International Journal of Arts and Humanities
ISSN: 3005-3455
DOI: https://doi.org/10.61424/ijah.v4i4.1149
Date Published Online: November 19, 2026
Journal Homepage: https://bluemarkpublishers.com/index.php/IJAH

IJAH
BLUEMARK PUBLISHERS

| RESEARCH ARTICLE

Useful but Not Always Right: Engineering Students' Use of ChatGPT for English Language Learning in a Non-Major Classroom in Bangladesh

Jannatul Ferdous[1] ✉ Riyad Ahamed[2] and Nishat Tasneem[3]
[123]Lecturer, Department of English, Bangladesh Army University of Science and Technology (BAUST), Saidpur, Bangladesh
Corresponding Author: Jannatul Ferdous, **E-mail**: jannatulferdousmou1998@gmail.com

| ABSTRACT
Generative AI tools such as ChatGPT are now part of how many university students study, but we still know little about how students outside English departments use them to learn English. This exploratory survey looked at engineering students taking a non-major English course at a technical university in northern Bangladesh. Sixty-three students answered an online questionnaire with closed and open-ended items on how they use ChatGPT, what benefits they see and what problems they face. Use was very common: 96.8% had used ChatGPT, 55.6% used it daily and 54.0% used it often or always for English-related tasks, mainly for writing help, assignment preparation and generating ideas. Most students agreed that ChatGPT is easy to use (76.2%), gives useful explanations (73.0%) and saves time (71.4%). At the same time, 76.2% said its answers are not always accurate or relevant, 74.6% wanted more guidance on using it, and 66.7% reported that poor internet access limits regular use. More than half (57.1%) held both views together, finding the explanations useful and the answers unreliable. Students who used ChatGPT more often for English reported greater benefits ($\rho = .41$) and more over-reliance ($\rho = .38$), but they were no more likely to notice unreliable output ($\rho = -.14$). Only 39.7% preferred asking ChatGPT to asking a teacher. Open-ended answers pointed to wrong answers, language that is too advanced, and difficulty writing prompts. Because the sample is small, drawn from one institution and based on self-report, the findings describe students' experience and not measured gains in proficiency. They suggest that these students need help in judging ChatGPT's output more than they need encouragement to use it.

| KEYWORDS
ChatGPT; generative artificial intelligence; English as a foreign language; engineering students; non-major English; AI literacy; over-reliance; Bangladesh

| ARTICLE INFORMATION
ACCEPTED: October 21, 2026 **PUBLISHED:** November 19, 2026 **DOI:** https://doi.org/10.61424/ijah.v4i4.1149

1. Introduction

ChatGPT reached university students faster than universities could decide what to do about it. Within a year of its release, students were using it to draft assignments, check grammar, translate, summarise readings and ask the questions they did not want to ask in class. Early commentary pointed to real opportunities for learning and to real risks, including wrong information, plagiarism and the loss of independent thinking (Kasneci et al., 2023). Surveys of students have since shown a similar mix: most hold positive views of generative AI, and many of the same students worry about accuracy and about depending on it too much (Chan & Hu, 2023).

Copyright: © 2026 The Author(s). This open access article is distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC- BY-NC-SA) License (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/), published by Bluemark Publishers.

Language learning is one of the areas where the tool seems most obviously useful. A learner can ask ChatGPT to explain a grammar rule, correct a sentence, suggest a better word or hold a conversation, and can ask again as many times as needed (Kohnke et al., 2023). Reviews of the first wave of research confirm that ChatGPT can widen learning opportunities and support personalised learning in ESL and EFL settings (Li et al., 2024; Lo et al., 2024). The same reviews point out three weaknesses in the evidence. Most studies deal with writing, and reading, speaking and listening have received much less attention. Many studies report what learners think, while few measure what they learn. And the research comes from a narrow range of contexts (Lo et al., 2024; Yang & Li, 2024).

One group that has been largely missed is students who study English as a non-major subject. Engineering students are a good example. Their main interest is their discipline, yet they need English to read textbooks, write laboratory reports, give presentations and, later, to work. In Bangladesh, English is taught throughout school, but many students arrive at university with limited confidence in using it (Hamid & Baldauf, 2008). A non-major English course usually runs for one semester, with a few contact hours a week. This leaves little room for individual feedback. Students in this position have a clear reason to look for help outside the classroom, and ChatGPT is the nearest help available. Research on out-of-class language learning shows that such self-directed use of technology can matter a great deal, but also that learners differ widely in how well they manage it (Lai & Gu, 2011; Reinders & Benson, 2017).

Research on ChatGPT in Bangladeshi higher education is growing. Hasib and Islam (2025) interviewed 20 students at one public university about their academic and non-academic uses. Bristi et al. (2025) examined the attitudes of 159 first-year EFL students towards using ChatGPT for academic writing, and Howlader et al. (2025) modelled acceptance among 729 students at nine universities. These studies tell us that Bangladeshi students have taken up ChatGPT quickly and that they see both value and risk in it. None of them, however, looks at English learning among students of engineering, and none asks how the benefits and the problems that students report relate to how much they use the tool.

This study addresses that gap on a small scale. We surveyed engineering students taking a non-major English course at Bangladesh Army University of Science and Technology (BAUST), a technical university in Saidpur in northern Bangladesh. We asked how often and for what they use ChatGPT, what benefits they perceive for their English, and what difficulties they meet. We also looked at how these answers go together, and we read students' written comments alongside the numbers.

The study makes three modest contributions. It gives a detailed account of ChatGPT use for English learning in a group that the literature has rarely examined: engineering students in a non-major English classroom in a lower-middle-income country. It reports perceived benefits and perceived problems side by side for the same students, which shows how often the two are held together. And it looks at whether students who use ChatGPT more are also more alert to its errors, a question that matters for how teachers respond. Throughout the paper, we treat students' answers as reports of experience. We make no claim that ChatGPT improved anyone's English.

1.1 Research questions

RQ1. How often, and for what purposes, do engineering students in a non-major English course use ChatGPT?

RQ2. What benefits do these students perceive in using ChatGPT for English language learning?

RQ3. What challenges do they report?

RQ4. How are frequency of use, perceived benefits and reported challenges related to one another?

RQ5. What do students' open-ended comments add to the survey results?

2. Conceptual Background and Literature Review

We did not set out to test a theory. We did need a way of thinking about what students were telling us, and three ideas from earlier work helped: the reasons people take up a technology, the trust they place in it, and the knowledge they need to use it well. This section explains each idea and reviews the related research on ChatGPT and language learning.

2.1 ChatGPT as a resource for learning English outside class

ChatGPT lets a learner type a question in ordinary language and receive an answer that can be adjusted on request. For a language learner, this covers a wide range of tasks: explaining a rule, giving examples, correcting a sentence, rewriting a paragraph, translating, suggesting vocabulary and simulating a conversation. Chatbots had been used in language learning before, but a review of that earlier work found that their usefulness was held back by technological limitations and by interest that faded once the novelty wore off (Huang et al., 2022). Generative models removed much of that limit, and reviews of ChatGPT in language education now describe it as a writing assistant, a conversation partner and a source of personalised explanation (Li et al., 2024; Lo et al., 2024).

Writing has received the most attention. In an intervention study with undergraduate ESL students in India, Mahapatra (2024) reported better academic writing after students used ChatGPT for formative feedback, together with positive views of that feedback. Teng (2024) followed 45 EFL learners in Macau who used ChatGPT for writing feedback over a semester and found positive perceptions linked to motivation, self-efficacy and engagement. Others are more cautious. Barrot (2023) and Warschauer et al. (2023) both note that the help ChatGPT gives second-language writers can replace their own effort as easily as it can support it, and that fluent text is not always correct text.

Evidence on other skills is thinner. Karataş et al. (2024) introduced ChatGPT into four weeks of guided activities with 13 foreign-language learners in Turkey, who reported gains in writing, grammar and vocabulary as well as higher motivation. Lo et al. (2024) found comparatively little research on reading, speaking and listening, and few studies that measured performance. What students believe ChatGPT helps with should therefore be kept apart from what it has been shown to improve. That distinction is important for a questionnaire study like ours.

2.2 Perceived usefulness and ease of use

The technology acceptance model holds that people take up a tool mainly when they find it useful and easy to use (Davis, 1989). Studies of ChatGPT broadly support this. In a survey of 405 EFL learners, Liu and Ma (2024) found that learners who saw ChatGPT as useful were more willing to use it for informal English learning, and that this willingness predicted actual use outside the classroom. In Bangladesh, Howlader et al. (2025) found that perceived usefulness, ease of use and perceived risk were all related to students' adoption of ChatGPT, and Bristi et al. (2025) found that both cognitive and affective attitudes predicted first-year EFL students' intention to use it for academic writing, with affective attitudes the stronger predictor.

Acceptance research explains why students use ChatGPT. It says less about whether they use it well. A tool can be easy, useful in the student's eyes and still be used in ways that do little for learning. For that reason, our questionnaire asked about usefulness and ease of use, and we read those answers together with what students said about problems.

2.3 Unreliable output, trust and over-reliance

ChatGPT produces confident, well-formed text whether or not the content is right. The reviews cited above list inaccurate information among the main concerns in language education (Lo et al., 2024), and Bangladeshi students interviewed by Hasib and Islam (2025) mentioned false references and doubts about reliability. For a language learner, this is a particular difficulty. The learner turns to the tool because they do not know the rule or the word, so they are poorly placed to notice when the tool is wrong.

Research on automation offers a useful way of framing the issue. Lee and See (2004) argue that trust in an automated system should be calibrated, meaning that it should match how reliable the system really is. Too little trust leads people to ignore help that would benefit them. Too much leads them to accept output without checking it, a pattern described as automation bias (Parasuraman & Manzey, 2010). In education, the second problem is usually discussed as over-reliance. A systematic review by Zhai et al. (2024) concluded that accepting AI output without question can weaken critical thinking and decision-making. Gerlich (2025) found that heavier use of AI tools was associated with lower critical-thinking scores, and that this link ran through cognitive offloading, the habit of handing mental work to an external aid (Risko & Gilbert, 2016).

Two questions follow for our study. Do students who find ChatGPT useful also recognise that it is unreliable? And do students who use it more become more aware of its errors, or only more dependent on it? Cross-sectional data cannot settle these questions, but it can show which pattern students' reports fit.

2.4 AI literacy and the need for guidance

Using ChatGPT well takes knowledge that students do not pick up automatically. Long and Magerko (2020) define AI literacy as the competencies that let people evaluate AI technologies critically and work with them effectively. Ng et al. (2021) group these competencies under knowing and understanding AI, using and applying it, evaluating and creating with it, and handling ethical issues. For language learners, two practical parts stand out. One is writing prompts that get the help the learner needs, which Yang and Li (2024) identify as a recurring theme in research on ChatGPT for second-language learning. The other is judging the answer, which Bearman et al. (2024) describe as evaluative judgement and see as a central skill in a time of generative AI.

Students and teachers appear to agree that this knowledge has to be taught. Kohnke et al. (2023) argue that both groups need specific digital competencies to use ChatGPT for language learning. Hasib and Islam (2025) call for institutional guidance and for teaching students to think critically about AI output, and UNESCO's guidance on generative AI in education makes a similar case at the level of policy (Miao & Holmes, 2023). Whether students themselves feel they need such guidance, and which students feel it most, has rarely been asked directly.

2.5 The present study

The research reviewed here leaves a specific gap. Studies of ChatGPT and language learning have concentrated on English majors or general EFL populations, on writing and on acceptance. Studies in Bangladesh have looked at university students in general, at academic writing intentions and at the determinants of adoption. We found no study of how engineering students in a non-major English course in Bangladesh use ChatGPT for English, and none that examined how use, perceived benefit, perceived unreliability, over-reliance and the wish for guidance relate to one another in such a group.

The ideas above gave us a simple set of expectations to explore. Students would probably find ChatGPT useful and easy to use (Section 2.2). Many would also report unreliable output (Section 2.3). What we could not predict was how these two views would sit together, whether heavier use would go with more awareness of error or with more dependence, and how many students would want guidance (Section 2.4). The study was designed to describe these patterns in one classroom setting.

3. Method

3.1 Research design

The study used a cross-sectional survey design with a small qualitative component. The closed questions carried most of the weight and described how students use ChatGPT and what they think of it. Four open-ended questions, placed at the end of the same questionnaire, let students explain their experience in their own words. The two kinds of data were collected at the same time, analysed separately and then compared (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). Because the written answers were short, we treat the qualitative part as a supplement to the survey and not as a full qualitative strand. The design is descriptive and exploratory. It can show what students report and how their reports go together, but it cannot show cause and effect.

3.2 Context and participants

The study took place at Bangladesh Army University of Science and Technology (BAUST) in Saidpur, northern Bangladesh. Engineering students at the university take a non-major English course in their first semester, alongside their disciplinary courses.

Participants were recruited through convenience sampling. The questionnaire link was shared with students taking the non-major English course who could be reached by the researcher, and those who agreed completed it. Sixty-three students responded, and all 63 responses were kept. The number of students who received the link was not recorded, so a response rate cannot be given. Thirty-six respondents were men (57.1%) and 27 were women (42.9%). They came from three departments: Computer Science and Engineering (37; 58.7%), Information and Communication Technology (20; 31.7%) and Electrical and Electronic Engineering (6; 9.5%). All but one were in their

first year (Table 1). A convenience sample of this size from one university cannot represent engineering students in general, and we interpret the results with that in mind.

3.3 Instrument

Data were collected with a self-administered online questionnaire written in English for this study (Appendix A). It had 25 items in four parts. The first part asked for department, year of study and gender. The second asked about use: whether the student had ever used ChatGPT, how often they used it, what they used it for (seven listed purposes, with more than one answer allowed and space to add others), how often they used it for English-related tasks, and which English skill they felt it helped most.

The third part contained 13 statements rated on a five-point scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Six statements dealt with perceived benefits. Following the ideas in Section 2.2, they covered ease of learning, confidence, time saving, usefulness of explanations, motivation and ease of use. One statement asked whether the student preferred asking ChatGPT to asking a teacher. Six statements dealt with challenges discussed in Sections 2.3 and 2.4: confusing answers, inaccurate or irrelevant answers, difficulty with speaking and listening practice, over-reliance, poor internet connection and the need for more guidance. None of the statements was negatively worded, so no reverse-scoring was needed.

The fourth part had four open-ended questions. They asked how ChatGPT had helped the student's English, what problems the student had met, how ChatGPT could be better used in non-major English classrooms, and whether the student had any other comments.

The questionnaire measures what students report. It does not measure their English proficiency, and answers about improvement in a skill are students' own judgements.

3.4 Procedure

The questionnaire was administered through Google Forms. Students were told the purpose of the study before they began, and consent was obtained at that point. Responses were collected in two periods. Fifty-three students responded between 15 and 22 November 2025, and a further 10 responded between 15 and 19 July 2026. The form did not ask for names, student numbers or e-mail addresses.

3.5 Data screening

We checked the dataset before analysis. There were no missing values on any closed item, and all responses fell within the valid range. Four points came up, and we report them so that readers can judge the data for themselves.

First, two students answered "No" when asked whether they had ever used ChatGPT, but both went on to report occasional use and to select purposes of use. We left their answers as given. Second, two students chose "Agree" for all 13 rating statements, which may reflect a lack of attention. Third, one respondent was a third-year student and one reported never using ChatGPT. Fourth, two respondents gave word-for-word identical answers to the open-ended questions, and a third repeated one of those answers. The three students' closed answers differed from one another, so they are separate people, and their closed answers were kept. The shared texts were long and polished and did not read like the other students' writing. We cannot tell where they came from, so we counted each shared text once in the qualitative analysis and did not quote from it.

No record was removed from the main analysis. To see whether the first three points affected the results, we repeated the analysis without the six records concerned (Section 4.6). The 10 responses collected in July 2026 did not differ from the earlier ones in perceived benefits or in frequency of use (Mann–Whitney tests, all $p > .10$), and the two sets were combined.

3.6 Quantitative analysis

Closed answers were summarised as frequencies and percentages. For the rating statements, we also report means, standard deviations and the percentage who agreed (a rating of 4 or 5). With 63 respondents, a single student changes a percentage by 1.6 points, so we give 95% confidence intervals for the main percentages, calculated with the Wilson method, which performs well in small samples (Wilson, 1927).

The six benefit statements were intended to reflect one idea, and their internal consistency was checked with Cronbach's alpha (Tavakol & Dennick, 2011). Where alpha was acceptable, a perceived-benefit score was calculated as the mean of the six items. The six challenge statements describe different kinds of problem, some to do with the tool, some with the learner and one with infrastructure, so we did not expect them to form a scale and checked this before deciding how to treat them.

To answer RQ4, we used Spearman's rank correlation, which suits ordinal ratings and does not assume a normal distribution. Because several correlations were examined, *p* values were adjusted with Holm's (1979) method, and for the main coefficients we give 95% confidence intervals from 5,000 bootstrap samples. We describe coefficients of about .10, .30 and .50 as small, medium and large (Cohen, 1988). Differences between groups were tested with Mann–Whitney and Kruskal–Wallis tests. All of these analyses are exploratory. The sample is small, no hypotheses were set in advance, and the coefficients describe how answers go together in this group and nothing more.

Two features of the questionnaire help to limit the bias that can arise when all the data come from one instrument. Participation was anonymous, and the benefit and challenge statements were grouped separately in the questionnaire (Podsakoff et al., 2003).

3.7 Analysis of open-ended answers

The open-ended answers were analysed with conventional content analysis, in which categories come from the data and are not fixed in advance (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). This approach suits short written survey answers, which are usually too brief for deeper interpretive methods (Braun et al., 2021). We read all the answers to each question several times, gave each meaningful point a short code in words close to the student's own, and grouped similar codes into categories. One answer could receive more than one code. Answers that carried no usable content, such as "Yes", "No" or a full stop, were counted separately as uninformative. We then counted how many answers fell into each category.

Most answers were a few words long. The counts therefore show what students chose to mention when asked an open question. They do not show how many students would agree with a point if asked directly, which is what the rating statements measure. Quotations are given as the students wrote them, including errors, and are labelled with a respondent number (for example, S7).

4. Results

4.1 Participant profile

Table 1 describes the sample. Men made up 57.1% of respondents and women 42.9%. More than half studied Computer Science and Engineering, and all but one student were in their first year.

Table 1: *Characteristics of Respondents (N = 63)*

Variable	Category	*n*	%
Gender	Male	36	57.1
	Female	27	42.9
Department	Computer Science and Engineering	37	58.7
	Information and Communication Technology	20	31.7
	Electrical and Electronic Engineering	6	9.5
Year of study	First	62	98.4
	Third	1	1.6
Period of response	15–22 November 2025	53	84.1
	15–19 July 2026	10	15.9

Note. Department names were typed by respondents and grouped by the researcher. Percentages are rounded to one decimal place and may not sum to 100.

4.2 Patterns of use (RQ1)

Almost every student had used ChatGPT (61 of 63; 96.8%, 95% CI [89.1, 99.1]), and more than half used it every day (35; 55.6%, 95% CI [43.3, 67.2]). Use for English was a little less intense but still common. Thirty-four students (54.0%, 95% CI [41.8, 65.7]) said they used ChatGPT often or always for English-related tasks (Table 2). The two kinds of use went together. Of the 35 daily users, 27 (77.1%) used ChatGPT often or always for English, compared with 7 of the 28 students (25.0%) who used it less than daily.

Table 2: *Frequency of ChatGPT Use and the Skill Students Felt It Helped Most (N = 63)*

Question	Response	*n*	%
How often do you use ChatGPT?	Daily	35	55.6
	Weekly	11	17.5
	Occasionally	12	19.0
	Rarely	4	6.3
	Never	1	1.6
How often do you use ChatGPT for English-related tasks?	Always	19	30.2
	Often	15	23.8
	Sometimes	20	31.7
	Rarely	9	14.3
Which English skill does ChatGPT help you improve the most?	Writing	28	44.4
	Vocabulary	16	25.4
	Speaking	11	17.5
	Reading	7	11.1
	Listening	1	1.6

Note. The skill question allowed one answer. It records students' own judgement and is not a measure of improvement.

Students could select as many purposes as applied (Table 3). Writing help was chosen most often (57.1%), followed by exam or assignment preparation (54.0%) and generating ideas (50.8%). Language-focused purposes came next: grammar correction (42.9%), vocabulary learning (36.5%) and translation between Bangla and English (33.3%). Speaking or pronunciation practice was the least common purpose (23.8%). The range of use varied a good deal. Twenty-five students (39.7%) selected a single purpose, while 30 (47.6%) selected three or more and 8 (12.7%) selected all seven.

When asked which one skill ChatGPT helped most, 44.4% of students chose writing and 25.4% chose vocabulary. Speaking was chosen by 17.5%, reading by 11.1% and listening by one student. Seven in ten students therefore placed the main benefit in writing or vocabulary.

Table 3: *Purposes for Which Students Used ChatGPT (N = 63; More Than One Answer Allowed)*

Purpose	*n*	%
Writing help (essays, reports, etc.)	36	57.1
Exam or assignment preparation	34	54.0
Idea generation or brainstorming	32	50.8
Grammar correction	27	42.9
Vocabulary learning	23	36.5

Purpose	*n*	%
Translation (Bangla–English)	21	33.3
Speaking or pronunciation practice	15	23.8

Note. Three students selected none of the listed purposes and wrote their own, including help with other subjects, writing e-mails and CVs, and finding answers to questions.

4.3 Perceived benefits (RQ2)

Table 4 gives the full distribution of answers to the 13 rating statements. Among the benefit statements, agreement was highest for ease of use (76.2%), useful explanations and examples (73.0%) and saving time (71.4%). It was lower for statements about learning itself. About half the students agreed that ChatGPT makes English learning easier (52.4%) and that they feel more confident using English after using it (50.8%), and fewer than half agreed that it motivates them to learn English more actively (46.0%). On these three statements, more than a third of students chose the neutral option. Few students disagreed with any benefit statement (6.3% to 15.9%).

The six benefit statements held together well as a scale (α = .84; corrected item–total correlations from .41 to .76). The mean perceived-benefit score was 3.60 (*SD* = 0.69), and 51 of the 63 students (81.0%) scored above the scale midpoint of 3. Students were, on the whole, moderately positive. They were clearer about the practical advantages of ChatGPT than about its effect on their learning.

Preference for ChatGPT over a teacher was a different matter. Only 25 students (39.7%) agreed that they prefer asking ChatGPT to asking their teacher, 21 (33.3%) were neutral and 17 (27.0%) disagreed. This was one of the two statements on which opinion was most evenly divided.

Table 4: *Responses to the Rating Statements (N = 63)*

Statement	SD	D	N	A	SA	*M* (*SD*)	Agree % [95% CI]
Perceived benefits							
ChatGPT is easy to use and understand.	2	3	10	39	9	3.79 (0.86)	76.2 [64.4, 85.0]
ChatGPT gives useful explanations and examples.	3	1	13	35	11	3.79 (0.92)	73.0 [61.0, 82.4]
ChatGPT saves me time when completing English tasks.	3	3	12	38	7	3.68 (0.91)	71.4 [59.3, 81.1]
ChatGPT makes English learning easier for me.	3	3	24	26	7	3.49 (0.93)	52.4 [40.3, 64.2]
I feel more confident using English after using ChatGPT.	2	6	23	25	7	3.46 (0.93)	50.8 [38.8, 62.7]
ChatGPT motivates me to learn English more actively.	3	7	24	22	7	3.37 (0.99)	46.0 [34.3, 58.2]
Preference							
I prefer using ChatGPT to ask questions instead of asking my teacher.	6	11	21	23	2	3.06 (1.03)	39.7 [28.5, 52.0]
Challenges							
ChatGPT does not always give accurate or relevant answers.	2	7	6	31	17	3.86 (1.05)	76.2 [64.4, 85.0]
I need more guidance on how to use ChatGPT effectively for learning English.	2	3	11	34	13	3.84 (0.92)	74.6 [62.7, 83.7]

Statement	SD	D	N	A	SA	*M* (*SD*)	Agree % [95% CI]
I sometimes find ChatGPT's answers confusing or unclear.	2	5	11	25	20	3.89 (1.05)	71.4 [59.3, 81.1]
A poor internet connection makes it hard to use ChatGPT regularly.	4	11	6	31	11	3.54 (1.16)	66.7 [54.4, 77.1]
It is difficult to use ChatGPT for speaking or listening practice.	4	8	19	24	8	3.38 (1.07)	50.8 [38.8, 62.7]
I rely too much on ChatGPT instead of thinking by myself.	6	16	18	16	7	3.03 (1.16)	36.5 [25.7, 48.9]

Note. SD = strongly disagree; D = disagree; N = neutral; A = agree; SA = strongly agree. Cell entries under these headings are numbers of students. Agree % = percentage choosing agree or strongly agree, with a Wilson 95% confidence interval. Within each group, statements are ordered by percentage agreeing.

4.4 Reported challenges (RQ3)

The problems students recognised most widely concerned the quality of ChatGPT's answers and their own ability to use it. Three quarters agreed that ChatGPT does not always give accurate or relevant answers (76.2%), and nearly as many found its answers sometimes confusing or unclear (71.4%). Fifty-four students (85.7%) agreed with at least one of these two statements, and 39 (61.9%) agreed with both. Three quarters also said they need more guidance on using ChatGPT effectively for learning English (74.6%). Only two statements in the whole questionnaire drew more agreement.

Two further challenges were practical. Two thirds of students agreed that a poor internet connection makes regular use difficult (66.7%), and half found ChatGPT difficult to use for speaking or listening practice (50.8%).

Over-reliance divided the group. Twenty-three students (36.5%) agreed that they rely too much on ChatGPT instead of thinking for themselves, 22 (34.9%) disagreed and 18 (28.6%) were neutral. This statement asks students to admit something unflattering, so the true figure may be higher.

As expected, the six challenge statements did not form a reliable scale ($\alpha = .62$). The internet statement in particular was almost unrelated to the others. We therefore analysed them one by one, with one exception. The statements about confusing answers and inaccurate answers were moderately correlated ($r = .49$) and both describe the quality of ChatGPT's output, so for RQ4 we averaged them into a two-item indicator of perceived unreliable output ($M = 3.87$, $SD = 0.90$; Spearman–Brown reliability = .65).

The most striking feature of Table 4 is that benefits and problems were reported by the same people. Thirty-six students (57.1%) agreed both that ChatGPT gives useful explanations and that its answers are not always accurate. Thirty-five (55.6%) agreed both that it saves time and that it is not always accurate. For most of these students, then, ChatGPT is useful and unreliable at once.

4.5 How use, benefits and challenges relate (RQ4)

Table 5 shows the correlations among frequency of use, perceived benefit and four of the views discussed above. Three patterns stand out.

First, students who used ChatGPT more often for English reported greater benefit ($\rho = .41$, 95% CI [.15, .64]). The mean benefit score rose step by step with frequency of English-related use, from 3.07 among those who rarely used it to 3.49 (sometimes), 3.69 (often) and 3.89 (always).

Second, the same students reported more over-reliance ($\rho = .38$, 95% CI [.14, .59]). The share agreeing that they rely on ChatGPT too much was 1 in 9 (11.1%) among those who rarely used it for English, 6 in 20 (30.0%) among those who sometimes did, 6 in 15 (40.0%) among those who often did and 10 in 19 (52.6%) among those who always did. Perceived benefit and over-reliance were themselves related ($\rho = .47$, 95% CI [.23, .66]).

Third, more frequent use did not go with greater awareness of unreliable output. The correlation between English-related use and the unreliability indicator was small, negative and not significant (ρ = −.14). Agreement that ChatGPT is not always accurate was high at every level of use, from 68.4% among those who always used it for English to 86.7% among those who often did, with no upward trend. Perceived unreliability was also only weakly related to perceived benefit (ρ = .22, not significant). Students seem to form their view of ChatGPT's accuracy separately from how much they use it and how useful they find it.

The three remaining views were closely tied to one another. Students who reported over-reliance were more likely to want guidance (ρ = .58) and to prefer ChatGPT to their teacher (ρ = .55), and the wish for guidance was stronger among students who saw more benefit (ρ = .45, 95% CI [.22, .64]). Of the 25 students who preferred asking ChatGPT to asking a teacher, 21 (84.0%) also said they need more guidance on using it. The students who lean on ChatGPT most are, by their own account, the ones who most want help with it.

Table 5: *Spearman Correlations Among Frequency of Use, Perceived Benefit and Selected Views (N = 63)*

Variable	*M* (*SD*)	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Overall frequency of use	–	–					
2. Frequency of English-related use	–	.64***	–				
3. Perceived benefit (6 items)	3.60 (0.69)	.31	.41*	–			
4. Perceived unreliable output (2 items)	3.87 (0.90)	−.17	−.14	.22	–		
5. Over-reliance	3.03 (1.16)	.27	.38*	.47**	.33	–	
6. Need for guidance	3.84 (0.92)	.25	.28	.45**	.35	.58***	–
7. Prefers ChatGPT to teacher	3.06 (1.03)	.18	.28	.46**	.27	.55***	.43**

Note. Frequency variables are ordinal (overall use: never to daily; English-related use: rarely to always), so no mean is given. Variables 3 to 7 are on a 1–5 scale. Asterisks refer to *p* values adjusted for 21 comparisons with Holm's method: *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001. Coefficients of .27 or above without an asterisk had unadjusted p < .05 but did not remain significant after adjustment.

We found no clear differences between groups. Women scored somewhat higher than men on perceived benefit (*M* = 3.77, *SD* = 0.71, against *M* = 3.47, *SD* = 0.66), but the difference was not significant (Mann–Whitney *U* = 360.5, *p* = .081). Perceived benefit did not differ across the three departments (Kruskal–Wallis *H* = 0.79, *p* = .67). With groups this small, only large differences could have been detected.

4.6 Sensitivity check

We repeated the analysis without the six records flagged in Section 3.5, which left 57 students. The results were almost the same. Every agreement percentage in Table 4 moved by about three points or less. The benefit scale remained reliable (α = .85). The main correlations kept their direction and size: English-related use with perceived benefit (ρ = .40) and with over-reliance (ρ = .38), perceived benefit with over-reliance (ρ = .42), with need for guidance (ρ = .42) and with preference for ChatGPT over a teacher (ρ = .43). The correlation between English-related use and perceived unreliable output stayed negative and not significant (ρ = −.23, *p* = .089). The findings do not depend on the flagged records.

4.7 Open-ended answers (RQ5)

After the shared texts described in Section 3.5 were counted once, there were 62 answers to each of the first three open-ended questions. Many were very short, and between 7 and 21 answers per question carried no usable content. Table 6 shows the categories and how often each was mentioned.

Table 6: *Categories From the Open-Ended Answers (62 Answers per Question)*

Question	Category	Answers	Example
How has ChatGPT helped your English?	Writing and sentence correction	17	"correcting my grammar and helping me write clearer sentences." (S24)
	Vocabulary	11	"It improved my vocabulary" (S53)
	Grammar	10	"For understanding grammar" (S16)
	Getting answers and finishing tasks	8	"By solving my regular task" (S2)
	Making topics easier to understand	5	"Understand the topic." (S54)
	Reading or speaking	6	"Being english speaking partner it helps me Improving my English speaking skill." (S57)
	General or unspecified help	10	"Many ways" (S34)
	No help, or not used for English	5	"Never actively tried" (S58)
	Uninformative	7	"Yes" (S14)
What problems have you faced?	Language too advanced, long or hard to follow	14	"Sometimes the explanations are too advanced, and I need simpler guidance." (S24)
	Wrong or inaccurate answers	13	"Many time it give wrong answers" (S16)
	Writing prompts and being understood	9	"Have to really put the effort to make it fully understand what I want" (S21)
	Internet connection or usage limits	3	"Internet is slow in my area, so it takes time to load." (S10)
	Other (repetitive answers, speaking, dependence)	4	"it repeats the same tips again and again." (S10)
	No problem	9	"There is no problem" (S22)
	Not used, or uninformative	13	"I rarely use" (S20)
How could ChatGPT be better used in non-major English classrooms?	Practice, explanation and feedback for learners	16	"by giving clear and easy explanation" (S13)
	Limited or no role in the classroom	7	"I don't think ChatGpt could be better in classroom" (S16)
	Uses for teachers	5	"Teachers can use it to make simple worksheets, short stories, or daily quizzes." (S10)
	Proper use and knowing more about it	4	"Using chatgpt properly" (S5)
	Improvements to the tool	4	"Without time limitation it will be nearly perfect" (S7)

Question	Category	Answers	Example
	Don't know	6	"I have no idea" (S32)
	Uninformative	21	"Yes" (S1)

Note. An answer could be placed in more than one category, so counts do not sum to 62. Quotations are reproduced as written.

How ChatGPT helped. The answers matched the closed questions closely. Writing came first, usually in the form of having sentences corrected or made clearer, followed by vocabulary and grammar. A few students described what makes the tool useful to them in a way the ratings could not. One wrote: "It makes every topic easier to understand. I can ask it more than once to make the topic even easier than before until i understand it properly. It is a big help after our teachers" (S7). Another said, "I can ask any question anytime" (S10). What these students value is being able to ask again without embarrassment and at any hour. Eight answers described help with getting answers or finishing tasks, with no mention of learning, and five students said ChatGPT had not helped their English or that they had not used it for that.

Problems. Two problems were mentioned about equally often. One was accuracy: "It does not give the100% correct answer Always" (S40); "It gives me wrong information sometimes" (S43). The other did not appear among the rating statements at all. Fourteen students said that ChatGPT's answers were too long, too detailed or written in words they did not know: "over complicated words" (S8); "Some times the words are unknown to me" (S53); "Sometimes it gives long answers that are hard to understand" (S10). For learners at this level, the language of the explanation can itself be the obstacle.

Nine students described difficulty in getting ChatGPT to understand what they wanted. "I need to give Chatgpt a right prompt to get my answer, which has not always been possible," one wrote (S25). Two simply answered "Prompt" (S1, S34). Only one student raised dependence without being asked, but did so sharply: "That we getting very much depending on this thing.For that our own knowledge is decreasing day by day" (S11).

Use in the classroom. Students who answered this question in substance mostly saw ChatGPT as a source of simple explanation, practice and feedback. A few thought first of teachers, suggesting that it could produce worksheets and quizzes or help with classes of mixed ability. Seven students saw little or no place for it in class. One put it plainly: "No chat GPT needed in classroom bcz teacher sir is the best for classroom" (S27).

Other comments. Most students had nothing to add. Among those who did, the request for guidance returned: "ChatGPT would be more helpful if students get guidance how to use it properly" (S13); "Teachers should guide students how to use chat gpt" (S45). One student explained why a teacher is still needed, and in doing so described the central problem of this study: "Chatgpt can make mistakes.If we do not know about the topic before we can not figure it out and we learn the incorrect thing.We need our teachers. What a classroom and teachers gives us it can not replace by chatgpt.Chatgpt can only be an alternative not the replacement" (S7).

4.8 Bringing the two kinds of data together

Table 7 sets the survey results beside the open-ended answers. On most points the two agreed. The written answers added two things the ratings could not show: that the difficulty of ChatGPT's own language is a problem for many students, and that writing prompts is a specific skill students feel they lack. On two points the written answers were nearly silent. Few students mentioned internet access or over-reliance unprompted, although many agreed with the rating statements on both.

Table 7: *Survey Results and Open-Ended Answers Compared*

Topic	Survey result	Open-ended answers	Fit	What the two show together
Where ChatGPT	Writing (44.4%) and vocabulary (25.4%) chosen as	Writing and sentence correction, vocabulary	Agreement	Students use ChatGPT mainly as a writing and

Topic	Survey result	Open-ended answers	Fit	What the two show together
helps	most-helped skill; writing help the top purpose (57.1%)	and grammar most often mentioned		word-level aid
Why it is valued	Easy to use (76.2%), useful explanations (73.0%), saves time (71.4%)	Can ask again and at any time; makes topics easier	Agreement, with added detail	The appeal is patient, repeated explanation on demand
Accuracy	76.2% say answers are not always accurate or relevant	Wrong answers the second most mentioned problem	Agreement	Unreliable output is widely recognised
Clarity of answers	71.4% sometimes find answers confusing or unclear	Answers too advanced, long or full of unknown words	Added detail	Confusion comes partly from language above the learner's level
Guidance and prompting	74.6% need more guidance	Trouble writing prompts; direct requests for teachers to guide	Added detail	Guidance is wanted, and prompting is one concrete need
Speaking and listening	50.8% find these hard to practise; listening chosen by one student	Rarely mentioned	Agreement	ChatGPT is not yet a spoken-language tool for most of these students
Over-reliance	36.5% agree; linked to more frequent use (ρ = .38)	One student raised it	Survey only	Dependence is admitted when asked but seldom volunteered
Internet access	66.7% say poor connection limits use	Three mentions	Survey only	Access is a real limit that students may take for granted
ChatGPT and the teacher	39.7% prefer asking ChatGPT	Teachers described as irreplaceable; some see no classroom role	Agreement	Most students see ChatGPT as a supplement to the teacher

Note. Fit describes how the open-ended answers relate to the survey result: agreement, added detail, or survey only (the open-ended answers say little).

5. Discussion

We wanted to know how engineering students in a non-major English course use ChatGPT for English, and what they make of it. Three findings stand out. First, ChatGPT is already an everyday tool for these students, used above all for writing and for getting through coursework. Second, most students find it useful and most find it unreliable, and more than half hold both views at once. Third, students who use ChatGPT more for English report more benefit and more dependence on it, but no more awareness of its errors, and three quarters of all students say they need guidance. These are patterns in what 63 students at one university reported at one point in time. They show how this group experiences the tool. They do not show what the tool does to their English.

5.1 An everyday tool, used mostly for writing

Nearly all respondents had used ChatGPT, and more than half used it daily. This agrees with other reports of rapid uptake among Bangladeshi university students (Hasib & Islam, 2025; Howlader et al., 2025) and with surveys elsewhere (Chan & Hu, 2023). For teachers of non-major English, the practical meaning is simple. The question of

whether students should use ChatGPT has already been answered by the students. What remains open is how they use it.

On that point, the results are fairly consistent. Writing help was the most common purpose, writing was most often named as the skill ChatGPT helps, and written answers were dominated by sentence correction, vocabulary and grammar. The research literature has been criticised for concentrating on writing (Lo et al., 2024), but in this group the students' own practice is concentrated in the same place. Speaking and listening were at the margin. Only about a quarter of students used ChatGPT for speaking or pronunciation, and half agreed that it is hard to use for spoken practice. Slow connections and limits on free accounts, both of which students mentioned, may be part of the reason.

The purposes students chose most often also deserve a second look. Alongside writing help, the top purposes were exam or assignment preparation and generating ideas, and some written answers described ChatGPT as a way of "solving my regular task". These are uses aimed at finishing work. The purposes most clearly aimed at learning the language, such as grammar, vocabulary and translation, came lower. Our data cannot separate using ChatGPT to learn from using it to get a task done, and for many students the two are probably mixed. But the order of purposes is a reminder that frequent use for English-related tasks is not the same thing as frequent English learning. Barrot (2023) and Warschauer et al. (2023) raise the same concern about second-language writing.

5.2 Useful for convenience, less clearly for learning

Students agreed most with the statements about ease of use, useful explanations and saving time. In the terms of the technology acceptance model, perceived ease of use and perceived usefulness were both high, which helps explain why use is so widespread (Davis, 1989; Liu & Ma, 2024). The written answers add what the usefulness consists of. Students valued being able to ask again, as often as they liked and at any time. In a short course with limited access to the teacher, that kind of patient, repeated explanation is hard to get anywhere else.

Agreement dropped, however, when the statements turned from convenience to learning. Only about half the students agreed that ChatGPT makes English learning easier or makes them more confident, and fewer than half said it motivates them. Many chose the neutral option. Studies in which teachers built ChatGPT into guided activities have reported clearer gains in motivation and confidence (Karataş et al., 2024; Teng, 2024). The students in our study were using the tool on their own, without any structure from the course. One reasonable reading is that unguided use delivers convenience fairly reliably and a sense of learning much less reliably. This fits the wider finding that learners differ in how well they manage technology for out-of-class language learning (Lai & Gu, 2011).

5.3 Useful and unreliable at once

The finding we consider most important is that the same students reported benefits and problems. Three quarters said ChatGPT's answers are not always accurate, and 57.1% agreed with that statement and also agreed that its explanations are useful. Hasib and Islam (2025) heard similar things in interviews, and Chan and Hu (2023) found positive attitudes and accuracy concerns side by side in a much larger sample. These students are not naive enthusiasts. They know the tool makes mistakes.

Knowing that a tool makes mistakes is different from knowing when it has made one. This is where the idea of calibrated trust is helpful (Lee & See, 2004). Calibration means relying on a system when it is right and holding back when it is wrong, and that requires the user to tell the two apart. A language learner often cannot. One student stated the problem better than we can: if you do not already know the topic, you cannot spot the mistake, and you "learn the incorrect thing" (S7). General doubt about accuracy, which these students clearly have, does not turn into the ability to check a particular answer.

The written answers pointed to a second problem that we had not asked about. Fourteen students said that ChatGPT's answers were too advanced, too long or full of unfamiliar words. This may explain part of the high agreement with the statement about confusing answers. For learners at a modest level of proficiency, an explanation in fluent, dense English can be as hard as the thing it explains. Much of the literature treats the quality of ChatGPT's explanations as a strength (Kohnke et al., 2023; Lo et al., 2024). For these students, the level of the language is itself a barrier, and getting past it depends on knowing how to ask for a simpler answer.

5.4 More use, more dependence, no more awareness of error

Students who used ChatGPT more often for English reported more benefit. That is unsurprising, and it could run in either direction: people use what they find useful, and they may find useful what they have learned to use. The more interesting results are the other two. Frequent users were more likely to say they rely on ChatGPT too much, and they were no more likely to say that its output is unreliable.

We might have expected the opposite of the second result. A student who uses a tool every day has more chances to catch it making mistakes. If experience alone taught students to judge ChatGPT's output, heavier users should report more unreliability. In this sample they did not, and the coefficient was, if anything, slightly negative. Taken with the positive link between use and over-reliance, this pattern is closer to what the automation literature would predict: familiarity breeds reliance more readily than it breeds scrutiny (Parasuraman & Manzey, 2010). It is also consistent with work that links heavier AI use to cognitive offloading (Gerlich, 2025; Zhai et al., 2024).

Some caution is needed here. The correlations are moderate, the confidence intervals are wide and the data come from a single questionnaire. Over-reliance was measured with one statement, and students may under-report it. We cannot say that using ChatGPT causes dependence, and it is equally possible that students who are less confident in English both use it more and lean on it more. What we can say is that, in this group, experience with the tool did not appear to bring greater awareness of its limits. That is worth testing properly, with measures of what students actually do when ChatGPT gives them a wrong answer.

5.5 Students are asking for guidance

Three quarters of students said they need more guidance on using ChatGPT for English. This is a notable result for a tool that the same students rated as easy to use. Ease of operation and skill in use are clearly different things to them. The written answers show what the skill involves. Students described struggling to write a prompt that gets the answer they need, and some asked directly for teachers to show them how. Prompting has been identified as a key part of using ChatGPT for language learning (Yang & Li, 2024), and it is one of the practical competencies that accounts of AI literacy describe (Long & Magerko, 2020; Ng et al., 2021).

The wish for guidance was strongest among the students who seemed most committed to the tool: those who saw more benefit, those who admitted over-reliance and those who preferred ChatGPT to their teacher. Of the 25 students in that last group, 21 wanted more guidance. This suggests that heavy users would welcome teaching on how to use ChatGPT and would not treat it as interference. It also suggests where such teaching is most needed.

5.6 The teacher's place

Only four in ten students preferred asking ChatGPT to asking their teacher, and the rest were neutral or disagreed. In their comments, some students called the teacher irreplaceable and described ChatGPT as "an alternative not the replacement" (S7). For most of this group, ChatGPT supplements the teacher. This agrees with Teng's (2024) learners, who saw the tool as a companion in learning.

The four in ten should not be passed over, though. A sizeable minority would sooner ask a machine than a teacher, and the reasons students gave for valuing ChatGPT suggest why: it is always available, and it can be asked the same question several times. In a short course with limited contact time, students may hesitate to take up a teacher's time or to show what they do not know. If so, the preference says as much about the limits of the classroom as about the attractions of the tool. The item measured preference only, and we did not ask students for their reasons, so this remains an interpretation.

5.7 Access

Two thirds of students agreed that a poor internet connection makes regular use of ChatGPT difficult, and a few mentioned limits on free accounts. Discussion of AI in education often assumes stable access, but access to digital tools is uneven, and the gap involves quality of connection and of service as well as simple availability (van Dijk, 2020). In a setting like northern Bangladesh, any plan to build ChatGPT into coursework has to allow for students who cannot rely on a connection or cannot pay for a subscription. Otherwise, classroom use of AI could widen differences between students that already exist. Yan (2023) raises a similar concern about educational equity.

5.8 Implications

For teachers of non-major English, the first implication is to teach students how to check what ChatGPT tells them. General warnings about accuracy will add little, because students already know the tool can be wrong. What they lack is practice in catching errors. Short classroom tasks can provide it. Students can be given a ChatGPT explanation of a grammar point that contains a mistake and asked to find it using the textbook, or asked to compare two AI corrections of the same sentence and decide which is better and why. Tasks like these build the evaluative judgement that Bearman et al. (2024) describe, and they keep the thinking with the student.

The second implication is to teach prompting as a language-learning skill. Students can be shown how to ask for a simpler explanation, a shorter answer, an example at their level, or an explanation in Bangla followed by one in English. Since many students find ChatGPT's language too advanced, this single skill would remove one of their most common problems. Writing a clear prompt in English is also useful language practice in its own right.

Third, teachers can talk openly about the difference between using ChatGPT to finish a task and using it to learn. One workable routine is to ask students to attempt the task first, then consult ChatGPT, then revise in their own words and note briefly what they changed and why. This gives ChatGPT the role of feedback on the student's own attempt. Students who admit to over-reliance appear open to this kind of guidance, and they should be the first to receive it.

For departments and universities, the findings support clear, course-level guidance on acceptable use of AI, written with students' real practices in mind. Students in this study were using ChatGPT daily, and most felt they had not been shown how to use it well. Guidance of this kind is in line with international recommendations (Miao & Holmes, 2023). Institutions also need to take access seriously. Coursework that depends on ChatGPT should be possible with a free account and a weak connection, or alternatives should be offered. Finally, the students' interest in asking questions repeatedly and at any time points to a need that does not have to be met by AI alone. More opportunities for low-stakes questions, in class or online, would serve the same need.

5.9 Limitations and future research

The study has clear limits. The sample was small and was recruited by convenience from one university, almost entirely from the first year and mostly from one department. The findings cannot be generalised to engineering students in Bangladesh, and the confidence intervals we report show how imprecise the percentages are. All the data are self-reported and were collected with one questionnaire at one time, so we have no measure of students' English, no record of what they actually did with ChatGPT and no basis for causal claims. Shared method may have inflated some correlations, even though the pattern of results, with some correlations near zero, suggests it did not drive them all.

The questionnaire was written for this study and has not been validated beyond the internal consistency of the benefit scale. Over-reliance, need for guidance and preference were each measured with a single statement, and the indicator of unreliable output had only two items and modest reliability. The questionnaire did not ask which version of ChatGPT students used or whether they paid for it, both of which could affect their experience. Data were collected in two periods eight months apart. We found no difference between the two sets of responses, but the second set was too small for a firm conclusion, and ChatGPT itself changed during that time. The open-ended answers were short and many were uninformative, so the qualitative findings are limited to what students chose to mention. A small number of open-ended answers were shared between respondents, as described in Section 3.5, and may not have been written unaided. The study did not undergo formal ethics committee review, which we report in the Declarations.

These limits point to the next steps. Larger studies across several universities and year groups could test whether the patterns found here hold more widely. The finding that heavier use did not go with greater awareness of error should be examined with performance measures, for example by giving students AI output that contains errors and seeing who notices. Interviews or think-aloud sessions would show how students decide whether to trust an answer. And classroom interventions could test whether teaching students to prompt and to check, as suggested above, changes how they use ChatGPT and whether their English improves as a result.

6. Conclusion

The engineering students in this study had already made ChatGPT part of how they deal with English. They used it mostly for writing, vocabulary and coursework, and they valued it because it is easy, quick and willing to explain as many times as they ask. They also knew it could be wrong. Most students held both views together, and three quarters wanted more guidance. Those who used ChatGPT most for English reported the most benefit and the most dependence, but they were no more alert to its errors than anyone else. In their own words, students pointed to wrong answers, explanations pitched above their level and the difficulty of writing a good prompt.

Our evidence comes from 63 students at one university who described their own experience at one point in time. It cannot show that ChatGPT improves or harms English learning, and it should not be generalised beyond similar settings. It does show where these students feel the gap lies. They do not need to be persuaded to use ChatGPT, and they do not need to be told that it makes mistakes. They need to be taught how to ask it better questions and how to check its answers. That is work for teachers, and most of these students still see the teacher as the person to do it. Testing whether such teaching changes how students use the tool, and what they learn, is the next step.

Declarations

Informed consent: All participants were informed of the purpose of the study before they began the questionnaire, and consent to participate was obtained at that point.

Ethical considerations: The study was a minimal-risk, anonymous questionnaire survey of adult university students. Formal approval from an institutional ethics committee was not sought before data collection, and the study does not claim such approval. Taking part was voluntary. The questionnaire did not collect names, student identity numbers or e-mail addresses, and no information that could identify an individual participant is reported in this paper.

Funding: This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Declaration of competing interest: The author(s) declare no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Data availability: The anonymised survey dataset is available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Use of generative AI: Generative AI tools were used to assist with data analysis, language editing and the organisation of the manuscript. The author(s) checked all content, data and references and take full responsibility for the work.

Publisher's Note: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers

References

[1] Barrot, J. S. (2023). Using ChatGPT for second language writing: Pitfalls and potentials. *Assessing Writing, 57*, Article 100745. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2023.100745

[2] Bearman, M., Tai, J., Dawson, P., Boud, D., & Ajjawi, R. (2024). Developing evaluative judgement for a time of generative artificial intelligence. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 49*(6), 893–905. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2024.2335321

[3] Braun, V., Clarke, V., Boulton, E., Davey, L., & McEvoy, C. (2021). The online survey as a qualitative research tool. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology, 24*(6), 641–654. https://doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2020.1805550

[4] Bristi, N. L., Shafie, L. A., Hajimia, H. B., & Hasan, M. K. (2025). Decoding EFL learners' intention to use ChatGPT for academic writing: Cognitive and emotional drivers. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research, 24*(3), 1–28. https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.24.3.1

[5] 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*, Article 43. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00411-8

[6] Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

[7] Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). SAGE.

[8] Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly, 13*(3), 319–340. https://doi.org/10.2307/249008
[9] Gerlich, M. (2025). AI tools in society: Impacts on cognitive offloading and the future of critical thinking. *Societies, 15*(1), Article 6. https://doi.org/10.3390/soc15010006
[10] Hamid, M. O., & Baldauf, R. B., Jr. (2008). Will CLT bail out the bogged down ELT in Bangladesh? *English Today, 24*(3), 16–24. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078408000254
[11] Hasib, M., & Islam, M. S. (2025). How university students in Bangladesh engage with ChatGPT: A qualitative study. *PLOS ONE, 20*(9), Article e0333089. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0333089
[12] Holm, S. (1979). A simple sequentially rejective multiple test procedure. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics, 6*(2), 65–70.
[13] Howlader, M. H., Tohan, M. M., Zaman, S., Chanda, S. K., Jiaxin, G., & Rahman, M. A. (2025). Factors influencing the acceptance and usage of ChatGPT as an emerging learning tool among higher education students in Bangladesh: A structural equation modeling. *Cogent Education, 12*(1), Article 2504224. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2025.2504224
[14] Hsieh, H.-F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research, 15*(9), 1277–1288. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732305276687
[15] Huang, W., Hew, K. F., & Fryer, L. K. (2022). Chatbots for language learning—Are they really useful? A systematic review of chatbot-supported language learning. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 38*(1), 237–257. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12610
[16] Karataş, F., Abedi, F. Y., Ozek Gunyel, F., Karadeniz, D., & Kuzgun, Y. (2024). Incorporating AI in foreign language education: An investigation into ChatGPT's effect on foreign language learners. *Education and Information Technologies, 29*, 19343–19366. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-12574-6
[17] Kasneci, E., Sessler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., Gasser, U., Groh, G., Günnemann, S., Hüllermeier, E., Krusche, S., Kutyniok, G., Michaeli, T., Nerdel, C., Pfeffer, J., Poquet, O., Sailer, M., Schmidt, A., Seidel, T., … Kasneci, G. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. *Learning and Individual Differences, 103*, Article 102274. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274
[18] Kohnke, L., Moorhouse, B. L., & Zou, D. (2023). ChatGPT for language teaching and learning. *RELC Journal, 54*(2), 537–550. https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882231162868
[19] Lai, C., & Gu, M. (2011). Self-regulated out-of-class language learning with technology. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 24*(4), 317–335. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2011.568417
[20] Lee, J. D., & See, K. A. (2004). Trust in automation: Designing for appropriate reliance. *Human Factors, 46*(1), 50–80. https://doi.org/10.1518/hfes.46.1.50_30392
[21] Li, B., Lowell, V. L., Wang, C., & Li, X. (2024). A systematic review of the first year of publications on ChatGPT and language education: Examining research on ChatGPT's use in language learning and teaching. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 7*, Article 100266. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100266
[22] Liu, G., & Ma, C. (2024). Measuring EFL learners' use of ChatGPT in informal digital learning of English based on the technology acceptance model. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching, 18*(2), 125–138. https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2023.2240316
[23] Lo, C. K., Yu, P. L. H., Xu, S., Ng, D. T. K., & Jong, M. S. Y. (2024). Exploring the application of ChatGPT in ESL/EFL education and related research issues: A systematic review of empirical studies. *Smart Learning Environments, 11*(1), Article 50. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-024-00342-5
[24] Long, D., & Magerko, B. (2020). What is AI literacy? Competencies and design considerations. In *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (pp. 1–16). Association for Computing Machinery. https://doi.org/10.1145/3313831.3376727
[25] Mahapatra, S. (2024). Impact of ChatGPT on ESL students' academic writing skills: A mixed methods intervention study. *Smart Learning Environments, 11*, Article 9. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-024-00295-9
[26] Miao, F., & Holmes, W. (2023). *Guidance for generative AI in education and research*. UNESCO.
[27] Ng, D. T. K., Leung, J. K. L., Chu, S. K. W., & Qiao, M. S. (2021). Conceptualizing AI literacy: An exploratory review. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 2*, Article 100041. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2021.100041
[28] Parasuraman, R., & Manzey, D. H. (2010). Complacency and bias in human use of automation: An attentional integration. *Human Factors, 52*(3), 381–410. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018720810376055
[29] Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(5), 879–903. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879
[30] Reinders, H., & Benson, P. (2017). Research agenda: Language learning beyond the classroom. *Language Teaching, 50*(4), 561–578. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444817000192
[31] Risko, E. F., & Gilbert, S. J. (2016). Cognitive offloading. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 20*(9), 676–688. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2016.07.002

[32] Tavakol, M., & Dennick, R. (2011). Making sense of Cronbach's alpha. *International Journal of Medical Education, 2*, 53–55. https://doi.org/10.5116/ijme.4dfb.8dfd
[33] Teng, M. F. (2024). "ChatGPT is the companion, not enemies": EFL learners' perceptions and experiences in using ChatGPT for feedback in writing. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 7*, Article 100270. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100270
[34] van Dijk, J. (2020). *The digital divide*. Polity Press.
[35] Warschauer, M., Tseng, W., Yim, S., Webster, T., Jacob, S., Du, Q., & Tate, T. (2023). The affordances and contradictions of AI-generated text for writers of English as a second or foreign language. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 62*, Article 101071. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2023.101071
[36] Wilson, E. B. (1927). Probable inference, the law of succession, and statistical inference. *Journal of the American Statistical Association, 22*(158), 209–212. https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.1927.10502953
[37] Yan, D. (2023). Impact of ChatGPT on learners in a L2 writing practicum: An exploratory investigation. *Education and Information Technologies, 28*, 13943–13967. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-11742-4
[38] Yang, L., & Li, R. (2024). ChatGPT for L2 learning: Current status and implications. *System, 124*, Article 103351. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2024.103351
[39] Zhai, C., Wibowo, S., & Li, L. D. (2024). The effects of over-reliance on AI dialogue systems on students' cognitive abilities: A systematic review. *Smart Learning Environments, 11*, Article 28. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-024-00316-7

Appendix A. Questionnaire

Part 1. Background

1. Department
2. Year of study
3. Gender

Part 2. Use of ChatGPT

4. Have you ever used ChatGPT? (Yes / No)
5. How often do you use ChatGPT? (Daily / Weekly / Occasionally / Rarely / Never)
6. For what purposes do you use ChatGPT? (Tick all that apply: grammar correction; writing help such as essays and reports; vocabulary learning; translation between Bangla and English; idea generation or brainstorming; exam or assignment preparation; speaking or pronunciation practice; other)
7. How often do you use ChatGPT for English-related tasks? (Always / Often / Sometimes / Rarely)
8. Which English skill do you think ChatGPT helps you improve the most? (Writing / Vocabulary / Speaking / Reading / Listening)

Part 3. Rating statements (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*)

9. ChatGPT makes English learning easier for me.
10. I feel more confident using English after using ChatGPT.
11. ChatGPT saves me time when completing English tasks.
12. ChatGPT gives useful explanations and examples.
13. ChatGPT motivates me to learn English more actively.
14. ChatGPT is easy to use and understand.
15. I prefer using ChatGPT to ask questions instead of asking my teacher.
16. I sometimes find ChatGPT's answers confusing or unclear.
17. ChatGPT does not always give accurate or relevant answers.
18. It is difficult to use ChatGPT for speaking or listening practice.
19. I rely too much on ChatGPT instead of thinking by myself.
20. A poor internet connection makes it hard to use ChatGPT regularly.
21. I need more guidance on how to use ChatGPT effectively for learning English.

Part 4. Open-ended questions

22. In what ways has ChatGPT helped you improve your English?

23. What problems have you faced while using ChatGPT for learning English?
24. How do you think ChatGPT could be better used in non-major English classrooms?
25. Any additional comments or suggestions?

Note. Items 9 to 14 formed the perceived-benefit scale. Items 16 and 17 were averaged as the indicator of perceived unreliable output. Response options for items 6 to 8 are listed as they appear in the data; options that no respondent selected should be checked against the original form.