Unlocking the Potential of AI in Higher Education: A Multi-Dimensional Study of ChatGPT Adoption at a South African University

Halalisile Hlobile Xulu*[1], Nomfundo Sinethemba Hlongwa [2], Kudakwashe Maguraushe[3]

[1&2]Teaching and Learning Development Centre, [3]Department of Information and Communication Technology

[1,2,3]Mangosuthu University of Technology, Umlazi, Durban, South Africa

Email: [1]xulu.halalisile@mut.ac.za, [2]hlongwa.nomfundo@mut.ac.za
[3]maguraushe.kuda@mut.ac.za

Abstract. The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) in education is rapidly evolving, extending transformative potential in increasing learning experiences. ChatGPT has gained significant attention for its educational relevance. While previous studies have primarily focused on the perspectives of educators, there is a significant gap in understanding students' perceptions of ChatGPT's impact on their learning experiences and ultimately, academic performance. This study seeks to address this gap by investigating students' perceptions of ChatGPT and its effects on their learning experiences and academic outcomes at Mangosuthu University of Technology in South Africa. A quantitative research approach was employed, that used a survey distributed to a sample size of 184 students. Using an electronic questionnaire, a five-point Likert scale was used to collect data, with statistical analysis conducted using SPSS version 26.0. The findings reveal that students perceive ChatGPT as a beneficial tool for enhancing their learning experiences. Major benefits include improved access to information, enhanced writing skills, and increased engagement in learning activities. Notwithstanding the benefits, there are concerns regarding academic integrity, lack of human interaction and biases, were noted. The study highlights the need for developing applicable frameworks to ensure the effective and ethical integration of AI tools such as ChatGPT in academic settings. Additionally, institutions should focus on promoting a supportive culture that fosters responsible use while addressing potential weaknesses. Further research is recommended to explore long-term impacts and develop strategies for mitigating negative consequences.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, ChatGPT, Learning Experiences, Perceptions, Higher Education

1.   Introduction

Artificial intelligence (AI) has played a significant role in digitalising societies, particularly in the field of education where its application is growing rapidly. The use of AI in education enables inclusivity and enhances quality, while also bringing education to an uninterrupted lifelong basis [1]. Several technological interventions and milestones have been witnessed within the education space and a good example of the use of AI in education is the Chat Generative Pre-Trained Transformer (ChatGPT), an AI-powered chatbot developed by OpenAI which was launched in November 2022 [2]. ChatGPT uses machine learning (ML) and sophisticated algorithms to process massive amounts of information from various sources, including news items, novels, Wikipedia, and webpages [3, 4]. It can produce texts in response to user prompts and generate sentences that mimic and resemble human language [5], a feature which enables it to be perceived as a powerful writing tool in academia.

ChatGPT has experienced rapid growth and widespread use in education. A study by [6] explored the possibilities of using Generative AI (GenAI) tools like ChatGPT to improve educational quality. The study discovered that academics could leverage ChatGPT for a variety of tasks, including developing test questions, customised course materials, and syllabi development. Likewise, students can use ChatGPT for tasks like information retrieval, question-specific searches, report and essay writing, software development, mathematical computations, and statistical analysis [7]. This was also testified by [8], who argued that ChatGPT has a positive impact on various key academic activities, including students' learning, research, studying and task management.

Despite its modern advancements, there are growing concerns about ChatGPT's possible impact on higher education. Notably, there are multiple instances where students exploit the system to cheat [9 - 11]. There is a risk to academic integrity, as ChatGPT has demonstrated its ability to pass legal and medical licensing exams and produce undetectable computer programs, statistical analyses, and research abstracts potentially compromising the eminence of academic work [12]. Unfortunately, the lack of appropriate legal frameworks and a lack of students who are committed to academic integrity have been the primary causes of the AI tools' improper adoption in higher education [12, 13]. These issues underscore the importance of understanding the factors influencing ChatGPT adoption and usage.

Although there is a growing discourse on the use of ChatGPT in academia, it is still an evolving phenomenon which is under investigation, with most research focusing on the opinions of academics regarding ChatGPT and its potential applications [13, 14]. There seems to be little focus on students and the factors influencing their intention to use ChatGPT [3, 15, 16]. Therefore, it is imperative to explore the factors that may influence students' intentions to use ChatGPT. This study aims to bridge this gap

by presenting a theoretical model and exploring students' perceptions and concerns about the use and adoption of ChatGPT at a South African institution , Mangosuthu University of Technology (MUT). Moreover, the study examined the factors influencing ChatGPT use and its impact on learning outcomes and the academic performance of students. The purpose is to contribute to the discussion on the advancement of educational strategies that enable the successful and responsible integration of ChatGPT and similar technologies into emerging educational institutions.

The rest of the paper will be structured as follows: theoretical background, methods, findings, discussions, recommendations, and conclusion.

2.   Literature Review

1. Background

ChatGPT is emerging as an intriguing subject, with many scholars exploring its capabilities in education, focusing on multiple aspects including its benefits, drawbacks, and whether the consideration of ethics is evaluated while using AI technologies [17]. Literature suggests that ChatGPT can greatly help within academia, with a variety of possibilities including student assessments, minimising repetitive work, and generating unique content [18]. Students are increasingly interested in using ChatGPT because of its ability to expand their learning experiences. However, the rising concerns emerging from using ChatGPT such as plagiarism and academic dishonesty should not be overlooked [19, 20]. Therefore, it becomes a prerequisite to comprehend how ChatGPT can be adopted within institutions of higher learning to purposefully unlock its potential for students without falling into various academic traps.

2. Theoretical background

To explore the factors affecting the adoption of AI tools in higher education, this study adopted the Technology-Organisation-Environment (TOE) theory, which was developed and introduced by [21]. The model serves as a primary theoretical lens for understanding the adoption and implementation of technological innovations within organisations [21, 22]. This model was chosen for its robustness as it is widely used for analysing technology adoption in many different fields, including education and has a strong theoretical foundation and useful empirical support [3, 23]. The *technological context* in the TOE framework encompasses the traits of the technology and how it influences its adoption [24]. Several studies have identified network quality, accessibility, system response, and ease of use as critical factors influencing technology adoption [22]. Despite the enormous potential and benefits of emerging AI-based technological solutions, users may resist using them if they have a difficult procedure or interface that differs significantly from present technology [25]. Therefore, an organisation must compare the benefits or features of new technology to those of existing technology before adopting or implementing it. Additionally, simplicity of access, connection with existing platforms, and user-friendly interfaces are critical in evaluat-

ing user satisfaction and adoption intention for ChatGPT [26, 27]. The *organisational context* focuses on characteristics such as organisational size, structure, culture, and resources [28]. Various studies point out that organisational culture influences technology adoption in a variety of settings, including educational institutions [9, 11]. Fostering a technology-friendly workplace, supporting faculty and staff training, and embedding AI-driven technologies into the curriculum are all aspects of organisational culture [9]. According to [24], understanding the adoption of ChatGPT among university students requires taking organisational culture into account. This construct includes the university's support for adopting ChatGPT, events such as incentive programs to encourage its usage and the favourable impact of university policies on ChatGPT adoption [26]. A supportive culture not only promotes the acceptance and usage of modern technologies in academic settings but also has an impact on broader institutional technology adoption trends [29]. Lastly, the *environmental context* considers external factors that can have an impact on technology adoption. It is believed that the external environment influences higher education institutions' adoption of AI tools, specifically ChatGPT [30]. Numerous studies have shown that positive word-of-mouth, peer recommendations, and testimonials are some of the factors motivating students to adopt and utilise ChatGPT for different purposes including education [9, 10, 26].

Therefore, this study seeks to test the following hypotheses:

H1: Technological factors significantly influence students' perceptions of ChatGPT's usefulness for academic tasks.

H2: Organisational support positively impacts students' adoption and usage of ChatGPT.

H3: Environmental factors significantly affect the successful integration of ChatGPT in the university.

3. Students' perceptions of the use of ChatGPT in education.

Previous studies have confirmed that students use ChatGPT for various academic purposes. ChatGPT assists students by providing access to the latest trends of technology in real-time, which in turn helps them to stay up to date with innovative technologies [18]. Another study by [31] concurred and pointed out that students benefit and enhance their learning practices and outcomes by familiarising themselves with newly implemented technologies such as ChatGPT. According to [32], ChatGPT also assists students' academic writing skills and provides solutions to improve writing quality content. Furthermore, ChatGPT provides grammar, proofreading, editing, and spelling check services to users while providing instant feedback [33]. It therefore implies that students who do not use English as a primary language academically and those who struggle with literacy skills can also use ChatGPT and benefit from it use [17].

AI tools like ChatGPT increase student engagement and encourage interest and motivation through their studies [34]. Likewise, [16] also suggests that ChatGPT is an optimistic tool, especially in rendering support to students with disabilities. The model can provide services of text-to-speech and speech-to-text during study engagements and discussions while conforming to individual personalised needs [12, 16]. Assistance received from ChatGPT allows students to argue the solutions, explanations, and suggestions that it gives them, this interaction encourages dependence and critical thinking for students who use this model [33, 35]. Students confirmed that ChatGPT exceeds the capabilities of other effective assistant tools such as Google, because it is very time efficient with rapid responses, thereby allowing students to save a lot of effort and energy on not having to search through several databases, webpages and sometimes having to download files [7]. This could explain why [35] emphasised the importance of adopting and utilising AI tools such as ChatGPT as holistic support in promoting collaborative learning and improving learning outcomes. Students also use ChatGPT to enhance their research skills as the model assists excellently with the evaluation and understanding of any topic while suggesting undiscovered literature on certain topics [36].

H4: Students' perceptions of ChatGPT capabilities significantly influence their academic performance and learning experience.

4. Pedagogical concerns of ChatGPT in education

Notwithstanding the numerous advantages of AI to education, some concerns relate to academic honesty, plagiarism, and biases in the writing of academic tasks such as research theses, report writing, software codes and essays [7, 9, 12]. ChatGPT should be used as an aid for improved researching and writing tools and not replace the creative and critical thinking skills of students cautioned [37, 35]. However, within the South African context, some institutions still face connectivity and access challenges and that could hinder the fair distribution of potential benefits obtained from utilising the AI technology tools [38]. This propels the digital divide [39], a common phenomenon within most historically disadvantaged institutions (HDIs). Students in underserved and remote locations face challenges of technological infrastructure, reliable internet access and AI tools intervention support from their institutions [38]. This is concurred by [40] who adds that learning frustrations and challenges arise from the limited trained dataset on ChatGPT since it cannot provide reliable and accurate answers to some of the user's prompts.

The adoption of AI tools brings forth another drawback of lack of human interaction as students face limitations in interacting with their classmates. This may harm learning since ChatGPT lacks empathy and human connection [31]. Whilst building personal connections with the lecturers is pertinent to students' academic success, unfortunately, chatbots prohibit that element [6]. Furthermore, discrimination and biases can be reinforced by using AI systems in academic settings [12]. Biases can stem from the fact that the ChatGPT application uses data that it is trained on, that is

data up to the year 2021 [41]. As such, AI chatbots may not be able to invent and update new curricula or courses, resolve students' physical concerns, provide counselling, and develop teaching methods [2]. Moreover, academic dishonesty is an unsettling drawback tied to the adoption of ChatGPT from both lecturing staff members' and students' perspectives [20]. Within the South African context, there were recorded concerns of cheating and inappropriate plagiarism with the use of AI tools at the University of Cape Town [35]. Interestingly, [33, 42] suggests that any AI-generated work, ideas, or solutions should not be considered plagiarism if the author of that work discloses that they used ChatGPT.

3. Methods

The study adopted a quantitative approach to ensure that the collected data was thoroughly analysed to draw statistical conclusions. A survey was adopted to better understand students' perspectives regarding ChatGPT. The target population was the Faculty of Management Sciences at Mangosuthu University of Technology (MUT). The population included 350 students within the faculty who confirmed that they use ChatGPT for their academic purposes. The Raosoft online calculator was used to measure the appropriate sample size. The research proposes using the Raosoft calculator for its accuracy and to meet the level that is desired margin of error which is usually 5% as well as the confidence level which is usually 95% [43]. Therefore, a sample size of n=184 was computed. The survey was distributed using a simple random sampling method, which allows every element in the population to have an equal chance of being chosen to participate in the study [16].

1. Data collection and analysis

Data was collected using an electronic questionnaire distributed randomly to 184 students who formed part of the recommended sample size of the study within the target population at MUT. Participants were to express their opinions and perceptions about ChatGPT on several dimensions using a five-point Likert scale questionnaire format, with options ranging from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree". Participants were emailed a link with a structured questionnaire having close-ended questions that were generated on Microsoft Forms (MS Forms). To increase the validity, and reliability of the instrument and method to be used, a pilot study was conducted with 15 participants who were conveniently selected from the target population. The statistical analysis and data analysis were conducted using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 26.0.

2. Reliability and validity

The internal consistency of the instrument was evaluated using Cronbach's Alpha (α) to ensure that it satisfied the validity requirements. An Alpha score of 0.70 or above indicates reliability and consistency [44]. Cronbach's Alpha test revealed outstanding

and moderate internal consistency for the ChatGPT TOE model instrument including perceptions, as Table 2 shows that all factors' Cronbach values were higher than the recommended cutoff value of 0.70 [44], indicating that the data is reliable.

3. Ethical Considerations

The authors were permitted to conduct this study at MUT through an ethical clearance *REF: RD1/23/2024* granted by the research ethical committee of the institution. Participants were given an informed consent form to either give consent or decline to participate before completing the questionnaire survey online. Furthermore, the form clearly stated that participation was voluntary, and participants were allowed to withdraw anytime without giving any reason. Additionally, to ensure anonymity and confidentiality during data collection, no personal data was required. The research did not pose any potential harm and the participants were informed before they consented to participate.

4. Findings

From a total of 184 students, 133 completed the survey, resulting in a 71.7% response rate which is within the range of acceptable response rates for research [45].

1. Demographics

Table 1 depicts the demographic distribution of the study participants. The distribution of genders demonstrates a relatively even split, with 46.6% being female and 53.4% being male participants. The biggest part of the participants belongs to the 18-24 age bracket (63.2%), with the following group being 25-30 years old (31.6%). The remaining age categories are only marginally represented. In terms of academic disciplines, Marketing and Accounting exhibit the highest prevalence at 29.3%, succeeded by Public Administration at 16.5%, Office Technology at 13.5%, and Human Resources Management at 11.3%. The educational breakdown data highlights that 63.9% of individuals are engaged in a Diploma program, with 24.8% in an Advanced Diploma program, and 11.3% in a Postgraduate Diploma/Honors program. This diversity in the demographic distribution offers a diverse perspective on the adoption of ChatGPT among distinct student categories.

Table 1: Demographic data

Characteristics	Categories	Frequency	Percentage%
Gender	Female	62	46.6
	Male	71	53.4
Age	Less than 18 Years	1	0.8
	18-24 years	84	63
	25-30 years	42	31.6
	31-35 years	5	3.8
	36-40 years	1	0.8
Field of study	Marketing	39	29.3
	Accounting	39	29.3
	Public Administration	22	16.6
	Office Technology	18	13.5
	Human Resources Management	15	11.3
Level of study	Diploma	85	63.9
	Advanced Diploma	33	24.8
	Postgrad diploma/Honors	15	11.3
Total		133	100

2. Reliability test

Table 2 depicts the reliability statistics of all the key variables examined in the study: Technological factors, Organisational factors, Environmental factors, and Perceptions.

Table 2: Reliability statistics for study variables

Factor	Cronbach's Alpha	No of Items
Technological factors	0.880	8
Organisational factors	0.920	8
Environmental factors	0.894	8
Perceptions	0.915	8

The Cronbach's Alpha coefficients for all variables exceed the minimum 0.70 threshold [46], indicating a high level of internal consistency. More specifically, Technological factors exhibit Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.880, Organisational factors 0.920, Environmental factors 0.894, and Perceptions 0.915. These results imply that the items under each variable reliably measure the same latent construct, thereby enhancing the credibility of the conclusions drawn from these variables.

3. Descriptive Analysis and the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation (PPMC)

Table 3 exhibits an overview of the descriptive statistics and Pearson Product-Moment Correlation (PPMC) for the variables Technological factors (TECHNO), Organisational factors (ORGANI), Environmental factors (ENVIRO) and Perceptions (PERCE).

Table 3: Descriptive analysis and Pearson correlation of variables

Details	Mean	Std. Deviation	PERCE	TECHNO	ORGANI	ENVIRO
PERCE	3.90	0.406	-			
TECHNO	4.11	0.418	0.867**	-		
ORGANI	4.06	0.421	0.789**	0.904**	-	
ENVIR	4.07	0.453	0.859**	0.856**	0.877**	-

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The mean values range from 3.90 to 4.11, signifying generally positive responses. The standard deviations are minimal, implying low variability in the responses. The PPMC show sturdy, favourable, and statistically significant correlations ($p < 0.01$) within all variable pairs. Notably, the strongest correlation exists between Technological and Organisational factors (0.904), with the weakest correlation observed between Perceptions and Technological factors (0.867). These significant correlations suggest a close interconnection among the variables, indicating that they potentially influence one another.

4. Distribution of data

Table 4 illustrates the skewness and kurtosis figures for four variables.

Table 4: Skewness and kurtosis of variables

Variable	Skewness	Kurtosis
Technological factors	0.906	0.683
Organisational factors	0.765	0.821
Environmental factors	0.879	0.667
Perceptions	0.875	0.714

The skewness values in Table 4 vary between 0.765 and 0.906, with the kurtosis values lying within the range of 0.667 to 0.821. These values represent a moderate level of skewness and kurtosis, indicating that the data distribution of each variable approx-

imates normality. This assumption of normality holds significant importance for further statistical analysis, enhancing the validity and reliability of the results.

5. Relationships between variables

Table 5 provides the results of the exploratory factor analysis (EFA) for the study variables. The factor loadings for each item range from 0.733 to 0.883, indicating that all items have strong associations with their respective factors. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy is 0.874, and Bartlett's test of sphericity is significant (p = 0.000), suggesting that the data is suitable for factor analysis. These results confirm the presence of distinct underlying factors corresponding to the study variables, validating the constructs used in the analysis. The EFA was used to explore the underlying relationships between measured variables.

Table 5: EFA for the variables

Factor	Item loading	KMO and Bartlett's test
P1	0.837	
P2	0.843	
P3	0.870	
P4	0.816	
P5	0.789	
P6	0.816	
P7	0.843	
P8	0.871	
T9	0.753	
T10	0.768	
T11	0.812	
T12	0.743	
T13	0.868	
T14	0.738	
T15	0.881	
T16	0.761	
O17	0.814	
O18	0.764	
O19	0.755	
O20	0.834	
O21	0.790	

O22	0.883	
O23	0.745	
O24	0.763	
E25	0.811	
E26	0.843	
E27	0.755	
E28	0.794	
E29	0.811	
E30	0.752	
E31	0.767	
E32	0.733	
		0.874(3415.265/28), p=.000

6. Hypotheses testing

Table 6 shows the results of hypothesis testing.

Table 6: Test of the hypotheses

Hypotheses	Constructs	Estimates	(p-value)	Conclusion
H1	TECH - PERC	0.801	***	Accepted
H2	ORG - ADOPT	0.786	***	Accepted
H3	ENV - INTG CHGPT	0.824	***	Accepted
H4	PERC - ACADEMIC	0.890	***	Accepted

***, Significance (p-value)

All hypotheses (H1 to H4) were supported with significant estimates and p-values less than 0.05 ($p < 0.05$), as recommended by [47]. Specifically, Technological factors significantly influence students' perceptions of ChatGPT's usefulness for academic tasks (Estimate = 0.801, $p < 0.001$); Organisational support positively impacts students' adoption and usage of ChatGPT (Estimate = 0.786, $p < 0.001$) and Environmental factors significantly affect the successful integration of ChatGPT in the university (Estimate = 0.824, $p < 0.001$). Furthermore, students' perceptions of ChatGPT capabilities significantly influence their academic performance and learning experience (Estimate = 0.890, $p < 0.001$). These findings underscore the importance of technological, organisational, and environmental support in fostering the adoption and effective use of ChatGPT in higher education.

5. Discussions

The study findings reveal that students perceive ChatGPT as a beneficial tool for enhancing their learning experiences, although there are concerns regarding academic integrity, lack of human interaction and biases, were noted. According to the findings, the effect of ChatGPT on the TECH-PERC element plays a crucial role in student academic success and enhancement. The results confirm that technological factors associated with the adoption of ChatGPT have a positive impact on students for academic purposes. In a digital era where smart devices and various technologies are used daily, students do not find ChatGPT difficult to use. The findings demonstrate an effective and acceptable use of ChatGPT technology proving that it is user-friendly and efficient for the needs and preferences of students as the outcome is favourable. Based on the results, it can be noted that stable technologies such as the availability of computer labs and internet connectivity contributed to favourable outcomes within the use and adoption of ChatGPT. The findings concur with [33] who noted that ChatGPT provides students with personalised learning, that promotes engaging and interactive learning processes that adhere to the student's individual needs. For the beneficial use and adoption of ChatGPT as a technical tool, robust network connectivity and good quality computing infrastructure are required in institutions.

The results demonstrate that the adoption and use of ChatGPT by students are positively impacted by organisational factors. In this regard, students are more likely to embrace and use ChatGPT efficiently when resources are available, and usage is encouraged for educational purposes. The participants reported a lack of thorough tutorials and training support for using ChatGPT and other AI tools for academic purposes. The results align with [29] who posited that institutional support in the form of technological tools increases the adoption of modern technologies including ChatGPT. Complimentary, [48] argues that training is crucial in every aspect and can improve the quality of learning when students receive training on the usage of AI technologies such as ChatGPT for learning. If students are not taught how to use and integrate these AI tools in academia responsibly, it may encourage them to misuse these tools. Results further indicate that the institution is concerned about possible ethical consequences from ChatGPT use, including plagiarism and issues with academic integrity. However, it has been revealed that ChatGPT usage guidelines are non-existent. This supports the claims by [9, 20] that higher education institutions should establish policies and guidelines for integrating AI tools.

The environmental factors also play a significant role in the successful adoption and use of ChatGPT in higher education. The hypothesis test findings show that H4 was accepted considering it has a significant effect on the successful integration of ChatGPT. Knowledge and resource constraints hinder universities from adopting ChatGPT. Furthermore, the institutions may struggle with drawbacks such as rigour and quality of academics, privacy and ethical concerns, resistance to change, and legal and regulatory considerations. As a recommendation, [6] suggested that HEIs should embrace the adoption of ChatGPT and digital transformation in academia because AI

technologies will further develop and improve so students are most likely to utilise them regardless of official permission.

Students' perceptions of ChatGPT were found to be positively correlated with its adoption. This is supported by prior studies that used AI-based learning tools [49]. The students considered the tool as easy to use and beneficial in education because it improves the quality of their learning. The study additionally found that ChatGPT helps students improve their research and writing skills by giving relevant information and responses. Participants found ChatGPT to provide instant access to a wide library of knowledge, allowing them to obtain relevant information quickly and effectively, an idea supported by [25]. The findings also reveal that students believe ChatGPT is likely to improve the way they study in the future, highlighting its potential to disrupt the process of education. They perceive ChatGPT as a tool that adapts to different learning paces and styles by delivering tailored explanations, answering queries in real-time, and providing a variety of resources to meet different learning demands. This is supported by [34, 50] who claimed that a personalised approach can increase participation, motivation, and understanding, making education more accessible and effective.

6. Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to explore the factors affecting the adoption and use of ChatGPT at a specified South African institution, MUT. The study has proved that technological factors, organisational support, and environmental factors all significantly influence students' perceptions of ChatGPT's usefulness for academic tasks. Additionally, the study proved that students' perceptions of ChatGPT capabilities significantly influence their academic performance and learning experience. However, there are focus points that need further investigation and intervention such as how institutions are in denial to adopt this AI technological tool into their curricula. We can conclude that more awareness and transparency regarding the adoption of ChatGPT need to be further explored focusing on students in disadvantaged institutions. This study provides practical advice based on its findings. The study helps universities to be better prepared to help academics and students adjust to AI technologies in academia. Furthermore, the study's findings are based on a specific sample of students from one institution. Participants' perspectives and experiences may be influenced by their demographics, cultural backgrounds, and academic fields. Therefore, future studies may look at increasing the sample to include a broader variety of students, both inside and outside of South Africa. Technology is gradually evolving so rejection is not an option, institutions need to embrace its utilisation.

7. Recommendations

The findings from this study on the influence of ChatGPT usage among students at a South African university have important practical implications for both educational institutions and policymakers. This study recommends that institutions develop and

release their guidelines, focusing on their own set of academic and ethical standards, as well as unique requirements and expectations. The results can be used by universities to guide the careful integration of ChatGPT and related AI technologies into their curricula. Institutions can further develop ways to harness the benefits of AI while mitigating any disadvantages. This includes using AI as a complement, teaching students critical thinking skills, and focusing on individual learning alongside technological use. To ensure ethical and responsible use of ChatGPT universities can invest in digital training that clearly states policies and rules that students and academics need to adhere to when using the tool instead of rejecting its use. Furthermore, the gap in literature focusing on the organisational perspective on the adoption and use of ChatGPT for academic purposes needs to be addressed.

References

1. Pedro, F., Subosa, M., Rivas, A., Valverde, P.: Artificial intelligence in education: Challenges and opportunities for sustainable development. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 7, place de Fontenoy, 75352 Paris 07 SP, France (2019).
2. OpenAI., 2023. ChatGPT. Retrieved from https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt/ last accessed on 2024/05/20.
3. Alshammari, S.H., Alshammari, M.H.: Factors Affecting the Adoption and Use of ChatGPT in Higher Education. International Journal of Information and Communication Technology Education (IJICTE) 20(1), 1-16 (2024).
4. Daun, M., Brings, J.: How ChatGPT will change software engineering education. In Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Innovation and Technology in Computer Science Education V. 1 pp. 110-116 (2023).
5. Scharth, M.: How to perfect your prompt writing for ChatGPT, Midjourney and other AI generators. The Conversation. https://theconversation.com/how-to-perfect-your-prompt-writing-for-chatgpt-midjourney-and-other-ai-generators-198776 Last accessed on 2024/06/27.
6. Dempere, J., Modugu, K., Hesham, A.: Ramasamy, L.K.: The impact of ChatGPT on higher education. In Frontiers in Education Vol. 8, p.p 1206936. Frontiers Media SA (2023).
7. Halaweh, M.: ChatGPT in education: Strategies for responsible implementation. Contemporary Educational Technology, 15(2) (2023).
8. Dube, S., Dube, S., Ndlovu, B. M., Maguraushe, K., Malungana, L., Kiwa, F. J., Muduva, M.: Students' Perceptions of ChatGPT in Education: A Rapid Systematic Literature Review. In K. Arai (Ed.), Proceedings Vol. 4(1). Springer Nature (2024).
9. Cotton, D.R., Cotton, P.A., Shipway, J.R.: Chatting and cheating: Ensuring academic integrity in the era of ChatGPT. Innovations in education and teaching international 61(2), 228-239 (2024).
10. Chaudhry, I. S. et al.: Time to Revisit Existing Student's Performance Evaluation Approach in Higher Education Sector in a New Era of ChatGPT — A Case Study, Cogent Education, 10(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2023.2210461 (2023).
11. Farrokhnia, M., Banihashem, S. K., Noroozi, O., Wals, A.: A SWOT analysis of ChatGPT: Implications for educational practice and research. Innovations in Education

and Teaching International https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2023.2195846 61(3), 460–474 (2023).

12. Rasul, T., Nair, S., Kalendra, D., Robin, M., de Oliveira Santini, F., Ladeira, W.J., Sun, M., Day, I., Rather, R.A., Heathcote, L.: The role of ChatGPT in higher education: Benefits, challenges, and future research directions. Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching, 6(1), 41-56 (2023).

13. Howell, B.E., Potgieter, P.H.: What do telecommunications policy academics have to fear from GPT-3? Telecommunications Policy 47(7), 102576 (2023).

14. Jeon, J., Lee, S., Choe, H.L: Beyond ChatGPT: A conceptual framework and systematic review of speech-recognition chatbots for language learning. Computers & Education, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2023.104898, 104898. (2023).

15. Gude, V.: Factors Influencing ChatGpt Adoption for Product Research and Information Retrieval. Journal of Computer Information Systems https://doi.org/10.1080/08874417.2023.2280918, 1–10. (2023).

16. Rahman, M.M., Watanobe, Y.: ChatGPT for education and research: Opportunities, threats, and strategies. Applied Sciences 13(9), 5783 (2023).

17. Adeshola, I., Adepoju, A.P.: The opportunities and challenges of ChatGPT in education. Interactive Learning Environments, 1-14 (2023).

18. Firaina, R., Sulisworo, D.: Exploring the usage of ChatGPT in higher education: Frequency and impact on productivity. Buletin Edukasi Indonesia 2(01), 39-46 (2023).

19. Lo, C.K.: What is the impact of ChatGPT on education? A rapid review of the literature. Education Sciences 13(4), (2023).

20. Ventayen, R.J.M.: OpenAI ChatGPT-Generated Results: Similarity Index of Artificial Intelligence-Based Contents. In International Conference on Soft Computing for Security Applications, pp. 215-226. Springer Nature, Singapore (2023).

21. Tornatzky, L. G., Fleischer, M.: The processes of technological innovation. Lexington Books. Lexington, MA (1990).

22. Ahmed, M.A.: ChatGPT and the EFL classroom: Supplement or substitute in Saudi Arabia's eastern region. Information Sciences Letters 12(7), 2727-2734 (2023).

23. Wong, G.K.: The behavioral intentions of Hong Kong primary teachers in adopting educational technology. Educational Technology Research and Development 64, 313-338 (2016).

24. Jo, H., Bang, Y.: Analyzing ChatGPT adoption drivers with the TOEK framework. Scientific Reports 13(1), (2023).

25. Kabra, G., Ghosh, V., Joshi, Y.: Factors influencing adoption of cloud computing services in HEIs: a UTAUT approach based on students' perception. International Journal of Business Information Systems 42(1), 103-122 (2023).

26. Chen, J.S., Le, T.T.Y., Florence, D.: Usability and responsiveness of artificial intelligence chatbot on online customer experience in e-retailing. International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management 49(11), 1512-1531 (2021).

27. Gupta, A., Yousaf, A., Mishra, A.: How pre-adoption expectancies shape post-adoption continuance intentions: An extended expectation-confirmation model. International Journal of Information Management 52, (2020).

28. Abdulkarem, A., Hou, W.: The impact of organizational context on the levels of cross-border E-commerce adoption in Chinese SMEs: the moderating role of environmental con-

text. Journal of Theoretical and Applied Electronic Commerce Research 16(7), 2732-2749 (2021).

29. Menon, D., Shilpa, K.: Chatting with ChatGPT': Analyzing the factors influencing users' intention to Use the Open AI's ChatGPT using the UTAUT model. Heliyon 9(11), (2023).

30. Hutajulu, R. S., Susita, D., and Eliyana, A.: The effect of digitalization and virtual leadership on organizational innovation during the COVID-19 pandemic crisis: A case study in Indonesia, 8(10), 57-64. https://doi.org/10.13106/JAFEB.2021.VOL8.NO10.0057, last accessed 2024/06/16.

31. Shoufan, A.: Exploring students' perceptions of ChatGPT: Thematic analysis and follow - up survey. IEEE Access (2023).

32. Valova, I., Mladenova, T., Kanev, G.: Students' Perception of ChatGPT Usage in Education. International Journal of Advanced Computer Science & Applications, 15(1), (2024).

33. Atlas, S.: ChatGPT for higher education and professional development: A guide to conversational AI (2023).

34. Ngo, T.T.A.: The perception by university students of the use of ChatGPT in education. International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (Online), 18(17), 4 (2023).

35. Jin, Y., Yan, L., Echeverria, V., Gašević, D., Martinez-Maldonado, R.: Generative AI in Higher Education: A Global Perspective of Institutional Adoption Policies and Guidelines. 2(11), 92-130 (2023).

36. Kasneci, E., Seßler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., Gasser, U., Groh, G., Günnemann, S., Hüllermeier, E., Krusche, S.: ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. Learning and individual differences, 103-110 (2023).

37. Hong, W.C.H.: The impact of ChatGPT on foreign language teaching and learning: Opportunities in education and research. Journal of Educational Technology and Innovation, 5(1) (2023).

38. Naidu, K., Sevnarayan, K.: ChatGPT: An ever-increasing encroachment of artificial intelligence in online assessment in distance education. Online Journal of Communication and Media Technologies, 13(3), (2023).

39. Maguraushe, K., Masimba, F., Muderedzwa, M.: Shrinking the digital divide in online learning beyond the COVID-19 pandemic: A Systematic Literature Review. 1st Zimbabwe Conference of Information and Communication Technologies (ZCICT), pp. 1-7, Harare, Zimbabwe, (2022).

40. Grassini, S.: Shaping the future of education: exploring the potential and consequences of AI and ChatGPT in educational settings. Education Sciences, 13(7), 692 (2023).

41. OpenAI.: ChatGPT: Optimizing language models for dialogue. OpenAI. https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt/,   last accessed 2024/05/26.

42. Jarrah, A.M., Wardat, Y., Fidalgo, P.: Using ChatGPT in academic writing is (not) a form of plagiarism: What does the literature say. Online Journal of Communication and Media Technologies, 13(4), 214-220 (2023).

43. Alhomoud, F.K., Basil, M., Bondarev, A.: Knowledge, attitudes and practices (KAP) relating to dietary supplements among health sciences and non-health sciences students in one of the universities of United Arab Emirates (UAE). Journal of clinical and diagnostic research: JCDR, 10(9), (2016).

44. Saunders, M. N. K., Lewis, P., and Thornhill, A.: Research methods for business students. 8th edn. Harlow: Pearson (2023).
45. Du Plooy-Cilliers, F., Davis, C. and Bezuidenhout, R.: Research Matters. Cape Town: Juta (2014).
46. Hait, N.C., Wise, L.E., Allegood, J.C., O'brien, M., Avni, D., Reeves, T.M., Knapp, P.E., Lu, J., Luo, C., Miles, M.F., Milstien, S.: Active, phosphorylated fingolimod inhibits histone deacetylases and facilitates fear extinction memory. Nature Neuroscience, 17(7), 971-980 (2014).
47. Pallant, J.: SPSS survival manual: A step-by-step guide to data analysis using IBM SPSS. Routledge (2020).
48. Hlongwa, N.S., Sithole, M.P.: November. Training and Support for Tutors: Sine Qua Non for effective tutorship in higher education. In The 10th Focus Conference (TFC 2023). pp. 53-77 Atlantis Press (2023).
49. Pillai, R. B., Sivathanu, B., Kaushik, N.: Students' adoption of AI-based teacher-bots (T-bots) for learning in higher education, Inf. Technol. People 1(1), 1-12 (2023).
50. Mnguni, N., Nkomo, N., Maguraushe, K., Mutanga, M.: An Experimental Study of The Efficacy of Prompting Strategies in Guiding ChatGPT for A Computer Programming Task. Journal of Information Systems and Informatics, 6(3), 1346-1359. (2024).