FCIC INSIGHTS
An Interdisciplinary Journal

P-ISSN: 1656-6483
E-ISSN: 1984-9977

ORIGINAL ARTICLE OPEN ACCESS Volume 03 | Issue 02 | Article 03 | 2025

# EXTENT OF CHATGPT UTILIZATION AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS OF FCIC: BASIS FOR POLICY RECOMMENDATION

**Marlyn S. Liagao[1], Maria Victoia A. Gonzaga[2]**

[1]yzadrei51618@gmail.com, College Faculty, College of Information Technology, Franciscan College of the Immaculate Conception, Baybay City, Leyte, Philippines
[2]mavictoriagonzaga@fcic.edu.ph, Dean, Graduate School, Franciscan College of the Immaculate Conception, Baybay City, Leyte, Philippines

## ABSTRACT

This study investigates the use of ChatGPT among FCIC students through a descriptive-correlational research design, examining not only the extent of usage but also the relationships between perceived ease of use, ethical concerns, and demographic factors. Findings show that most users are between 18 and 24 years old, with a higher proportion of female students, particularly those enrolled in Education, Business Administration, Criminology, and Information Technology programs. Students commonly utilize ChatGPT for idea generation and drafting, though many experience difficulties when working on complex tasks and express concerns related to plagiarism and misinformation. Correlational analyses (Spearman and Chi-square tests) reveal no significant differences in usage across age groups or academic programs, while notable differences in perceptions were observed based on sex. Overall, students acknowledge the educational value of ChatGPT and emphasize the need for clear institutional guidelines to ensure responsible and ethical use.

**Keywords: ChatGPT, *AI in Education, Extent of Use***

**Received:** August 2025
**Accepted:** October 2025
**Available:** December 2025

**Recommended Citation:**
Liagao, M. ,& Gonzaga, M.V. (2025). Extent of ChatGPT Utilization Among College Students Of FCIC: Basis for Policy Recommendation. *Franciscan College of the Immaculate Conception Insights*. 3(2). 41- 58. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18210756

## INTRODUCTION

Technological advancements particularly in artificial intelligence (AI)—have significantly transformed education. AI tools such as ChatGPT now offer personalized learning, task automation, and real-time feedback (Kamalov et al., 2023). ChatGPT helps students engage more deeply by providing customized support, simplifying complex topics, and encouraging critical thinking (Montenegro-Rueda et al., 2023). However, responsible use of these tools is essential (Yilmaz, 2023). At the Franciscan College of the Immaculate Conception (FCIC), while students actively use ChatGPT, no research has yet explored its specific applications at the institution. This study aims to address this gap by examining students' usage, perceptions, and trust in ChatGPT, as well as the relationships between these variables and students' socio-demographic profiles. The findings will help inform AI literacy programs, enhance teaching strategies, and guide the development of policies that promote the ethical use of AI in education.

### Research Questions

The study determined the extent of ChatGPT use among FCIC College students. Specifically, this study sought to answer the following questions:

1.What is the socio-demographic profile of the respondents in terms of?
- 1.1 Age
- 1.2. Sex
- 1.3. Program

2. What are the students' perceptions of the use of ChatGPT?
3.Is there a significant difference in student's perceptions of ChatGPT usage across different socio-demographic profiles?
4. What are the students' perceptions regarding the ethical implications of using ChatGPT in academic activities?
5.What is the student's extent of use of ChatGPT?
6.Is there a significant difference in the extent of use across different socio-demographic profiles?
7.What policy can be proposed based on the results of the study?

## METHODOLOGY

### Research Design

This study employed a descriptive-correlational design to determine how extensively ChatGPT is used by students at the Franciscan College of the Immaculate Conception (FCIC). By systematically collecting data on usage patterns, perceptions, and behaviors, the study examined the relationships between these factors and student demographics such as age, sex, and academic program. This approach enabled statistical comparisons across groups, providing clear and objective insights into the extent and correlations of ChatGPT use among FCIC students.

## The Sample and Locale of the Study

The study employed a stratified sampling technique to identify students from Franciscan College of the Immaculate Conception (FCIC) who had prior experience using ChatGPT for academic purposes. A pre-survey was first conducted with the entire student population of 877, with 527 students responding (60%). From this initial group, 435 students (83% of respondents) indicated familiarity with ChatGPT and were classified as the relevant stratum for the main study. All 435 identified users were invited to participate and comprised the final sample. Focusing on this specific subgroup allowed the researchers to gather targeted and meaningful data on how ChatGPT is used in academic settings, including its perceived benefits and associated challenges.

***Table 1. Distribution of the Respondents***

| PROGRAM | POPULATION | SAMPLE |
|---|---|---|
| Bachelor In Secondary Education | 116 | 90 |
| Bachelor Of Science in Business Administration | 98 | 84 |
| Bachelor Of Science in Criminology | 103 | 80 |
| Bachelor Of Science in Information Technology | 80 | 78 |
| Bachelor Of Science in Hospitality Management | 61 | 49 |
| Bachelor Of Science in Office Administration | 20 | 18 |
| Diploma in Midwifery | 14 | 13 |
| Bachelor in Elementary Education | 21 | 12 |
| Bachelor Of Science in Midwifery | 10 | 9 |
| Associate Computer Technology | 2 | 2 |
| **TOTAL** | **527** | **435** |

## Research Instrument

The study utilized a modified and validated survey instrument adapted from Obenza et al. (2023) to assess ChatGPT usage among FCIC students. The survey was divided into four sections: socio-demographics, perceptions, ethical considerations, and extent of use, providing comprehensive insights into students' experiences. Content validity was established through expert review by a panel of faculty members with expertise in educational technology, research, and ethics, who evaluated each item for clarity, relevance, and alignment with the study's objectives. Their feedback informed revisions to item wording, structure, and coverage of key constructs (perceived usefulness, ethical concerns, and extent of use). The revised instrument was then pilot tested with a small group of FCIC students to check clarity, completion time, and initial item performance. Minor modifications were made based on pilot feedback.

The final version of the questionnaire demonstrated high internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha = .954) and adhered to ethical standards in terms of informed consent, voluntary participation, and confidentiality. The results highlighted how students perceive both the benefits and risks of using ChatGPT, its impact on their learning, and the importance of establishing clear institutional guidelines.

## Gathering of Data

The researcher secured FCIC approvals from the School President and Deans and ensured ethical compliance through digital consent and inclusive participation options. From the 435 identified ChatGPT users, responses were gathered via Google Forms. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and non-parametric inferential tests.

Section 1 responses were analyzed using descriptive statistics to profile students by age, sex, and degree program. Section 2 used weighted means to assess student perceptions of ChatGPT, highlighting its benefits and challenges in education. Perception was categorized as follows:

| Range | Perception Level | Description |
|---|---|---|
| 4.21-5.00 | Very positive | The student holds a very high view of ChatGPT, agreeing strongly with the statement. |
| 3.41-4.20 | Somewhat positive | The student has a high view of ChatGPT, agreeing with the statement. |
| 2.61-3.40 | Neutral | The student has neither a high nor a low view of ChatGPT or feels unsure about the statement. |
| 1.81-2.60 | Somewhat Negative | The student has a somewhat low view of ChatGPT, disagreeing with the statement. |
| 1.00-1.80 | Very Negative | The student holds a very low view of ChatGPT, strongly disagreeing with the statement. |

To explore whether students' perception of ChatGPT varied based on demographic factors such as age, sex, or academic program, Spearman correlation was used to examine relationships between ordinal perception scores and socio-demographic variables. For group comparisons involving ordinal data (e.g., perceptions and extent of use derived from Likert scales), non-parametric tests such as the Kruskal–Wallis H test (for age and program) and the Mann–Whitney U test (for sex) were considered more appropriate than parametric tests. Accordingly, chi-square results are interpreted with caution and treated as exploratory, with emphasis placed on the overall pattern of similarities across groups.

In analyzing Section 3 of the survey, the researcher applied descriptive statistics such as measures of central tendency (mean, median, and mode) and measures of dispersion (standard deviation and range) to identify overall trends and understand the variability in students' ethical viewpoints. A higher standard deviation indicated a wider spread of opinions, while the range showed the extent of variation in responses related to the ethical concerns of ChatGPT usage. Ethical concern items were measured as agreement with ethical statements and interpreted using the following scale:

| Range | Verbal Interpretation | Description |
|---|---|---|
| 4.21-5.00 | Highly Ethical | The student supports the use of ChatGPT within the institution, emphasizing the need for comprehensive governing policies. |
| 3.41-4.20 | Very Ethical | The student generally supports the use of ChatGPT within the institution but may recognize a need for some policies or guidelines. |
| 2.61-3.40 | Ethical | The student is unsure about the role of ChatGPT in the institution and/or the necessity of governing policies. They might see both potential benefits and drawbacks. |
| 1.81-2.60 | Slightly Ethical | The student has reservations about ChatGPT's use within the institution, potentially believing the risks outweigh the benefits. They might support only minimal use with strict guidelines. |
| 1.00-1.80 | Non-Ethical | The student opposes the use of ChatGPT within the institution or believes it should only have a minimal role. They are likely to see significant risks or ethical issues and may oppose any guidelines that appear to legitimize its use. |

To identify overall trends in how FCIC college students perceived and used ChatGPT, the study used descriptive statistics, particularly weighted mean scores. This standardized approach ensured consistent responses and facilitated quantitative analysis. To assess the degree of agreement or variation in student opinions, standard deviation was also calculated. Based on responses to 10 items, students were then categorized into five usage levels: extremely high, high, moderate, low, or very low, enhancing the study's depth and reliability. To explore differences, means and distributions between statements were compared to determine which aspects fell into the following categories:

| Range | Verbal Interpretation | Description |
|---|---|---|
| 4.21-5.00 | Extremely High | The student consistently and extensively employs ChatGPT in their learning practices. |
| 3.41-4.20 | High | The student employs ChatGPT frequently for various aspects of their learning. |
| 2.61-3.40 | Moderate | The student uses ChatGPT occasionally or for specific learning tasks. |
| 1.81-2.60 | Low | The student has minimal interaction with ChatGPT in their studies. |
| 1.00-1.80 | Very Low | The student has no prior experience with ChatGPT. |

To investigate the relationships between socio-demographic factors and the extent of ChatGPT use, Spearman correlation was employed. This test was used to examine whether there were significant associations between ordinal usage scores and categorical variables such as age, sex, and academic program. In line with current methodological guidance, non-parametric group comparisons (Kruskal–Wallis for age/program, Mann–Whitney U for sex) are

recommended for future or supplementary analyses to confirm patterns suggested by the exploratory chi-square results.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The study on ChatGPT utilization among FCIC college students examines key sociodemographic factors such as age, sex, and academic program alongside the respondent's level of familiarity with ChatGPT. This provides a foundational understanding of the student population and the context in which the technology is being used. Out of the 877 students, 527 participated in the pre-survey, and 435 (83%) reported prior experience with ChatGPT, indicating strong awareness. The study also examined how demographic factors influenced perceptions and usage patterns and assessed students' views on the ethical use of ChatGPT in academic settings. Findings were presented through both tables and descriptive narratives for ease of understanding.

### Socio-Demographic Profile

**Age:** The analysis revealed that 83.9% of respondents were aged 18 to 24, confirming that younger students are the primary users of ChatGPT. This is consistent with Strzelecki's (2023) findings on younger users' openness to technology. In contrast, minimal participation from those under 18 (0.7%), aged 25–34 (14.9%), and 35–44 (0.5%) reflects lower engagement among older groups, supporting Al-Emran et al.'s (2020) observation that older users prefer tools aligned with familiar skills. This highlights the need for future research on improving usability and AI literacy for older demographics, who may be slower to adopt new tools despite potential benefits.

***Table 1.1 Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Demographic Profile of FCIC College Students***

| Attributes | | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Age (in years)** | | | |
| | Below 18 | 3 | .7 |
| | 18 to 24 | 365 | 83.9 |
| | 25 to 34 | 65 | 14.9 |
| | 35 to 44 | 2 | .5 |
| **Total** | | **435** | **100** |
| **Sex** | | | |
| | Male | 181 | 41.6 |
| | Female | 254 | 58.4 |
| **Total** | | 435 | 100 |
| **Programs** | | | |
| | Bachelor in Secondary Education | 90 | 21 |
| | Bachelor of Science in Business Administration | 84 | 19 |
| | Bachelor of Science in Criminology | 80 | 18 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Bachelor of Science in Information Technology | 78 | 18 |
| | Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management | 49 | 11 |
| | Bachelor of Science in Office Administration | 18 | 4.1 |
| | Diploma in Midwifery | 13 | 3 |
| | Bachelor in Elementary Education | 12 | 2.8 |
| | Bachelor of Science in Midwifery | 9 | 2.1 |
| | Associate in Computer Technology | 2 | 0.5 |
| **Total** | | **435** | **100** |

**Programs:** The analysis of academic programs shows varied levels of ChatGPT usage among FCIC College students, with the highest participation from those in Secondary Education (20.7%), Business Administration (19.3%), Criminology (18.4%), and Information Technology (17.9%). This suggests a strong interest in AI tools among these fields, aligning with Vasquez-Cano (2023), who notes that academic background influences perceptions of AI. In contrast, programs such as Associate in Computer Technology (0.5%), Midwifery (2.1%), and Elementary Education (2.8%) showed lower levels of engagement, aligning with Mazzocchi et al.'s (2021) discussion on how contextual factors influence the adoption of new technologies. These differences highlight the need for further research on discipline-specific barriers and motivations to better support integration of ChatGPT across diverse academic contexts.

**Student Perception of ChatGPT**

Table 2.1 shows that FCIC students generally hold a "Somewhat Positive" perception of ChatGPT. They particularly value its ease of use (mean score of 4.41), which encourages them to incorporate the tool into their study routines and enhances their overall productivity. Students also recognize ChatGPT's contribution to improving learning quality and providing academic support (Gapud et al., 2023; Ngo, 2023; El Ghalayini et al., 2023). However, they are cautious about its limitations, particularly its handling of complex tasks, risks of plagiarism, emotional insensitivity, inaccuracies, and potential biases (Obenza et al., 2023; Shoufan et al., 2023). With an overall weighted mean of 4.02, students recognize ChatGPT as a beneficial academic tool while maintaining a critical and responsible attitude toward its use.

This pattern—high perceived usefulness coupled with awareness of risk suggests that students are not simply uncritical adopters of AI tools. Instead, they appear to be actively negotiating how and when ChatGPT should be used, which underscores the importance of institutional policies and AI literacy efforts that can support informed decision-making rather than blanket prohibition or unregulated use.

*Table 2.1 Students' Perception of the Use of ChatGPT*

| No. | Indicator | Weighted Mean | Level of Perception |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | ChatGPT is simple and convenient. | 4.41 | Very Positive |
| 9 | ChatGPT's responses may contain inaccurate information. | 4.15 | Somewhat Positive |
| 6 | ChatGPT has limitations in its ability to handle complex tasks. | 4.12 | Somewhat Positive |
| 8 | ChatGPT has limited emotional intelligence and empathy, which can lead to output that is insensitive or inappropriate. | 4.11 | Somewhat Positive |
| 10 | ChatGPT sometimes exhibits biases and produces outputs that may be perceived as unfair. | 4.09 | Somewhat Positive |
| 2 | ChatGPT can easily understand the content I provided. | 4.08 | Somewhat Positive |
| 7 | ChatGPT has issues with plagiarism or information leakage | 3.89 | Somewhat Positive |
| 3 | ChatGPT can help improve the quality of learning. | 3.88 | Somewhat Positive |
| 5 | ChatGPT can help me enhance my learning abilities. | 3.78 | Somewhat Positive |
| 4 | ChatGPT can provide me with more learning opportunities. | 3.73 | Somewhat Positive |
| **Overall** | | **4.02** | **Somewhat Positive** |

*Legend:*

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *4.21 – 5.00* | *Very Positive* | *1.81 – 2.60* | *Somewhere Negative* |
| *3.41 – 4.20* | *Somewhat Positive* | *1.00 – 1.80* | *Very Negative* |
| *2.61 – 3.40* | *Neutral* | | |

**Significant Relationship Between the Socio-Demographic Profile and Student's Perception of the Use of ChatGPT**

Table 3.1 shows that the chi-square test revealed no significant differences in ChatGPT perceptions based on age, sex, or academic program. For age, the chi-square value was 16.373 with 9 degrees of freedom and a p-value of 0.059, which is slightly above the typical significance threshold of 0.05, indicating that differences in ChatGPT perceptions across age groups were not statistically significant. The moderate contingency coefficient of 0.190 suggested that age might influence ChatGPT perceptions to some extent, but not strongly enough to be considered a key factor.

Regarding sex, the chi-square value was 2.154 with 3 degrees of freedom and a p-value of 0.541, well above 0.05, suggesting that there was no significant difference in ChatGPT perception between male and female students. The low contingency coefficient of 0.013 further emphasized that sex had minimal impact on perception. Similarly, for academic programs, the chi-square value was 28.316 with 27 degrees of freedom and a p-value of 0.395, indicating no significant difference in ChatGPT perception across various educational programs.

Given that perceptions were measured using Likert scales, this chi-square findings should be treated as exploratory. More suitable non-parametric tests (e.g., Kruskal–Wallis and Mann–Whitney) would likely lead to the same overall conclusion: students' perceptions of ChatGPT are largely consistent across age, sex, and academic program, which reinforces the idea that ChatGPT has become a broadly accepted tool across the FCIC student body.

***Table 3.1 Relationship between Socio-Demographic Profile and Students' Perception of The Use of Chat GPT***

| Socio-demographic Profile | Chi-Square Value | df | Contingency Coefficient | p- value | Significance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Age | 16.373[a] | 9 | .190 | 0.059 | Not Significant |
| Sex | 2.154[a] | 3 | .013 | 0.541 | Not Significant |
| Program | 28.316[a] | 27 | .247 | 0.395 | Not Significant |

## Ethical Considerations on ChatGPT Utilization

The data in Table 4.1 provides a clear picture of how students feel about the ethical implications of using ChatGPT in their academic work. Overall, students express concern that using ChatGPT for assignments might diminish the value of their education (weighted mean = 3.97, "Agree"). This suggests that many students are mindful of how the tool may affect their academic integrity. However, they report more neutral positions when it comes to the idea of relying on ChatGPT too much (mean = 3.40) or using it to deepen their learning (mean = 3.24). This shows that although students appreciate the tool's convenience, they remain cautious about relying on it too heavily in their study habits. Their opinions on using ChatGPT regularly also reflect this caution (mean = 3.17). At the same time, students appreciate ChatGPT's strengths, particularly its ability to provide immediate, personalized feedback on assignments (mean = 4.13, "Agree" to "Strongly Agree"). They are also aware of the tool's limitations, such as its potential to give inaccurate or off-topic responses (means of 4.18 and 4.16, both in the "Agree" to "Strongly Agree" range). There is a consensus that ChatGPT is helpful for specific academic tasks, such as brainstorming or drafting initial ideas (mean = 3.92, "Agree"). Students also strongly agree that its use should be guided by clear institutional policies (mean = 4.26, "Strongly Agree") and that ChatGPT-assisted work should be properly disclosed when submitted (mean = 4.14, "Agree").

These findings align with previous research. Lo (2023) underscores the importance of educators providing ethical guidance on the use of AI tools, a sentiment echoed by the students in this study, who likewise call for clearer institutional policies. Welding (2023) also notes that unclear or missing guidelines can create confusion, a concern similarly raised by the students in this study. Mhlanga (2023) supports the idea of proactive education on responsible AI use, which matches the students' awareness of ChatGPT's limitations and their desire for careful, guided use. Taken together, the results suggest that high levels of personal use can coexist with a strong desire for institutional regulation, indicating that students do not view policy as a threat to their autonomy but as a framework that can help them use AI tools more responsibly.

*Table 4.1 Student Ethical Considerations on ChatGPT Utilization*

| No. | Indicator | Weighted Mean | Verbal Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 9 | The institution needs clear policies and guidelines in place to address the use of ChatGPT. | 4.26 | Highly Ethical |
| 6 | I understand generative AI technologies like ChatGPT can generate output that is out of context or inappropriate. | 4.18 | Very Ethical |
| 7 | I understand generative AI technologies like ChatGPT can generate output that is factually inaccurate output. | 4.16 | Very Ethical |
| 10 | I believe it is essential to disclose the use of ChatGPT when submitting academic work. | 4.14 | Very Ethical |
| 5 | I think ChatGPT can provide me with personalized and immediate feedback and suggestions for my assignments. | 4.13 | Very Ethical |
| 1 | ChatGPT to complete assignments undermines the value of university education. | 3.97 | Very Ethical |
| 8 | ChatGPT utilization should be allowed for specific academic tasks (e.g., brainstorming, initial drafts, language practice). | 3.92 | Very Ethical |
| 2 | I can become over-reliant on ChatGPT. | 3.40 | Ethical |
| 3 | I am willing to invest time and effort to utilize ChatGPT for learning better. | 3.24 | Ethical |
| 4 | I envision integrating ChatGPT into my learning practices in the future. | 3.17 | Ethical |
| **Overall** | | **3.86** | **Very Ethical** |

*Legend:*

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *4.21 – 5.00* | *Highly Ethical* | *1.81 – 2.60* | *Slightly Ethical* |
| *3.41 – 4.20* | *Very Ethical* | *1.00 – 1.80* | *Non-Ethical* |
| *2.61 – 3.40* | *Ethical* | | |

**Students' Extent of Use of ChatGPT**

The data in Table 5.1 highlights how frequently students use ChatGPT for various purposes in their academic activities. On average, students reported using ChatGPT "Often" across multiple categories. They use it to save time (mean = 4.05), generate accurate outputs (mean = 3.99), and gain unique insights (mean = 3.90). Additionally, students report that ChatGPT increases their interest and motivation to learn (mean = 3.63), improves their communication skills (mean = 3.74), enhances their reading and writing abilities through proofreading support (mean = 3.83), and strengthens their digital competence (mean = 3.94). The tool is also used for improving problem-solving skills (mean = 3.96) and overall learning

(mean = 3.71). The overall mean of 3.86 indicates that students frequently use ChatGPT across various learning activities, highlighting its significant role in their academic routines.

Two broad patterns of use emerge from these items. First, there are productivity-oriented uses (e.g., saving time, generating accurate outputs, gaining unique insights), suggesting that students rely on ChatGPT to optimize study efficiency and manage workloads. Second, there are skill-development uses (e.g., improving problem-solving, communication, reading, writing, and digital competence), indicating that ChatGPT is also viewed as a tool for continuous learning and personal development. Although a formal factor analysis was beyond the scope of this study, future research could use such techniques to more rigorously identify these clusters and design targeted support or guidelines around them.

These findings align with existing research, which underscores ChatGPT's potential to enhance education and research (Abbas et al., 2023). The frequent use of the tool by students supports its growing value in academic settings (Sallam et al., 2024), demonstrating its diverse applications for learning (Essel et al., 2022). However, concerns about authenticity and ethical issues such as plagiarism have been highlighted in previous studies (Dwivedi et al., 2023), suggesting that the integration of ChatGPT into education must be approached with careful consideration. While students appreciate the tool's ability to personalize learning and engage them (Abdaljaleel et al., 2023), they also emphasize the need to address accuracy and plagiarism issues (Chatterjee et al., 2020; Forman et al., 2023). The findings reinforce the importance for higher education institutions of cultivating critical evaluation skills and implementing responsible usage strategies (Kalla et al., 2023).

***Table 5.1: Students' Extent of Use of ChatGPT***

| No. | Indicator | Weighted Mean | Verbal Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | I use ChatGPT to save time. | 4.05 | Often |
| 4 | I use ChatGPT to generate accurate output. | 3.99 | Often |
| 9 | I use ChatGPT to improve my problem-solving skills. | 3.96 | Often |
| 8 | I use ChatGPT to improve my digital competence. | 3.94 | Often |
| 3 | I use ChatGPT to provide unique insights and perspectives that I may not have thought of myself. | 3.90 | Often |
| 1 | I use ChatGPT in my learning practices. | 3.84 | Often |
| 7 | I use ChatGPT to improve my reading and writing abilities (proofreading) | 3.83 | Often |
| 6 | I use ChatGPT to improve my communication skills. | 3.74 | Often |
| 10 | I use ChatGPT frequently for learning. | 3.71 | Often |
| 5 | I use ChatGPT to increase my interest and motivation in learning. | 3.63 | Often |
| **Overall** | | **3.86** | **Often** |

*Legend:*

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *4.21 – 5.00* | *Always* | *1.81 – 2.60* | *Rarely* |
| *3.41 – 4.20* | *Often* | *1.00 – 1.80* | *Never* |
| *2.61 – 3.40* | *Sometimes* | | |

**Significant Relationship Between the Socio-Demographic Profile and Students' Extent of Use of ChatGPT**

***Table 6.1 Relationship between Socio-Demographic Profile and Students' Extent of Use of ChatGPT***

| Socio-demographic Profile | Chi-Square Value | df | Contingency Coefficient | p- value | Significance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Age | 13.089[a] | 12 | 0.171 | 0.363 | Not Significant |
| Sex | 11.264[a] | 4 | 0.159 | 0.024 | Significant |
| Program | 45.679[a] | 36 | 0.308 | 0.129 | Not Significant |

The analysis of socio-demographic profiles in relation to ChatGPT use provided several key insights. For age, the chi-square value was 13.089 with a p-value of 0.363, indicating no statistically significant difference in ChatGPT usage across different age groups. The weak contingency coefficient of 0.171 suggests that age had little impact on how frequently or in what manner students used ChatGPT. In terms of academic program, the chi-square value was 45.679 with a p-value of 0.129, which exceeded the 0.05 threshold, suggesting no significant difference in usage across different programs. Despite the moderate association indicated by the contingency coefficient of 0.308, the variation in ChatGPT use was not significantly influenced by the students' educational programs.

For sex, the chi-square value was 11.264 with a p-value of 0.024, which is below the 0.05 significance threshold and would typically be interpreted as statistically significant. However, because extent-of-use scores were derived from Likert-scale itemsm,, chi-square is not the most appropriate test for comparing groups on this variable. More suitable non-parametric tests such as the Mann–Whitney U test are recommended. Considering this, the apparent sex difference is treated as tentative and is not foregrounded as a central finding of the study. Instead, the weight of the evidence—across age, sex, and program—indicates that patterns of ChatGPT use are broadly similar across demographic groups.

This overall uniformity suggests that institutional policies, support programs, and AI literacy initiatives can be designed at the college-wide level, with only minor tailoring needed for specific subgroups, rather than requiring separate strategies for each demographic category.

**Policy Development for ChatGPT Usage**

The study highlights the widespread use of ChatGPT among FCIC College students and proposes a series of steps to manage its academic use responsibly. These include drafting a policy that outlines acceptable use and ethical guidelines, seeking feedback from the academic community, presenting the policy for approval by administrators and faculty, and implementing it through handbooks, syllabi, and orientation sessions. This approach seeks to balance innovation with academic integrity, ensuring that ChatGPT is used ethically and responsibly in educational settings.

## CONCLUSION

### Summary of Findings

The study found that FCIC students aged 18 to 24, especially females in Education, Business, Criminology, and IT, commonly use ChatGPT. While students appreciate its ease of use, they also recognize its limitations and ethical concerns. Usage patterns did not differ by age or program but varied by sex. Students emphasized the need for institutional guidelines to support ethical and responsible use of ChatGPT, which served as the basis for formulating the policy recommendation.

### Conclusion

The study shows that younger female students, especially those in Education and Business Administration, frequently use ChatGPT and recognize its benefits while also acknowledging its limitations. The findings suggest a need for targeted support and mentorship programs for female students. Institutions are encouraged to establish clear ethical guidelines for AI use, with particular emphasis on academic integrity and data privacy. Ongoing research is recommended to further examine the demographic factors that influence AI tool usage and to ensure equitable access for all learners. Additionally, integrating AI literacy into the curriculum can help students use these technologies responsibly. This highlights the need for proactive policies that maximize ChatGPT's educational benefits while maintaining high academic standards.

### Recommendations

Based on the results of the study, the following are recommended:

1. Establish clear institutional policies on ethical AI use to address academic integrity, plagiarism, and appropriate usage.
2. Implement educational programs to raise awareness about the ethical implications of ChatGPT and train students in its responsible use.
3. Provide resources to help students use ChatGPT as a supplementary tool for tasks like brainstorming and initial drafts, encouraging original work.
4. Enhance the curriculum to improve students' critical evaluation skills for assessing the accuracy of ChatGPT's outputs.
5. Continuously monitor ChatGPT usage and its impact on learning outcomes to adjust policies and support structures accordingly.

## REFERENCES


Abdelkader, O. A. (2023). ChatGPT's influence on customer experience in digital marketing: Investigating the moderating roles. *Heliyon*, *9*(8), e18770. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e18770

Adiguzel, T., Kaya, M. H., & Cansu, F. K. (2023). Revolutionizing education with AI: Exploring the transformative potential of ChatGPT. In Contemporary Educational Technology (Vol. 15, Issue 3). Bastas. https://doi.org/10.30935/cedtech/131

Alneyadi, S., & Wardat, Y. (2023). ChatGPT: Revolutionizing student achievement in the electronic magnetism unit for eleventh-grade students in Emirates schools. Contemporary Educational Technology, 15(4). https://doi.org/10.30935/cedtech/13417

Bodani, N., Lal, A., Maqsood, A., Altamash, S., Ahmed, N., & Heboyan, A. (2023). Knowledge, Attitude, and Practices of General Population Toward Utilizing ChatGPT: A Cross-sectional Study. SAGE Open, 13(4). https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440231211079

Bonsu, E., & Baffour-Koduah, D. (2023). From the consumers' side: Determining students' perception and intention to use ChatGPT in Ghanaian higher education. https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-2686760/v1

Borthick, A. F., Jones, D. R., & Wakai, S. (2003). Designing Learning Experiences within Learners' Zones of Proximal Development (ZPDs): Enabling Collaborative Learning On-Site and Online. *Journal of Information Systems*, *17*(1), 107–134. https://doi.org/10.2308/jis.2003.17.1.107

Chan, C. K. Y., & Hu, W. (2023). Students' voices on generative AI: perceptions, benefits, and challenges in higher education. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 20(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00411-8

Chatterjee, S., Majumdar, D., Misra, S., & Damaševičius, R. (2020). Adoption of mobile applications for teaching-learning process in rural girls' schools in India: an empirical study. Education and Information Technologies, 25(5), 4057–4076. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-020-10168-6

Dempere, J., Modugu, K., Hesham, A., & Ramasamy, L. K. (2023). The impact of ChatGPT on higher education. *Frontiers in Education*, *8*. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2023.1206936

el Ghalayini, Y., & Zarrad, R. G. (n.d.). Assessing Students' Perception of the Effectiveness of ChatGPT in Undergraduate Writing Courses in Tunisia.

Essel, H. B., Vlachopoulos, D., Essuman, A. B., & Amankwa, J. O. (2024). ChatGPT effects cognitive skills of undergraduate students: Receiving instant responses from AI-based

conversational large language models (LLMs). Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 6. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2023.100198

Firat, M. (2023). What ChatGPT means for universities: Perceptions of scholars and students. *Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching*, *6*(1), 57–63. https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2023.6.1.22

Forman, N., Udvaros, J., & Avornicului, M. S. (2023). Araştırma Makalesi ChatGPT: A new study tool shaping the future for high school students. International Journal of Advanced Natural Sciences and Engineering Researchers, 4(4), 95–102. https://doi.org/10.59287/ijanser.2023.7.4.562

Fulmer, R. (2018, December 13). *Using psychological artificial intelligence (Tess) to relieve symptoms of depression and anxiety: Randomized controlled trial*. JMIR Mental Health. https://mental.jmir.org/2018/4/e64/

Gapud, A. ,Ding, L., Li, T., Jiang, S., (2023). Students' perceptions of using ChatGPT in a physics class as a virtual tutor. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *20*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00434-1

Gill, S. S., & Kaur, R. (2023). ChatGPT: Vision and challenges. *Internet of Things and CyberPhysical Systems*, *3*, 262–271. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iotcps.2023.05.004

Halaweh, M. (2023). ChatGPT in education: Strategies for responsible implementation. *Contemporary Educational Technology*, *15*(2). https://doi.org/10.30935/cedtech/13036

Heaven, W.D (2023). ChatGPT is going to change education, not destroy it. MIT TechnologyReview.https://www.technologyreview.com/2023/04/06/1071059/chatgptchange-not-destroy-education-openai/

Hernandez, Alexander. (2023, November). Predicting the Use Behavior of Higher Education Students on ChatGPT Evidence from the Philippines. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/376452880

Hwang, G. J., Xie, H., Wah, B. W., & Gašević, D. (2020). Vision, challenges, roles and research issues of Artificial Intelligence in Education. In *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence* (Vol. 1). Elsevier B.V. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2020.100001

Jangjarat, K., Kraiwanit, T., Limna, P., & Sonsuphap, R. (2023). Public perceptions towards ChatGPT as the Robo-Assistant. Online Journal of Communication and Media Technologies, 13(3). https://doi.org/10.30935/ojcmt/13366

Kalla, D., & Kuraku, S. (2023). Study and Analysis of Chat GPT and its Impact on Different Fields of Study. In International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology (Vol. 8, Issue 3). www.ijisrt.com

Kamalov, F., Santandreu Calonge, D., & Gurrib, I. (2023). New Era of Artificial Intelligence in Education: Towards a Sustainable Multifaceted Revolution. Sustainability

(Switzerland), 15(16). https://doi.org/10.3390/su151612451

Kloosterman M. (2023, October 24). Using ChatGPT to support student-led inquiry. Edutopia. https://www.edutopia.org/article/using-chatgpt-support-student-led-inquiry/

Klos, Maria Carolina. (2021, August 12). *Artificial Intelligence-Based Chatbot for Anxiety and Depression in University Students: Pilot Randomized Controlled Trial*. PubMed.

Kumar, D., Librarian, K., & College, B. S. (n.d.). ChatGPT use among University Students: an exploratory study. https://ssrn.com/abstract=4636198

Limna, P., Kraiwanit, T., Jangjarat, K., Klayklung, P., & Chocksathaporn, P. (2023). The use of ChatGPT in the digital era: Perspectives on chatbot implementation. *Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching*, *6*(1), 64–74. https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2023.6.1.32

Lo, C. K. (2023). What Is the Impact of ChatGPT on Education? A Rapid Review of the Literature. In Education Sciences (Vol. 13, Issue 4). MDPI. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13040410

Lund, B. D., & Wang, T. (2023). *Chatting about ChatGPT: How may AI and GPT impact academia and libraries?* https://ssrn.com/abstract=4333415

Lyss Welding. (2023, March 17). Half of college students say using AI is cheating | BestColleges. BestColleges.com. https://www.bestcolleges.com/research/collegestudents-ai-tools-survey/

Mabuan, R. A. (2024). ChatGPT and ELT: Exploring Teachers' Voices. International Journal of Technology in Education, 7(1), 128–153. https://doi.org/10.46328/ijte.523

Mandal, A., Ali, A., & Bhatia, M. (2023). Gender differences in technology use among university students: Insights from the digital era. International Journal of Technology and Human Interaction, 19(1), 1-18. https://doi.org/10.4018/IJTHI.20230101.oa1

Mhlanga, D. (n.d.). Open AI in Education, the Responsible and Ethical Use of ChatGPT Towards Lifelong Learning. https://ssrn.com/abstract=4354422

Montenegro-Rueda, M., Fernández-Cerero, J., Fernández-Batanero, J. M., & López-Meneses, E. (2023). Impact of the Implementation of ChatGPT in Education: A Systematic Review. In Computers (Vol. 12, Issue 8). Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute (MDPI). https://doi.org/10.3390/computers12080153

Ngo, T. T. A. (2023). The Perception by University Students of the Use of ChatGPT in Education. International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning, 18(17), 4–19. https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v18i17.39019

Obenza, B. N., Salvahan, A., Rios, A. N., & Solo, A. (2023). University Students' Perception and Use of ChatGPT: Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Higher Education Article in. International Journal of Human Computing Studies. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10360697

Rahman, M. M., & Watanobe, Y. (2023). ChatGPT for Education and Research: Opportunities, Threats, and Strategies. *Applied Sciences (Switzerland)*, *13*(9). https://doi.org/10.3390/app13095783

Roumeliotis, K. I., & Tselikas, N. D. (2023). ChatGPT and Open-AI Models: A Preliminary Review. In Future Internet (Vol. 15, Issue 6). MDPI. https://doi.org/10.3390/fi15060192

Sallam, M., Barakat, M., & Khatib, S. el. (n.d.). ChatGPT Usage and Attitudes are Driven by Perceptions of Usefulness, Ease of Use, Risks, and Psycho-Social Impact: A Study among University Students in the UAE. https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-3905717/v1

Schindler, L. A., Burkholder, G. J., Morad, O. A., & Marsh, C. (2017). Computer-based technology and student engagement: a critical review of the literature. In International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education (Vol. 14, Issue 1). Springer Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-017-0063-0

Shoufan, A. (2023). Exploring Students' Perceptions of ChatGPT: Thematic Analysis and Follow-Up Survey. IEEE Access, 11, 38805–38818. https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2023.3268224

Singh, H., Tayarani-Najaran, M., & Yaqoob, M. (2023). Exploring computer science students' perception of ChatGPT in higher education: A descriptive and correlation study. *Education Sciences*, *13*(9), 924. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13090924

Strzelecki, A. (2023). Exploring the adoption of AI tools in higher education: The role of age and familiarity. Journal of Educational Technology Systems, 51(2), 145-161. https://doi.org/10.1177/00472395221089176

Strzelecki, A. (2023). To use or not to use ChatGPT in higher education? A study of students' acceptance and use of technology. *Interactive Learning Environments*. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2023.2209881

Tiwari, C. K., Bhat, M. A., Khan, S. T., Subramaniam, R., & Khan, M. A. I. (2023). What drives students toward ChatGPT? An investigation of the factors influencing adoption and usage of ChatGPT. Interactive Technology and Smart Education. https://doi.org/10.1108/ITSE-04-2023-0061

Tlili, A., Shehata, B., Adarkwah, M. A., Bozkurt, A., Hickey, D. T., Huang, R., & Agyemang, B. (2023). What if the devil is my guardian angel: ChatGPT as a case study of using chatbots in education. Smart Learning Environments, 10(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-023-00237-x

Ugwu, F., Ugwuanyi, R., Mbajiorgu, O., & Nnadi, C. (n.d.). Use of Social Media for Research and Scholarly Research Outputs Use of Social Media for Research and

Scholarly Research Outputs of Librarians in Two Universities in Enugu State of Librarians in Two Universities in Enugu State Use of Social Media for Research and Scholarly Research Outputs of Librarians in Two Universities in Enugu State. https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac

Umali, J. N. D. (2024). Artificial Intelligence Technology Management of Teachers, Learners Motivation and Challenges Encountered. International Journal of Educational Research.https://www.ijmcer.com/wpcontent/uploads/2024/06/IJMCER_MM063082 1880.pdf

Valova, I., Mladenova, T., & Kanev, G. (2024). Students' Perception of ChatGPT Usage in Education. In IJACSA) International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications (Vol. 15, Issue 1). www.ijacsa.thesai.org

Vasquez-Cano, E. (2023). Student perceptions of AI tools in higher education: A comparative analysis. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 20(1), 32. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00436-5

Verma, M. (n.d.). *Novel Study on AI-Based Chatbot (ChatGPT) Impacts on Traditional Library Management*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/368608640

von Garrel, J., & Mayer, J. (2023). Artificial Intelligence in studies—use of ChatGPT and AIbased tools among students in Germany. Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 10(1). https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-02304-7

Yilmaz, H., Maxutov, S., Baitekov, A., & Balta, N. (2023). Student Attitudes towards Chat GPT: A Technology Acceptance Model Survey. International Educational Review, 1(1), 57–83. https://doi.org/10.58693/ier.114

Yilmaz, R., & Karaoglan Yilmaz, F. G. (2023). Augmented intelligence in programming learning: Examining student views on the use of ChatGPT for programming learning. Computers in Human Behavior: Artificial Humans, 1(2), 100005. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbah.2023.100005

Uzumcu, O., Acilmis, H. Do Innovative Teachers use AI-powered Tools More Interactively? A Study in the Context of Diffusion of Innovation Theory. *Tech Know Learn* **29**, 1109–1128 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10758-023-09687-1

Zhang, K., & Aslan, A. B. (2021). AI technologies for education: Recent research & future directions. In *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence* (Vol. 2). Elsevier B.V. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2021.100025