ISSN 2598-2451

ADOPTION OF GENERATIVE AI IN SECRETARIAL PRACTICES: INSIGHTS FROM INDONESIAN ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONALS

Yohanes Adven Sarbani[1], Andreas E. Hadisoebroto[2]

[1,2] Study Program of Office Administration, Faculty of Business,
Widya Mandala Surabaya Catholic University

e-mail : adven@ukwms.ac.id[1], *e-mail* : andreas@ukwms.ac.id[2]

Abstrak

Perkembangan pesat kecerdasan buatan (AI) telah mentransformasi pekerjaan administrasi dan kesekretariatan melalui otomatisasi korespondensi, pelaporan, dan penjadwalan. Namun, kajian empiris mengenai adopsi AI di kalangan profesional administrasi di Indonesia masih terbatas. Penelitian ini bertujuan mengisi kesenjangan tersebut dengan menganalisis bagaimana staf administrasi dan sekretaris mengadopsi AI, hambatan yang dihadapi, serta implikasinya bagi praktik profesional. Penelitian menggunakan desain deskriptif kuantitatif dengan orientasi eksploratif, melalui survei daring terstruktur terhadap 26 responden. Analisis deskriptif menunjukkan 96,2% responden berpendidikan Diploma dan 80,8% memiliki pengalaman kerja lebih dari lima tahun. Alat AI yang paling banyak digunakan adalah ChatGPT dan Grammarly, terutama untuk penyusunan dan penyuntingan dokumen. Hasil penelitian menegaskan bahwa efisiensi dan kemudahan penggunaan menjadi faktor utama pendorong adopsi, sementara isu akurasi, kepercayaan, dan keterbatasan bahasa menjadi penghambat. Dibandingkan dengan studi sebelumnya yang menyoroti resistensi, profesi sekretaris menunjukkan tingkat penerimaan lebih tinggi karena kesesuaian AI dengan kebutuhan efisiensi tugas. Temuan ini memperluas teori TAM, UTAUT, dan Task–Technology Fit dengan menambahkan dimensi kesesuaian linguistik dan budaya. Secara praktis, organisasi disarankan untuk menyediakan pelatihan literasi AI, membangun kebijakan tata kelola, mendorong praktik hibrid manusia–AI, serta mendukung pengembangan AI lokal berbahasa Indonesia.

Kata kunci: Kecerdasan Buatan (AI), Profesi Sekretaris dan Administrasi, Penerimaan Teknologi, Transformasi Digital Perkantoran, Literasi AI dan Tata Kelola

Abstract

The rapid development of artificial intelligence (AI) has transformed administrative and secretarial work through the automation of correspondence, reporting, and scheduling. However, empirical studies on AI adoption among administrative professionals in Indonesia remain limited. This study aims to fill this gap by analyzing how administrative staff and secretaries adopt AI, the challenges they face, and the implications for professional practice. The research employed a quantitative descriptive design with an exploratory orientation, using a structured online survey involving 26 respondents. Descriptive analysis revealed that 96.2% of respondents held a Diploma degree and 80.8% had more than five years of work experience. The most widely used AI tools were ChatGPT and Grammarly, primarily for drafting and editing documents. The findings emphasize that efficiency and ease of use are the main drivers of adoption, while issues of accuracy, trust, and language limitations act as barriers. Compared with previous studies highlighting resistance, the secretarial profession demonstrated higher levels of acceptance due to the alignment of AI with task efficiency needs. These findings extend the TAM, UTAUT, and Task–Technology Fit theories by adding the dimension of linguistic and cultural fit. Practically, organizations are advised to provide AI literacy training, establish governance policies, promote hybrid

human–AI practices, and support the development of localized AI systems tailored to the Indonesian language.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence Adoption, Secretarial and Administrative Professions, Technology Acceptance, Workplace Digital Transformation, AI Literacy and Governance

A. Introduction

The rapid advancement of artificial intelligence (AI) has brought transformative changes across industrial sectors, including administration and secretarial work. AI enables the automation of both routine and complex tasks through natural language processing (NLP), voice recognition, and machine learning. These capabilities contribute directly to improving efficiency, reducing human error, and enhancing organizational productivity (Dwivedi et al., 2021; Lee et al., 2023).

In administrative contexts, digital transformation has accelerated with the adoption of AI-based applications such as ChatGPT, Grammarly, and Notion AI. These tools are increasingly utilized by administrative and secretarial professionals to draft documents, proofread and correct grammar, summarize reports, and manage work schedules. Their widespread usage reflects the operational reality that AI has shifted from being a conceptual innovation to an indispensable workplace utility (Cranefield et al., 2023; Marzuki et al., 2023; Parycek et al., 2023)

However, despite its growing relevance, the integration of AI in administrative work is not without challenges. Professionals often face issues such as limited digital literacy, organizational unpreparedness, and skepticism about the accuracy of AI outputs. Concerns over data privacy and ethical implications of AI-generated content also persist (Parycek et al., 2023). These barriers suggest that the adoption of AI requires not only access to tools but also institutional support and clear policy frameworks.

The urgency of this research lies in the increasing dependency of administrative professionals on AI to complete essential tasks while simultaneously navigating the risks and uncertainties associated with AI adoption. Without adequate training and institutional guidelines, AI utilization may lead to misuse, overreliance, or compromised communication quality. Thus, a systematic investigation into how AI impacts efficiency and productivity in administrative settings becomes critically important (Kelly et al., 2023)

In the Indonesian context, secretarial work has experienced significant changes due to digitalization. Sarbani (2021) emphasizes that secretaries' behavior in digital correspondence demonstrates not only their technical proficiency but also their adaptability and professionalism when transitioning from traditional to digital communication platforms. This shows that technology adoption in administrative work is deeply tied to behavioral and attitudinal shifts among professionals (Khaerunnisa et al., 2024; OECD, 2024; van Noordt et al., 2025; Wicaksono et al., 2025) This policy direction illustrates that AI adoption is no longer optional but part of the broader governance reform.

Empirical studies in Indonesian higher education provide further evidence of the growing adoption of digital technologies that underpin AI integration. For example, Sewandono et al. (2023)examined e-learning adoption in state universities during uncertain conditions and found that learning collaboration quality, information quality, and course content support indirectly shape performance expectancy through actual use and user satisfaction. These findings highlight that performance expectancy and system usage are central determinants in technology acceptance, suggesting that similar dynamics are likely to influence the adoption of AI-based applications in academic and administrative settings.

Specifically, in the domain of office administration, empirical studies in Indonesia show that AI applications are well accepted and practically beneficial. For example, Ninghardjanti, Subarno, Winarno, & Umam (2026) investigated AI adoption among Office Administration students at Universitas Sebelas Maret using an integrated TAM and IS Success Model framework, and found that information quality, system quality, and user acceptance significantly influenced AI tools usage (with ChatGPT being the predominant tool). Such findings underscore that in office administration education, students perceive AI as helpful in tasks related to document creation, summarization, and managing information flows.

At the same time, systematic reviews in both global and Indonesian contexts have consistently warned of risks associated with the adoption of generative AI tools such as ChatGPT. Major systematic reviews highlight persistent concerns about plagiarism, difficulties in detecting AI-generated content, factual inaccuracies in outputs, and broader ethical dilemmas, thereby underscoring the importance of institutional policies, revised assessment practices, and capacity-building initiatives (Albadarin, Tukiainen, Saqr, & Pope, 2024; Baig & Yadegaridehkordi, 2024; Mai et al., 2024). Within Indonesia, empirical research has similarly surfaced ethical worries: a digital ethics model study found academics concerned about plagiarism and loss of critical thinking with ChatGPT (Baig & Yadegaridehkordi, 2024; Dwihadiah et al., 2024; Pradana et al., 2023; Suci Dian Martha et al., 2025). These findings collectively reinforce the idea that while AI offers clear benefits, adoption must be paired with responsible usage frameworks, institutional guidelines, and training.

Globally, prior studies have focused primarily on AI adoption in corporate or industrial environments, emphasizing managerial or strategic perspectives (Shakeel & Siddiqui, 2021). While valuable, such research leaves a gap in understanding how AI is implemented in administrative and secretarial work, especially in Indonesia. Unlike managers or executives, administrative professionals carry out support tasks where efficiency, communication clarity, and document accuracy are critical.

Theoretically, this study builds on the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT), the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), and Task-Technology Fit (TTF). Integrating these three frameworks allows for a comprehensive analysis of both user perceptions and task–technology alignment in administrative work (Goodhue & Thompson, 1995; Venkatesh et al., 2003). By applying these models to the Indonesian context, this study extends their applicability to an underexplored professional group.

Accordingly, this study aims to address three main research problems: (1) how administrative and secretarial professionals in Indonesia use AI in their daily work, (2) to what extent AI adoption improves efficiency, productivity, and communication quality, and (3) what enabling and inhibiting factors influence AI adoption in this context. The novelty lies in situating the analysis within the Indonesian administrative workforce, thereby contributing both to theoretical discourse and to practical policy recommendations for sustainable digital transformation. Practically, it provides actionable insights for organizations and educational institutions on how to design training, governance, and localized AI tools tailored to the Indonesian professional context.

B. Research Methods

This study adopted a quantitative descriptive design with an exploratory orientation to examine the adoption of artificial intelligence (AI) applications in administrative and secretarial work. The descriptive component allows us to map and quantify features of AI usage (e.g., frequency, perceived efficiency), while the exploratory orientation is justified because the subject is relatively understudied in Indonesia and there are no well-established theory-driven models specific to administrative secretarial AI adoption. Similar methodological choices have been used in recent research on early adoption of emerging technologies (Faiz et al., 2024; Sousa et al., 2023).

Population and Sampling

The target population comprised administrative and secretarial professionals working in higher education institutions, private companies, and government organizations. A purposive sampling strategy was applied to recruit participants actively engaged in administrative tasks and with prior exposure to AI-based applications. A total of 26 respondents participated in this study. Although relatively small, this sample size is adequate for exploratory research and provides preliminary insights into emerging practices (Marshall et al., 2013)

Instrument Development

Data were collected through a structured questionnaire developed based on three theoretical frameworks: the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT) (Venkatesh et al., 2003)the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) (Davis, 1989), and the Task–Technology Fit (TTF) framework (Goodhue & Thompson, 1995). The instrument consisted of four sections:

1) Demographic and professional information (e.g., education, years of experience, sector, job position).
2) Types and frequency of AI applications used (e.g., ChatGPT, Grammarly, Canva AI, Notion AI).
3) Perceptions of AI adoption (usefulness, ease of use, task–technology alignment, performance expectancy, social influence).
4) Perceived impacts of AI (efficiency, productivity, communication quality).

Data Collection Procedures

The questionnaire was distributed online via Google Forms between January and February 2025. Participants were invited through professional associations, institutional networks, and administrative staff groups. Participation was voluntary, informed consent was obtained, and anonymity was maintained to ensure confidentiality.

Data Analysis

The collected data were analyzed using descriptive statistics (frequencies, percentages, and means). Respondent demographics are presented in the Results section through tables for clarity. The analysis emphasized adoption patterns and perceptions mapped against the TAM, UTAUT, and TTF dimensions.

Ethical Considerations

This research adhered to ethical standards for social science research. Participation was voluntary, anonymity was preserved, and no personally identifiable information was collected. While the small purposive sample (N = 26) limits generalizability, the exploratory design provides baseline evidence that can guide future large-scale or mixed-method studies on AI adoption in administrative professions.

C. Results and Discussion

Respondent Profile and Sectoral Context

The demographic composition of respondents provides the foundation for interpreting AI adoption trends in secretarial and administrative work. In this sample (n = 26), the vast majority held a Diploma (D3) degree (96.2%), while only 3.8% had a Bachelor's degree. These data indicate that, in this setting, AI adoption is concentrated among diploma-level graduates. A pattern consistent with the idea that vocational pathways are an important route for preparing administrative personnel for digital and AI-enabled tasks. Research on AI integration in vocational education and broader reviews of AI–HR interactions support the plausibility of this mechanism (Basu et al., 2023; Bujold et al., 2024; Jaya et al., 2024).

Work experience also shaped adoption patterns: 65.4% of respondents had more than five years of professional experience, while only 19.2% were early-career professionals with less than five years of tenure. Such distribution suggests that adoption insights are largely shaped by mid-career practitioners who have witnessed transitions from manual to digital tools. Sectoral representation was diverse, with respondents from education (19.2%), hospitality/trading (15.4%), property/real estate (11.5%), manufacturing (11.5%), government (7.7%), media (7.7%), and other professional sectors (19.2%).

The majority working as secretaries (34.6%) and administrative staff (26.9%) confirms the representativeness of the study, capturing insights from professionals most directly responsible for document preparation and coordination tasks. The demographic characteristics of the respondents are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Respondent Profile (N = 26)

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Education	Diploma (D3)	25	96.2%
	Bachelor (S1)	1	3.8%
Work Experience	< 5 years	5	19.2%
	5–10 years	10	38.5%
	11–15 years	7	26.9%
	> 15 years	4	15.4%
Business Sector	Education (universities/schools)	5	19.2%
	Food & Beverage / Hospitality / Trading	4	15.4%
	Property / Real Estate / Developer	3	11.5%
	Edu Tech	2	7.7%
	Broadcasting / Media	2	7.7%
	Manufacturing / Heavy Equipment / Motor	3	11.5%
	Government / Public Sector	2	7.7%
	Others (Legal, Design, Consultancy)	5	19.2%
Job Position	Secretary / Executive Assistant	9	34.6%
	Administrative Staff	7	26.9%
	Manager / Head / Coordinator	6	23.1%
	Support Staff / Others	4	15.4%

Frequency and Patterns of AI Use

The results show that AI tools are integrated into routine secretarial practices. 69.2% of respondents used AI daily or several times per week, while only 7.7% reported rare or no use.

Table 2. Frequency of AI Tool Use

Frequency of Use	Frequency	Percentage
Daily	8	30.8%
Several times/week	10	38.4%
Monthly/Occasional	6	23.1%
Rarely/Never	2	7.7%

Respondents highlighted the use of ChatGPT, Grammarly, Canva AI, and Notion AI for drafting documents, grammar checking, summarization, and translation. This reflects global patterns where generative AI tools are initially adopted for text-heavy, low-risk tasks (Przegalinska et al., 2025)

In Indonesia, AI was also used for bilingual communication, which distinguishes local adoption patterns from global trends. This reflects the linguistic demands of secretarial work in a multilingual context, where communication often alternates between Bahasa Indonesia and English.

Efficiency and Productivity Enhancement

One of the strongest perceived benefits of AI adoption was efficiency. 84.6% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that AI improved time management in task completion.

Table 3. AI Impact on Time Efficiency

Response Category	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Agree	11	42.3%
Agree	11	42.3%
Neutral	2	7.7%
Disagree	1	3.8%
Strongly Disagree	1	3.8%

Respondents described that AI often reduced drafting or editing times by 30–40%. For secretaries, whose roles are tied to time-sensitive tasks such as correspondence, reporting, and meeting documentation, this efficiency directly translates to enhanced job performance. These findings echo (Freeman et al., 2024) who experimentally demonstrated that generative AI boosts productivity in knowledge work.

Ease of Use and Adoption Challenges

The majority (80%) rated AI tools as “easy” or “very easy” to use, confirming the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) (Davis, 1989), which stresses the role of usability in driving adoption.

Table 4. Perceived Ease of Use

Category	Frequency	Percentage
Very Easy	8	30.8%
Easy	13	50.0%
Neutral	3	11.5%
Difficult	2	7.7%
Very Difficult	0	0.0%

Nevertheless, trust remained a critical concern. Respondents often perceived AI outputs as needing manual verification, particularly when documents had legal, cultural, or client-sensitive content.

Accuracy and Trust Concerns

Despite efficiency, skepticism about accuracy was evident. 46% of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that AI outputs were fully reliable.

Table 5. Perceived Accuracy and Trust

Category	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Agree	4	15.4%
Agree	8	30.8%
Neutral	2	7.7%
Disagree	8	30.8%
Strongly Disagree	4	15.4%

This confirms prior findings that adoption is shaped not only by usability but also by trust in system outputs (Dwivedi et al., 2021). For Indonesian respondents, trust issues were amplified by the fact that Bahasa Indonesia outputs were less reliable compared to English.

Organizational Support and Training Needs

Respondents consistently emphasized the need for structured guidance. 65% agreed or strongly agreed that organizations should provide training or policies.

Table 6. Perceived Need for Training/Support

Category	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Agree	10	38.5%
Agree	7	26.9%
Neutral	5	19.2%
Disagree	3	11.5%
Strongly Disagree	1	3.9%

This demonstrates that current AI adoption is individual-driven rather than institutionally guided. As (Kelly et al., 2023) argue, digital adoption in organizations often begins informally at the employee level, but without governance, risks of inconsistency and ethical breaches remain high.

Discussion

Comparative Perspective and Theoretical Implications

The findings of this study reveal adoption dynamics that contrast with previous research on higher education. For example, Nagy et al. (2024) reported that AI adoption in higher education was often limited

due to infrastructural barriers, institutional resistance, and ethical concerns surrounding the use of generative AI in teaching and assessment. In contrast, the secretarial professionals surveyed in this study demonstrated relatively higher levels of adoption. This divergence highlights the importance of professional role orientation in shaping adoption drivers. For secretaries, whose daily tasks emphasize efficiency, accuracy, and speed, AI offers clear functional benefits that outweigh potential concerns. By contrast, academic roles such as lecturers face dilemmas involving academic integrity and fairness, which complicate adoption decisions, as highlighted in recent analyses of generative AI ethics in higher education (Mariyono & Alif Hidayatullah, 2025)

From a theoretical standpoint, these findings reaffirm the explanatory power of the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT), and the Task–Technology Fit (TTF) framework. In line with TAM and UTAUT, efficiency (performance expectancy), usability (effort expectancy), and peer influence (social influence) emerged as major drivers of adoption. However, inhibitors such as trust, accuracy, and linguistic limitations align with earlier observations that AI adoption is not only a matter of perceived usefulness but also of contextual reliability (Dwivedi et al., 2021; Lee et al., 2023)

Importantly, this study extends the TTF framework by introducing linguistic and cultural fit as a novel dimension influencing adoption. In multilingual contexts such as Indonesia, task-technology alignment cannot be fully achieved if AI systems fail to generate outputs in accurate and culturally appropriate Bahasa Indonesia. This echoes recent calls in IS literature to adapt adoption models to non-Western contexts, where cultural-linguistic considerations significantly affect trust and usage (Parycek et al., 2023; Shakeel & Siddiqui, 2021; Youssef Alyoussef et al., 2025). Thus, this study contributes to theory by expanding TTF beyond technical alignment to encompass socio-linguistic appropriateness.

Practical Implications for Organizations

Based on these results, several practical implications emerge for organizations aiming to foster effective AI adoption among administrative and secretarial staff:

a. Introduce AI literacy training to enhance staff competencies

Training initiatives should not be limited to technical usage but should also include modules on critical evaluation of AI outputs, ethical considerations, and data security. Prior research emphasizes that holistic digital skills programs are essential for preparing staff to harness AI as a productivity tool while simultaneously safeguarding professional standards in correspondence, reporting, and decision-making (Dwivedi et al., 2023; Aroles et al., 2023).

b. Develop clear AI governance policies, ensuring consistency and accountability

Without explicit policies, AI use risks inconsistency and ethical breaches. Governance frameworks should define acceptable use cases, establish protocols for handling sensitive data, and create accountability structures. Clear policies foster trust among employees while ensuring compliance with organizational and legal standards (Floridi & Cowls, 2019).

c. Encourage hybrid practices where AI accelerates tasks but humans verify sensitive outputs

A balanced model allows AI to handle repetitive or time-intensive tasks, while humans ensure outputs meet contextual, cultural, and ethical requirements. This hybrid approach is increasingly promoted as best practice in professional environments to mitigate risks of overreliance on AI (Freeman et al., 2024).

d. Support localized AI tools optimized for Bahasa Indonesia to address language-related reliability issues

AI adoption in Indonesia faces unique challenges due to the underrepresentation of Bahasa Indonesia in global AI training datasets. Organizations should therefore advocate for investment in localized tools or partner with developers to fine-tune systems for local linguistic and cultural needs. Doing so enhances reliability, reduces translation errors, and increases trust in AI outputs (Setiawan & Luthfiyani, 2023)

Limitations and Future Directions

While offering important insights, this study is limited by its relatively small sample size (N = 26) and its reliance on descriptive statistics. These constraints limit generalizability and restrict causal inferences. Future studies should employ larger and more diverse samples, apply inferential statistical methods such as Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) to test theoretical relationships, and adopt longitudinal designs to capture evolving patterns of adoption. Mixed-method approaches could also enrich understanding by exploring the lived experiences of professionals navigating AI integration in their work.

D. Conclusion

This study examined the adoption of generative AI among secretarial and administrative professionals in Indonesia, highlighting how AI tools are reshaping efficiency, usability, and trust in professional tasks. The findings reveal that while AI adoption is frequent (69.2% use daily or weekly) and largely associated with efficiency gains (84.6% perceive time savings) and ease of use (80% rate tools easy/very easy), concerns about accuracy and trust (46% express doubts) and the absence of organizational support (65% request training and policy frameworks) remain significant barriers.

From a theoretical perspective, the study affirms the relevance of Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), UTAUT, and Task–Technology Fit (TTF) frameworks in explaining adoption patterns. However, it also extends existing models by introducing the dimension of linguistic and cultural fit, underscoring that generative AI adoption in multilingual contexts requires not only technical alignment with tasks but also contextual and cultural reliability. This constitutes a critical theoretical contribution, suggesting that trust in AI is mediated not only by system performance but also by how effectively outputs resonate with local languages and work practices.

From a practical standpoint, the results emphasize the urgency of institutionalizing AI literacy training, developing governance policies, and supporting localized AI tools. Organizations that fail to provide structured guidance risk fragmented adoption, inconsistent outputs, and ethical vulnerabilities.

Conversely, those that proactively shape AI integration can leverage it as a catalyst for improving productivity, communication, and competitiveness in administrative functions.

The study also carries important policy implications. Vocational education institutions must adapt curricula to equip graduates not only with administrative competencies but also with AI literacy and critical evaluation skills. Policymakers should encourage standardized AI governance frameworks to balance innovation with accountability, especially in professions dealing with sensitive documentation.

Despite its insights, the research is constrained by its modest sample size (N = 26) and reliance on descriptive analysis. Future research should deploy larger, cross-sectoral samples, adopt inferential methods such as structural equation modeling, and use longitudinal designs to track adoption trajectories over time. Qualitative approaches such as interviews and focus groups may also uncover deeper insights into professional trust, ethical dilemmas, and cultural attitudes toward AI.

In sum, this study demonstrates that generative AI adoption among Indonesian secretarial professionals is enthusiastically embraced but cautiously practiced. It enhances efficiency and usability yet exposes vulnerabilities in trust, accuracy, and institutional preparedness. By addressing these gaps, both theory and practice can move toward a more responsible, localized, and transformative integration of AI in professional administrative work.

References

Baig, M. I., & Yadegaridehkordi, E. (2024). ChatGPT in the higher education: A systematic literature review and research challenges. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *127*, 102411. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2024.102411

Cranefield, J., Winikoff, M., Chiu, Y.-T., Li, Y., Doyle, C., & Richter, A. (2023). Partnering with AI: the case of digital productivity assistants. *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand*, *53*(1), 95–118. https://doi.org/10.1080/03036758.2022.2114507

Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, and User Acceptance of Information Technology. *MIS Quarterly*, *13*(3), 319. https://doi.org/10.2307/249008

Dwihadiah, D. L., Niyu, N., & Purba, H. (2024). Digital Ethics Model Concerning the Use of ChatGPT in Indonesian Higher Education. *Information, Medium, and Society: Journal of Publishing Studies*, *23*(1), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.18848/2691-1507/CGP/v23i01/1-22

Dwivedi, Y. K., Hughes, L., Ismagilova, E., Aarts, G., Coombs, C., Crick, T., Duan, Y., Dwivedi, R., Edwards, J., Eirug, A., Galanos, V., Ilavarasan, P. V., Janssen, M., Jones, P., Kar, A. K., Kizgin, H., Kronemann, B., Lal, B., Lucini, B., … Williams, M. D. (2021). Artificial Intelligence (AI): Multidisciplinary perspectives on emerging challenges, opportunities, and agenda for research, practice and policy. *International Journal of Information Management*, *57*, 101994. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2019.08.002

OECD. (2024). *Enabling Digital Innovation in Government: The OECD GovTech Policy Framework*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/a51eb9b2-en

Floridi, L., & Cowls, J. (2019). A Unified Framework of Five Principles for AI in Society. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3831321

Freeman, B., Arriola, K., Cottell, D., Lawlor, E., Erdman, M., Sutherland, T., & Wells, B. (2024). Evaluation of Task Specific Productivity Improvements Using a Generative Artificial Intelligence Personal Assistant Tool. *American Journal of Artificial Intelligence*, *8*(2), 68–80. https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajai.20240802.16

Goodhue, D. L., & Thompson, R. L. (1995). Task-Technology Fit and Individual Performance. *MIS Quarterly*, *19*(2), 213. https://doi.org/10.2307/249689

Kelly, S., Kaye, S.-A., & Oviedo-Trespalacios, O. (2023). What factors contribute to the acceptance of artificial intelligence? A systematic review. *Telematics and Informatics*, *77*, 101925. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2022.101925

Khaerunnisa, D., Wahyudi, A., Anggraeni, A., Suminar, L., & Nugroho, A. (2024). Public Sector AI Adoption: Regional Government Efforts in Improving Organizational Performance. *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Administration Science, ICAS 2023, 29 November 2023, Bandung, West Java, Indonesia*. https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.29-11-2023.2347793

Lee, M. C. M., Scheepers, H., Lui, A. K. H., & Ngai, E. W. T. (2023). The implementation of artificial intelligence in organizations: A systematic literature review. *Information & Management*, *60*(5), 103816. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2023.103816

Marshall, B., Cardon, P., Poddar, A., & Fontenot, R. (2013). Does Sample Size Matter in Qualitative Research?: A Review of Qualitative Interviews in is Research. *Journal of Computer Information Systems*, *54*(1), 11–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/08874417.2013.11645667

Marzuki, Widiati, U., Rusdin, D., Darwin, & Indrawati, I. (2023). The impact of AI writing tools on the content and organization of students' writing: EFL teachers' perspective. *Cogent Education*, *10*(2). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2023.2236469

Parycek, P., Schmid, V., & Novak, A.-S. (2023). Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Automation in Administrative Procedures: Potentials, Limitations, and Framework Conditions. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy*, *15*(2), 8390–8415. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13132-023-01433-3

Pradana, M., Elisa, H. P., & Syarifuddin, S. (2023). Discussing ChatGPT in education: A literature review and bibliometric analysis. *Cogent Education*, *10*(2). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2023.2243134

Przegalinska, A., Triantoro, T., Kovbasiuk, A., Ciechanowski, L., Freeman, R. B., & Sowa, K. (2025). Collaborative AI in the workplace: Enhancing organizational performance through resource-based and task-technology fit perspectives. *International Journal of Information Management*, *81*, 102853. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2024.102853

Sarbani, Y. A. (2021). Perilaku Sekretaris dalam Berkorespondensi Digital. *Jurnal Administrasi Dan Kesekretarisan*, *6 (2)*, 124–146.

Setiawan, A., & Luthfiyani, U. K. (2023). Penggunaan ChatGPT Untuk Pendidikan di Era Education 4.0: Usulan Inovasi Meningkatkan Keterampilan Menulis. *Jurnal PETISI*, *04*(01). https://chat.openai.com.

Sewandono, R. E., Thoyib, A., Hadiwidjojo, D., & Rofiq, A. (2023). Performance expectancy of E-learning on higher institutions of education under uncertain conditions: Indonesia context. *Education and Information Technologies*, *28*(4), 4041–4068. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-022-11074-9

Shakeel, A., & Siddiqui, D. A. (2021). The effect of Technological, Organizational, Environmental, and Task Technology fit on the Adoption and usage of artificial intelligence (AI) for talent acquisition (TA): Evidence from the Pakistani banking sector. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3943071

Suci Dian Martha, A., Widowati, S., & Puspa Rahayu, D. (2025). Assessing Student Readiness and Perceptions of ChatGPT in Learning: A Case Study in Indonesian Higher Education. *Journal of Information Technology Education: Research*, *24*, 023. https://doi.org/10.28945/5599

van Noordt, C., Medaglia, R., & Tangi, L. (2025). Policy initiatives for Artificial Intelligence-enabled government: An analysis of national strategies in Europe. *Public Policy and Administration*, *40*(2), 215–253. https://doi.org/10.1177/09520767231198411

Venkatesh, Morris, Davis, & Davis. (2003). User Acceptance of Information Technology: Toward a Unified View. *MIS Quarterly*, *27*(3), 425. https://doi.org/10.2307/30036540

Wicaksono, F., Abdul Aziz, Y. M., Ariesmansyah, A., & Arifin, R. K. (2025). Artificial Intelligence in Public Administration: Practice and Ethics for Talent Management in Public Sector. *KnE Social Sciences*, *10*(4), 216–225. https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v10i4.18037

Youssef Alyoussef, I., Mohammed Drwish, A., Adel Albakheet, F., Hassan Alhajhoj, R., & Ahmed Al-Mousa, A. (2025). AI Adoption for Collaboration: Factors Influencing Inclusive Learning Adoption in Higher Education. *IEEE Access*, *13*, 81690–81713. https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2025.3567656