

Use of ChatGPT among Student Nurses in Baguio City, Philippines: A Cross-sectional Study

Carl Austin T. Lacanlale, RN, Cherylina G. Dalilis, PhD, RN, Breanna Stefanie S. Gayagay, RN, Sarah May D. Da-o, RN, Tiziana M. Bilog, RN, Francesca Anne D. Bacsca, RN, Dominique Anne P. Lauzon, RN, Abigail Mariano, RN, Shevawn T. Rabara, RN, Ron Andrei A. Reyes, RN and Jessica Loren M. Torio, RN

Saint Louis University, Baguio City, Benguet, Philippines

ABSTRACT

Background and Objectives. ChatGPT, an advanced artificial intelligence (AI) platform developed by OpenAI, is increasingly used in nursing education and practice. However, limited studies have explored its use among student nurses and how factors such as sex and year level affect its adoption. Addressing this gap is essential to ensure the responsible integration of AI and preserve nursing competencies, such as critical thinking and problem-solving. This study aimed to determine the extent of ChatGPT use among student nurses, including differences between sexes and year level, as well as the factors that facilitate or hinder its use.

Methods. This quantitative descriptive study involved student nurses from Saint Louis University, Baguio City, selected through proportionate random sampling in February 2024. Participants were aged 18 years or older, enrolled in the 2023–2024 academic year, and had prior experience using ChatGPT. The researchers administered a 30-item self-developed questionnaire, which demonstrated strong content validity (CVI = 0.92) and reliability (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.85$). Researchers used weighted mean to measure the extent of ChatGPT use, two-sample t-tests, and ANOVA to evaluate significant differences by sex and year level, and frequency and percentage to identify the most common factors that facilitate and hinder its use. All analyses were conducted using Jamovi version 2.4.

Results. Student nurses (N = 300) reported a slightly extensive use of ChatGPT ($\bar{x}_w = 2.40$), with quick response time ($\bar{x} = 2.85$) and concise summarization of key concepts ($\bar{x} = 2.85$) as the main reasons for use. There were no significant differences in use between sexes ($p = 0.761$) or year levels ($p = 0.062$). The most frequently reported facilitating factors were ease of use (66.67%) and ability to generate useful answers (50.33%), while the main hindrances were long user queues (45.33%) and lack of references (45%).

Conclusion. The adoption of ChatGPT among student nurses is driven by its ease of use, perceived usefulness, and quality of responses, as reflected in participants' moderate to slightly extensive use for summarizing concepts, generating ideas, and obtaining explanations. In light of these findings, nursing programs should incorporate ChatGPT as a supportive learning resource while guiding its responsible use. Future research should ensure balanced gender representation, consider demographic factors such as age and technological proficiency, and explore ChatGPT's applications across disciplines using qualitative or mixed-methods approaches.

Keywords: artificial intelligence, nursing, education, ChatGPT



Paper and E-poster Presentations – Outstanding Podium Presentation Award, 14th National Nursing Research Conference, November 29, 2024, University of San Agustin Auditorium, Iloilo City, Philippines.

Poster Presentation – Best Poster Award, 24th Regional Nursing Research Congress, May 3, 2025, Maryheights Multipurpose Hall, Saint Louis University, Bakakeng Campus, Baguio City, Philippines.

eISSN 2094-9278 (Online)
Published: June 15, 2026
<https://doi.org/10.47895/amp.vi0.11158>
Copyright: The Author(s) 2026

Corresponding author: Carl Austin T. Lacanlale, RN
Saint Louis University
Upper Bonifacio St., Baguio City,
Benguet, 2600 Philippines
Email: austin.lacanlale@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Artificial intelligence (AI) refers to the capability of a machine to carry out cognitive processes that can be interrelated with the human mind, which includes learning, reasoning, perceiving, problem-solving, and decision-making.¹ Over the year, AI has been increasingly integrated into our technologically transformed world, influencing diverse fields such as communication, business, healthcare, and education.²

Within AI, chatbots represent a specialized application designed to generate responses from plain-language user prompts using statistical and probability-based language models.³ Powered by advances in machine learning, neural networks, and natural language processing, these systems simulate human-like dialogue and provide instant responses to user inquiries.⁴ Among them, Chat Generative Pre-trained Transformer (ChatGPT) has gained popularity after being publicly available due to its ability to deliver accurate, coherent, and automated interactions without needing a human operator.^{5,6} This enables interactive conversations, which improve personalized learning experiences by responding to queries, all while actively contributing to content generation tasks.

ChatGPT has immense potential for application across various industries, including education.⁷ Integrating ChatGPT into nursing education has the capability to transform learning by improving access to essential resources, simplifying information retrieval, and serving as a virtual assistant that directs users towards relevant materials.⁸ It also supports real-time knowledge acquisition, allowing learners to clarify concepts instantly and engage more deeply with course material. Through its capacity for individualized interaction, ChatGPT promotes both self-directed and collaborative learning by adapting to a user's pace and providing tailored feedback and support, fostering motivation and helping students achieve their educational goals.⁹ As a result, ChatGPT is increasingly recognized as a useful tool in healthcare education for improving learning efficiency and student engagement.

Beyond education, ChatGPT also shows promise in clinical practice in healthcare. A study had mentioned its usefulness in generating case summaries and care plans, identifying appropriate nursing interventions tailored to specific patient needs, and supporting communication through clear, patient-centered instructions.¹⁰ It can also function as a form of Clinical Decision Support (CDS), which offers task-specific recommendations regarding the delivery of care to patients, thus enhancing the use of Electronic Health Records (EHRs).¹¹ Through large language models and reinforcement learning from human feedback, ChatGPT can help refine CDS alerts and assist with complex clinical reasoning, contributing to the development of more intelligent and adaptive healthcare systems.¹²

At present, universities and colleges in the Philippines are starting to adopt the smart campus concept, leveraging

advanced digital infrastructure technologies, including artificial intelligence and chatbots.¹³ This steady introduction and utilization have sparked ongoing discussions about whether these tools truly enhance the learning environment for today's students or risk diminishing the essential role of educators.¹⁴ Although ChatGPT has its own abundant benefits, it has also notable drawbacks. Several studies have identified limitations such as inaccurate citations and references to sources that do not exist.^{15,16} A SWOT analysis further identified issues such as its tendency to revise its responses when prompts are rephrased, revealing inconsistencies in reasoning.⁸ Additional concerns have also been raised about potential biases in its training data, which can lead to factual inaccuracies that users may perceive as credible if not verified.^{17,18}

Furthermore, these limitations pose significant risks to student nurses. Generative AI tools like ChatGPT can be misused to cheat on exams or generate academic work that closely resembles human writing, raising concerns about plagiarism and academic integrity. Additionally, the presentation of highly convincing yet inaccurate information may lead to overreliance, potentially hindering the development of essential skills such as critical thinking, problem-solving, and communication.^{8,18,19} Using ChatGPT also raises ethical and practical concerns, including issues of privacy, data security, and algorithmic bias, which further compromise the reliability and effectiveness of AI-assisted interventions.²⁰ The perception of these risks further influences students' attitudes toward technology, their adoption of ChatGPT, and their social and academic behaviors.¹⁷ Understanding the factors and barriers that affect students' ability to adopt AI technologies is therefore crucial for guiding institutional policies and ethical practices. This is particularly important considering the limited guidelines currently governing AI use in education, which may affect both students and educators.²¹ Without addressing these concerns, unregulated use of AI could potentially impede the development of analytical and critical thinking, underscoring the urgency of ensuring balanced and responsible AI integration in academic settings.¹¹

While there is a vast study on the use and factors affecting the use of ChatGPT, limited research has examined demographic differences, particularly in relation to sex and year level. Existing findings suggest that male students tend to use ChatGPT more frequently than female students, and that lower-year students exhibit higher levels of usage compared to their senior counterparts.²² Given the rapid integration of generative AI tools into academic settings, it is important to understand how student nurses incorporate these tools into learning. Examining the extent of use, along with demographic variations and both facilitating and hindering factors, can provide valuable insights into its educational impact. As a result, such information is essential for institutional policies, promoting responsible use, and ensuring that foundational nursing competencies such as critical thinking, problem-solving, and communication are

not compromised. Moreover, inconsistencies in previous findings and the scarcity of local research, particularly within Baguio City, highlight the need for localized evidence on ChatGPT use among student nurses.

Conceptual Framework

Technology Acceptance Model

The study used Davis' Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) and Bandura's Social Learning Theory (SLT). TAM focuses on two main constructs, which are Perceived Ease of Use (PEOU), the degree to which a system is free of effort and difficulty, and Perceived Usefulness (PU), the extent to which a system enhances performance.²³ PEOU and PU influence a user's attitude toward the system and Behavioral Intention (BI) to use it, which in turn affects actual use. External Factors (EF), such as social, cultural, or environmental influences, may also affect PEOU and PU.

In this study, TAM was applied to examine how student nurses use ChatGPT for academic tasks and comfort, and to identify factors that facilitate or hinder its use. PEOU and PU represent facilitating factors, whereas the EF will encompass the hindering factors, influencing attitudes and BI toward ChatGPT. Academic pressures, peer role modeling, and exposure through social media act as precursors, shaping perceptions of usefulness and ease of use. Positive perceptions strengthen attitudes and BI, promoting consistent adoption and use of ChatGPT in academic practice.

Bandura's Social Learning Theory

According to the Social Learning Theory (SLT), individuals learn by observing and imitating the behavior of others.²⁴ Three primary factors explain how an individual learns and adapts to specific actions: Person, which refers to individual characteristics and attitudes; Behavior, which involves the actions performed; and Environment, which encompasses social and physical surroundings. The theory focuses on comprehending, predicting, reshaping, or influencing behavior.²⁵ All these three are bilaterally interrelated because if one factor is affected, it can influence the other two. The theory also proposed four processes: Attention, Retention, Reproduction, and Motivation.²⁶ A behavior must first capture attention, then be remembered, physically or mentally reproduced, and motivated to be imitated. This theory explains how student nurses may adopt tools like ChatGPT after observing peers, role models, or social influences in their learning environment.

In this study, the people were the student nurses, the behavior was their use of ChatGPT, and the environment included the factors that facilitate or hinder its use. The attention process started when ChatGPT caught a student nurse's attention and showed the potential benefits for academic tasks. The retention process took place when they repeatedly used ChatGPT. The reproduction process occurred when they applied ChatGPT in academic work,

and motivation was influenced by encouragement or discouragement from their surroundings. Moreover, adoption of ChatGPT depends not only on its usefulness and ease of use but also on social and environmental cues. Academic pressures from clinical duties and coursework create a need for supportive tools, while observing peers or positive examples on social media draws attention, supports retention, encourages reproduction, and sustains motivation as students see its benefits reinforced. Thus, SAL explains how adoption emerges through modeling and environmental influences, guiding student nurses in integrating new technology into their academic practice.

OBJECTIVES

The study aimed to determine the extent of use of ChatGPT among student nurses, compare between sexes and across year levels, and identify factors that facilitate or hinder its use.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study was approved by the Saint Louis University Research Ethics Committee (SLU-REC 2024-046) and the University Research Innovation Center (UnRIC).

Study Design, Setting, and Population

The study employed a descriptive quantitative cross-sectional survey design using a questionnaire.^{27,28}

The study was conducted at Saint Louis University, School of Nursing, Allied Health and Biological Sciences, School of Nursing Department, Baguio City, in February 2024. The inclusion criteria of the respondents were the following: student nurses who were at least 18 years old, currently enrolled for the academic year 2023-2024, and had used ChatGPT, verified through verbal preliminary questions. Exclusion criteria were those who did not have a registered ChatGPT account and those with a poor internet connection.

Sampling Method and Sample Size

Based on 1,111 officially enrolled student nurses during the first semester of AY 2023-2024, and using Slovin's formula with a 5% margin of error and a 95% confidence level, the calculated sample size was 295. To ensure representativeness, the study employed proportionate random sampling. To get the final number of respondents, the number of male and female respondents per year level was divided by the total population, multiplied by the sample size (Table 1). The researchers added five respondents, making the final sample size of 300.

Data Gathering Tool

The study utilized a researcher-developed questionnaire, derived from related literature and validated for content, achieving a scale-level content validity index (S-CVI) of

Table 1. Profile of Respondents

Year Level	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Total
Male	27	15	17	15	74
Female	54	60	50	62	226
Total					300

0.92.¹⁷ The internal consistency reliability of the instrument was acceptable, with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.85, computed using Jamovi Project Version 2.4.^{29,30} Pilot testing with 30 students for readability led to revisions in items rated as difficult to understand. Readability tests resulted in an FOG index of 10.32 and an SMOG index of 9.70.

The questionnaire had two parts: (1) the respondent's profile, including sex and year level, and (2) a 30-item questionnaire proper which assessed ChatGPT usage. The second part was further categorized into three parts: (1) extent of use (10 items), (2) facilitating factors (10 items), and (3) hindering factors (10 items), all measured using a 4-point Likert scale.

The extent of use was interpreted based on the following scale: 1.00–1.74 (Not Extensive), 1.75–2.49 (Slightly Extensive), 2.50–3.24 (Moderately Extensive), and 3.25–4 (Very Extensive). Meanwhile, agreement with the facilitating and hindering factors was rated based on the following scale: 1.00–1.74 (Strongly Disagree), 1.75–2.49 (Disagree), 2.50–3.24 (Agree), and 3.25–4 (Strongly Agree).

Data Collection

The researchers requested permission to distribute questionnaires from the dean, associate dean, and department heads of Levels 1 to 4 of the School of Nursing, Allied Health, and Biological Sciences (SONAHBS), ensuring balanced representation across all year levels. Recruitment began with third-year students due to accessibility and familiarity. A preliminary question, "Have you used ChatGPT?" was asked to verify eligibility. Those who answered yes were invited to participate. Questionnaires were distributed in person during students' free time to avoid disruption of classes. Sufficient time was provided for completion, and the researchers reviewed completed questionnaires for completeness before retrieval.

Statistical Analysis

The weighted mean was used to determine the extent of use of ChatGPT among student nurses (Table 2a). In this study, responses were scored using a 4-point Likert scale, with each response category assigned a corresponding numerical value. The weighted mean was then computed as the average of the item responses measuring the extent of use, with each item contributing equally to the overall score. A two-sample t-test was used to compare the extent of use of ChatGPT among student nurses according to sex. Furthermore, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to compare the extent of use of ChatGPT across the four-year levels.

Table 2a. Scale of Interpretation for the Extent of Use of ChatGPT

Score	Interpretation	Description
1-1.74	Not extensive	The student nurses have used ChatGPT rarely during the week.
1.75-2.49	Slightly extensive	The student nurses have used ChatGPT sometimes during the week.
2.5-3.24	Moderately extensive	The student nurses have used ChatGPT frequently during the week.
3.25-4	Very extensive	The student nurses have always used ChatGPT during the week.

Table 2b. Scale of Interpretation for Facilitating and Hindering Factors in Using ChatGPT

Score	Interpretation	Description
1-1.74	Strongly Disagree	The student nurse has a negative view of the item. This indicates a significant disagreement with the statement.
1.75-2.49	Disagree	The student nurse implies a negative view of the item but may not wholly oppose it.
2.5-3.24	Agree	The student nurse suggests a positive view or alignment with the statement, but it may not be the highest level of agreement.
3.25-4	Strongly Agree	The student nurse has a very strongly supportive view of the statement, and they are in complete alignment.

Frequency and percentage were used to describe the facilitating and hindering factors of ChatGPT use among student nurses (Table 2b). Mean scores for each factor were computed and interpreted using the established Likert scale ranges. No subgroup interaction effects or sensitivity analyses were performed. All questionnaires were screened for completeness, and all responses were included in the analysis.

The classification of scales of interpretation used in the study was determined through an arbitrary but justified division of the total possible scores. This approach was adopted to categorize responses into meaningful groups for clearer interpretation of the findings.

RESULTS

There was slightly extensive use of ChatGPT among student nurses (Overall $\bar{x}_w = 2.40$). The highest-rated uses were ChatGPT's quick response time ($\bar{x} = 2.85$), ability to summarize key concepts concisely ($\bar{x} = 2.85$), generate ideas for assignments, projects, and research topics ($\bar{x} = 2.65$), and ability to provide customized, interactive explanations ($\bar{x} = 2.53$), all categorized as moderately extensive. Features such as language improvement and academic performance were rated slightly extensive ($\bar{x} = 1.98$), while language translation was minimally used ($\bar{x} = 1.65$) (Table 3).

Table 3. Extent of Use of ChatGPT among Student Nurses (N = 300)

Criteria for the extent of use	$\bar{x}$	I
<i>Use ChatGPT because it responds quickly and immediately to my inquiries.</i>	2.85	ME
<i>Obtain concise summaries and quickly grasp key ideas and concepts.</i>	2.85	ME
<i>Generate ideas for various assignments, projects, or research topics.</i>	2.65	ME
<i>Use it because it provides customized, interactive explanations.</i>	2.53	ME
<i>Assists in improving language skills (grammar, vocabulary, sentence structure, and overall language fluency)</i>	2.43	SE
<i>Using ChatGPT has improved my academic performance.</i>	2.40	SE
<i>It can handle new subjects and tasks without substantial retraining</i>	2.34	SE
<i>Use ChatGPT as a source of information in my university assignments</i>	2.31	SE
<i>Using ChatGPT has become a habit.</i>	1.98	SE
<i>Use ChatGPT when translating languages that I do not understand.</i>	1.65	NE
Average weighted mean	2.40	SE

Legend:

1 - 1.74 = Not Extensive (NE)

1.75 - 2.49 = Slightly Extensive (SE)

2.5 - 3.24 = Moderately Extensive (ME)

3.25 - 4 = Very Extensive (VE)

Males ($\bar{x} = 2.44$) used ChatGPT slightly more than females ($\bar{x} = 2.38$), but there was no significant difference ($t = 0.76, p = 0.38$).

Year level 2 students had the highest mean ($\bar{x} = 2.52$), and level 4 students had the lowest mean ($\bar{x} = 2.25$). There was no significant difference across year levels ($F = 2.47; p = 0.06$).

The most cited facilitating factor was ease of use (66.67%), followed by ChatGPT's ability to generate appropriate and useful answers (50.33%) (Table 4). Meanwhile, the least cited facilitating factors were its minimal technical knowledge and human-like responses (39.67%) and its role in improving decision-making (38.33%).

The most cited hindering factors were long content generation times due to a long queue of users (45.33%) and lack of references (45%) (Table 5). The least cited hindering factors were outdated information (37%) and potential plagiarism violations of the student handbook's code of discipline (31.33%).

DISCUSSION

The findings reveal that student nurses did not use ChatGPT extensively for their academics on a weekly basis. In line with TAM, this could be attributed to varying levels of perceived ease of use and perceived usefulness suggesting that while ChatGPT serves as a supplemental tool, students rely more on familiar platforms such as Google, Bing, YouTube,

Table 4. Facilitating Factors of Using ChatGPT among Student Nurses (N = 300)

Questions	n	%
<i>Is easy to use.</i>	200	66.67
<i>Generates appropriate and useful answers.</i>	151	50.33
<i>Helps me work more efficiently and produces better work.</i>	148	49.33
<i>Helps in a better understanding of difficult topics and concepts.</i>	148	49.33
<i>The positive experiences of others have encouraged me to use ChatGPT.</i>	142	47.33
<i>Helps me to save time when searching for information.</i>	131	43.67
<i>Is always accessible when I need it.</i>	131	43.67
<i>Does not require extensive technical knowledge.</i>	119	39.67
<i>Provides human-like responses to look and sound like genuine conversations.</i>	119	39.67
<i>Helps come up with better decisions based on the recommendations made by ChatGPT.</i>	115	38.33

Table 5. Hindering Factors of Using ChatGPT among Student Nurses (N = 300)

Questions	n	%
<i>Takes too long to generate content with the long queue of users.</i>	136	45.33
<i>It does not provide references.</i>	135	45.00
<i>Poor understanding of the context of my question.</i>	133	44.33
<i>Its proficiency in different languages may differ, and its performance may change based on the language in which it is engaging.</i>	129	43.00
<i>Using ChatGPT would result in a lack of originality in my university assignments and duties.</i>	128	42.67
<i>Potential security risks of using ChatGPT for conversations with it may be recorded and stored.</i>	124	41.33
<i>I am concerned about the reliability of the information provided by ChatGPT.</i>	121	40.33
<i>Fear of relying too much on ChatGPT and not developing my critical thinking skills.</i>	113	37.67
<i>Only provides outdated information from 2021 backwards.</i>	111	37.00
<i>The use of ChatGPT would be a violation of the SLU student handbook's code of discipline for plagiarism.</i>	94	31.33

and electronic resources provided in Google Classroom for data collection and learning.³¹ Its use is primarily for idea generation, supporting but not replacing critical thinking.³²⁻³⁴ Limited transparency regarding underlying algorithms and students' familiarity with other academic tools may further reduce reliance on ChatGPT.^{35,36} Thus, these factors indicate that while students show a positive attitude toward the technology, it has not become a habitual part of their academic practice.

Learner motivation remains a key factor in integrating technology into education. Student nurses demonstrate high motivation, enhanced self-confidence, and academic

competence, which encourages the use of ChatGPT for idea generation while relying on other search engines for cross-referencing.³¹ ChatGPT also fosters creativity and innovation by providing alternative perspectives that students can evaluate and compare.³⁵ The findings underscore the role of professors in guiding students to use AI tools like ChatGPT as supplemental resources, promoting critical thinking and preventing over-reliance.

Students' slightly extensive use of ChatGPT can be explained by its perceived efficiency and convenience in supporting academic tasks. As reflected in the findings (Table 3), students primarily use it for idea generation and concept clarification rather than as a primary academic source. Its human-like responses promote interactive engagement and rapid feedback, making it useful for academic work.³⁶ Furthermore, it supports learning by helping students generate new ideas and understand complex topics.⁸ Students also expressed satisfaction with its ability to provide personalized responses, enhancing its role as a supplementary learning tool.³⁷

The findings further indicate that ChatGPT is mainly used to support task completion, suggesting partial reliance and underscoring the importance of balancing its use with critical thinking and independent learning. This aligns with Table 4, where efficiency, time-saving, and quick idea generation were identified as key facilitating factors for its use.³⁸ Its ability to provide fast and customized responses further increases continued use and engagement among students.³⁹⁻⁴² However, variability in responses and occasional inconsistencies prompt students to verify information and conduct further research, reinforcing the need to balance AI use with independent learning and critical thinking.

The lack of a sex-based difference in ChatGPT usage aligns with a previous cross-sectional study conducted in Jordan that assessed health sciences students' attitudes and use of ChatGPT using a TAM-based instrument.⁴³ The study included 458 university students, the majority of whom were undergraduate health sciences students. Results showed no statistically significant differences in ChatGPT use between males and females, suggesting that usage patterns were not influenced by sex. This may reflect equal access to the tool among students. Contextual factors such as curriculum structure or individual technology preferences may influence minor variations. However, overall usage patterns appear consistent across sex.

Highest usage in level 2 students, although not statistically significant, is likely due to the onset of Related Learning Experiences (RLE) and increased academic workload. At this stage, students rely on ChatGPT as a supplemental resource to manage tasks efficiently, while still recognizing the need to verify its responses and use it alongside other reference materials. Contrarily, level 4 students attained the lowest average score, reflecting their adaptations to the nature and bulk of academic requirements. A previous study similarly reported that students use ChatGPT to support assignments

and exam preparation, particularly under heavier workloads.⁴⁴ Despite these patterns, statistical analysis revealed no significant differences in ChatGPT use across year levels, indicating that students generally share similar perceptions of its usefulness and ease of use. This suggests that ChatGPT can serve as a supportive learning tool for student nurses at all levels, enhancing engagement and learning without replacing critical thinking or other academic resources.

The perception of ChatGPT as a user-friendly tool in educational environments by providing students with personalized and reliable guidance, delivering tailor response within minutes, and significantly reduces the time required to complete academic requirements.⁴⁵ Additionally, ChatGPT's accessibility across devices and intuitive features, such as voice input, make it convenient to use and encourage students to incorporate it into their academic routines as a supplemental aid rather than a primary resource. At the same time, its intuitive and straightforward design supports perceived ease of use, further motivating adoption. On the other hand, challenges remain, as text-based conversational systems like ChatGPT may be less user-friendly, especially for individuals with visual impairments or limited writing and reading abilities.⁴⁶

The second-highest facilitating factor was the ability of ChatGPT to generate appropriate and useful answers, suggesting that student nurses find its responses supportive in meeting academic requirements. This aligns with previous studies demonstrating ChatGPT's potential in knowledge-based question-answering tasks.⁴⁷ However, it is stated that ChatGPT is trained on large collections of textual data freely available on the internet, but it is not always possible to ensure that the information provided is accurate.⁴⁸ While ChatGPT is promising in generating functional responses, its limitations in accuracy and reliability necessitate careful consideration and verification of information, particularly in contexts where the consequences of misinformation may be significant.

Table 5 shows the hindering factors of using ChatGPT among student nurses, with the highest-ranked issue being delays in generating content, often attributed to a long queue of users. This suggests that prolonged response times may interfere with students' ability to use the tool efficiently for academic tasks. While some users may tolerate such delays as part of AI's processing demands, others may perceive them as disruptive, particularly when completing time-sensitive requirements.⁴⁹ Moreover, ChatGPT may encounter difficulties understanding complex contexts or maintaining coherence during lengthy conversations, potentially resulting in irrelevant responses and long response times.⁵⁰

The second-highest hindering factor is the lack of references in ChatGPT's responses, which raises concerns about the reliability of its generated information. Although the tool can provide citations, studies show that these are often inaccurate. Only 14% of the suggested references are verifiable, and many fail to support the claims made, with

some even being fabricated.⁵¹⁻⁵³ This reflects student nurses' emphasis on verifying sources where source credibility is essential, which is crucial for their academic work. Overall, these findings underscore the need for refining ChatGPT's performance and accuracy to maximize its role as a supplemental tool in nursing education while ensuring its use aligns with academic integrity.

Limitations

This study has several limitations. The use of purposive sampling from a single department limits the generalizability of the findings to the entire university. In addition, the study relies on cross-sectional data from Saint Louis University in Baguio City, making the findings context-specific. The exclusive focus on ChatGPT means that other AI platforms and broader academic applications were not considered. Furthermore, there was unequal representation of sexes, and factors such as academic discipline, socioeconomic background, and technological proficiency were not examined. Future research should explore diverse samples, multiple institutions, and comparative AI analyses for a more comprehensive understanding.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

ChatGPT is a valuable educational supplementary tool for student nurses, with adoption driven by its perceived ease of use, usefulness, and quality of responses. Overall use was slightly extensive, with the most frequently used functions being quick responses, summarization, and idea generation, while chronic use and language translation were less frequent. Its responsiveness and efficiency enhance user experience across all year levels. While ChatGPT supports learning, it should not replace critical thinking, as overreliance or misuse could compromise problem-solving skills and clinical reasoning, which are essential in healthcare education. These findings support and extend TAM and SLT, emphasizing responsible integration to maximize benefits while safeguarding educational outcomes.

Students are encouraged to use ChatGPT to clarify concepts and generate ideas while maintaining their critical thinking and problem-solving skills. Educational institutions should establish clear, discipline-specific guidelines for the responsible use of AI, provide training on effective ChatGPT utilization, and monitor its application to maintain academic integrity while enhancing learning outcomes.

Acknowledgments

On behalf of all the authors, we express our heartfelt gratitude to God Almighty for His guidance and blessings, which made this research possible. We sincerely thank Saint Louis University, the School of Nursing, Allied Health, and Biological Sciences – Nursing Program, and its dedicated faculty for their invaluable guidance and unwavering support

throughout this journey. We also honor the late Dr. Cherylina G. Dalilis, our esteemed research mentor, whose guidance and encouragement were instrumental in shaping this work. Lastly, we extend our deepest gratitude to our parents, families, and friends for their constant love and support, which have inspired us every step of the way.

Statement of Authorship

All authors certified fulfillment of ICMJE authorship criteria.

Author Disclosure

All authors declared no conflicts of interest.

Funding Source

The study was funded by the authors.

REFERENCES

1. Rai A, Constantinides P, Sarker S. Next generation digital platforms: Toward human-ai hybrids [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2024 Dec 7]. Available from: <https://research.manchester.ac.uk/en/publications/next-generation-digital-platforms-toward-human-ai-hybrids>.
2. Richardson M, Clesham R. Rise of the machines? The evolving role of AI technologies in high-stakes assessment. *Lond Rev Educ*. 2021;19(1):1-13. doi: 10.14324/lre.19.1.09.
3. Zielinski C, Winker M, Aggarwal R, Ferris L, Heinemann M, Lapeña JF, et al. Chatbots, generative AI, and scholarly manuscripts: WAME recommendations on chatbots and generative artificial intelligence in relation to scholarly publications. *Colomb Med (Cali)*. 2023 Sep 30;54(3):e1015868. doi: 10.25100/cm.v54i3.5868. PMID: 38089825; PMCID: PMC10712422.
4. Gupta A. Introduction to AI Chatbots. *Int J Eng Res Technol*. 2020;9(7). doi: 10.17577/ijertv9is070143.
5. Aydın Ö, Karaarslan E. Is ChatGPT leading generative ai? What is beyond expectations? *Acad Platf J Eng Smart Syst*. 2023 Jan 31;11(3):118-34. doi: 10.2139/ssrn.4341500.
6. Kalla D, Smith N, Samaah F, Kuraku S. Study and analysis of Chat GPT and its impact on different fields of study. *IJISRT*. 2023;8(3): 827-33.
7. Davar NF, Dewan MAA, Zhang X. AI Chatbots in education: Challenges and opportunities. *Information*. 2025;16(3):235. doi: 10.3390/info16030235
8. Abujaber AA, Abd-alrazaq A, Al-Qudimat AR, Nashwan AJ. A Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) analysis of ChatGPT integration in nursing education: a narrative review. *Cureus*. 2023;15(11):e48643. doi: 10.7759/cureus.48643. PMID: 38090452; PMCID: PMC10711690.
9. Khan RA, Jawaid M, Khan AR, Sajjad M. ChatGPT - reshaping medical education and clinical management. *Pakistan J Med Sci*. 2023;39(2). doi: 10.12669/pjms.39.2.7653. PMID: 36950398; PMCID: PMC10025693.
10. Scerri A, Morin KH. Using chatbots like ChatGPT to support nursing practice. *J Clin Nurs*. 2023;32(15-16):4211-3. doi: 10.1111/jocn.16677.
11. Craig KJT, Fusco N, Lindsley K, Snowdon JL, Willis VC, Arriaga YE, et al. Rapid review: Identification of digital health interventions in atherosclerotic-related cardiovascular disease populations to address racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic health disparities. *Cardiovasc Digit Health J*. 2020;1(3):139-48. doi: 10.1016/j.cvdhj.2020.11.001. PMID: 35265886; PMCID: PMC8890337.

12. Liu S, Wright AP, Patterson BL, Wanderer JP, Turer RW, Nelson SD, et al. Using AI-generated suggestions from ChatGPT to optimize clinical decision support. *J Am Med Inform Assoc.* 2023 Jun 20;30(7): 1237-45. doi: 10.1093/jamia/ocad072. PMID: 37087108; PMCID: PMC10280357.
13. Estrellado CJ, Miranda JC. Artificial intelligence in the Philippine educational context: Circumspection and future inquiries. *Int J Sci Res Publ.* 2023 May 23;13(5):16-22. doi: 10.29322/ijsrp.13.05.2023. p13704.
14. Montenegro-Rueda M, Fernández-Cerero J, Fernández-Batanero JM, López-Meneses E. Impact of the implementation of ChatGPT in education: A systematic review. *MDPI.* 2023;12(8):153. doi: 10.3390/computers12080153.
15. Cahan P, Treutlein B. A conversation with ChatGPT on the role of computational systems biology in stem cell research. *Stem Cell Reports.* 2023; 18(1):1-2. doi: 10.1016/j.stemcr.2022.12.009
16. Lubowitz JH. ChatGPT, an artificial intelligence chatbot, is impacting medical literature. *Arthroscopy.* 2023;39(5):1121-1122. doi: 10.1016/j.arthro.2023.01.015
17. Sallam M. ChatGPT utility in healthcare education, research, and practice: Systematic review on the promising perspectives and valid concerns. *Healthcare (Basel).* 2023 Mar 19;11(6):887. doi: 10.3390/healthcare11060887. PMID: 36981544; PMCID: PMC10048148.
18. Deng J, Lin Y. The benefits and challenges of ChatGPT: an overview. *Front Comput Intell Syst.* 2023;2(2):81-3. doi: 10.54097/fcis.v2i2.4465
19. Tiwari CK, Bhat MohdA, Khan ST, Subramaniam R, Khan MA. What drives students toward ChatGPT? An investigation of the factors influencing adoption and usage of ChatGPT. *Interact Technol Smart Educ.* 2023 Aug 29;21(3):333-55. doi: 10.1108/itse-04-2023-0061.
20. Baskara FXR. The promises and pitfalls of using Chat GPT for self-determined learning in higher education: An argumentative review. *Pros Semin Nas Fakultas Tarb dan Ilmu Kegur.* 2023 May 22;(2): 95-101. doi: 10.47435/sentikjar.v2i0.1825.
21. Cruz JP, Sembekova A, Omirzakova D, Bolla SR, Balay-odao EM. Attitudes toward and readiness for medical artificial intelligence among medical and health science students. *Health Prof Educ.* 2024; 10(3). doi: 10.55890/2452-3011.1296.
22. Abdaljeel M, Barakat M, Alsanafi M, Salim NA, Abazid H, Malaeb D, et al. A multinational study on the factors influencing university students' attitudes and usage of ChatGPT. *Sci Rep.* 2024 Jan 23;14(1):1983. doi: 10.1038/s41598-024-52549-8. PMID: 38263214; PMCID: PMC10806219
23. Davis FD. Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly.* 1989;13(3): 319. doi: 10.2307/249008.
24. Boone T, Reilly A, Sashkin M. Social learning theory [Internet]. 1977 [cited 2023 Oct]. Available from: <https://www.deepdyve.com/lp/sage/social-learning-theory-albert-bandura-englewood-cliffs-n-j-prentice-58nloqifPh?key=sage>.
25. Koutroubas V, Galanakis M. Bandura's social learning theory and its importance in the organizational psychology context. *J Psychol Res.* 2022;12(6):315-22. doi: 10.17265/2159-5542/2022.06.001.
26. Simply Psychology. Mcleod S. Albert Bandura's social learning theory in psychology [Internet]. 2024 [cited Feb 2024]. Available from: <https://www.simplypsychology.org/bandura.html>.
27. Bhat A. Descriptive research: Characteristics, methods + examples [Internet]. *Accounting Nest.* 2023 [cited Nov 2023]. Available from: <https://www.questionpro.com/blog/descriptive-research/>.
28. Polit DF, Beck CT. *Essentials of nursing research: Appraising evidence for nursing practice: International edition.* 9th ed. Lippincott Williams & Wilkins; 2018.
29. Jamovi. *Open Statistical Software for the Desktop and Cloud.* Version 2.4 [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2024 May]. Available from: <https://www.jamovi.org/>.
30. The Ohio State University. *Jamovi. Quantitative Methodology Center* [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2023 Nov]. Available from: <https://u.osu.edu/qmc/jamovi/#:~:text=Jamovi%20is%20an%20open%20source,offering%20a%20more%20intuitive%20interface>.
31. Tripathi B, Shrestha S. Impact of search engines in guiding students. *Intell J Multidiscip Res.* 2022 Mar;1(1):47-54.
32. Pallivathukul RG, Soe HHK, Donald PM, Samson RS, Ismail ARH. ChatGPT for academic purposes: Survey among undergraduate healthcare students in Malaysia. *Cureus.* 2024 Jan 27;16(1): e53032. doi: 10.7759/cureus.53032. PMID: 38410331; PMCID: PMC10895383.
33. Fauzi F, Tuhuteru L, Sampe F, Ausat AMA, Hatta HR. Analysing the role of ChatGPT in improving student productivity in higher education. *J Educ.* 2023 Apr;5(4):14886-91. doi.org/10.31004/joe.v5i4.2563.
34. Kasneci E, Sessler K, Küchemann S, Bannert M, Dementieva D, Fischer F, et al. ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. *Learn Indiv Differ.* 2023 Apr;103:102274. doi: 10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274.
35. Halaweh M. ChatGPT in education: Strategies for responsible implementation. *Cont Ed Technology.* 2023 Mar 7;15(2):ep421. doi: 10.30935/cedtech/13036.
36. Meo SA, Al-Masri AA, Alotaibi M, Meo MZS, Meo MOS. ChatGPT knowledge evaluation in basic and clinical medical sciences: Multiple choice question examination-based performance. *Healthcare (Basel).* 2023 Jul 17;11(14):2046. doi: 10.3390/healthcare11142046. PMID: 37510487; PMCID: PMC10379728.
37. Ngo TTA. The perception by university students of the use of ChatGPT in Education. *Int J Emerg Technol Lear.* 2023 Sept;18(17):4-19. doi: 10.3991/ijet.v18i17.39019.
38. Livberber T, Ayvaz S. The impact of artificial intelligence in academia: Views of Turkish academics on ChatGPT. *Heliyon.* 2023 Sep 1; 9(9):e19688. doi: 10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e19688. PMID: 37809772; PMCID: PMC10558923.
39. Javid M, Haleem A, Singh RP, Khan S, Khan IH. Unlocking the opportunities through ChatGPT tool towards ameliorating the education system. *BenchCouncil Trans Benchmarks Stand Eval.* 2023 May 26;3(2):100115. doi: 10.1016/j.tbench.2023.100115.
40. Zielinski C, Winker MA, Aggarwal R, Ferris LE, Heinemann M, Lapeña JF, et al. Chatbots, generative AI, and scholarly manuscripts: WAME recommendations on chatbots and generative artificial intelligence in relation to scholarly publications. *Curr Med Res Opin.* 2024 Jan;40(1):11-13. doi: 10.1080/03007995.2023.2286102. PMID: 38112256.
41. Williamson B, Macgilchrist F, Potter J. Re-examining AI, automation and datafication in education. *Learn Media Technol.* 2023 Jan 30;48(1):1-5. doi: 10.1080/17439884.2023.2167830.
42. Castillo AGR, Silva GJS, Arocutipia JPF, Berrios HQ, Rodriguez MAM, Reyes GY et al. Effect of Chat GPT on the digitized learning process of university students. *Journal of Namibian Studies.* 2023; 33:1-15. doi: 10.59670/jns.v33i.411.
43. Sallam M, Salim NA, Barakat M, Al-Mahzoum K, Al-Tammemi AB, Malaeb D, et al. Assessing health students' attitudes and usage of ChatGPT in Jordan: Validation study. *JMIR Med Educ.* 2023 Sep 5;9:e48254. doi: 10.2196/48254. PMID: 37578934; PMCID: PMC10509747.
44. Budhiraja R, Joshi I, Challa JS, Akolekar HD, Kumar D. "It's not like Jarvis, but it's pretty close!" - Examining ChatGPT's usage among undergraduate students in computer science. In: Herbert N, Seton C, editors. *ACE '24: Proceedings of the 26th Australasian Computing Education Conference*; 2024 Jan 29-Feb 2; Sydney, Australia. New York: Association for Computing Machinery. p. 124-133.
45. Hung J, Chen J. The benefits, risks, and regulation of using ChatGPT in Chinese academia: A content analysis. *Soc Sci.* 2023;12(7):380. doi: 10.3390/socsci12070380.
46. Qu X, Liu H, Sun Z, Yin X, Ong YS, Lu L, et al. Towards building voice-based conversational recommender systems: Datasets, potential solutions and prospects. In: Chen H, Duh WJ, Huang H, Kato MP, Mothe J, Poblete B, editors. *SIGIR '23: Proceedings of the 46th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*; 2023 Jul 23-27; Taipei, Taiwan. New York: Association for Computing Machinery; 2023. p. 2701-2711.

47. Chen Y, Zhang Y, Yu J, Yang L, Xia R. In-Context learning for knowledge base question answering for unmanned systems based on large language models. In: Wang H, Han X, Liu M, Cheng G, Liu Y, Zhang N, editors. Knowledge Graph and Semantic Computing: Knowledge Graph Empowers Artificial General Intelligence. Springer Singapore; 2023:364. doi: 10.1007/978-981-99-7224-1.
48. Dwivedi YK, Kshetri N, Hughes L, Slade EL, Jeyaraj A, Kar AK, et al. Opinion paper: "So what if ChatGPT wrote it?" Multidisciplinary perspectives on opportunities, challenges and implications of generative conversational AI for research, practice and policy. *Int J Inf Manag.* 2023;71:102642. doi: 10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2023.102642.
49. Gnewuch U, Morana S, Adam MTP, Maedche A. Opposing effects of response time in human-chatbot interaction. *Bus Inf Syst Eng.* 2022 May 30;64(6):773–91. doi: 10.1007/s12599-022-00755-x.
50. Nazir A, Wang Z. A comprehensive survey of ChatGPT: Advancements, applications, prospects, and challenges. *Meta Radiol.* 2023 Sep;1(2):100022. doi: 10.1016/j.metrad.2023.100022. PMID: 37901715; PMCID: PMC10611551.
51. Zuccon G, Koopman B, Shaik R. ChatGPT hallucinates when attributing answers. In: Ai Q, Liu Y, Moffat A, Huang X, Sakai T, Zobel J, editors. SIGIR-AP '23: Proceedings of the Annual International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval in the Asia Pacific Region; 2023 Nov 26–28; Beijing, China. New York: Association for Computing Machinery; 2023. pp. 46–51.
52. Thorp HH. ChatGPT is fun, but not an author. *Science.* 2023 Jan 27;379(6630):313. doi: 10.1126/science.adg7879. PMID: 36701446.
53. Manohar N, Prasad SS. Use of ChatGPT in academic publishing: A rare case of seronegative systemic lupus erythematosus in a patient with HIV infection. *Cureus.* 2023 Feb 4;15(2):e34616. doi: 10.7759/cureus.34616. PMID: 36895547; PMCID: PMC9988440.