FACTA UNIVERSITATIS
Series: **Teaching, Learning and Teacher Education** Vol. 9, N°1, 2025, pp. 75 -89
https://doi.org/10.22190/FUTLTE250409010T

Original research paper

UNDERSTANDING STUDENT ENGAGEMENT WITH *CHATGPT*: PERSPECTIVES FROM LANGUAGE TEACHERS IN SERBIA AND SWEDEN

UDC 004.738.5:: 371.3(497.11+485)
81'243:378.18(497.11+485)

Miloš Tasić[1], Dušan Stamenković[2]

[1]Faculty of Mechanical Engineering, University of Niš, Serbia
[2]School of Culture and Education, Södertörn University, Stockholm, Sweden

ORCID iDs: Miloš Tasić https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4355-2326
Dušan Stamenković https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0121-4591

Abstract. *The rapid development of LLM-based tools, such as ChatGPT, has significantly transformed teaching and learning processes, by providing powerful language-processing capabilities. While ChatGPT offers valuable support in writing, summarization, and information retrieval, its unregulated use has raised concerns about academic integrity, critical thinking, and ethical considerations. This study examines teachers' views on student engagement with ChatGPT from the perspective of language teachers in Serbia and Sweden. Through an open-ended questionnaire distributed to eight language teachers, this research explores four key areas: (1) students' motivations for using ChatGPT, (2) perceived benefits and drawbacks, (3) ethical concerns and implications for academic integrity, and (4) the extent to which students' real-world applications align with OpenAI's guidelines. Thematic analysis of teachers' responses reveals that while ChatGPT can improve research and writing skills, overreliance on the content it generates poses risks to cognitive engagement and independent learning. Moreover, concerns about plagiarism and the authenticity of student work are prominent. These findings contribute to ongoing discussions on the responsible integration of AI-based tools in education and offer insights into how language teachers deal with the related challenges and opportunities.*

Key words: *language teaching, LLMs, ChatGPT, English, Serbian, Swedish*

Received April 9, 2025 / Accepted June 5, 2025
Corresponding author: Miloš Tasić
University of Niš, Faculty of Mechanical Engineering, Aleksandra Medvedeva 14, 18104 Niš, Serbia
E-mail: milos.tasic@masfak.ni.ac.rs

1. INTRODUCTION

The rise of large language models (LLMs) and tools based on them has significantly reshaped the academic landscape, providing students with unprecedented access to language-processing capabilities that can assist with a wide range of educational tasks. Since its release, ChatGPT has become a widely used resource in higher education, praised for its ability to generate human-like text, summarize content, and assist with writing-related tasks. As universities grapple with the implications of this rapidly evolving technology, both its benefits and potential drawbacks are coming into sharper focus. While ChatGPT is frequently employed as a tool for academic support, its unregulated use has raised ethical and pedagogical concerns, particularly regarding academic integrity, critical thinking, and the role of AI in the learning process. Numerous studies have explored the motivations behind student engagement with ChatGPT and other LLM-based writing assistants, and the findings suggest that students turn to such tools to streamline their studies, improve their writing, and gain quick access to information. However, concerns remain regarding the potential for overreliance, misuse, and the erosion of essential cognitive skills such as argumentation, synthesis, and independent analysis. Some of these concerns have already been addressed by relevant EU institutions (European Commission, 2022), but our decision to focus on OpenAI's ChatGPT-related guidelines (OpenAI, 2024) was driven by its global reach and greater accessibility for students. Recognizing the above challenges, OpenAI has published this guide to help students use ChatGPT responsibly, emphasizing its role as a supplementary aid rather than a substitute for critical engagement with academic material. Yet, how students actually use ChatGPT in practice, and how closely their usage aligns with these guidelines, remains an open question.

This paper seeks to examine student engagement with ChatGPT from the perspective of language teachers, who are uniquely positioned to observe both the advantages and potential pitfalls of AI-assisted learning. This unique position comes from their direct engagement with students' writing and critical thinking processes, their ability to assess ChatGPT's impact on language development, and their role in upholding academic integrity. To gain insight into how students interact with ChatGPT, an open-ended questionnaire was distributed to language teachers across various educational contexts in Serbia and Sweden. These questionnaires were designed to capture teachers' observations regarding students' motivations for using ChatGPT, the perceived benefits and drawbacks, ethical concerns, and the degree to which students' usage aligns with OpenAI's official recommendations.

The study addresses four key research questions:

(1) In teachers' views, what are the primary reasons students use ChatGPT in their studies?
(2) What benefits and challenges do language teachers associate with students' use of ChatGPT?
(3) What are the teachers' views on the relation between the use of ChatGPT and academic integrity, i.e., what are the main ethical considerations in thar regard?
(4) To what extent do students' real-world applications of ChatGPT align with OpenAI's intended uses?

The findings from this study should contribute to ongoing discussions about the role of LLM-based tools in education and provide further insight into how language students and teachers navigate the opportunities and challenges presented by tools such as ChatGPT.

2. Theoretical Background and Literature Review

This section introduces a range of studies that have examined the role of generative AI in education and focused on its applications in general learning environments. It will also reference studies that have evaluated the impact of LLM-based tools on language teaching, and, finally, OpenAI's (2024) recommendations for student use.

2.1. Using Generative AI in Education

The integration of generative AI into education is increasingly reshaping traditional teaching and learning paradigms. Following the crisis-prompted shift to online teaching in 2020 (see Gacs et al., 2020; Tasić & Stamenković, 2024), the question of how to move forward with teaching has become one of the central challenges. With tools such as ChatGPT, both students and teachers now have access to powerful language models that can generate text, summarize information, and engage in interactive discussions. These LLM-based technologies offer new opportunities for personalized learning, feedback, and scaffolding, enabling students to explore concepts at their own pace and receive instant support. However, the use of generative AI in education also raises critical questions about its pedagogical value, ethical implications, and potential limitations. As noted in the introduction, while tools grounded in LLMs can stimulate engagement and accessibility, concerns about academic integrity, misinformation, and the risk of diminishing critical thinking skills remain central to discussions on its implementation. Teachers play a crucial role in guiding students toward responsible use of such technologies, striving to ensure that generative AI serves as a complement rather than a replacement for traditional learning methods.

Several studies have assessed the growing role of generative AI in education and discussed its benefits and challenges. This has become one of the more productive fields of research in humanities today. Felix (2020) argued that while AI can assist in teaching practices, it cannot replace educators due to their uniquely human attributes, such as the ability to foster existential reflection, instil norms and values, and provide historical and social context. Similarly, Chan & Tsi (2024) emphasized that although some believe generative AI may eventually replace teachers, most students and educators generally recognize that human teachers possess critical thinking skills, emotional intelligence, and the capacity to nurture social-emotional competencies, which are all qualities that current AI technologies lack. In a similar vein, Guilherme (2019) criticized the increasing technologization of education, warning that it might diminish the depth of teacher-student relationships. This change can impact the level of trust and connectedness in the classroom, potentially leading to a depersonalized learning environment. Similarly to Felix's (2020) and Chan & Tsi's (2024) claims, these concerns align well with the proposition that only humans possess inner experience, which integrates emotions with perception and thoughts, providing us with something AI cannot replicate (see Holyoak, 2024; Ichien et al., 2024). Luo (2024) further noted that generative AI's role in education has contributed to an erosion of trust between students and teachers, especially regarding assessments. Issues such as the lack of transparency in evaluating AI-generated work and the perception of AI as a tool for academic dishonesty have created low-trust environments that may hinder meaningful educational engagement.

Despite these concerns, research has also highlighted the potential benefits of AI in education when implemented effectively. Kim et al. (2020) found that students' acceptance of AI teaching assistants depended on their perceived usefulness and ease of

communication, suggesting that AI can serve as a valuable complement to human instruction. Additionally, Chiu et al. (2024) noted that teacher support played an important role in raising students' intrinsic motivation to learn with AI-based tools. Their findings indicated that AI can facilitate learning, but also that it is most effective when combined with strong teacher guidance that fosters student engagement and autonomy. The role of AI in language learning, therefore, presents both challenges and opportunities. Finally, from a policy perspective, Sanusi et al. (2024) examined the implementation of AI in K-12 education and stressed the importance of teacher training, strategic policies, funding, infrastructure, and partnerships for successfully integrating AI into schools. They pointed out that both educators and students view pedagogical strategies as crucial, while collaborations with AI companies and higher education institutions can further advance AI education.

When it comes to the context of higher education, the use of LLM-based tools such as ChatGPT among university students has sparked both enthusiasm and concern, with different studies exploring various motivations, influences, and consequences of their adoption. There is little doubt that its presence in university settings has become particularly important (see Bates et al., 2020; Šijan et al., 2024). The likelihood of ChatGPT usage depends on a range of factors. Baek et al. (2024) revealed that students' engagement with the tool is shaped by demographic factors, institutional policies, and socioeconomic background. According to the authors, AI can serve as an empowering resource, but it may also reinforce existing inequalities within academia. Similarly, Chowdhury Niloy et al. (2024) identified key drivers of student interaction with ChatGPT and demonstrated strong correlations between students' intentions and actual usage patterns, which can, in turn, lead to valuable insights for policymakers aiming to optimize AI integration in education. Conversely, Abbas et al. (2024) cautioned that ChatGPT, often used in response to academic workload and time pressure, can lead to unintended consequences such as procrastination, memory loss, and declining academic performance. Taken together, these studies, much like the broader research outlined above, underscore the complexity of AI use in education and highlight the need for balanced policies that acknowledge both the benefits and the potential drawbacks of employing LLMs in academic environments.

2.2. Generative AI and Teaching Languages

When it comes to language teaching, generative artificial intelligence has begun to transform various aspects of language education. Tools powered by LLMs offer new possibilities for student engagement, autonomous learning, and personalized language feedback. These systems can generate coherent text, answer language-related questions, and simulate conversations, thereby making them valuable resources for language learners. However, their integration into educational settings has also raised concerns regarding accuracy, critical thinking, and pedagogical effectiveness. For language teachers, generative AI presents both opportunities and challenges. On the one hand, it can potentially increase student motivation by providing interactive and context-sensitive language practice. On the other hand, it may lead to excessive reliance on such tools, thus reducing students' ability to develop independent linguistic competence. Furthermore, ethical considerations (see Akgun & Greenhow, 2022), such as plagiarism detection, bias in the content generated by LLM-based tools, and the teacher's role in mediating AI use, require a critical approach to their implementation in language education. So, the discussion within the language education context mirrors the broader debates outlined above – where both the advantages and limitations of generative AI are recognized.

This is reflected in various studies in the field, as the emerging body of research on generative AI in language education highlights both the opportunities and challenges it presents. Moorhouse and Kohnke (2024) examined the impact of generative AI on initial language teacher education (ILTE) and concluded that teacher educators recognized the significant influence of AI tools on curriculum and assessment, but that many also felt unprepared (both in terms of competence and confidence) to integrate them effectively. Similarly, Moorhouse (2024) explored the readiness of novice and first-year language teachers to incorporate AI into their teaching and noted that, while first-year teachers appear more confident in utilizing AI tools, novice teachers often lack the necessary knowledge and experience. Rahimi and Sevilla-Pavón (2024) explored the role of ChatGPT readiness in shaping language teaching innovation and demonstrated that teachers who are more prepared to use AI tend to develop novel teaching methods and approaches. Their study suggests that integrating ChatGPT into pedagogical strategies can help teachers and that professional development in AI literacy is crucial. The authors recommend that, particularly in ELT, stakeholders should shift their focus from AI programming to AI. In line with the more cautious approach previously discussed, Law (2024) acknowledged considerable benefits of AI tools, but stressed that teachers must also be aware of potential risks, including ethical concerns and over-reliance on AI-generated content. Furthermore, Zhi & Wang (2024) examined how AI influences students' willingness to communicate in English as a foreign language and found that teacher-student rapport plays a far more significant role, while the influence of AI remains comparatively limited. While interpersonal relationships remain more impactful, AI-mediated activities are increasingly recognized as shaping students' communicative attitudes, though their effects remain modest. The authors emphasized the need for further research on how AI and traditional teaching approaches interact to optimize language learning. The ultimate goal is to achieve a balance between technological advancements and essential teacher-student dynamics.

Beyond pedagogical implications, the psychological impact of AI integration on teachers represents another critical area of concern. Kohnke et al. (2024) examined the phenomenon of technostress among English language instructors and found that the rapid advancement of AI, combined with inadequate training, can contribute to elevated stress levels and resistance to AI adoption. Finally, Crompton et al. (2024) provided a broader perspective on the role of AI in English language teaching and learning and showed the need to equip teachers with a solid understanding of AI, its benefits, and its potential drawbacks. Taken together, these studies align with the findings discussed in the previous section: although generative AI holds transformative potential for language education, its successful implementation requires comprehensive teacher training, attention to ethical issues, and a balanced approach to integration into pedagogical practice.

2.3. OpenAI's guidelines for student use (OpenAI 2024)

As already mentioned above, in recognition of the possible downsides of using ChatGPT against acceptable academic practices, its developer, OpenAI, has come up with a set of 12 recommendations for student use, outlined in their "Student's Guide to Writing with ChatGPT" (OpenAI, 2024). Introduced as a means of helping students become better writers and thinkers, the guide comprises the following recommendations:

1. Delegate citation grunt work to ChatGPT,
2. Quickly get up to speed on a new topic,

3. Get a roadmap of relevant sources,
4. Complete your understanding by asking specific questions,
5. Improve your flow by getting feedback on structure,
6. Test your logic with reverse outlining,
7. Develop your ideas through Socratic dialogue,
8. Pressure-test your thesis by asking for counterarguments,
9. Compare your ideas against history's greatest thinkers,
10. Elevate your writing through iterative feedback,
11. Use Advanced Voice Mode as a reading companion, and
12. Don't just go through the motions – hone your skills.

OpenAI's guidelines can roughly be divided into four categories. The first is the technical category (recommendations 1 and 11), where certain features of ChatGPT can be used to facilitate students' work by providing technical assistance. The second category contains recommendations 2, 3, and 4, which are related to the preparation phase of academic writing. These suggestions allow students to more easily establish their theoretical framework and set the foundation for their research. The next category is the structure category (recommendations 5 and 6), in which OpenAI advises students on how to use ChatGPT to test their reasoning and construct their essays in a satisfactory manner. The final and largest category comprises recommendations 7, 8, 9, 10, and 12, and focuses on improving students' argumentation and critical thinking. In this category, OpenAI offers a number of possible ways in which students can develop their thinking and writing skills by asking ChatGPT to provide constructive feedback and put forward counterarguments to their ideas.

The guide concludes with OpenAI's call for students to be transparent in their use of ChatGPT. Acknowledging that their application can be employed in unethical ways, OpenAI urges students to be open about how they useChatGPT. According to the guide, some of the simplest actions students can take include properly citing their sources and generating shareable links that allow instructors to assess their use of AI. By doing so, ChatGPT's developers believe that students can demonstrate their commitment to academic integrity and use their LLM-based tool in a principled manner (OpenAI, 2024).

3. METHODOLOGY

In this section, we present our research design, describe our participant pool, and outline the overall analytical approach applied to the collected data.

3.1. Research design: Open-ended questionnaire

To operationalize our research questions, we developed a questionnaire to cover the four main aspects we aimed to investigate. The questionnaire used in this study (available in the Appendix) was structured into five sections, each designed to gather information on language teachers' experiences, perspectives, and concerns regarding the use of ChatGPT in education. Part A focused on collecting basic demographic and professional background information, such as age, native language, teaching experience, and the languages our respondents taught. It also assessed their self-reported IT skills and prior training in the use of generative AI tools. Part B investigated teachers' perceptions of students' motivations for using ChatGPT. Respondents were asked to identify common reasons why students turned to the tool, the benefits students reported, and whether they

primarily used it for academic support or as a shortcut for completing assignments. This section aimed to provide insights into students' engagement with ChatGPT and its role in their studies. Part C explored the perceived benefits and challenges associated with ChatGPT use in language learning. Teachers were asked to reflect on the tool's impact on students' learning experiences, including its potential to improve or hinder critical thinking and problem-solving skills. Additionally, this section examined any negative consequences observed, such as over-reliance on the content generated by LLM-based tools or diminished independent learning skills. Parts D and E addressed ethical considerations and alignment with OpenAI's guidelines. Part D focused on concerns regarding academic integrity, asking whether respondents had encountered unethical uses of ChatGPT and how they believed universities should regulate its use. Part E evaluated teachers' awareness of OpenAI's student guide and their observations regarding whether students followed or deviated from the recommended practices. Together, these sections provided insight into institutional challenges and potential strategies for the responsible integration of AI in education.

3.2. Participants

The study included eight language teachers from Serbia (n=4) and Sweden (n=4), who had diverse backgrounds in teaching experience, language instruction, and familiarity with digital tools. Four Serbian teachers (three female, one male) participated, ranging in age from 36 to 52 years. They are labelled Sr1–Sr4. Their teaching experience varied from 12 to 31 years, primarily instructing Serbian (n=2) or English (n=2) at undergraduate and graduate levels. Their IT proficiency ranged from intermediate to advanced, with two teachers actively using digital tools such as online platforms, phonetic transcription software, and LLM-powered tools, while the other two did not use IT teaching aids. None had received formal training in the use of LLM-based tools such as ChatGPT in education. The Swedish cohort consisted of four teachers (also three female, one male), labelled Sw1–Sw4, aged 43 to 56, with 14 to 32 years of experience. They taught Swedish (n=2), English (n=2), or other subjects in English and Swedish at undergraduate, graduate or continuing education levels. Their IT proficiency was generally intermediate to advanced, and most integrated digital tools into their teaching, including Canvas, PowerPoint, ChatGPT, and reference tools. Two participants had received formal training on LLM-based tools, either through workshops, conferences, or peer learning, while the other two had not.

3.3. Approaching the data: Thematic analysis

To analyse the open-ended responses provided by the eight participants, a thematic analysis approach was employed (see Braun & Clarke, 2021; Guest, MacQueen, & Namey, 2012). This method allowed for the identification, organization, and interpretation of patterns within qualitative data. The analysis followed a systematic process and, in our case, ensured that responses were categorized into the four predefined themes: (1) Teacher insights on student motivations for using ChatGPT, (2) Perceived benefits and challenges of ChatGPT usage, (3) Risks related to academic integrity and institutional perspectives, and (4) Comparison with OpenAI's Student Guide.

The first step in the analysis involved familiarization with the data. All responses were gathered by theme and read multiple times to ensure a thorough understanding of the content. Initial notes were taken to highlight recurring ideas and key points. Following this, a coding process was conducted, where segments of text relevant to the research themes were labelled

with descriptive codes. These codes were then grouped into broader categories that aligned with the four thematic areas (with some overlaps).

Once coding was completed, the themes were refined by identifying patterns and relationships across participants' responses. For example, statements regarding students' reasons for using ChatGPT were synthesized under the first theme, while mentions of learning benefits or limitations were categorized under the second and third themes, respectively. Additionally, responses reflecting concerns about ethical use, plagiarism, or institutional regulations were analysed within the third theme. The final theme focused on comparing teachers' perceptions with OpenAI's guidelines (though these responses were not available in all completed questionnaires). Direct quotations from participants were included to illustrate key findings and support interpretation.

4. Findings and Thematic Analysis

The following section presents the key findings from teacher responses, organized thematically. First, we examine teachers' insights into students' motivations for using ChatGPT and discuss concerns regarding its role as a shortcut versus a learning aid. Next, we explore the perceived benefits and challenges of ChatGPT in academic settings, followed by an overview of its impact on academic integrity and ethical considerations.

4.1. Teacher Insights on Student Motivations for Using ChatGPT

A recurring theme in teachers' responses is that students primarily use ChatGPT as a shortcut to complete assignments rather than as a tool for academic support. Many teachers explicitly stated that students rely on ChatGPT to generate text, structure essays, and produce assignments they are expected to complete independently. For example, one participant remarked, "Unfortunately, [students use it] to produce assignments they themselves are supposed to write" (Sw4). Similarly, participant Sr3 observed, "Most of them see it as a shortcut to completing assignments". This sentiment is echoed across multiple responses, indicating a widespread concern among teachers that students may be using ChatGPT to bypass critical thinking and writing processes.

While the shortcut approach dominates teachers' perceptions, some participants acknowledged alternative motivations. For instance, some students reportedly use ChatGPT to assist with organizing references and writing theoretical sections of research (Sr1). Additionally, a few students seem to benefit from ChatGPT when searching for literature, definitions, and explanations of key concepts, as stated by participant Sr2. One teacher noted that students appreciate "the speed with which information can be found" but also acknowledged that such information may lack credibility (Sr2). Another notable reason for using ChatGPT relates to language barriers. One teacher pointed out that "students with Swedish as a second language feel that their lacking language skills don't have to stop them from succeeding in their classes anymore" (Sw2). This suggests that for some students, ChatGPT functions as a support tool that helps them articulate their ideas more effectively in academic writing.

Despite these potential benefits, most teachers remain sceptical about whether students use ChatGPT for genuine academic development. Participants Sr3 and Sw4 noted that students rarely admit to using ChatGPT unless caught, supporting the perception that its use is often associated with academic dishonesty. However, one participant offered a more optimistic

perspective, noting that workshops on responsible AI use have helped some students realize how ChatGPT can serve as an academic support tool rather than just a shortcut (Sr4).

4.2. Perceived Benefits and Challenges of ChatGPT Usage

As expected, responses from language teachers address both the advantages and drawbacks of students' reliance on ChatGPT in their learning experiences. Whereas some recognize its potential as a supportive tool for research and language learning, others express concerns about its impact on students' cognitive development and academic integrity – some responses are notably well-balanced.

One of the primary benefits associated with ChatGPT is its ability to assist students in finding and analysing information. Several participants pointed out that the tool provides access to a wide range of sources and helps students navigate digital research more effectively. One participant emphasized that many undergraduate students struggle to identify relevant search terms and resources, stating "ChatGPT can truly be of great help when it comes to such tasks" (Sr2). Similarly, participant Sw3 noted its usefulness in structuring writing, particularly in generating topic sentences and guiding students through the initial stages of composition. Moreover, ChatGPT serves as a supplementary learning tool for more advanced students. Participant Sw2 observed that "students who are already at a pretty high level can reach further," using ChatGPT to deepen their understanding and explore new perspectives. This aligns with participant Sr3's observation that if students utilize ChatGPT for brainstorming and refining their work rather than as a shortcut, they can significantly improve their critical thinking, speaking, and writing skills.

Likewise, participants voiced concerns about the potential drawbacks of ChatGPT in language learning. A recurring theme among the responses is the risk of students becoming overly dependent on the tool, which can lead to reduced cognitive engagement. Participant Sr1 warned that "students research less and therefore do not use their full cognitive potential," while participant Sw4 observed that many students use ChatGPT in ways that hinder their learning rather than support it. Another major concern is the decline in critical thinking skills. Several participants pointed out that students often accept ChatGPT-generated responses without question and thus fail to critically evaluate or reflect on the material. Participant Sr4 noted that students who merely copy and paste ChatGPT's output "without giving such materials any thought whatsoever" are unlikely to develop the analytical skills necessary for deeper learning. This aligns with another concern that students may not yet recognize the limitations of ChatGPT-generated text: "On the first read-through, ChatGPT suggestions seem really good. But the more one reads, the more problems one spots and realizes that it's necessary to fix or fill in the text" (Sw3). Additionally, some responses stressed the widening gap between students who already possess strong foundational skills and those who struggle. Participant Sw2 noted that "Gen AI makes the differences between 'good' and 'struggling' students bigger, especially after a longer period," as those who rely on ChatGPT too heavily may miss out on essential skill development. This concern extends to academic integrity, with participant Sr3 observing that some students believe they can "outsmart their teachers by providing responses generated by ChatGPT" instead of engaging with the material authentically.

Ultimately, the effectiveness of ChatGPT in language learning depends largely on how students and teachers approach its use. Participants emphasized the importance of promoting AI literacy and teaching students how to critically engage with ChatGPT-

generated content. As participant Sr4 pointed out, ChatGPT's impact on critical thinking "depends on the mindset and possibly also on the way instructors approach the use of ChatGPT in the classroom." Teachers who encourage students to use the tool as a means of exploration and refinement (rather than as a shortcut) may help mitigate some of the challenges associated with reliance on LLM-based tools while still exploiting its potential benefits.

4.3. ChatGPT, Academic Integrity, Ethics, and Institutional Perspectives

The integration of ChatGPT into academic work raises significant concerns regarding academic integrity, with teachers expressing concerns about plagiarism, over-reliance on ChatGPT-generated content, and the potential erosion of critical thinking skills. The primary ethical considerations discussed by teachers revolve around the authenticity of student work, the challenge of detecting ChatGPT-generated content, and the necessity for clear institutional guidelines and training to ensure responsible usage. One of the central concerns is the risk of students over-relying on ChatGPT without critically engaging with the material. As one participant noted, "The probability of producing 'fake science' or even 'pseudo-science' is high" (Sr3). This issue extends beyond mere plagiarism and reflects a broader fear that students might accept ChatGPT-generated information uncritically, leading to the dissemination of inaccurate or misleading knowledge. Similarly, participant Sr2 expressed concerns about the credibility of information provided by ChatGPT, stating that students may not "even know enough about the problem at hand" to assess the validity of the generated content. Another ethical dilemma involves the detection of ChatGPT-generated submissions. While some participants acknowledged instances of students using ChatGPT inappropriately (Sr4 mentioned its use in annotated bibliographies, while Sw2 cited students lying about their ChatGPT usage), others pointed out the difficulties in proving such misconduct. Participant Sw4 expressed scepticism about the feasibility of addressing the issue, stating, "Perhaps the only way out is getting rid of any form of academic evaluation involving writing in an uncontrolled environment." This highlights a broader institutional challenge regarding how universities can uphold academic integrity in an era where LLM-based tools are widely accessible and difficult to regulate.

The participants offered various solutions to mitigate these ethical concerns. Several advocated for the implementation of ChatGPT-detection tools to verify student work (Sr1, Sr4). However, others stressed the need for comprehensive training, not only for students but also for teachers. Participant Sr3 suggested that "students have to be provided with guided training to learn how to use ChatGPT responsibly," arguing that ethical awareness would naturally deter misuse. Likewise, participant Sr2 called for university-level training programmes to ensure that both students and faculty understand the appropriate and ethical applications of AI in academic contexts. Some participants also suggested re-evaluating assessment methods to address the challenges posed by AI. One participant proposed that "anything that students write which could have been with the use of AI should not be graded" (Sw3), while also questioning the value of grading work that relies more on prompt engineering than on original thought. Meanwhile, participant Sw2 recommended revising course goals and examinations to ensure that assessments accurately reflect students' independent learning and skill development. Finally, based on the responses, it can be concluded that addressing these ethical challenges requires a multilayered approach combining detection mechanisms, training initiatives, and institutional reforms to preserve the integrity of academic work in the digital age.

4.4. Comparison with OpenAI's Student Guide

Given the fact that only one of our participants reported being acquainted with the recommendations in OpenAI's student guide and noted that current student usage does not align with it, we can say that there is insufficient data to provide an adequate response to the final research question. Based on the data collected, it can be concluded that neither teachers nor students are sufficiently informed about OpenAI's student guide. Moreover, judging by the interviewed teachers' responses to other survey questions, it is clear that much remains to be done to align students' use of ChatGPT with OpenAI's guidelines.

5. CONCLUSIONS

The process of integrating ChatGPT into student learning presents a complex interplay of opportunities and challenges, which language teachers in Serbia and Sweden identified in a rather similar fashion. While the tool provides students with advanced support for research, writing, and comprehension, concerns regarding academic integrity, critical thinking, and overreliance on LLM-based tools remain significant among both groups of teachers. The insights gathered from teachers in this study stress the need for a more concrete application of guidelines on ethical AI usage, as well as pedagogical strategies that promote responsible engagement with generative AI. As we move forward based on what we have learned, teachers and institutions must collaborate to establish additional policies that balance innovation and academic rigor. They also need to make sure that tools such as ChatGPT serve as a complement to, rather than a substitute for, student learning. Boosting critical awareness and responsible AI use in language education can be tailored in a way that harnesses the potential of ChatGPT, while simultaneously addressing its risks. OpenAI's guide appears to be a convenient starting point, primarily as far as students are concerned, due to its high accessibility and global reach. Even though it remains to be seen exactly to what extent students are aware of said guidelines, since their perspectives were not included in our study, it can be assumed that their answers would not differ much from the teachers' responses in this regard. We believe that being introduced to OpenAI's recommendations would be particularly important for students, as it would provide further proof that their teachers' concerns are valid. However, OpenAI's guidelines would benefit from a more systematic approach, as the recommendations currently appear to be rather unevenly developed and randomly ordered. Using the European Commission's (2022) guidelines as a reference point and involving experts in the field would help improve the guide.

At the same time, there are certain limitations to this study of which we are fully aware. First, the small sample size of eight teachers limits the generalizability of the findings. A broader study involving a larger and more diverse group of teachers would provide a more comprehensive understanding of the impact of LLM-based tools on language learning. This limitation was particularly evident when it came to our final research question. In hindsight, it might have been more effective to operationalize this question differently – for example, the main principles from OpenAI's student guide could have been listed, coupled with a task of assessing whether students generally adhered to them. Second, the study relies on self-reported data from teachers, which may introduce bias in interpreting students' engagement with ChatGPT. To gain a more balanced perspective, future research should incorporate direct input from students. Finally, as LLM-based technologies evolve rapidly, the findings of this study may soon become outdated, which necessitates continuous reassessment of how generative AI is influencing education.

Based on these limitations, we can also propose several potential directions for future research. To begin with, expanding the sample size and including teachers from various educational levels and disciplines would improve the overall validity and generalizability of the results. Investigating students' own perceptions and experiences with ChatGPT through the combination of quantitative and qualitative research methods could provide a more comprehensive understanding of its role in academic engagement. Additionally, longitudinal studies could be conducted to track changes in the use of LLM-based tools and their impact on learning outcomes over time. Lastly, another promising avenue for future research involves comparative studies that examine cultural and institutional responses to ChatGPT across different educational systems. Such research could further reveal how generative AI is reshaping learning practices on a global scale.

Acknowledgments. *This research was financially supported by the Ministry of Science, Technological Development and Innovation of the Republic of Serbia (Contract No. 451-03-137/2025-03/200109) (Miloš Tasić). An early version of this study was presented at the 13th National Forum for English Studies 2025, held in association with Lund University, on 9–11 April 2025.*

REFERENCES

Abbas, M., Jam, F. A., & Khan, T. I. (2024). Is it harmful or helpful? Examining the causes and consequences of generative AI usage among university students. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 21*, 10. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00444-7

Akgun, S., & Greenhow, C. (2022). Artificial intelligence in education: Addressing ethical challenges in K-12 settings. *AI and Ethics, 2*(3), 431–440. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-021-00096-7

Baek, C., Tate, T., & Warschauer, M. (2024). "ChatGPT seems too good to be true": College students' use and perceptions of generative AI. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 7*, 100294. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100294

Bates, T., Cobo, C., Mariño, O., & Wheeler, S. (2020). Can artificial intelligence transform higher education? *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 17*(1), 42. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-020-00218-x

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). *Thematic analysis: A practical guide.* SAGE Publications.

Chan, C. K. Y., & Tsi, L. H. Y. (2024). Will generative AI replace teachers in higher education? A study of teacher and student perceptions. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 83*, 101395. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2024.101395

Chiu, T. K. F., Moorhouse, B. L., Chai, C. S., & Ismailov, M. (2024). Teacher support and student motivation to learn with artificial intelligence (AI)-based chatbots. *Interactive Learning Environments, 32*(7), 3240–3256. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2023.2172044

Chowdhury Niloy, A., Bari, Md A., Sultana, J., Chowdhury, R., Meem Raisa, F., Islam, A., Mahmud, S., Jahan, I., Sarkar, M., Akter, S., Nishat, N., Afroz, M., Sen, A., Islam, T., Tareq, M. H., & Hossen, Md A. (2024). Why do students use ChatGPT? Answering through a triangulation approach. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 6*, 100208. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100208

Crompton, H., Edmett, A., Ichaporia, N., & Burke, D. (2024). AI and English language teaching: Affordances and challenges. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 55*, 2503–2529. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13460

European Commission: Directorate-General for Education, Youth, Sport and Culture. (2022). *Ethical guidelines on the use of artificial intelligence (AI) and data in teaching and learning for educators*. Publications Office of the European Union. https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2766/153756

Felix, C. V. (2020). The role of the teacher and AI in education. In E. Sengupta, P. Blessinger, & M. S. Makhanya (Eds.), *International perspectives on the role of technology in humanizing higher education* (Vol. 33, pp. 33–48). Emerald Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/S2055-364120200000033003

Gacs, A., Goertler, S., & Spasova, S. (2020). Planned online language education versus crisis-prompted online language teaching: Lessons for the future. *Foreign Language Annals, 53*(2), 380–392. https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12460

Guest, G. S., Macqueen, K. M., & Namey, E. E. (2012). *Applied thematic analysis*. SAGE Publications.

Guilherme, A. (2019). AI and education: The importance of teacher and student relations. *AI & Society, 34*, 47–54. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-017-0693-8

Holyoak, K. J. (2024, August 27). Why I am not a Turing machine. *Journal of Cognitive Psychology.* https://doi.org/10.1080/20445911.2024.2395573

Ichien, N., Stamenković, D., & Holyoak, K. J. (2024). Large language model displays emergent ability to interpret novel literary metaphors. *Metaphor and Symbol, 39*(4), 296–309. https://doi.org/10.1080/10926488.2024.2380348

Kim, J., Merrill, K., Xu, K., & Sellnow, D. D. (2020). My teacher is a machine: Understanding students' perceptions of AI teaching assistants in online education. *International Journal of Human–Computer Interaction, 36*(20), 1902–1911. https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2020.1801227

Kohnke, L., Zou, D., & Moorhouse, B. L. (2024). Technostress and English language teaching in the age of generative AI. *Educational Technology & Society, 27*(2), 306-320. https://doi.org/10.30191/ETS.202404_27(2).TP02

Law, L. (2024). Application of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) in language teaching and learning: A scoping literature review. *Computers and Education Open, 6*, 100174. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeo.2024.100174

Luo, J. (2024). How does GenAI affect trust in teacher-student relationships? Insights from students' assessment experiences. *Teaching in Higher Education*, Online first, https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2024.2341005

Moorhouse, B. L. (2024). Beginning and first-year language teachers' readiness for the generative AI age. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 6*, 100201. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100201

Moorhouse, B. L., & Kohnke, L. (2024). The effects of generative AI on initial language teacher education: The perceptions of teacher educators. *System, 122*, 103290. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2024.103290

OpenAI. (2024, December 8). *A student's guide to writing with ChatGPT.* OpenAI. https://openai.com/chatgpt/use-cases/student-writing-guide

Rahimi, A. R., & Sevilla-Pavón, A. (2024). The role of ChatGPT readiness in shaping language teachers' language teaching innovation and meeting accountability: A bisymmetric approach. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 7*, 100258. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100258

Sanusi, I. T., Agbo, F. J., Dada, O. A., Yunusa, A. A., Aruleba, K. D., Obaido, G., Olawumi, O., & Oyelere, S. S. (2024). Stakeholders' insights on artificial intelligence education: Perspectives of teachers, students, and policymakers. *Computers and Education Open, 7*, 100212. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeo.2024.100212

Šijan, A., Ilić, L., Predić, B., Viduka, D., & Rančić, D. (2024). Bibliometric analysis of artificial intelligence applications in higher education using Web of Science database. *Facta Universitatis, Series: Teaching, Learning and Teacher Education, 8*(2), 119–130. https://doi.org/10.22190/FUTLTE241104011S

Tasić, M., & Stamenković, D. (2024). Engineering and management students' views on online and face-to-face EAP teaching. *ESP Today, 12*(1), 136–154. https://doi.org/10.18485/esptoday.2024.12.1.7

Zhi, R., & Wang, Y. (2024). On the relationship between EFL students' attitudes toward artificial intelligence, teachers' immediacy and teacher-student rapport, and their willingness to communicate. *System, 124*, 103341. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2024.103341

RAZUMEVANJE STUDENTSKE INTERAKCIJE SA APLIKACIJOM *CHATGPT* IZ PERSPEKTIVE NASTAVNIKA JEZIKA IZ SRBIJE I ŠVEDSKE

Nagli razvoj alata generativne veštačke inteligencije, poput ChatGPT, značajno je izmenio procese nastave i učenja time što je omogućio korišćenje moćnih aplikacija za obradu jezika. Iako ChatGPT pruža važnu podršku pri pisanju, sumiranju i pronalaženju informacija, njegova neregulisana upotreba istovremeno podriva osnove akademskog integriteta, kritičkog mišljenja i etičkih principa. U ovom radu se razmatraju stavovi nastavnika jezika iz Srbije i Švedske prema načinu na koji studenti koriste ChatGPT. Pomoću upitnika sa otvorenim pitanjima koji je popunilo osam nastavnika jezika, ovo istraživanje sagledava četiri ključne oblasti: (1) motivaciju studenata za korišćenje aplikacije ChatGPT, (2) uočene prednosti i mane takve upotrebe, (3) etičke izazove i implikacije po akademski integritet i (4) meru u kojoj je to kako studenti koriste ChatGPT u stvarnom životu usklađeno sa uputstvima kompanije OpenAI. Tematska analiza odgovora nastavnika pokazala je da uprkos činjenici da ChatGPT može da unapredi veštine istraživanja i pisanja, preveliko oslanjanje na sadržaje generisane pomoću veštačke inteligencije predstavlja opasnost po kognitivni angažman i nezavisno učenje. Štaviše, naročito dolazi do izražaja zabrinutost oko plagiranja i autentičnosti studentskog rada. Nalazi ovog istraživanja doprinose tekućoj raspravi o odgovornom integrisanju veštačke inteligencije u obrazovanje i pružaju uvid u to kako nastavnici jezika izlaze na kraj sa izazovima i mogućnostima koje pružaju alati generativne veštačke inteligencije.

Ključne reči: *nastava jezika, generativna veštačka inteligencija, ChatGPT, engleski, srpski, švedski*

APPENDIX
THE QUESTIONNAIRE USED IN THE STUDY

Part A: Basic Information	
Age:	
Gender (optional):	
Native language:	
Other languages you speak fluently:	
Country you teach in:	
Years of language teaching experience:	
Languages you currently teach:	
At what educational levels do you primarily teach (e.g., undergraduate, graduate, continuing education)?	
How would you describe your level of IT skills? (Beginner / Intermediate / Advanced)	
Do you use any IT teaching aids in your classes, and if so, to what extent (excluding hardware such as video projectors, interactive boards, etc.)?	
Have you received any formal training on using AI tools such as ChatGPT in education?	

Part B: Motivation for Using ChatGPT
What do you think are the most common reasons students in your courses use ChatGPT?
Have students expressed any particular benefits they experience from using ChatGPT in their studies?
Do you think students use ChatGPT more for academic support or as a shortcut to completing assignments?

Part C: Perceived Benefits and Challenges
In what ways do you think ChatGPT positively impacts students' learning experiences?
Have you observed any negative consequences of students relying on ChatGPT? If so, what are they?
Do you think ChatGPT improves or hinders students' ability to think critically and solve problems, especially with regard to language learning?

Part D: Academic Integrity and Ethical Concerns
What concerns do you have regarding students' use of ChatGPT in academic work?
Have you encountered cases where students used ChatGPT in ways that you consider unethical?
How do you think universities should regulate or guide the use of ChatGPT to maintain academic integrity?

Part E: Alignment with OpenAI's Guidelines
Are you acquainted with the recommendations in OpenAI's student guide? – YES / NO (If yes, please answer the following questions.)
Based on your experience, how do the ways in which students use ChatGPT compare with the recommendations in OpenAI's student guide?
Are there specific ways in which students misuse ChatGPT that diverge from OpenAI's intended use?