

25-03-2026

Students' trust toward AI-generated outcomes in English Language learning

Firdaus Ditya Pamungkas & Rizqi Akbarani

To cite this article: Pamungkas, F. D., & Akbarani, R. (2026). Students' trust toward AI-generated outcomes in English language learning. *Priviet Social Sciences Journal*, 6(3), 479–490. <https://doi.org/10.55942/pssj.v6i3.1614>

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.55942/pssj.v6i3.1614>



Follow this and additional works at: <https://journal.privietlab.org/index.php/PSSJ>
Priviet Social Sciences Journal is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

This PSSJ: Original Article is brought to you for free and open access by Privietlab. It has been accepted for inclusion in Priviet Social Sciences Journal by an authorized editor of Privietlab Journals

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use are available at: <https://journal.privietlab.org/index.php/PSSJ/about>



Students' trust toward AI-generated outcomes in English Language learning

Firdaus Ditya Pamungkas¹ & Rizqi Akbarani²

¹Faculty of Civil Engineering, Universitas Soerjo, Ngawi, East Java, Indonesia

²Faculty of Islamic Civilisation History, UIN Kiai Ageng Muhammad Besari Ponorogo, East Java, Indonesia

*e-mail: fidityapamungkas@gmail.com

Received 31 January 2026

Revised 18 March 2026

Accepted 25 March 2026

ABSTRACT

The emergence of Artificial Intelligence in the education sector has risen rapidly. AI offers several conveniences, particularly for university students, as a tool that can help overcome the challenges of academic learning. However, students do not full and uncritically trust the outcomes generated by AI. This study aimed to explore the extent of students' trust in AI-generated outcomes, especially ChatGPT in English language learning. A descriptive quantitative was employed, with a questionnaire used as the primary data collection instrument. The participants of this study were 30 first year university students from non-English program at the same institution. The results indicates that students generally perceive AI outcomes, especially ChatGPT as beneficial for learning English, they continue to use AI as a supportive too rather than as a substitute for completing all academic tasks. In addition, students tend to use AI only when academic tasks or specific learning needs require it, rather than relying on it continuously. Overall, AI serves as an effective support for students in English language learning when used appropriately and its suitable contexts. So, this research can be implied in English learning where teacher or lecturer should not discourage the use of generative AI but instead guide students in verifying and critically evaluating AI-generated content. Thus, the use of AI in English learning requires clear ethical guidelines and academic policies so that it can be used optimally without ignoring the principles of honesty and academic responsibility.

Keywords: students' trust; AI outcomes; higher education; English language learning

priviet lab.
RESEARCH & PUBLISHING



1. INTRODUCTION

In the past ten years or so, Artificial Intelligence (AI) has revolutionized the way humans produce and/or access knowledge. In the realm of higher learning, AI is not only a technological innovation but a new kind of learning environment that influences learning behaviour among students (Lukman et al., 2024). There are various AI-based tools such as recommendation systems, natural language processing, and machine learning, which facilitate students with instant feedback and learning assistance (Budiyanto et al., 2025). AI tools can identify the learning needs of the students and present information in an appropriate way to facilitate independent learning (Nursyahida et al., 2024). In such a way, AI is a significant actor in the learning process rather than a passive tool.

However, as the use of artificial intelligence (AI) by students continues to grow, a new trend has been identified in the way this technology is considered and used in academic activities. In this regard, AI is often considered an alternative source of knowledge, which is recognized as quick, objective, and exhaustive (Rinekso et al., 2025). In some cases, this technology has even been considered an academic "authority" by students (Pramerta, 2025). This assumption, in turn, has created a new trend in the interaction of students with AI technology, in which the reliability and accuracy of AI have been considered a critical factor in academic decision-making (Rifky, 2024). However, the capabilities of AI technology, based on data, algorithms, and probabilities, have limitations, including bias, contextual mistakes, and conceptual oversimplification (Sabariah et al., 2024).

In English language learning, learners face complex challenges in linguistic, cognitive, and affective aspects (Fitria, 2023). Learners are required to master English language skills in theoretical and practical aspects, such as reading, writing, listening, and speaking, with substantial practice and feedback for each skill (Kusrini & Amalia, 2021). There are various conveniences offered by artificial intelligence (AI) technology, such as grammar correction, instant translation, vocabulary improvement, and even talking practice (Nursyahida et al., 2024). English language learning with the aid of AI technology offers opportunities for more flexible and differentiated learning, especially for learners with different levels and learning styles (Rukiati et al., 2023). However, there are issues concerning English language learning with the aid of AI technology, such as learners' real understanding of English language processes or just producing output that may seem correct (Sahmaniasl, 2024).

In this context, the concept of student trust in AI-generated results emerges as a key area of scientific research. The concept of trust can be described as students' confidence in the accuracy, credibility, and utility of AI-generated results in the English language learning process (Martín-Moncunill & Alonso Martínez, 2025). A strong level of trust can not only facilitate the extensive use of AI, but it can also, to a certain extent, undermine the development of critical thinking skills among students in identifying errors and inaccuracies in AI-generated results. On the other hand, a weak level of trust can limit the use of AI, despite its significant potential in the English language learning process (Martín-Moncunill & Alonso Martínez, 2025; Rukiati et al., 2023). Therefore, understanding the development of student trust, its determinants, and its implications for the English language learning process and learning outcomes can be seen as a key prerequisite for the development of critical learning strategies (Holzer & Daumiller, 2023).

This study focuses on generative AI tools, particularly ChatGPT, as a widely used application among students for academic writing tasks. Chat GPT is one of generative AI that most used among students where Chat GPT can produce coherent and contextually relevant text based on user input, which supports various academic activities such as drafting essays, generating ideas, and summarizing information. Its accessibility and efficiency have contributed to its widespread adoption in educational settings (Bukartaite & Hooper, 2023). However, the increasing use of ChatGPT also raises important questions regarding students' trust in AI-generated outputs. Trust is important factor that enable individuals to use a technology freely, without concern, and with a sense of security (To & Trinh, 2021). So, trust contribute positively to the acceptance and use of Chat GPT by university students. Trust in this context can be understood as students' perceptions of the accuracy, reliability, and credibility of the information produced by the AI. A higher level of trust may lead students to rely more heavily on AI outputs without verification, while lower levels of trust may encourage more critical evaluation and cross-

checking practices. Therefore, examining how students develop and express trust toward generative AI is essential to understanding their academic behaviour and responsible use of such technologies.

Several previous studies have shown that the use of AI like Chat GPT in English language learning, especially in the context of higher education, has received significant research interest in Indonesia. In one study by (Nasho Ah-Pine & Awuye, 2025), their research revealed significant variation in students' confidence regarding the reliability of ChatGPT, influenced by their prior experience with AI, their understanding of its limitations and their strategies for cross-verifying information. Key concerns include ethical considerations, such as fears of academic dishonesty and potential biases in AI-generated content. The findings suggest a need for clear guidelines on the appropriate use of generative AI in academic settings.

Another research from (Hertiki et al., 2025) found that using Chat GPT in English learning have many benefits, such as time efficiency, enhanced grammar and vocabulary knowledge, increased productivity, promotion of independent learning, and adaptability to diverse learning needs. However, challenges like over-reliance, overly general responses, technical disruptions, the necessity for specific prompts, and limitations in providing credible academic sources were also identified. So, this research underscored ChatGPT's potential as a supplementary tool that supported language learning while highlighting the importance of human guidance in maintaining educational balance.

In addition, (Devi et al., 2025) examined students' direct experiences in using ChatGPT for improving their English language acquisition. The research finding emphasized that students' trust in AI is largely influenced by their direct experiences and understanding of its ease of use and quick response. In general terms, it appears that students' trust in AI depends on various factors and conditions.

Another study from (Deep et al., 2025), indicated that ChatGPT enhances learning outcomes in ESL by helping students improve their writing skills, grammar proficiency, and speaking fluency. Moreover, it fostered student engagement due to its personalized feedback and accessible learning resources. There were, however, concerns about plagiarism, factual errors, and dependency on AI tools. Although ChatGPT and similar models present promising opportunities and benefits in ESL education, there is a need for structured implementation and ethical guidance.

Another research by (Fitriani & Rini, 2025), found that the reliability and consistency of AI feedback were examined in the context of assessing students' writing tests. The study found that although AI was consistent in providing feedback, the level of quality and depth of feedback affected the level of trust that the students had in the output generated by AI. This study is consistent with the argument that trust among students is not just based on the ease and speed with which AI generates output but is also based on the perceptions of the accuracy of the output generated in an academic setting.

Another study highlighting aspects of student perception and trust was conducted by (Aeni et al., 2025), who compared automated and human assessment in English speaking skills learning. This study found that students tended to value AI like Chat GPT as an efficient and objective practice tool but remained sceptical of its ability to capture the nuances of communication and pragmatic aspects of language. This result led students to place greater trust in a hybrid assessment model, where AI serves as an initial supporter and the lecturer as the primary assessor. These findings suggest that student trust in AI is conditional and heavily influenced by the type of language skill being learned.

Further research on some aspects of student perception and trust, carried out by (Aeni et al., 2025), examined the application of AI in teaching and assessing students' acquisition of English-speaking skills. The research findings reveal that students trust AI as an effective means for improving their speaking skills but are sceptical about its potential for understanding communicative and pragmatic features of language. Therefore, students preferred a combination of AI and human assessment, where AI is used as an aid and the instructor as the main assessor. This research finding suggests that students' trust in AI is conditional and largely depends on the language skill being acquired.

This study is based on a review of previous studies and proposes that, despite the acceptance and popularity of artificial intelligence (AI) especially Chat GPT in learning and teaching the English language, students' trust in AI outcomes is partial and depends on certain contexts. Most studies on the topic focus on perceptions, effectiveness, and experiences related to using AI, while studies on students' trust in

accuracy and credibility in AI outcomes are scarce. Therefore, this study aims to fill a gap in previous studies by conducting a deep investigation into how far students trust AI outcomes in learning and teaching English especially in using Chat GPT.

2. RESEARCH METHOD

This research used a quantitative approach with a descriptive design. Quantitative research is research that used to examine phenomena through research instruments, with data analysed using statistical technique (Abdullah et al., 2022). Quantitative research involved variables that can be measured using specific instruments, which are then analysed using statistical procedures where in this research, researchers used questionnaire instruments used Likert scale that analysed used descriptive statistic based on mean and percentage the questionnaire result.

Researchers provided questionnaire for 30 participants from university students of non-English program where all of participants were first year students from similar university. The questionnaire used Likert type-scale to measure opinion and perception of participants. Likert type-scale is a psychometric instrument used to measure attitudes, opinions, or perceptions in a research context. The scale typically consists of a statement followed by a symmetrical number of responses, ranging from “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree” (Koo & Yang, 2025). The topic and scoring scale of questionnaire in this research can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1. Topic and scoring scale of questionnaires for participants (university students)

Topics of Questionnaire	Scale of scoring
1. Students’ trust toward the accuracy of AI outcomes	1 = strongly disagree 2 = disagree 3 = neutral 4 = agree 5 = strongly agree
2. Students’ critical and verification attitudes towards AI outcomes	
3. Students’ trust toward AI consistency and reliability in English learning	
4. The frequency of students using AI in English learning	1 = never 2 = rarely 3 = sometimes 4 = often 5 = very often

Meanwhile, the statements based on each topic of questionnaire can be seen in Table 2

Table 2. The Statements of each topic of questionnaire

Topics of Questionnaire	Statements of each Topic
1. Students’ trust toward the accuracy of AI outcomes	1. I believe that the answers or explanations provided by AI in English learning are generally accurate.
	2. I find the AI’s grammar correction results reliable.
	3. I am confident that AI can provide correct explanations regarding English sentence structure.
2. Students’ critical and verification attitudes towards AI outcomes	1. I usually double-check AI results before using them in academic assignments.
	2. I compare the AI results with other sources (books, lecturers, or journals) to ensure their accuracy.
	3. Even when using AI, I still strive to understand the material independently.
3. Students’ trust toward AI consistency and reliability in English learning	1. The AI provided consistent answers when I asked similar questions.
	2. I feel the AI can be used repeatedly without compromising the quality of the learning outcomes.

	3	I believe AI is a reliable resource for supporting English learning.
4. The frequency of students using AI in English learning	1	I use AI to help me learn English.
	2	I rely on AI when working on English assignments.
	3	I use AI as a supplementary resource besides books or materials from lecturers.

The data obtained from the questionnaire was arranged and presented in a table form to investigate students’ trust in AI outcomes in learning and teaching English. Data analysis followed three stages: data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing. In the data reduction phase, all the data obtained from the questionnaire were checked, chosen, and arranged according to their relevance to the study. Researchers collected the data results. In the data display phase, the data obtained from the questionnaire were arranged according to their relevance and then presented in a form that can be easily understood based on mean and percentage the data results. Finally, in the conclusion-drawing phase, the data obtained from the questionnaire was interpreted and conclusions were drawn based on observations and differences between the data obtained.

4. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Result

This part presents the results and discussion based on the analysis of the data obtained from the questionnaire on students’ use and trust in artificial intelligence (AI) in learning and teaching English. The data obtained from the questionnaire were analysed descriptively and presented in a table form to make it easier for readers to read and understand the data.

Table 3. Students’ responses toward their trust in accuracy of AI outcomes

Topic	Statements	Categorize	Frequency	Percentage
Students’ trust toward the accuracy of AI outcomes	I believe that the answers or explanations provided by AI in English learning are generally accurate.	Strongly Disagree	0	0%
		Disagree	1	3%
		Neutral	2	7%
		Agree	20	67%
		Strongly Agree	7	23%
	I find the AI's grammar correction results reliable.	Strongly Disagree	0	0%
		Disagree	2	7%
		Neutral	5	17%
		Agree	18	60%
		Strongly Agree	5	16%
	I am confident that AI can provide correct explanations regarding English sentence structure.	Strongly Disagree	0	0%
		Disagree	4	13%
		Neutral	6	20%
		Agree	15	50%
		Strongly Agree	5	17%

Based on Table 3 the questionnaire data collected, the students show a positive inclination towards the accuracy of the results produced by the AI in English language learning. This is based on the fact that, for the first statement, most of the students agreed (67%) and strongly agreed (23%), with none showing strong disagreement. Only a few showed disagreement (3%) and neutrality (7%). This shows that most of

the students have a high level of confidence in the accuracy of the information provided by the AI in English language learning.

Similar results were also observed for the second statement, which dealt with the reliability of the results produced by the AI in English language learning. Sixty percent of the students agreed and strongly agreed that the results produced by the AI are reliable, as they can be used for grammar corrections. However, a few showed neutrality (17%) and disagreement (7%). This shows that most of the students have confidence in the ability of the AI to carry out grammar corrections, though a few are sceptical about the results produced by the AI.

The results for the third statement, which dealt with the ability of the AI to clarify English sentence structures, also showed a high level of positivity. Fifty percent of the students showed agreement and strong agreement, with 20% showing neutrality and 13% showing disagreement. None of the students showed strong disagreement. This shows that most of the students are confident in the ability of the AI to clarify English sentence structures, though they are sceptical about the results produced by the AI compared to the previous items.

Table 4. Students’ responses toward their critical and verification attitudes of AI outcomes

Topic	Statements	Categorize	Frequency	Percentage
Students’ critical and verification attitudes towards AI outcomes	I usually double-check AI results before using them in academic assignments.	Strongly Disagree	0	0%
		Disagree	0	0%
		Neutral	2	7%
		Agree	20	67%
		Strongly Agree	8	26%
	I compare the AI results with other sources (books, lecturers, or journals) to ensure their accuracy.	Strongly Disagree	0	0%
		Disagree	5	17%
		Neutral	7	23%
		Agree	15	50%
		Strongly Agree	3	10%
	Even when using AI, I still strive to understand the material independently.	Strongly Disagree	0	0%
		Disagree	0	0%
		Neutral	3	10%
		Agree	15	50%
		Strongly Agree	12	40%

From the data collected in Table 4, the students show a critical attitude towards the results produced by the AI in English language learning. This is based on the fact that, for the first item, most of the students showed agreement (67%) and strongly agreed (26%), with none showing disagreement and strong disagreement. Only a few showed neutral (7%). This shows that most of the students do not blindly follow the results produced by the AI and, therefore, scrutinize the results before they are integrated into academic assignments.

In the second statement, the responses of the students varied. Half of them agreed, 10% strongly agreed, 23% were neutral, and 17% disagreed. Although most students still have a positive perception of verification practices, the presence of neutral and disagreeing responses indicates that not all students regularly verify the results of AI by other sources of academic information.

Moving on to the third statement, the atmosphere was decidedly positive. 50% agreed and 40% strongly agreed, with only 10% being neutral and no one disagreeing. This indicates that while AI is useful, it does not completely substitute for independent study; rather, it assists in the learning process.

Table 5. Students’ responses toward their trust in AI consistency and reliability in English learning

Topic	Statements	Categorize	Frequency	Percentage
Students’ trust toward AI consistency and reliability in English learning	The AI provided consistent answers when I asked similar questions.	Strongly Disagree	0	0%
		Disagree	9	30%
		Neutral	15	50%
		Agree	6	20%
		Strongly Agree	0	0%
	I feel the AI can be used repeatedly without compromising the quality of the learning outcomes.	Strongly Disagree	0	0%
		Disagree	15	50%
		Neutral	10	33%
		Agree	5	17%
		Strongly Agree	0	0%
	I believe AI is a reliable resource for supporting English learning.	Strongly Disagree	0	0%
		Disagree	7	23%
		Neutral	7	23%
		Agree	13	44%
		Strongly Agree	3	10%

From the data of Table 5, students’ trust toward AI consistency tends to be moderate and not entirely positive. For the first statement, most respondents were neutral (50%), followed by disagree (30%), and only 20% agreed. No respondents strongly agreed or strongly disagreed. This distribution indicates that most students are not fully confident in the consistency of AI’s answers, especially when the same or similar questions are asked repeatedly.

A stronger finding was seen in the second statement. 50% of respondents disagreed, 33% were neutral, and only 17% agreed. No respondents chose the strongly agree category. These data indicate significant doubt among students toward the stability of AI output quality over repeated use, resulting in a limited long-term reliability of AI.

Meanwhile, relatively more positive results were seen in the third statement. With this statement, 44% of respondents agreed and 10% strongly agreed, while 23% were neutral and 23% disagreed. These findings indicate that while students doubt the consistency and stability of AI quality, they still recognize its role as a supporting resource in English language learning.

Table 6 Students’ responses toward their frequencies using AI in English learning

Topic	Statements	Categorize	Frequency	Percentage
The frequency of students using AI in English learning	I use AI to help me learn English.	Never	0	0%
		Rarely	3	10%
		Sometimes	15	50%
		Often	9	30%
		Very Often	3	10%
	I rely on AI when working on English assignments.	Never	0	0%
		Rarely	3	10%
		Sometimes	14	47%
		Often	9	30%
		Very Often	4	13%
	I use AI as a supplementary resource besides books or materials from lecturers.	Never	0	0%
		Rarely	7	23%
		Sometimes	11	37%

	Often	7	23%
	Very Often	5	17%

Analysing [Table 6](#), it can be ascertained that the use of AI in English learning is quite prevalent. In the first statement, most students reported using AI “sometimes” (50%), followed by “often” (30%), and finally “very often” (10%). Only 10% of the students reported using AI “rarely,” with no one reporting that they “never” use it. This indicates that AI is becoming a regular feature of English learning, although its use is situational rather than habitual.

In the second statement, a similar trend was noted. 47% of the students reported using AI “sometimes,” 30% “often,” and 13% “very often” for assignments. Ten percent reported using AI “rarely,” with no one reporting that they “never” use it. This indicates that AI is a commonly used tool for English assignments, although it is not used for every assignment.

In the third statement, the responses were more varied. 37% of the students reported using AI “sometimes,” 23% reported using it “often,” and 17% reported using it “very often” as a supplement. Meanwhile, 23% of the students reported using AI “rarely,” with no one reporting that they “never” use it.

4.2. Discussion

The results obtained and presented in [Table 3](#) reveal that students, on average, have a high level of trust in the results obtained using AI, as they are considered accurate for English language learning. A considerable number of students who agreed or strongly agreed with the three statements presented above reveal that they trust AI as a source of help, especially for obtaining general explanations, grammar correction, and obtaining explanations on sentence structure. This is also in accordance with the defining characteristics of AI, as it can offer immediate responses based on general knowledge of the English language, hence facilitating the processes of English language learning for students ([Nursyahida et al., 2024](#)). Although there were also several students who offered neutral and disagree responses, this also suggests that students have a certain level of trust in the results obtained using AI. This is a critical form of trust, as it implies that students recognize the value of using AI, as well as its limitations, such as a lack of contextual explanations and the fact that it is sometimes wrong. This is a better and healthier form of trust and utilization of AI for English language learning. The fact that different levels of trust were observed about different aspects of English language learning suggests that students have a higher trust level about the mechanical aspects of English, such as grammar correction and the correctness of general explanations, than about the deeper aspects of English, such as sentence structure. All of this suggests that, at the moment, AI is just an auxiliary tool and is not used as a source of authority about English language learning ([Aeni et al., 2025](#)). As a result, it is still very important for teachers to offer conceptual explanations and ensure the comprehensive achievement of students about English language learning.

Moreover, based on the results obtained and presented in [Table 4](#) above, students interact with AI results actively and not in a passive manner. As a result, many students reported that they double-check the results obtained from AI before applying them. Such a position implies that students view AI as a learning device rather than a sole source for learning and mastering the English language ([Sahmaniasl, 2024](#)). However, based on a comparison with other sources, students’ verification of results obtained from AI is inconsistent. Some students failed to regularly benchmark their results obtained from AI with other scholarly sources such as books, teachers, and scholarly journals. Some reasons for such a position may include a high degree of trust in results obtained from AI at the beginning ([Fitriani & Rini, 2025](#)).

However, as indicated by the information in [Table 5](#), there is a marked difference between how reliable AI is as a study guide and how reliable it is in terms of consistency. The inconsistencies in the replies offered by AI may be attributed to its basic nature, whereby it is using probabilities and contexts from what has been written. As such, even if a question has a similar form, it may still elicit a different reply ([Holzer & Daumiller, 2023](#)). Nevertheless, based on the information obtained from the data, despite these inconsistencies, most students still view it as a reliable source for learning and other purposes. As such, it is a force to be reckoned with in terms of learning and mastering the English language. Therefore,

it is safe to say that for one to make optimal use of AI, it should be employed as a supportive learning guide, and its use should be supplemented with other learning tools and a teacher (Rinekso et al., 2025).

Meanwhile, Table 6 reveals that students use AI in moderation and in particular cases in studying English. The recurring word "sometimes" in all three sentences implies that AI is not an integral part of their daily routines. Rather, they use it depending on the situation, such as when the lessons are too complex or when they need to submit assignments (Aeni et al., 2025). This reveals an adaptive and situational approach towards AI use. The significant use of AI for assignments implies that students recognize AI as an efficient tool for their academic needs. However, the lack of repetition for the word "very often" implies that they are being cautious and not too reliant on AI for their assignments. This might be because they are aware of academic integrity and the limitations of AI. Furthermore, AI is an auxiliary tool with diverse usage, which again implies that students are not too reliant on AI and instead view it as an alternative source of information. Rather, they use AI for better comprehension and alternative information or for faster access to information (Sahmaniasl, 2024). AI is an auxiliary tool for learning and is not meant to replace traditional materials such as textbooks and teachers.

5. CONCLUSION

The increasing trend of using AI in the academic process of university students is an area that requires careful examination and consideration. The process of learning English is already complicated and requires fluency in various areas such as reading, listening, speaking, and writing. This makes students more receptive and open-minded about the benefits and advantages that AI can bring into their academic process. Nevertheless, they do not just blindly accept and adopt what AI offers. Instead, they analyse and evaluate what AI offers and then proceed with their academic process. From the results and discussion above, students have a high level of trust and confidence in what AI offers for their English language learning process. Students also do not use AI passively or without consideration but rather demonstrate a high level of critical engagement with the results generated by AI. In addition, the perceived inconsistency of AI responses may stem from students' experience of receiving different answer to similar questions. This can be understood because AI operates based on linguistic probabilities and input context, which may lead to varied responses even when the questions are similar. In the end, Artificial Intelligence should be used as a supportive learning tool rather than as a shortcut to complete all academic tasks, particularly for both students and educators.

This study is limited by its small sample size and focus on a single institution, so the other researcher can improve the research with big sample, many campus, and used other AI like Gemini, Meta, etc. Besides that, the findings of this study have several practical implications. First, teacher or lecturer should not discourage the use of generative AI but instead guide students in verifying and critically evaluating AI-generated content. Second, students need to develop responsible and reflective practices when using AI tools, ensuring that they do not rely solely on generated outputs without validation. This research scaffold students' use of generative AI by integrating verification practices, where students need awareness in the wise of use of AI where AI should be used as a supporting tool, not as a substitute for students' thinking processes, creativity, and academic English skill. Third, educational institutions or university are encouraged to incorporate AI literacy and ethical guidelines into the curriculum to support the responsible use of generative AI. Finally, as trust plays a significant role in students' reliance on AI, it is important to foster a balanced approach that promotes both trust and critical thinking. Thus, the use of AI in English learning requires clear ethical guidelines and academic policies so that it can be used optimally without ignoring the principles of honesty and academic responsibility.

Ethical Approval

No applicable

Informed Consent Statement

No applicable

Authors' Contributions

FDP formulated research topic and title and wrote introduction. RA wrote research methods. FDP distributed questionnaires to students. RA compiled the results FDP wrote discussion and conclusion.

Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors

Data Availability Statement

The data presented in this study are available on request from the corresponding author due to privacy reasons.

Funding

This research received no external funding.

Notes on Contributors

Firdaus Ditya Pamungkas

<https://orcid.org/0009-0009-6129-996X>

Firdaus Ditya Pamungkas is affiliated with Soerjo University, located in Ngawi, East Java, Indonesia. He is an active lecturer who experts in English language teaching. With background of English Literature in bachelor's degree and English Language Education in master's degree, he wrote some research in scope of English linguistic and literature, English education, and development of technology in education.

Rizqi Akbarani

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8368-4230>

Rizqi Akbarani is an active lecturer in UIN Kiai Ageng Muhammad Besari Ponorogo. With her background of English Language Education, both in bachelor and master degree, she active as professional reasearcher and presenter in some local conferences. Her area of expertises are English education, and development of technology in education.

REFERENCES

- Abdullah, K., Jannah, M., Aiman, U., Hasda, S., Fadilla, Z., Taqwin, T., Masita, M., Ardiawan, K. N., & Meilida, E. S. (2022). *Metodologi penelitian kuantitatif*. Yayasan Penerbit Muhamad Zaini.
- Aeni, N., Muhalim, M., Ganteng, H., Tahir, M., & Talib, A. (2025). English education students' perceptions of automated vs human assessment in spoken English proficiency. *Al-Isblab: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 17(3). <https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v17i3.7655>
- Budiyanto, D., Tridinanti, G., Saputri, K., Apriani, E., & Sartika, D. (2025). Artificial intelligence in ELT: Advancing adaptive and personalized language learning. *JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, 13(4), 2151–2161. <https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v13i4.16713>

- Bukartaite, R., & Hooper, D. (2023). Automation, artificial intelligence and future skills needs: An Irish perspective. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 47(10), 163–185. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJTD-03-2023-0045>
- Deep, P. D., Martirosyan, N., Ghosh, N., & Rahaman, M. S. (2025). ChatGPT in ESL higher education: Enhancing writing, engagement, and learning outcomes. *Information*, 16(4), 316. <https://doi.org/10.3390/info16040316>
- Devi, N. N. R. S., Santosa, M. H., & Kusuma, I. P. I. (2025). Investigating experience of university students in using ChatGPT in English learning context. *Journal of Educational Study*, 5(2), 159–170. <https://doi.org/10.36663/joes.v5i2.1069>
- Fitria, T. N. (2023). Integrating English language teaching (ELT) into Islamic boarding schools: A review of strategy and challenges. *Journal of English Language and Pedagogy (JELPA)*, 1(2), 64–78. <https://doi.org/10.51826/jelpa.v1i2.772>
- Fitriani, F., & Rini, P. Z. E. (2025). Can we trust AI to assess writing? An analysis of scoring reliability and feedback consistency. *Jurnal Profesi Keguruan*, 10(1), 66–79. <https://doi.org/10.15294/jpk.v11i1.25849>
- Hertiki, H., Alifiah, F., & Nordin, R. (2025). English education students' perceptions of ChatGPT AI in English learning tool. *Magister Scientiae*, 53(2), 127–137. <https://doi.org/10.33508/mgs.v53i2.5809>
- Holzer, A., & Daumiller, M. (2023). Building trust in the classroom: Perspectives from students and teachers. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-025-00961-7>
- Koo, M., & Yang, S.-W. (2025). Likert-type scale. *Encyclopedia*, 5(1), 18. <https://doi.org/10.3390/encyclopedia5010018>
- Kusrini, N. A. R., & Amalia, E. R. (2021). The influence of integration of four skills to the performance of undergraduate students on TOEFL sample test. *Scholastica: Jurnal Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan*, 3, 61–74.
- Lukman, L., Agustina, R., & Aisy, R. (2024). Problematika penggunaan artificial intelligence (AI) untuk pembelajaran di kalangan mahasiswa STIT Pernalang. *Jurnal Madaniyah*, 13(2), 242–255. <https://doi.org/10.58410/madaniyah.v13i2.826>
- Martín-Moncunill, D., & Alonso Martínez, D. (2025). Students' trust in AI and their verification strategies: A case study at Camilo José Cela University. *Education Sciences*, 15(10), 1307. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15101307>
- Miranty, D., Widiati, U., Cahyono, B. Y., & Suzila, T. I. (2023). Automated writing evaluation tools for Indonesian undergraduate EFL students' writing. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 12(3), 1705. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v12i3.24958>
- Nasho Ah-Pine, E., & Awuye, I. S. (2025). Exploring the trustworthiness of ChatGPT: How students perceive AI reliability in a business school context. *Journal of International Education in Business*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JIEB-09-2024-0123>
- Nursyahida, H. M., Ramadhanti, T., Aulia, N. H. I., Puteri, N., & Tarihoran, N. (2024). The use of AI and its effectiveness in ELT: A systematic review. *Algebra: Jurnal Pendidikan, Sosial dan Sains*, 4(2), 10–18. <https://doi.org/10.58432/algebra.v4i2.1064>
- Pramerta, I. G. P. A. (2025). English language teaching (ELT) policy in the AI era: Challenges and opportunities. *Jurnal Santiaji Pendidikan*, 15(2). <https://doi.org/10.36733/jsp.v15i2.12356>
- Pratama, K. D., & Irawati, T. (2024). English students' perceptions of automated writing evaluation (AWE) in writing engagement at the university level. *EnJourMe: English Journal of Merdeka*, 9(2), 68–82. <https://doi.org/10.26905/enjourme.v9i2.13844>
- Rifky, S. (2024). Dampak penggunaan artificial intelligence bagi pendidikan tinggi. *Indonesian Journal of Multidisciplinary on Social and Technology*, 2(1), 37–42. <https://doi.org/10.31004/ijmst.v2i1.287>
- Rinekso, A. B., Muslim, A. B., & Rodliyah, R. S. (2025). The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) in English language teaching practices: A meta-synthesis study. *ETERNAL (English Teaching Journal)*, 16(2), 465–484. <https://doi.org/10.26877/eternal.v16i2.1691>

- Rukiati, E., Wicaksono, J. A., Taufan, G. T., & Suharsono, D. D. (2023). AI on learning English: Application, benefit, and threat. *Journal of Language, Communication, and Tourism*, 1(2), 32–40. <https://doi.org/10.25047/jlct.v1i2.3967>
- Sabariah, S., Ruffi, R., Rusmawati, R. D., Bandono, A., & Kurniawan, A. (2024). Pemanfaatan AI dalam pengajaran dan pembelajaran. *Resona: Jurnal Ilmiah Pengabdian Masyarakat*, 8(2), 337. <https://doi.org/10.35906/resona.v8i2.2288>
- Sahmaniasl, R. (2024). AI integration in teaching ELT for Iranian intermediate and higher levels learners. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation*, 5(3), 390–393.
- To, A. T., & Trinh, T. H. M. (2021). Understanding behavioral intention to use mobile wallets in Vietnam: Extending the TAM model with trust and enjoyment. *Cogent Business & Management*, 8(1), 1891661. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2021.1891661>