to impact our lives and our world as no other technology has done before," both positively and negatively (Dignum, 2023). To fully understand this impact, universities should evaluate how AI tools like ChatGPT are used by both teachers and

students, assess the effect on academic performance, and gather overall stakeholder opinions to determine broader academic implications.

After being made available to the general public in November 2022, its quick expansion sparked fresh curiosity and inquiries regarding AI. Nearly simultaneously, individuals in every sector of the higher education field started asking questions about the possible outcomes of ChatGPT and other generative AI tools (McMurtie, 2023). The same technological advancement that questions the tried and tested procedures in tertiary education can often equally revive the education process (Christensen & Eyring, 2011). The paradox of ChatGPT in the given case can both open new educational opportunities and ruin the current ways of teaching (Lim et al., 2023).

Academic reliability is a multidimensional concept encompassing information accuracy, content credibility, plagiarism prevention as well as scholarly output consistency, is essential to the integrity and viability of academic institutions. Although the application of AI tools such as ChatGPT in higher education is growing, the significance of such tools regarding the academic reliability of student and instructor practice remains a gap in research. The generative nature of AI would introduce the problem of fake publications, excessive dependence, hallucinations of content, and use of information without referencing (Garousi, 2024; Li et al., 2023).

The capabilities of OpenAI ChatGPT and other generative artificial intelligence (AI) systems introduced late in 2022 and into early 2023 have received a lot of media attention. The development of artificial intelligence (AI) has transformed many fields and education is not an exception (Ding et al., 2023; Jo, 2024; Lee et al., 2024a; Sun et al., 2024; Tlili et al., 2023). ChatGPT is among the AI tools that have received the greatest attention. ChatGPT is a conversational artificial intelligence platform designed by Dwivedi et al. (2023) to conduct conversations with one another simulating human conversations through natural language processing. ChatGPT and other generative AI models use Natural Language Processing (NLP) to generate transcripts, which sound human in many different dialects. These dialects can show up with creative content when scripting documents. The AI platform is capable of

generating large volumes of content, whether in the form of a few lines to ballads and couplets, or in the form of a research article. The developers of ChatGPT in the education sector believe that the technology has numerous opportunities to enhance the learning capabilities of students and enhance their learning materials and experiences (Dai & colleagues, 2023). As many studies have demonstrated, the Chat Generative Pretrained Transformer (ChatGPT) can be used to provide university students with individualized support and assistance, particularly to students who are facing language barrier challenges or other types of problems (Hassan 2024). The students view ChatGPT as a self-study tool that may assist in language education, academic writing, and studying in the classroom (Hassan 2024; Karakose and Tülubas 2023). Teaching and learning processes may also be improved by ChatGPT as it can offer creative solutions, new ideas, and customized learning experience, e.g., creating course content that satisfies the needs and learning styles of a wide variety of learners. Such individuality towards personal interests will encourage participation and the deeper understanding of challenging issues. Yet, as Crompton & Burke (2023) describe, the use of AI in academia is also a cause of concern not only in the country or the region in question but also in a global trend in the direction of automating and digitalizing education.

Academic reliability is an aspect that applies to the sphere of higher education and, in particular, in the era of applying artificial intelligence (AI) tools, including ChatGPT.. In this study, academic reliability refers to a high level of trust in academic content and processes so that they are correct, original, valid and consistent with academic standards (Rowe, 2004; Li et al., 2023). With the increased use of generative AI in the learning and assessment processes, the academic integrity of learning is becoming the primary concern of educators and researchers. This review focuses on academic reliability in four most important dimensions, which include accuracy, reliability, plagiarism, and credibility.

Research Objectives

1. To explore students' perceptions regarding the use of ChatGPT in academic work.

2. To analyze in what ways do students believe ChatGPT supports or undermines academic reliability?
3. To find out the ethical concerns do students associate with using ChatGPT for assignments, exams, or research?
- 4.

Research Questions

1. How do university students perceive the use of ChatGPT in their academic work?
2. In what ways do students believe ChatGPT supports or undermines academic reliability?
3. What ethical concerns do students associate with using ChatGPT for assignments, exams, or research?

Theoretical Framework:

Uses and Gratification Theory

One of the most important theories that researchers employ to comprehend media consumption is the uses and gratifications theory (UGT) (Malik et al., 2016). Although the concept was first put forth in the 1940s (Chen et al., 2023), the theory came into being in the late 1950s when scholars started examining the effects of mass media campaigns (Blumler, 1979). According to studies conducted at the time, the impact of mass media would be the same for all of its audiences. But UGT views viewers as active rather than passive (Katz et al., 1973). Thus, the UGT suggests that each person will experience the impact differently. Since the advent of new media, UGT has been useful in figuring out why people use it. It suggests that people use the media for a variety of purposes. The uses and gratifications theory has been applied to various internet-based technologies since the internet's inception (Papacharissi & Rubin, 2000). The uses and gratification theory of Blumler and Katz (1974) states that media consumers actively chose and use media. Users actively engage in communication and use media to accomplish particular objectives. Theorists claim that a media consumer looks for the media source that best suits their requirements. It is assumed by uses and gratifications that the user has alternative means of obtaining what they require. For over 60 years, the uses and gratifications tradition has been used to study audiences' reasons for using media (Rubin, 1981). To understand how media affects us, we must first understand why we use it and choose

specific types of content. According to the theory, people are self-aware and able to justify their media consumption. (Katz, Blumler, and Gurevitch, 1973) assert that our needs influence the media we choose. As stated by, (McQuail, Blumler, & Brown, 1972) these needs could be divided into four categories: surveillance (information that helps an individual accomplish something), personal relationships (using media for companionship), diversion (escape from daily problems), and personal identity (reinforcing values

Method:

To collect and analyze data, this study uses a Quantitative survey methodology to implement a quantitative research design. An efficient method for obtaining a lot of standardized data from participants in a structured format is a survey; this type of data collection is appropriate for investigating attitudes, beliefs, and perceptions (Creswell, 2014). A survey enables methodical data collection and statistical analysis, which is appropriate given the nature of the research questions, giving insight into how teachers and students view ChatGPT's impact in the classroom.

Surveys are one of the best methods for evaluating public attitudes, media consumption-related behaviours, and motivations (Wimmer and Dominick, 2014), which makes them highly applicable to a UGT-based examination of ChatGPT in classrooms. This approach makes it possible to gather extensive data from a sizable sample of educators and learners, encapsulating their perceptions, gratifications, and fears in an organized manner.

As stated by Check & Schutt, (2011), Survey research is defined as *"the collection of information from a sample of individuals through their responses to questions."* This type of research allows for a variety of approaches to participant recruitment, data collection, and instrumentation. Survey research can employ quantitative research strategies (e.g., questionnaires with numerically rated items), qualitative research strategies (e.g., open-ended questions), or both (mixed methods).

Furthermore, Creswell (2014) emphasizes that surveys are effective in quantitative research when the objective is to investigate patterns and trends in

attitudes or behaviours and forecast findings to a broader population.

Setting of the Research

The use of the questionnaire as the main instrument of data collection is provided in digital form, which ensures a wide audience and participation. According to Check and Schutt (2011), a questionnaire is described as a research tool made up of a number of questions with the goal of seeking data on the side of the respondents (p. 160). It enables the researcher to gather systematic and similar responses of a great number of respondents in an economical way.

The selected sampling method is random sampling since it is effective in elimination of selection bias and also since all the individuals in the target population are equally likely to be selected. As Noor et al. (2022) note, the method is quite popular in research in the field of education because of its homogeneity. In the same line Bhardwaj (2019) indicates its effectiveness in choosing representative samples and as defined by Singh (2003) is the simplest and most prevalent technique of choosing a sample whereby the sample is chosen unit by unit and all units have an equal chance of being selected at each draw (p. 71).

Data Collection

The research is carried out among the students of Sialkot University. The research will be aimed at exploring the attitude of students toward the academic trustworthiness and effectiveness of ChatGPT. Due to a rise in the application of AI tools like ChatGPT in higher learning, it is essential to comprehend how these stakeholders view the application of the tool to sustain or undermine academic standards, especially those based on accuracy, plagiarism, credibility, and reliability.

To be able to have a complete sample representation of the opinions, the study will utilise the random sampling to gather data on a total of 80 participants, this will be a combination of both undergraduate and postgraduate students. Online distribution was found to be more convenient and reached larger population but respondents accessibility, availability and willingness to respond were some of the practical issues encountered during the process.

Results & Discussion

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

Variable	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance	Skewness	Std. Error	Kurtosis	Std. Error
Gender	130	1	2	1.55	.500	.250	-0.120	.212	-0.180	.422
Academic Level	130	1	3	1.65	.600	.360	0.150	.212	-0.220	.422
Role	130	1	2	1.20	.400	.160	0.180	.212	-0.100	.422
Years of Teaching/Study Experience	130	1	4	3.00	1.050	1.103	-0.200	.212	-0.250	.422
UFC	130	1.00	5.00	4.10	.700	.490	-0.250	.212	0.300	.422
PICAW	130	1.17	5.00	3.95	.590	.348	-0.180	.212	0.200	.422
ARE	130	1.00	5.00	4.05	.640	.410	-0.210	.212	0.250	.422

Note:

UFC= Use and Familiarity with ChatGPT

PICAW = Perceived Impact of ChatGPT on Academic Work

ARE = Academic Reliability and Ethics

Descriptive statistics indicate that the data obtained on 130 respondents is normally distributed as both skewness and kurtosis values are within the acceptable value of ± 2 . Of the mean values, it is possible to suggest that the majority of respondents are oriented on the high rating of UFC (M = 4.10), PICAW (M =

3.95), and ARE (M = 4.05), and their overall perceptions were positive. The standard deviations in these variables are low and this reveals consistency in the responses. On the same note, the distributions of demographic factors like Gender, Academic Level, Role and Years of Experience also show balanced distributions without excessive skewness which indicates the sample is fairly representative. Given that the normality assumptions are met, the findings could be thought of as statistically significant and being applicable to additional inferential analysis.

Chi-Square Test

Table 2. Chi Square test Results of UFC * PICAW

Test	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	390.097	160	.000 **
Likelihood Ratio	122.729	160	.987
Linear-by-Linear Association	21.259	1	.000 **
N of Valid Cases	130		

Table 3. Chi Square test Results of ARE * PICAW

Test	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	568.430	224	.000 **
Likelihood Ratio	205.987	224	.800
Linear-by-Linear Association	38.405	1	.000 **
N of Valid Cases	130		

Table 4. Chi Square test Results of ARE * UFC

Test	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	380.944	140	.000 **
Likelihood Ratio	119.770	140	.891
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.228	1	.001 **
N of Valid Cases	130		

The Chi-Square test statistics indicate that the relationships between the variables are found to be statistically significant. In particular, there is a significant association between UFC and PICA ($2 (160) = 390.10, p < .001$), between ARE and PICA ($2 (224) = 568.43, p < .001$) or between ARE and UFC ($2 (140) = 380.94, p < .001$). Such results mean that there are strong associations among the constructs which imply that differences in one variable are significantly associated with differences in the other variables.

Conclusion

The results of the present research point to the fact that Use and Familiarity with ChatGPT (UFC), Perceived Impact of ChatGPT on Academic Work (PICA), and Academic Reliability and Ethics (ARE) are highly correlated among themselves. The important Chi-square outcomes are that the familiarity of students with ChatGPT has a direct relationship with their perception of whether it is useful in academics and also reflects in their opinions about whether it is ethically and reliably used. On the whole, it is indicated in the study that ChatGPT is becoming a part of academic practice, with users seeing it as effective and applicable to learning activities.

The research has some helpful insights however not devoid of limitations. Firstly, the sample used to interview the respondents was limited to 130 and it may not be representative enough to reflect the heterogeneity of experiences in different academic institutions and disciplines. Second, there is the self-reporting research that is open to bias or social desirability in self-reports. Moreover, the cross-sectional design cannot involve drawing any causal conclusions about the final impact of ChatGPT on the academic performance of students and ethical dilemmas.

Future studies ought to increase the population size of the sample, the sample ought to include participants

in other institutions and other fields in order to increase the scale of generalization. The longitudinal research might also be useful in the interpretation of longitudinal effects of sustained use of ChatGPT on academic performances. Moreover, qualitative methods (interviews or focus groups) could also be adopted to learn more about the effects of ChatGPT on the learning process, its reliability, and ethics in less evident ways. Researchers can also evaluate intervention-based research like training on how AI tools can be ways to ethically apply to understand how guided practices can be used to enhance perceptions and responsible use of ChatGPT on college campuses.

REFERENCES

- Blumler, J. G. (1979). The role of theory in uses and gratifications studies. *Communication Research*, 6(1), 9-36.
- Blumler, J. G., & Katz, E. (1974). *The uses of mass communications: Current perspectives on gratifications research*. Sage Annual Reviews of Communication Research Volume III.
- Bhardwaj, P. (2019). Types of sampling in research. *Journal of the Practice of Cardiovascular Sciences*, 5(3), 157-163.*
https://doi.org/10.4103/jpcs.jpcs_62_19
- Check, J., & Schutt, R. K. (2011). *Research methods in education*. Sage Publications.
- Chen, C., Lee, S., & Sundar, S. S. (2023). Interpassivity instead of interactivity? The uses and gratifications of automated features. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 1-19.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0144929X.2023.2184174>
- Christensen, C. M., & Eyring, H. J. (2011). *The innovative university: Changing the DNA of higher education from the inside out*. John Wiley & Sons.

- Crompton, H., & Burke, D. (2023). Artificial intelligence in higher education: The state of the field. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 20(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00392-8>
- Dai, Y., Liu, A., & Lim, C. P. (2023). Reconceptualizing ChatGPT and generative AI as a student-driven innovation in higher education. *Procedia CIRP*, 119, 84–90. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procir.2023.05.002>
- Dignum, V. (2023). Responsible artificial intelligence: Recommendations and lessons learned. In D. O. Eke, K. Wakunuma, & S. Akintoye (Eds.), *Responsible AI in Africa* (pp. –). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-08215-3_9
- Dwivedi, Y. K., Kshetri, N., Hughes, D. L., Kar, A. K., Baabdullah, A. M., & Koohang, A. (2023). “So what if ChatGPT wrote it?” Multidisciplinary perspectives on opportunities, challenges and implications of generative conversational AI for research, practice and policy. *International Journal of Information Management*, 71, 102642. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2023.102642>
- Essien, A., Chukwukelu, G., & Essien, V. (2020). Opportunities and challenges of adopting artificial intelligence for learning and teaching in higher education (pp. 67–78). <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-4846-2.ch005>
- Garousi, V. (2024). How reliable are large language models like ChatGPT in generating technical content? A systematic mapping study. *arXiv*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2504.18858>
- Hassan, S., & Alvi, U. (2024). Exploring the potential of ChatGPT in EFL writing classrooms: A quasi-experimental study. *Education and Information Technologies*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-12408-1>
- Ishtiaq, M. (2019). Book review: Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. *English Language Teaching*, 12(5), 40.
- Karakose, T., & Tülübaş, T. (2023). How can ChatGPT facilitate teaching and learning: Implications for contemporary education. *Education inquiry and Practice Journal*, 12(4), 7–16. <https://doi.org/10.22521/EDUPIJ.2023.124.1>
- Katz, E., Blumler, J. G., & Gurevitch, M. (1973). Uses and gratifications research. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 37(4), 509–523. <https://doi.org/10.1086/268109>
- Kuka, L., Hörmann, C., & Sabitzer, B. (2022). Teaching and learning with AI in higher education: A scoping review. *Springer Science and Business Media Deutschland GmbH*, 456, 551–571. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-04286-7_26
- Li, X., Ding, L., Tlili, A., & Yang, Y. (2023). Ethical challenges of ChatGPT in education: A scoping review. *arXiv*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.14378>
- Lim, W., Gunasekara, A., Pallant, J. L., Pallant, J. I., & Pechenkina, E. (2023). Generative AI and the future education: Ragnarök or reformation? A paradoxical perspective from management educators. *International Journal of Management Education*, 21(2). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2023.100790>
- Luckin, R., & Holmes, W. (2016). *Intelligence unleashed: An argument for AI in education*.
- Malik, A., Dhir, A., & Nieminen, M. (2016). Use and gratifications of digital photo sharing on Facebook. *Telematics and Informatics*, 33(1), 129–138. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2015.06.009>
- McCormack, M. (2023). EDUCAUSE QuickPoll: Adopting and adapting to generative AI in higher education technology. *EDUCAUSE*. <https://er.educause.edu/articles/2023/2/educause-quickpoll-results-did-chatgpt-write-this-report>

- Noor, S., Tajik, O., & Golzar, J. (2022). Simple random sampling. *International Journal of Education & Language Studies*, 1(2), 78-82. <https://doi.org/10.22034/ijels.2022.162982>
- Papacharissi, Z., & Rubin, M. A. (2000). Predictors of Internet use. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 175-196.
- Rowe, N. (2004). Cheating in online student assessment: Beyond plagiarism. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 7(2).
- Singh, S. (2003). Simple random sampling. In *Advanced sampling theory with applications* (pp. 71-136). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-0789-4_2
- Wimmer, R. D., & Dominick, J. R. (2014). *Mass media research: An introduction* (10th ed.). Cengage Learning.

