THEOSINESIS
Journal of Integrative Understanding and Ethical Praxis
Volume 1, Number 3, July – September 2025

Language Understanding in ChatGPT: A Psycholinguistic Study of an Intelligent Machine and Its Social Implications

Husnil Khotimah[1]

[1]Sekolah Tinggi Agama Islam Negeri Mandailing Natal, Mandailing Natal, Indonesia
Corresponding Author: husnilkhotimah571@gmail.com

Submission: 02 December 2025 **Revision:** 04 December 2025 **Accepted:** 08 December 2025

Abstract

ChatGPT has transformed the way society interacts with language and information. This system is capable of generating text that closely resembles human conversation; however, it often raises questions about the extent to which it truly understands the meaning being conveyed. This study aims to describe the characteristics of ChatGPT's responses in processing language and to examine its impact on people's thinking and communication habits. A descriptive qualitative approach was employed, using direct conversational interactions through various types of prompts as the data collection technique. The data were analyzed through stages of reading, coding, and categorizing similar response patterns to identify linguistic structures, contextual features, and meaning tendencies within each answer. The results indicate that ChatGPT demonstrates a high level of language fluency, yet its responses remain predictive rather than conceptual. Furthermore, the study found a tendency among users to rely on the system's outputs without engaging in critical verification.

Keywords: ChatGPT; Language Understanding; Society; Digital Psycholinguistics; Technology

Abstrak

ChatGPT telah mengubah cara masyarakat berinteraksi dengan bahasa dan informasi. Sistem ini mampu menghasilkan teks yang menyerupai percakapan manusia, namun sering kali menimbulkan pertanyaan tentang sejauh mana ia benar-benar memahami makna yang disampaikan. Penelitian ini bertujuan menggambarkan karakteristik respons ChatGPT dalam memproses bahasa serta melihat dampaknya terhadap kebiasaan berpikir dan berkomunikasi masyarakat. Pendekatan yang digunakan adalah kualitatif deskriptif dengan teknik pengumpulan berupa percakapan langsung menggunakan berbagai jenis prompt. Data dianalisis dengan tahapan membaca, memberi kode, dan mengelompokkan pola respons yang serupa untuk menemukan pola linguistik, konteks, dan kecenderungan makna dalam setiap jawaban. Hasilnya menunjukkan bahwa ChatGPT memiliki kemampuan bahasa yang sangat lancar, tetapi responsnya masih bersifat prediktif, belum konseptual. Selain itu, ChatGPT berpotensi memiliki efek kecenderungan masyarakat untuk bergantung pada hasil sistem tanpa verifikasi kritis.

Kata Kunci: ChatGPT; Pemahaman Bahasa; Masyarakat; Psikolinguistik Digital; Teknologi

INTRODUCTION

ChatGPT has emerged as one of the most popular forms of artificial intelligence due to its ability to respond to a wide range of questions with fluent and convincing language. However, behind this strength lies a fundamental problem: the answers it generates are not always accurate or contextually appropriate. The system operates based on word prediction patterns rather than genuine comprehension of meaning. As a result, ChatGPT often produces explanations that sound logical yet are factually incorrect. Many users are misled by its polished and polite tone, assuming that every response it provides represents the truth.[1] This issue has raised new concerns in society, particularly because the boundary between accurate information and automatically generated content is becoming increasingly difficult to distinguish in everyday digital conversations.

As ChatGPT's popularity grows, many people have begun to treat it as a primary source of information, inspiration, and even personal decision-making.[2] This phenomenon marks a significant shift in how individuals think and seek answers. ChatGPT is no longer limited to work or educational purposes but is also used for casual activities such as writing messages, generating creative ideas, or seeking advice.[3] The convenience and speed it offers have made users increasingly dependent on it. Over time, a new pattern of dependency has emerged, people tend to trust machine-generated outputs more than their own judgment. This situation indicates a subtle form of digital addiction, in which comfort and practicality gradually replace the need for critical thinking and independent verification of truth.

The habit of relying on ChatGPT for various purposes has altered how people process information. Many individuals now judge the truth of an answer based on how convincingly it is presented rather than on its sources or logic. This pattern slowly shifts the value of critical thinking into mere efficiency in obtaining answers. In the educational context, this phenomenon is evident in the growing use of ChatGPT to complete assignments without deep understanding. In everyday life, society has become increasingly accustomed to the instant convenience offered by this technology.[4] Although it appears helpful, such habits reduce one's capacity for reflection and analysis. Consequently, the relationship between humans and information becomes increasingly superficial, dependent on a seemingly intelligent machine that nonetheless lacks true awareness of meaning.

Research on language comprehension and the social implications of ChatGPT has been widely conducted. Li et al. explored the psychological attributes of artificial intelligence through a

1 Zhi Quan and Zhiwei Chen, "Human–Computer Pragmatics Trialled: Some (Im)Polite Interactions with ChatGPT 4.0 and the Ensuing Implications," *Interactive Learning Environments* 33, no. 2 (February 7, 2025): 1020–39, https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2024.2362829.

2 Avishek Choudhury, Safa Elkefi, and Achraf Tounsi, "Exploring Factors Influencing User Perspective of ChatGPT as a Technology That Assists in Healthcare Decision Making: A Cross Sectional Survey Study," *PLOS ONE* 19, no. 3 (March 8, 2024): e0296151, https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0296151.

3 Christian Tarchi et al., "The Use of ChatGPT in Source-Based Writing Tasks," *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education* 35, no. 2 (2025): 858–78, https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-024-00413-1.

4 Mohd Javaid et al., "Unlocking the Opportunities through ChatGPT Tool towards Ameliorating the Education System," *BenchCouncil Transactions on Benchmarks, Standards and Evaluations* 3, no. 2 (2023): 100115, https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tbench.2023.100115.

psychometric approach but did not address the underlying processes of language comprehension.[5] Li et al. focused on ChatGPT's explanatory capabilities in conversations, yet did not examine the internal linguistic mechanisms that shape its responses.[6] Atieku-Boateng et al. emphasized ChatGPT's role in education and academic assessment rather than its linguistic and social contextual understanding.[7] Cen et al. compared the technical accuracy of large language models (LLMs) in the medical field but overlooked the psycholinguistic dimension of language interaction.[8] Meanwhile, Liao et al. investigated the application of ChatGPT in healthcare services without analyzing the social communication dynamics between humans and machines.[9]

Based on the identified research gaps, this study aims to examine ChatGPT's responses to society as a representation of artificial intelligence's capacity for language understanding and social interaction. Through this objective, the research is expected to provide theoretical implications by offering new insights into how AI language systems construct meaning and adapt to users' social contexts. Practically, the findings may serve as a reference for developing more empathetic, contextual, and ethical language models in human communication. Socially, this study seeks to foster public critical awareness of how AI shapes patterns of interaction, perception, and communication dynamics in an increasingly AI-centered digital era.

Method

This study employed a descriptive qualitative approach aimed at understanding how ChatGPT responds to human language across various conversational contexts.[10] This approach was chosen because it allows the researcher to explore meanings, patterns, and tendencies within the generated responses without relying on statistical calculations. The primary focus was to analyze the forms of responses, linguistic styles, and semantic as well as pragmatic tendencies that emerge in interactions with the system. Through this approach, ChatGPT was treated as an object of digital linguistic inquiry, rather than merely a technological tool. A deep textual analysis was conducted to describe the characteristics of the model's responses in understanding, interpreting, and constructing language based on given prompts.

The data collection process was carried out through a series of direct conversations with ChatGPT using various types of commands or questions (prompts). Each interaction was designed to test specific aspects such as meaning accuracy, contextual sensitivity, and the ability to address topics related to culture and morality. All conversational outputs were saved in textual form and

5 Yuan Li et al., "Quantifying Ai Psychology: A Psychometrics Benchmark for Large Language Models," *ArXiv* (2024).

6 Grace Li, Milad Alshomary, and Smaranda Muresan, "' Is ChatGPT a Better Explainer than My Professor?': Evaluating the Explanation Capabilities of LLMs in Conversation Compared to a Human Baseline," *ArXiv* (2024).

7 Harry Atieku-Boateng et al., "Leveraging on Chatgpt, an Artificial Intelligence (AI) Tool to Transform Examination Writing in Higher Education," June 25, 2024, https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-4550887/v1.

8 Ling-Ping Cen et al., "Benchmarking the Performance of Large Language Models in Uveitis: A Comparative Analysis of ChatGPT-3.5, ChatGPT-4.0, Google Gemini, and Anthropic Claude3," June 25, 2024, https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-4237467/v1.

9 Chihying Liao et al., "AI-Enhanced Healthcare: Integrating ChatGPT-4 in EPROs for Improved Oncology Care and Decision-Making: A Pilot Evaluation," *Current Oncology* 32, no. 1 (December 26, 2024): 7, https://doi.org/10.3390/curroncol32010007.

10 John W Creswell and Cheryl N Poth, *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing among Five Approaches* (Sage publications, 2016).

categorized according to the emerging linguistic themes. The analysis followed qualitative procedures involving stages of reading, coding, and grouping similar response patterns. Each result was then interpreted contextually to examine the extent to which ChatGPT could emulate human-like understanding.[11] This approach enabled the identification of natural linguistic patterns formed through the interaction between the system and users within digital spaces.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

ChatGPT and Society in the Contemporary Era

The emergence of ChatGPT marks a new chapter in the relationship between humans and language technology. This system is not merely a digital innovation but also a symbol of profound change in how people think, learn, and communicate. With its ability to mimic human conversation, ChatGPT has become part of daily life, used in education, business, entertainment, and even personal communication.[12] The contemporary era illustrates how the boundaries between humans and machines have become increasingly blurred, creating a new social space filled with interactions between human thought and algorithmic processes. This phenomenon raises crucial questions: to what extent do people understand machine-generated language that appears human-like, and how do its linguistic responses begin to shape human behavior, values, and perceptions of knowledge and truth?

ChatGPT functions not only as a technological tool but also as a mirror reflecting the direction of cultural transformation. Society now lives in a world where digital interaction has become part of daily routines, and language serves as the primary bridge between humans and machines. ChatGPT's ability to interpret context and respond in natural language has made it widely accepted as a new conversational partner. On the other hand, its emergence challenges traditional concepts of communication and understanding.[13] Language is no longer solely a human possession; it has become a shared domain between human intelligence and algorithms. This shift redefines the cultural meaning of communication from a purely social instrument to a collaborative phenomenon that merges human creativity with the predictive capabilities of digital systems.

One of the most visible impacts of ChatGPT is the revolution in information access. People no longer depend solely on books or formal institutions to acquire knowledge. With a single prompt, one can understand nearly any topic quickly and conveniently. This change signifies a transition from an information-seeking society to an information-receiving one. Speed replaces depth, and convenience becomes the dominant value in learning processes. Although this transformation opens opportunities for greater knowledge accessibility, it also carries the risk of declining analytical ability. ChatGPT accelerates thinking processes but does not necessarily

11 Matthew B Miles and A Michael Huberman, *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook*, 2nd ed. (Sage Publications, 1994).

12 A. Shaji George and A. S. Hovan George, "A Review of ChatGPT AI's Impact on Several Business Sectors," *Partners Universal International Innovation Journal* 1, no. 1 SE-Articles (February 18, 2023): 9–23, https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7644359.

13 Gaurang Bansal et al., "Transforming Conversations with AI—A Comprehensive Study of ChatGPT," *Cognitive Computation* 16, no. 5 (2024): 2487–2510, https://doi.org/10.1007/s12559-023-10236-2.

cultivate understanding.[14] This phenomenon portrays the new face of the information society, fast, efficient, yet often shallow in evaluating truth.

ChatGPT's ability to mimic human speech patterns has brought a profound transformation in communication behavior.[15] People now converse not only with other humans but also with systems capable of responding naturally and politely. This situation has reshaped expectations for communication: rapid, clear, and devoid of emotional conflict. Such patterns signify a shift from empathetic to efficient communication. On one hand, this facilitates self-expression; on the other, it reduces spontaneity and emotional depth in genuine conversations. ChatGPT introduces a new form of communication, neutral and uniform, while simultaneously challenging the authenticity of human interaction traditionally rooted in experience, tone, and emotion.

In digital contexts, language functions not merely as a tool of expression but as a space of interaction between humans and artificial intelligence. ChatGPT demonstrates how words serve as a bridge connecting human logic and algorithms.[16] Through language, the system learns to recognize human thought patterns, while humans learn to adapt their questioning style to achieve desired outputs. This reciprocal relationship marks the emergence of a new communication model: collaborative, interactive, and prediction-based. However, underlying this dynamic lies a crucial question—who truly controls meaning? As human language begins to be shaped by machine-generated responses, concerns arise that creativity and spontaneity may be replaced by linguistic structures governed by artificial systems.

ChatGPT illustrates that language comprehension can occur without consciousness. The system can produce logically coherent answers yet lacks awareness of actual meaning. This phenomenon introduces new challenges in distinguishing between intelligence and understanding. Society now faces a fundamental question: does linguistic fluency equate to cognitive capability? In many cases, users perceive ChatGPT's articulate responses as evidence of intelligence, when in fact, they are merely reproductions of existing textual patterns. When appearance becomes the metric of truth, the capacity for critical interpretation risks diminishing. This challenge underscores the growing complexity of the human–machine relationship in the contemporary linguistic landscape.

ChatGPT has positioned humanity within a new paradigm in an algorithm-driven world. Humans are no longer the sole producers of language but also consumers of machine-generated texts. This transformation compels individuals to adjust their ways of thinking and interacting. On one hand, this technology expands human capacity for writing, learning, and creativity; on the other, it tests the limits of human authenticity amidst automated dominance. The contemporary era is one in which artificial intelligence not only assists but also influences collective thinking.

14 Hao Yu, "RETRACTED: The Application and Challenges of ChatGPT in Educational Transformation: New Demands for Teachers' Roles," *Heliyon* 10, no. 2 (January 30, 2024), https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e24289.

15 Federica Biassoni and Martina Gnerre, "Exploring ChatGPT's Communication Behaviour in Healthcare Interactions: A Psycholinguistic Perspective," *Patient Education and Counseling* 134 (2025): 108663, https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2025.108663.

16 Bansal et al., "Transforming Conversations with AI—A Comprehensive Study of ChatGPT."

Within this space, humans must strive to preserve their role as meaning-makers, ensuring that language retains its human value amid the accelerating digital current.

Characteristics of ChatGPT's Responses to Various Aspects of Language Comprehension

ChatGPT demonstrates remarkable linguistic capability in responding to diverse forms of instructions and questions. Through a series of conversational analyses, the model was found capable of generating structured, coherent, and naturally flowing sentences. However, beneath this fluency lies a distinct boundary between linguistic imitation and genuine comprehension. In various contexts, ChatGPT often produces convincing yet semantically or contextually inaccurate answers. Observations of its linguistic behavior reveal that the system operates through word-prediction patterns rather than conceptual understanding. Thus, its strength lies in structural and stylistic proficiency, while its limitation emerges in grasping deeper meanings, contexts, or nuances.

ChatGPT can produce grammatically sound sentences with logical structures and natural diction. Each response flows smoothly, resembling human-generated text.[17] For instance, when prompted with a descriptive question such as "Describe the atmosphere of a morning in the mountains," the model constructs detailed imagery, depicting cool air, the scent of earth, and the warmth of sunlight. Although the result appears vivid, the description stems not from real experience but from linguistic associations statistically learned during training. This reveals that ChatGPT's linguistic skill is a form of imitation rather than reflection, demonstrating how language can be reconstructed without consciousness or experiential meaning.

In interpreting meaning, ChatGPT tends to follow the most common word associations. When given an ambiguous sentence like "I will go to the bank later," the model almost invariably interprets "bank" as a financial institution rather than a riverbank. This decision is not based on contextual reasoning but on statistical frequency within its training data. Without additional contextual cues, the model defaults to the most statistically dominant interpretation.[18] This pattern highlights the semantic limitation of ChatGPT, it processes language superficially rather than through meaning-based reasoning. Although the responses sound correct, the underlying process is mere recognition of frequently co-occurring word patterns.

When faced with sentences containing implied intent, ChatGPT often struggles to interpret the speaker's intention.[19] For example, when presented with the indirect statement "This room is quite dark, isn't it?", the model tends to respond by describing lighting conditions rather than offering a solution such as "Shall I turn on the light?". In human conversation, such statements are typically understood as indirect requests. This demonstrates that ChatGPT has yet to grasp implicatures or the social purposes behind utterances. Its responses remain confined to

17 Joseph Christopher D T Briana, "Is ChatGPT-Produced Text Authentic? A Contrastive Analysis of Cohesive Markers in Human and AI-Generated Text," *Journal of English and Applied Linguistics* 3, no. 2 (2024): 4.

18 Lisa Miracchi Titus, "Does ChatGPT Have Semantic Understanding? A Problem with the Statistics-of-Occurrence Strategy," *Cognitive Systems Research* 83 (2024): 101174, https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogsys.2023.101174.

19 Marta Andersson and Dan McIntyre, "Can ChatGPT Recognize Impoliteness? An Exploratory Study of the Pragmatic Awareness of a Large Language Model," *Journal of Pragmatics* 239 (2025): 16–36, https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2025.02.001.

literal content rather than conversational intent. In other words, while the system produces grammatically correct sentences, it lacks understanding of communicative goals.

In conversations involving cultural elements, ChatGPT tends to generate general, globalized answers.[20] When asked to explain a local tradition such as *mangupa* from Mandailing Natal, its response appears well-structured yet blends unrelated cultural elements. It portrays *mangupa* merely as a thanksgiving ritual without referencing its symbolic or social significance in the local context. This pattern indicates that ChatGPT's cultural comprehension is heavily influenced by English-dominated training sources. As a result, local details are often omitted or replaced with universalized narratives. While the answers may appear accurate on the surface, they fail to capture the cultural and linguistic depth of diversity.

ChatGPT exhibits strong narrative abilities. It can compose well-organized paragraphs featuring coherent plots, metaphors, and engaging storytelling styles. For instance, when asked to write a short story about a child learning honesty, the model produces a complete narrative with conflict and moral resolution. However, upon closer inspection, the storyline often follows generic templates commonly found online. There is little originality or unique moral reflection. This suggests that ChatGPT's narrative capability functions as pattern reconstruction rather than creative invention. The system does not comprehend the moral essence of its stories but merely reproduces familiar narrative structures from its training corpus.

When responding to prompts requiring sensory descriptions, ChatGPT displays impressive detail. For example, when asked to "Describe the smell of the first rain after the dry season," it replies poetically about the scent of wet soil and the freshness of the air. The answer feels vivid but does not stem from real sensory experience. The model lacks perception but relies on associative patterns humans use to describe such phenomena. This demonstrates ChatGPT's strength in simulating emotional and sensory expression without genuine experience. Its power lies in building imaginative impressions rather than authentic emotional depth.

When asked repeated questions with slightly different phrasing, ChatGPT often produces varied responses conveying similar meanings. For instance, when prompted multiple times with "What is language as a system of symbols?", the model's responses differ in tone and structure but consistently express the same core idea. This phenomenon indicates high linguistic flexibility but inconsistent conceptual stability. Sometimes the first explanation is more accurate than the second, depending on how the question is phrased. This pattern reflects ChatGPT's probabilistic nature—its outputs vary with prompt context rather than being grounded in fixed conceptual understanding. Consequently, the language it generates is dynamic but lacks a stable conceptual foundation.

Implications of ChatGPT's Responses on Society

ChatGPT has exerted a profound influence on how people interact with language and technology. The system functions not merely as a writing assistant but as a conversational partner that shapes new ways of acquiring and understanding information. Its ability to deliver quick and coherent responses makes many users feel as though they are conversing with a human, as

20 M Tuna, K Schaaff, and T Schlippe, "Effects of Language- and Culture-Specific Prompting on ChatGPT," in *2024 2nd International Conference on Foundation and Large Language Models (FLLM)*, 2024, 73–81, https://doi.org/10.1109/FLLM63129.2024.10852463.

illustrated in Table 1. Sherry Turkle, a technology sociologist from MIT, refers to this phenomenon as a form of *"artificial intimacy"*—a condition in which humans begin to build emotional connections with machines. This phenomenon signifies a significant social shift: people now communicate not only *through* technology but also *with* it. The transformation demonstrates how rapidly the boundary between human and artificial intelligence is blurring in everyday life.

Table 1. ChatGPT's Language Responses

Source: Author

Linguistic Aspect	Characteristics of the Response	Example Case
General Linguistics	Produces fluent, well-structured, and natural sentences	Describing a morning scene in the mountains
Semantics	Selects the most common meaning, lacks contextual sensitivity	"Bank" interpreted as a financial institution
Pragmatics	Responds literally, fails to grasp implied meaning	"This room is a bit dark" answered with description only
Cultural Understanding	Provides globalized, bias-prone explanations favoring dominant cultures	"Mangupa" ritual described with mixed cultural elements
Narrative Ability	Creates coherent stories based on general narrative patterns	Moral story about an honest child
Descriptive & Imaginative	Generates vivid, poetic details without real sensory experience	"The smell of the first rain" described emotionally
Response Consistency	Shows stylistic variation but unstable conceptual meaning	Different answers to similar questions about language

In the field of education, ChatGPT has altered the way people learn and teach. Many students use this system to write assignments, comprehend difficult concepts, or seek inspiration. Positively, learning has become more efficient, and access to knowledge has become more inclusive. However, a new habit has emerged, relying on instant answers without engaging in deep thought. Teachers and lecturers now face a dilemma: whether to utilize artificial intelligence as a supportive tool or to avoid excessive dependence on it. According to Pierre Bourdieu, education is not merely about knowledge transmission but also about the formation of *habitus*, a way of thinking and behaving shaped through lived learning experiences. When those experiences are replaced by machine-generated outputs, the process of developing intellectual character may gradually diminish.[21]

21 Pierre Bourdieu, "Structures, Habitus, Practices," in *Rethinking the Subject* (Routledge, 2018), 31–45.

The polished and persuasive language of ChatGPT often leads users to assume that its responses are always correct. On one hand, this enhances digital literacy by encouraging people to frame better questions and explore new topics. On the other hand, it fosters a tendency to accept information without verification. Bourdieu argues that such inequality of knowledge can create *symbolic disparities*—where those capable of verifying information gain more power than those who simply trust machine-generated results.[22] Literacy in the digital era thus extends beyond reading and writing; it includes understanding how automated systems think. Without this critical literacy, society risks being trapped in the illusion of truth, persuasive language that appears credible but is not always accurate.

The development of ChatGPT also influences social interaction patterns. People increasingly communicate with digital systems to compose messages, seek advice, or express emotions. Manuel Castells describes modern society as a *network society*, a community interconnected through global information networks. ChatGPT reinforces this social form by making digital communication more personal and instantaneous. The positive impact lies in facilitating cross-cultural and multilingual interactions, yet the negative aspect arises when human relationships become more superficial. Turkle warns that as people grow accustomed to machines that are always polite and responsive, they may lose empathy in real conversations.[23] Consequently, communication becomes technically efficient but emotionally shallow, lacking social sensitivity and human depth.

The convenience offered by ChatGPT has made many individuals dependent on it for various activities, from idea generation to decision-making. This dependency fosters a new behavioral pattern: fast, practical, yet prone to losing reflection. Castells explains that in a network society, technology is not merely a tool but a structure that shapes human thought and behavior. This is evident in the growing tendency to trust machine outputs over personal judgment. When thinking processes are delegated to automated systems, humans relinquish partial control over meaning and evaluation. This condition suggests that digital dependency is not only technological but also cognitive—transforming how humans perceive and construct everyday reality.[24]

ChatGPT has had a significant positive impact in broadening access to knowledge. Individuals who previously struggled to grasp complex topics can now learn through simplified and accessible language. Socially, this contributes to greater informational equality across diverse communities. This aligns with Castells' assertion that knowledge is the primary source of power in an information society. With systems like ChatGPT, geographic and economic barriers in education can be reduced. However, this benefit will reach its full potential only if people remain

22 Pratham Parekh, "The Cultural Politics of 'Objectivity': A Sociological Critique of GenAI-Based Feedback Mechanisms in Educational Assessment BT - Innovative Educational Assessment with Generative AI: Opportunities, Challenges, and Practical Case Studies," ed. Mohamed Lahby (Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland, 2026), 29–50, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-032-05306-0_2.

23 Sherry Turkle, "Empathy Machines: Forgetting the Body," in *A Psychoanalytic Exploration of the Body in Today's World* (Routledge, 2017), 17–27.

24 Ala Yankouskaya, Magnus Liebherr, and Raian Ali, "Can ChatGPT Be Addictive? A Call to Examine the Shift from Support to Dependence in AI Conversational Large Language Models," *Human-Centric Intelligent Systems* 5, no. 1 (2025): 77–89, https://doi.org/10.1007/s44230-025-00090-w.

critical and aware that the system is not an absolute source of truth. Technology may open the doors to information, but humans must continue to define its value, meaning, and direction.[25]

Conversely, the speed and convenience of ChatGPT are reshaping the human thought process. When answers are instantly available, the desire to explore and analyze diminishes. Turkle refers to this phenomenon as *"thinking shallowness"* a tendency toward superficial reasoning caused by constant interaction with machines. People have become accustomed to seeking instant certainty rather than understanding underlying processes. Over time, this habit weakens reflective and critical reasoning skills. Moreover, excessive trust in ChatGPT's responses can blur the distinction between opinion and fact. In the long term, this may foster a passive society, no longer knowledge seekers, but mere information receivers. This condition indicates that artificial intelligence influences not only language but also the very structure of human thought.

CONCLUSION

The findings of this study indicate that ChatGPT demonstrates strong linguistic proficiency in terms of structure, fluency, and politeness, yet it does not exhibit a deep understanding of meaning. Its responses are predictive rather than conceptual, often sounding logical but not always accurate. In the context of communication, ChatGPT is capable of imitating human conversational styles and adapting to various interactional contexts, yet it remains dependent on patterns learned from its training data. Another key finding reveals the presence of bias when the model responds to cultural and local contextual issues, as well as a growing tendency among users to rely heavily on its outputs. These results suggest that the system's language generation ability operates at a level of simulation rather than genuine comprehension comparable to that of humans.

This study is limited by the scope of interactions and the variety of prompts used, meaning that the results do not encompass the full range of possible conversations from different users. Additionally, the research focuses solely on ChatGPT's linguistic behavior in textual form without directly addressing the psychological aspects of user interaction. Future research should involve broader observations that include participants from diverse social backgrounds and varying levels of digital literacy. Such an approach would provide a deeper understanding not only of how ChatGPT constructs language but also of how people interpret and adapt to this system. Further studies could also enrich the analysis by exploring its impact on cognitive patterns, communication ethics, and learning habits in digital environments.

25 Anne L Roggeveen and Raj Sethuraman, "Customer-Interfacing Retail Technologies in 2020 & Beyond: An Integrative Framework and Research Directions," *Journal of Retailing* 96, no. 3 (2020): 299–309, https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretai.2020.08.001.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Andersson, Marta, and Dan McIntyre. "Can ChatGPT Recognize Impoliteness? An Exploratory Study of the Pragmatic Awareness of a Large Language Model." *Journal of Pragmatics* 239 (2025): 16–36. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2025.02.001.

Atieku-Boateng, Harry, Richard Darko Osei, Victoria Aryee, Lydia Essien, and Beatrice Atieku-Boateng. "Leveraging on Chatgpt, an Artificial Intelligence (AI) Tool to Transform Examination Writing in Higher Education," June 25, 2024. https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-4550887/v1.

Bansal, Gaurang, Vinay Chamola, Amir Hussain, Mohsen Guizani, and Dusit Niyato. "Transforming Conversations with AI—A Comprehensive Study of ChatGPT." *Cognitive Computation* 16, no. 5 (2024): 2487–2510. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12559-023-10236-2.

Biassoni, Federica, and Martina Gnerre. "Exploring ChatGPT's Communication Behaviour in Healthcare Interactions: A Psycholinguistic Perspective." *Patient Education and Counseling* 134 (2025): 108663. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2025.108663.

Bourdieu, Pierre. "Structures, Habitus, Practices." In *Rethinking the Subject*, 31–45. Routledge, 2018.

Briana, Joseph Christopher D T. "Is ChatGPT-Produced Text Authentic? A Contrastive Analysis of Cohesive Markers in Human and AI-Generated Text." *Journal of English and Applied Linguistics* 3, no. 2 (2024): 4.

Cen, Ling-Ping, Fang-Fang Zhao, Han-Jie He, Jia-Jian Liang, Yun Wang, Hongjie Lin, Feifei Chen, Tai-Ping Li, Jian-Feng Yang, and Lan Chen. "Benchmarking the Performance of Large Language Models in Uveitis: A Comparative Analysis of ChatGPT-3.5, ChatGPT-4.0, Google Gemini, and Anthropic Claude3," June 25, 2024. https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-4237467/v1.

Choudhury, Avishek, Safa Elkefi, and Achraf Tounsi. "Exploring Factors Influencing User Perspective of ChatGPT as a Technology That Assists in Healthcare Decision Making: A Cross Sectional Survey Study." *PLOS ONE* 19, no. 3 (March 8, 2024): e0296151. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0296151.

Creswell, John W, and Cheryl N Poth. *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing among Five Approaches*. Sage publications, 2016.

George, A. Shaji, and A. S. Hovan George. "A Review of ChatGPT AI's Impact on Several Business Sectors." *Partners Universal International Innovation Journal* 1, no. 1 SE-Articles (February 18, 2023): 9–23. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7644359.

Javaid, Mohd, Abid Haleem, Ravi Pratap Singh, Shahbaz Khan, and Ibrahim Haleem Khan. "Unlocking the Opportunities through ChatGPT Tool towards Ameliorating the Education System." *BenchCouncil Transactions on Benchmarks, Standards and Evaluations* 3, no. 2 (2023): 100115. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tbench.2023.100115.

Li, Grace, Milad Alshomary, and Smaranda Muresan. "' Is ChatGPT a Better Explainer than My Professor?': Evaluating the Explanation Capabilities of LLMs in Conversation Compared to a Human Baseline." *ArXiv*, 2024.

Li, Yuan, Yue Huang, Hongyi Wang, Xiangliang Zhang, James Zou, and Lichao Sun. "Quantifying Ai Psychology: A Psychometrics Benchmark for Large Language Models." *ArXiv*, 2024.

Liao, Chihying, Chinnan Chu, Mingyu Lien, Yaochung Wu, and Tihao Wang. "AI-Enhanced Healthcare: Integrating ChatGPT-4 in EPROs for Improved Oncology Care and Decision-Making: A Pilot Evaluation." *Current Oncology* 32, no. 1 (December 26, 2024): 7. https://doi.org/10.3390/curroncol32010007.

Miles, Matthew B, and A Michael Huberman. *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook*. 2nd ed. Sage Publications, 1994.

Parekh, Pratham. "The Cultural Politics of 'Objectivity': A Sociological Critique of GenAI-Based Feedback Mechanisms in Educational Assessment BT - Innovative Educational Assessment with Generative AI: Opportunities, Challenges, and Practical Case Studies." edited by Mohamed Lahby, 29–50. Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland, 2026. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-032-05306-0_2.

Quan, Zhi, and Zhiwei Chen. "Human–Computer Pragmatics Trialled: Some (Im)Polite Interactions with ChatGPT 4.0 and the Ensuing Implications." *Interactive Learning Environments* 33, no. 2 (February 7, 2025): 1020–39. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2024.2362829.

Roggeveen, Anne L, and Raj Sethuraman. "Customer-Interfacing Retail Technologies in 2020 & Beyond: An Integrative Framework and Research Directions." *Journal of Retailing* 96, no. 3 (2020): 299–309. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretai.2020.08.001.

Tarchi, Christian, Alessandra Zappoli, Lidia Casado Ledesma, and Eva Wennås Brante. "The Use of ChatGPT in Source-Based Writing Tasks." *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education* 35, no. 2 (2025): 858–78. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-024-00413-1.

Titus, Lisa Miracchi. "Does ChatGPT Have Semantic Understanding? A Problem with the Statistics-of-Occurrence Strategy." *Cognitive Systems Research* 83 (2024): 101174. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogsys.2023.101174.

Tuna, M, K Schaaff, and T Schlippe. "Effects of Language- and Culture-Specific Prompting on ChatGPT." In *2024 2nd International Conference on Foundation and Large Language Models (FLLM)*, 73–81, 2024. https://doi.org/10.1109/FLLM63129.2024.10852463.

Turkle, Sherry. "Empathy Machines: Forgetting the Body." In *A Psychoanalytic Exploration of the Body in Today's World*, 17–27. Routledge, 2017.

Yankouskaya, Ala, Magnus Liebherr, and Raian Ali. "Can ChatGPT Be Addictive? A Call to Examine the Shift from Support to Dependence in AI Conversational Large Language Models." *Human-Centric Intelligent Systems* 5, no. 1 (2025): 77–89. https://doi.org/10.1007/s44230-025-00090-w.

Yu, Hao. "RETRACTED: The Application and Challenges of ChatGPT in Educational Transformation: New Demands for Teachers' Roles." *Heliyon* 10, no. 2 (January 30, 2024). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e24289.