ARTICLE

Discourse Analysis on the Ethical Dilemmas on the Use of AI in Academic Settings from ICT, Science, and Language Instructors

Jason V. Chavez [1]* , *Jhordan T. Cuilan* [2], *Sali S. Mannan* [3], *Narrin U. Ibrahim* [4], *Aisha A. Carolino* [5], *Abubakar Radjuni* [6], *Salman E. Albani* [6], *Benigno A. Garil* [7]

[1] *Graduate School, Zamboanga Peninsula Polytechnic State University, Zamboanga City 7000, Philippines*

[2] *Department of English, Benguet State University, La Trinidad, Benguet 2601, Philippines*

[3] *College of Computer Studies, Mindanao State University-Sulu, Jolo, Sulu 7400, Philippines*

[4] *College of Business Administration, Mindanao State University-Sulu, Jolo, Sulu 7400, Philippines*

[5] *Senior High School Department, Mindanao State University-Sulu, Jolo, Sulu 7400, Philippines*

[6] *College of Education, Mindanao State University-Sulu, Jolo, Sulu 7400, Philippines*

[7] *College of Humanities, Social Sciences, and Communication, Basilan State College, Isabela City 7300, Zamboanga Peninsula, Philippines*

ABSTRACT

Artificial intelligence (AI) in education has the potential to revolutionize learning by addressing significant challenges and accelerating progress. Generative AI, such as ChatGPT, has demonstrated the ability to produce high-quality text and other content, potentially transforming academic tasks like essay writing. Despite these advantages, educators are concerned about the ethical implications of AI use. Risks such as misinformation, academic dishonesty, and overreliance on AI must be thoroughly assessed. This discourse analysis explored the perceptions of teachers on AI use in academic settings, highlighting concepts leading to ethical issues involved in its use. Convenience sampling (n = 30) was used to select the participants for a one-on-one interview. Findings indicated that overreliance, dishonesty, cheating, are plagiarism were some ethical issues that emerged from the discourse. Convenience, driven by ease and accessibility, can lead students

to excessively use AI, which may inadvertently hamper their learning processes. Overreliance, fueled by trust in generated outputs, can result in students depending heavily on AI-generated information, which may not always be accurate or critically analyzed. Students who feel incapable of producing quality work on their own may resort to AI, believing they lack the necessary skills. This reliance on AI can erode their confidence and critical thinking abilities, further entrenching their dependence on technology. While AI can enhance learning and efficiency, it also poses risks of academic dishonesty, overreliance, and diminished student engagement with the learning process. Teachers perceive AI use as unethical, primarily due to how students interact with and depend on AI, ultimately affecting their academic integrity and genuine intellectual development.

Keywords: Academic Dishonesty; AI Overreliance; Artificial Intelligence; Ethical Issues; Learning

1. Introduction

Artificial intelligence has a profound impact on shaping the future, surpassing the influence of any other invention in this century. AI-powered tools, such as plagiarism detection software, text-generating algorithms, and automatic essay graders, have emerged as valuable resources for students seeking to enhance their skills[1]. With AI, it becomes possible to personalize learning experiences, optimize efficiency, and enhance effectiveness in educational settings[2, 3] The origins of AI can be traced back to the 1950s, when researchers first began exploring the concept. However, a notable milestone in the history of AI can be identified with the advent of highly advanced large language models, such as ChatGPT, which have granted the public unprecedented access to this technology[4]. This development can be seen as a significant turning point, as it has opened up new possibilities and implications for AI applications[5–7]. Preliminary investigations have indicated that ChatGPT exhibits the ability to effectively accomplish the written section of the United States Medical Licensing Examination[8]. Additional research has demonstrated the potential uses of AI-based chat systems like ChatGPT in medicine, including information sharing about cancer, aiding in clinical diagnosis, writing scientific research papers, and patient communication[9–11] Despite its potential in integrating the education system, ethical questions emerged, revealing the limitations of AI use in academic settings. Some scholars raise concerns about the ethical implications of ChatGPT and its potential harmful impact on evaluation processes, students' ability to think critically, and scientific integrity[12]. In the education sector, in particular, important problems have arisen about developments like essay writing technology. Particularly,[13] opened a question about how learners should be evaluated when it is possible to produce documents of believable writing quality in a matter of seconds using only a few strategic language cues. In fact, relying too much on AI technology and losing the pleasure of independent learning might lead to a lack of self-education and foolishness[14]. These kinds of incidents make AI in education a "double-edged sword," since it both generates and proclaims benefits and threats to the current educational system and becomes a weapon that might be abused[15].

In the Philippines, Sara Duterte, the vice president and secretary of education, has called on experts and policymakers to overcome the difficulties and "uncertainties" associated with integrating AI and other cutting-edge technology into digital education[16]. A study from Far Eastern University revealed that students use AI to improve their grades, minimize errors, or even due to peer pressure[17]. In contrast, Filipino teachers believed it is challenging to implement AI in education because of its potential to expand the means for academic dishonesty and cheating[18]. As AI technology becomes more prevalent in educational settings, educators are at a crossroads, evaluating whether these advancements offer more benefits or pose significant risks to students. While AI presents undeniable advantages, such as personalized learning and administrative efficiency, it also brings forth ethical concerns that need thorough examination. With that, this paper addressed how teachers perceived AI use as 'unethical' and assessed its extent through narrative discourse analysis.

2. Literature Review

2.1. AI in Education

The increased use of technology to shape the expectations and skills of students in accessing, obtaining, manipulating, constructing, creating, and communicating information within digital environments has led to the flourishing of students[19, 20]. For more than a century, researchers have been investigating the possibilities of AI technology in educational settings[21]. It has become a transformative force in education, promising to improve the ways for teaching and learning by personalizing lessons, automating repetitive processes, and delivering recommendations based on data[22]. In recent years, there has been a noticeable increase in the use of AI in education, with more educational institutions and organizations investigating the possible advantages of AI-driven technology[23, 24].

AI in Education (AIED) is the use of AI tools or application programs in educational environments to support instruction, learning, or decision-making[25]. AI technologies recreate human intellect to make judgments, predictions, and forecasts so that computer systems can support educators or policymakers as well as students with personalized advice, supports, or evaluations[26–29]. The potential of this technology to address some of the most significant challenges in education today, revolutionize teaching and learning practices, and expedite progress is noteworthy[30]. Generative AI focuses on computational techniques capable of generating novel and meaningful content like text, images, or audio[31]. The generation process is based on the analysis and understanding of training data, which serves as the foundation for the creation of new and original content[32]. AI has demonstrated its ability to generate various forms of textual content, including poems[33], political statements[34], and academic papers[35]. These AI-generated texts often possess a level of quality that makes them difficult to distinguish from content produced by humans[31, 36]. With the abundance of extensive datasets, researchers have created Chatbots and conversational AI systems, such as ChatGPT, which present a novel method for delivering natural responses to human prompts[37]. The emergence of ChatGPT is considered a significant development that can transform conventional forms of academic tasks and evaluations, including the practice of essay composition[38]. The integration of AI technology in classrooms not only alleviates some of the teacher's workload, but also enhances students' learning outcomes[39, 40].

2.2. Ethical Issues in AI Use

Educators are at a critical juncture when it comes to the functions and uses of technology in education. Their primary concern revolves around whether it can potentially cause detrimental effects or provide advantages to students[41]. Although AI technology offers undeniable advantages for students and teachers, it is important to acknowledge the potential risks and ethical concerns associated with it[42]. These risks should be thoroughly assessed through conceptual and empirical studies to identify potential threats.

Although AIED has experienced significant progress, there is a lack of understanding of the ethical principles that should govern the design, development, and implementation of ethical and reliable AI in education. This paper discussed several aspects of ethical issues regarding AI use (like ChatGPT) in academic setting within the lens of teacher's perceptions.

Understandably, the educational world has been greatly disturbed by recent advancements, particularly with the introduction of AI[43]. Despite the potential of technology to transform education, there are several challenges that researchers and practitioners face in relation to the implementation and use of educational technologies[44]. AI has the potential to become widespread in all aspects of life, where individuals may be vulnerable to threats without their knowledge or awareness[45]. For example, ChatGPT has exhibited impressive text generation abilities, yet it has also shown instances of inaccurate or deceptive information[46]. Similarly, ChatGPT also lacks the ability to use idioms, cite sources correctly, evaluate their quality, follow to ethical standards, make frequently logical and grammatical errors, struggle with complex mathematical expressions, and ignores its shortage of knowledge[47, 48]. The susceptibility of ChatGPT to manipulation for purposes such as spreading disinformation or impersonating individuals is a consequence of its capacity to produce text that closely resembles human writing[49].

Due to the extensive use of ChatGPT, numerous educational institutions across the globe have taken steps to restrict or outright ban its usage. Seattle public schools outlawed the use of Chat GPT in January 2023, while Sciences Po in

Paris prohibits professors from employing AI technologies in undetected ways[50]. RV University in Bangalore, India has banned students from using Chat GPT to accomplish projects, assessments, or laboratory tests[51]. These procedures attempt to ensure students use ChatGPT technologies responsibly, prevent overreliance and abuse, and maintain academic integrity and quality of education[52, 53].

2.3. Human Behavior behind AI Use

Human behavior might be a significant angle for ethical issues regarding AI use in academic settings. Empirical research has examined whether individuals trust AI-assisted decision-making and what factors influence this trust[54]. The recent interest in making AI more interpretable has sparked numerous studies on how AI explanations affect people's trust in the AI model. Previous research often focused on straightforward factors like the AI model's performance indicators[55–57]. However, more recent studies have shifted towards evaluating whether and how the explanations provided by AI impact trust[58, 59].

At its core, people are less likely to experiment with new technology if they perceive considerable risks[60]. Research shows that human forecasters lose trust in automated recommendation systems when they make mistakes, whereas they are tolerant of human errors[61]. Teachers, in particular, may consider automated recommendations as meaningless if they do not align with their personal opinions[62]. End-users may struggle to interpret and evaluate learning analytics data[63]. To effectively utilize learning analytics, end-users must possess a fundamental understanding of data literacy including ability to critically analyze the outcomes derived from big data analysis and subsequently make informed decisions based on the data[64]. Without this knowledge, the potential benefits of AI in enhancing educational outcomes may not be fully realized. Furthermore, extensive engagement with technology has resulted in a cognitive shift towards algorithmic thinking—without basic human thinking[65]. As it progresses through activities such as planning and organizing, it eventually depletes the human brain's cognitive capacity. Relying heavily on AI can impair professional skills and cause stress when physical or mental assessments are required[66].

3. Materials and Methods

3.1. Research Design

This study was qualitative research dealing with the message patterns about the ethical dilemmas surrounding the use of AI in academic setting. Specifically, exploratory design was used to gather the perceptions of ICT, science, and language teachers on the use of AI. Exploratory design is effective in identifying significant ideas, relationships, and narratives, which are foundational for subsequent quantitative and theoretical analyses[67–69].

3.2. Population and Sampling

The participants of this study were ICT, science, and language instructors in Zamboanga City, Philippines. Convenient sampling was used to sample the instructors to be interviewed[70]. This method was chosen due to its practicality and efficiency, allowing the researchers to gather data quickly from readily accessible participants[71]. In this case, the instructors were selected based on their availability and willingness to participate in the study. While this approach facilitated the collection of preliminary insights and minimized logistical challenges, it is important to note that it may not fully represent the broader population of instructors. There was a total of 30 participants participated in the study—ten (10) instructors in each of the mentioned teaching discipline.

3.3. Research Instrument

Semi-structured interviews are widely utilized as a data collection technique in qualitative research. It is important to note that the effectiveness of the interview guide significantly impacts the outcomes of the study[72]. The quality and trustworthiness of a study depend on the rigorousness of data gathering processes[72].

An interview is a discourse between a researcher and their research participants. The interview process relies on the interviewee's availability and willingness to provide information[73]. The researcher has a discourse with the subject(s) to ask pertinent questions about the study topic. To elicit the responses from the participants, this study developed semi-structured interview guide questions based on the guidelines of[73]. Apparently, they suggested that the researchers should (i) determine the needs in conducting a semi-structured in-

terview, (ii) use some known concepts, (iii) formulate an interview guide, and (iv) pilot test the prepared guide.

In developing the interview guide questions, researchers first identified the specific objectives and information requirements of their study, ensuring that the interview questions would address these needs effectively. The researchers ensured that their questions were grounded in existing knowledge and could elicit insightful responses. Based on the identified needs and known concepts, the re-

searchers developed a structured guide that included open-ended questions designed to encourage detailed and thoughtful responses from the participants. Before the actual data collection, the interview guide was pilot tested with a small group of participants similar to those in the main study. This step allowed the researchers to refine the questions, address any ambiguities, and ensure that the guide was effective in eliciting the desired information. Presented in **Table 1** is the interview guide of this study.

Table 1. Interview guide questions of the study.

Objectives	Interview Questions
Determine the unresolved ethical dilemmas on the Use of AI in Academic Settings from ICT, science, and language Instructors	a. What is your general position on the use of AI in the academic setting? Elaborate. b. What are some unresolved ethical dilemmas on the use of AI in your department (mention specifically if ICT, science, or language-oriented department in terms of honesty? Enumerate and provide specific examples. c. What are some unresolved ethical dilemmas on the use of AI in your department (mention specifically if ICT, science, or language-oriented department in terms of technology-dependency? Enumerate and provide specific examples. d. What are some unresolved ethical dilemmas on the use of AI in your department (mention specifically if ICT, science, or language-oriented department in terms of tolerance on the abuse of usage? Enumerate and provide specific examples. e. How should academic institutions resolve the ethical dilemmas you mentioned? Suggest the process.
Compare the identified unresolved ethical dilemmas on the Use of AI in Academic Settings from ICT, science, and language Instructors	a. The unresolved ethical dilemmas on the use of AI in their respective department in terms of honesty, technology-dependency, and tolerance on the abuse of usage b. The suggested process to resolve the ethical dilemmas in their respective departments?

3.4. Data Gathering Procedure

Initially, this study conducted an online survey that gathered potential participants in the study. The online survey served as a preliminary step to identify and recruit instructors who were suitable and willing to participate in the interviews. Google forms gathered initial data from participants i.e., teaching discipline, years in service, contact information, familiarity in AI. This information was used to further identify which of them will be interviewed. After selection, the participants were contacted to confirm their participation in the study. This contact process involved sending personalized emails or making phone calls to each selected instructor, providing them with detailed information about the study's objectives, the nature of their involvement, and the expected time commitment. The researchers also took this opportunity to address any questions or concerns the participants might have had, ensuring that they fully understood

the study's scope and their role within it.

During the scheduled interview, a brief overview of the topics to be discussed was given, emphasizing the importance of the participants' insights and experiences. The interviewers followed the semi-structured interview guide, which included a mix of open-ended questions designed to elicit detailed responses while allowing for the natural flow of conversation. Throughout the interview, the researchers actively listened, occasionally probing deeper into specific areas of interest[67, 74]. The researchers took detailed notes and, with the participants' consent, recorded the conversations to ensure the accuracy of the data collected.

3.5. Data Analysis

The primary data in this study was the narratives of the participants. Narrative discourse analysis was used to interpret the responses from the interview. Discourse analy-

sis provides a tool to examine the 'orderly modes of talking' through which humans explain for and make connections between themselves and their social contexts [74–76]. This study patterned the analysis based on the guide on psychological discourse analysis [77]. The researchers framed specific questions that would guide their analysis, focusing on how the instructors articulate their experiences and perspectives on ICT, science, and language education in Zamboanga City. They compiled a comprehensive corpus of the interview data, which included transcriptions of all recorded conversations and relevant notes. An initial reading of the transcriptions was conducted, focusing on identifying the action orientation of the discourse. Patterns and recurring themes described how participants used language to achieve specific actions or convey particular viewpoints. The researchers analyzed the data to identify various discursive devices and rhetorical or interactional strategies employed by the participants. This involved examining how language was used to construct identities, manage relationships, and negotiate meanings. They provided examples from the transcriptions, illustrating how specific language features and patterns contributed to the participants' expressions and interactions.

4. Results

Objective 1. Determine the unresolved ethical dilemmas on the use of AI in academic settings from ICT, science, and language instructors.

Teachers generally expressed support for AI in educational settings. However, they seem to have some relevant concern on the use of AI, especially in generating contents and outputs. Teachers expressed some remarkable concerns about the misuse of AI by students, particularly in terms of academic dishonesty, cheating, plagiarism, and overreliance. Consequently, these concerns reflected a deeper apprehension about the long-term educational implications of AI use.

4.1. AI Use in Education

In analyzing the message patterns of statements about AI in education, several key themes and rhetorical strategies emerge. For example, one teacher supported the use of AI in academic setting because it can be used for personalizing lessons, automating routine tasks, and support in conducting research. Another teacher said that it can help students learn languages faster by providing personalized exercises and instant feedback. The use of 'very useful' and 'help students learn…faster' conveys a strong support for practical applications of AI in making education more efficient and tailored to individual needs.

> *"As an ICT teacher, I think AI can make learning better by personalizing lessons, automating tasks, and helping with research. But we need to use it wisely."*

> *"I believe AI can be very useful in education. It can help students learn languages faster by providing personalized exercises and instant feedback."*

However, it was evident that they also understand its general effects. Two teachers said to 'use it wisely' and 'do not rely on AI for everything.' This particular perspective reflected an understanding that while AI offers significant advantages, it must be integrated thoughtfully to maintain the integrity of the learning process and ensure that students develop their own capabilities without becoming overly dependent on technology.

> *"But we need to use it wisely to make sure students actually learn and don't just rely on AI for everything."*

4.2. Dishonesty in Using AI

Teachers expressed are somehow worried about the misuse of AI by students, focusing on the potential for cheating. This concern was articulated through examples of specific academic tasks, such as writing essays and translating texts, where students might use AI and submit the output as their own work.

> *"Students might use AI to write essays or translate texts and then submit it as their own work."*

> *"In our ICT department, honesty is a big issue with AI. Some students might cheat by using AI to write essays or complete assignments and then saying it's their own work."*

Some teachers were aware that AI could write or trans-

late texts. This can be a gateway for students to cheat and 'submit it as their own work.' For teachers, honesty in education is essential and that they feel worried about the impact of AI on student's academic honesty and increase their tendency to cheat.

4.3. Overreliance on AI

Another dilemma that appeared in the discourse was how students were overreliant on the use of AI in academic settings. Although teachers were generally positive on the application of AI, it was still evident that they presented some concerns. For example, one teacher articulated that using AI for everything might delimit students to develop their critical thinking skills. This highlights a foundational concern in education that reliance on AI might circumvent the cognitive processes necessary for independent learning and reasoning.

> *"We are also worried about students relying too much on AI. If they use AI for everything, they might not learn to think critically or solve problems on their own."*

Teachers use the term 'always' to suggest a habitual reliance on AI, potentially leading to a diminished understanding fundamental coding and problem-solving competencies. Some teachers were suggesting that AI reliance involves frequent interaction with AI, which could undermine such foundational learning processes. Possibly, 'AI reliance' could develop when students are frequently exposed to AI use for quite some time.

> *"If they always use AI for coding and problem-solving, they might not learn those skills well themselves."*

> *"They always use AI for translations or writing, they might not learn to do these tasks on their own. This dependence can reduce their ability to think critically and creatively in the language they are learning."*

4.4. AI Plagiarism as Cheating

Because students are using AI to make content and pass it off as their own, some teachers considered this as a form of 'cheating.' Some teachers used the term 'fake content' and 'plagiarized work' to describe the output of students who use AI tools. For example, in ICT, students use AI to generate their code and submit this as their own work. Teachers considered this as plagiarism or cheating because students are not 'contributing original ideas.'

> *"Students might use AI to plagiarize or produce fake content, such as using AI to generate essays or articles without contributing original ideas."*

> *"Some students might misuse AI tools, which is a big concern. They could use AI to create fake content or plagiarize work."*

> *"They use it to cheat on their assignments, like using AI to generate code and then submitting it as their own work. Without clear rules, this kind of misuse can become a big issue."*

Objective 2. Compare the identified unresolved ethical dilemmas on the use of AI in academic settings from ICT, science, and language instructors.

One major difference on the context of ethical dilemma on AI in academic setting was its nature and characteristics. There were differences on the characteristics of the use of AI across discipline which generally impacts how teachers perceived it.

For example, ICT teachers believed that students use AI in programming because students struggle to understand the principles of programming tasks. In fact, AI can effectively bypass the extensive practice and gradual learning typically associated with programming education, making the process more accessible and less daunting for learners. This could explain why teachers considered AI as a form of shortcut in learning because it cuts down essential forms of cognitive development processes.

> *"Students often struggle with breaking down complex problems into smaller, manageable tasks and then writing code to solve each part. I feel this is the reason why they use AI."*

> *"Unlike making essays, AI is very talented in making its own programming codes."*

> *"Programming takes like months or years to practice. But with AI, it becomes simple."*

For language instructors, it seems they were hesitant on the use of AI in education. Language teachers believed that students use AI because they feel 'good' in its output and that they are only being 'slaved' by their unskillfulness. For them, although AI can produce essays, they still 'lack thought process' and unable to 'build ideas.' What makes AI use unethical was the inability of its users to use their own skills to generate outputs—and this chains down their learning and thinking skills.

> *"Students use AI because they feel good when reading its output. But from teacher's standpoint, the contents it gives seem meaningless, especially in essays."*

> *"I feel some students use AI to make output because they cannot do it themselves. They are being slaved by the fact that they are not talented enough."*

> *"You can ask AI to do many essays, but it lacks on thought process and building of ideas."*

> *"I still not positive in the use of AI. I am reading its output and I feel that humans can do better."*

> *"Although it explains well, AI still lacks the complexity of human thinking."*

Discourse indicated that science teachers were less concerned about the use of AI. They believed that AI use can do good when used well. For example, one teacher was 'surprised' and 'amazed' on how AI relay ideas and explain topics in science. They considered science as a challenging subject to learn but when someone can accompany them in their learning process, it makes the process easier and meaningful. Because of how 'simple' and 'comprehensible' the contents are, it causes students to use them in making their assignments.

> *"I'm leaning towards being positive on AI use. Although I feel that it is unethical, it still makes learning science easier."*

> *"I tried using AI to explain science topics. Surprisingly, it explains it well. I am amazed by how it gives you information and how it explains every detail you want."*

> *"Science is very interesting when someone can explain it to you well. It is very simple and comprehensible for students. This could be the reason why students choose to use AI when making their science assignments because they understand it well themselves."*

5. Discussion

Teachers appreciate how AI can make learning more efficient and can help in meeting student needs, especially in subjects like languages, where it provides personalized exercises and feedback. However, teachers also expressed remarkable concerns about the misuse of AI, particularly regarding academic dishonesty, cheating, plagiarism, and overreliance. Several studies on the ethical issues of generative AI come into light. One of the primary concerns associated with ChatGPT texts is their high degree of similarity to human-generated content, making it challenging to determine authorship[78]. This poses a significant issue in the context of student evaluation, particularly when assessments rely on essays, as it raises concerns about potential unfair benefits that students may gain[79, 80]. This study particularly identified that the use of AI in academic settings opened opportunities for academic dishonesty. For example, one teacher said that *"some students might cheat by using AI to write essays or complete assignments and then saying it's their own work."*

Significant concerns have emerged regarding academic misconduct because of the use of chatbots powered by AI[81, 82]. Using AI chatbots, students are able to conveniently and expeditiously obtain auto-generated answers, responses, or potentially plagiarized content[83]. This accessibility may inadvertently encourage students to violate the core principles of academic integrity[84, 85]. Evidently, teachers believed AI use have potential ethical issues attributed from it. For example, *"students use AI because they feel good"* which might cause them to *'cheat'* and *'assume its theirs.'* Essentially, 'feeling good' reflects psychological concepts like convivence, ease, and value. The ethical concern extended beyond mere convenience, as it challenges the very foundation of academic integrity by facilitating dishonest practices and eroding the value of genuine intellectual effort. The concept of convenience can directly influence students to

frequently use AI to the point it hampers their overall learning processes without knowing it. This is possible because 'convenience' appears to be a new phenomenon in several human interactions like online shopping[86, 87], mobile banking[88], or even theft[89]. The ongoing development of technologies has resulted in the availability of convenient and instantaneous access to contents which has made the practice of plagiarizing easier than ever before[90, 91]. Without a clear institutional guideline for AI use, teachers immediately tag AI use as a form of 'cheating' and 'academic dishonesty.'

Overreliance could be a relevant area of concern in the context of AI use. Unlike convenience, overreliance mostly involved frequent use of AI to make contents which can be fueled by 'trust' not 'ease.' Excessive trust, also referred to as overtrust, has the potential to result in the misuse of technology, as individuals may excessively rely on systems without sufficient justification for such trust[92]. This phenomenon has the potential to result in undesirable outcomes, both in terms of economic implications and ethical perceptions[93]. In fact, it is possible that can be a significant determinant of people's reliance on AI advice[94]. This study identified that students use AI because *"it gives you information and…it explains every detail you want"* as well as *"[students] understand [the output] well."* This causes students to trust the system and the output it generated. As they trusted the system throughout time, it also causes them to rely on any information it generates. The misplaced trust can have a significant impact on the analysis and interpretation of output[95]. This mechanism was particularly observable in science-based learning where students use AI to generate explanations for science topics.

In language learning, one striking discourse theme emerged as a significant contributor to AI use. Language teachers believed that students who feel incapable of writing essays are likely to engage in AI misuse. The phenomenon of learned helplessness emerges when individuals develop a belief in their own lack of control over events[96]. From a broader standpoint, this conceptualized learned helplessness as a state of impaired regulation in goal-directed behavior results from an inability to achieve a desired outcome[97]. When students make their own essays, they are particularly exposed to a stimulus to do it well to achieve something e.g., high scores. However, in an event where they feel 'incapable of' as they are too 'unskilled' to produce quality output, they ultimately resort on AI use. As one teacher said, *"students use AI…because they [feel they] cannot do it themselves."* Based on learned helplessness, individuals perceive their actions to have minimal impact on the environment, leading to a persistent state of helplessness when they eventually experience the consequences[98]. This possibly what makes AI use an ethical issue because it introduces students into a state of helplessness causing them to question their own skills in writing, 'thought process' and 'building of ideas.'

There were relevant patterns on how teachers perceived AI use in academic setting as 'unethical.' However, it seems that it becomes unethical because of how people interact with AI systems and how they consume its output. For example, when students are overreliant on AI, it causes them to be dependent to the point it hampers their learning process. The opportunity that AI gives e.g., content generation, explanations, becomes a gateway for students to be less dedicated to their learning. This mechanism was somehow complex because of how human perceptions interact with the environment and take action from it. This what makes AI use concerning for teachers because it causes users to cheat and rely on it during their academic journey.

6. Conclusion

In examining the patterns of statements about AI in education, several key themes emerged. One of the primary concerns expressed by teachers was the potential for academic dishonesty facilitated by AI. Examples included students using AI to write essays or translate texts and submitting the work as their own. This issue was particularly pronounced in ICT departments, where students might use AI to generate code. Teachers worry that this kind of misuse undermines the core values of academic integrity and increases students' tendency to cheat.

Overreliance on AI was another significant ethical dilemma identified by teachers. Although they acknowledged the benefits of AI, they expressed concern that excessive reliance on AI for academic tasks might impede the development of critical thinking and problem-solving skills. Frequent use of AI for coding, translations, or writing tasks could prevent students from learning these skills independently, ultimately hindering their cognitive development and ability to think creatively.

The study found that language teachers were particularly worried about students' use of AI due to a perceived lack of capability in writing essays. They believed that students who feel unskilled or incapable of producing quality work are more likely to misuse AI, leading to a reliance that diminishes their ability to think critically and develop original ideas. This phenomenon, akin to learned helplessness ,highlights a key ethical issue where students' dependence on AI may erode their confidence and skill in generating original content.

There were still evident limitations on identifying the ethical dilemma on AI use in academic setting. There is a need for more empirical research to understand the long-term effects of AI use on students' learning and development. Current studies often rely on narrative evidence or short-term observations, which may not capture the full scope of impacts of AI use on academic integrity and student development. There is also a need for future studies to integrate concepts such as learned helplessness, trust, and convenience on AI use because these appeared to be the strong determinants for overreliance to AI, academic dishonesty, and cheating.

Author Contributions

Conceptualization, J.V.C., J.T.C., S.S.M., N.U.I., A.A.C., A.R., S.E.A. and B.A.G.; methodology, J.V.C., J.T.C., S.S.M., N.U.I., A.A.C., A.R., S.E.A. and B.A.G; software, A.A.C., A.R., S.E.A. and B.A.G; validation, J.V.C., J.T.C., S.S.M. and N.U.I.; formal analysis, J.V.C., J.T.C., S.S.M., N.U.I., A.A.C., A.R., S.E.A. and B.A.G; investigation, J.V.C., J.T.C., S.S.M., N.U.I., A.A.C., A.R., S.E.A. and B.A.G; resources, J.V.C., J.T.C., S.S.M., N.U.I., A.A.C., A.R., S.E.A. and B.A.G.; data curation, J.V.C., J.T.C., S.S.M., N.U.I., A.A.C., A.R., S.E.A. and B.A.G.; writing—original draft preparation, J.V.C., J.T.C., S.S.M., N.U.I., A.A.C., A.R., S.E.A. and B.A.G.; writing—review and editing, J.V.C., J.T.C., S.S.M., N.U.I., A.A.C., A.R., S.E.A. and B.A.G.; visualization, J.V.C., J.T.C., S.S.M., N.U.I., A.A.C., A.R., S.E.A. and B.A.G.; supervision, J.V.C., J.T.C., S.S.M., N.U.I., A.A.C., A.R., S.E.A. and B.A.G.; project administration, J.V.C., J.T.C., S.S.M., N.U.I., A.A.C., A.R., S.E.A. and B.A.G.; funding acquisition, J.V.C., J.T.C., S.S.M., N.U.I., A.A.C., A.R., S.E.A. and B.A.G. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Institutional Review Board Statement

Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement

Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

Data Availability Statement

Data is accessible upon request.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

[1] Smyrnaiou, Z., Liapakis, A., Bougia, A., 2023. Ethical use of artificial intelligence and new technologies in education 5.0. Journal of Artificial Intelligence, Machine Learning and Data Science. 1(4), 119–124. DOI: https://doi.org/10.51219/JAIMLD/Anastasios-Liapakis/15

[2] Chaudhry, M.A., Kazim, E., 2022. Artificial intelligence in education (AIEd): A high-level academic and industry note 2021. AI and Ethics. 2(1), 157–165. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-021-00074-z

[3] Zaman, B.U.I., 2024. Transforming education through AI benefits risks and ethical considerations. Preprints. 1–11. DOI: https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202407.0859.v1

[4] Weidener, L., Fischer, M., 2024. Artificial intelligence in medicine: Cross-sectional study among medical students on application, education, and ethical aspects. JMIR Medical Education. 10, 1–18. DOI: https://doi.org/10.2196/51247

[5] Doshi, R.H., Bajaj, S.S., Krumholz, H.M., 2023. ChatGPT: Temptations of progress. The American Journal of Bioethics. 23(4), 6–8. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/15265161.2023.2180110

[6] Haenlein, M., Kaplan, A., 2019. A brief history of artificial intelligence: On the past, present, and future of artificial intelligence. California Management Review. 61(4), 5–14. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0008125619864925

[7] Inoferio, H.V., Espartero, M., Asiri, M., et al., 2024.

Coping with math anxiety and lack of confidence through AI-assisted Learning. Environment and Social Psychology. 9(5), 1–14. DOI: https://doi.org/10.54517/esp.v9i5.2228

[8] Kung, T.H., Cheatham, M., Medenilla, A., et al., 2023. Performance of ChatGPT on USMLE: Potential for AI-assisted medical education using large language models. PLoS Digital Health. 2(2), 1–12. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pdig.0000198

[9] Dave, T., Athaluri, S.A., Singh, S., 2023. ChatGPT in medicine: An overview of its applications, advantages, limitations, future prospects, and ethical considerations. Frontiers In Artificial Intelligence. 6, 1–5. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2023.1169595

[10] Iannantuono, G.M., Bracken-Clarke, D., Floudas, C.S., et al., 2023. Applications of large language models in cancer care: current evidence and future perspectives. Frontiers In Oncology. 13, 1–6. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3389/fonc.2023.1268915

[11] Lecler, A., Duron, L., Soyer, P., 2023. Revolutionizing radiology with GPT-based models: current applications, future possibilities and limitations of ChatGPT. Diagnostic And Interventional Imaging. 104(6), 269–274. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.diii.2023.02.003

[12] Qadir, J., 2023. Engineering education in the era of ChatGPT: Promise and pitfalls of generative AI for education. In Proceedings of the 2023 IEEE Global Engineering Education Conference; Kuwait; 1–4 May 2023. pp. 1–9. DOI: 10.1109/EDUCON54358.2023.10125121

[13] Gašević, D., Siemens, G., Sadiq, S., 2023. Empowering learners for the age of artificial intelligence. Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence. 4, 1–4. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2023.100130

[14] Bu, Q., 2022. Ethical risks in integrating artificial intelligence into education and potential countermeasures. Science Insights. 41(1), 561–566. DOI: https://doi.org/10.15354/si.22.re067

[15] Hagendorff, T., 2020. The ethics of AI ethics: An evaluation of guidelines. Minds and Machines. 30(1), 99–120. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-020-09517-8

[16] Marcelo, E., 2023. Address challenges in AI, technology in education. Available from: https://www.philstar.com/headlines/2023/09/24/2298601/address-challenges-ai-technology-education (cited 7 March 2024).

[17] Dela Rosa, A.C., Dacuma, A.K., Ang, C.A., et al., 2024. Assessing AI adoption: Investigating variances in AI utilization across student year levels in far Eastern University-Manila, Philippines. International Journal of Current Science Research And Review. 7(5), 1–8. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.47191/ijcsrr/V7-i5-31

[18] Eslit, E., 2023. Thriving beyond the crisis: Teach-ers' reflections on literature and language education in the era of artificial intelligence (AI) and globalization. Preprints 2023. 1–14. DOI: https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202307.2151.v1

[19] Green, T.D., Donovan, L.C., 2018. Learning anytime, anywhere through technology: In: Hall. G.E., Quinn, L.F., Gollnick, D.M., (Eds.). The Wiley handbook of teaching and learning. Wiley Blackwell: Hoboken, NJ, USA. pp. 225–256. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118955901.ch9

[20] Gligorea, I., Cioca, M., Oancea, R., et al., 2023. Adaptive learning using artificial intelligence in e-learning: A literature review. Education Sciences. 13(12), 1–27. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13121216

[21] Hesham, A., Dempere, J., Akre, V., et al., 2023. Artificial intelligence in education (AIED): Implications and challenges. In: Johnston. A. (Ed.). Proceedings of the HCT International General Education Conference (HCT-IGEC 2023), Atlantis Highlights in Social Sciences, Education and Humanities 13. Atlantis Press: Netherlands. pp. 126–140. DOI: https://doi.org/10.2991/978-94-6463-286-6_10

[22] Li, H., Xu, T., Zhang, C., et al., 2024. Bringing generative AI to adaptive learning in education. Cornell University: Ithaca, NY. DOI: https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2402.14601

[23] Dwivedi, Y.K., Hughes, L., Ismagilova, E., et al., 2021. Artificial intelligence (AI): Multidisciplinary perspectives on emerging challenges, opportunities, and agenda for research, practice and policy. International Journal of Information Management. 57, 1–47. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2019.08.002

[24] Su, J., Yang, W., 2022. Artificial intelligence in early childhood education: A scoping review. Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence. 3, 1–13. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2022.100049

[25] Sharifuddin, N.S., Hashim, H., 2024. Benefits and challenges in implementing artificial intelligence in education (AIED) in ESL classroom: A systematic review (2019-2022). International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences. 14(1), 146–164. DOI: https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v14-i1/20422

[26] Fitria, T.N., 2023. The use of artificial intelligence in education (AIED): Can ai replace the teacher's role? Epigram. 20(2), 165–187. DOI: https://doi.org/10.32722/epi.v20i2.5711

[27] Hwang, G.J., Xie, H., Wah, B.W., et al., 2020. Vision, challenges, roles and research issues of artificial intelligence in education. Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence. 1, 1–5. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2020.100001

[28] Hwang, G.J., Chang, P.Y., Tseng, W.Y., et al., 2022. Research trends in artificial intelligence-associated nursing activities based on a review of academic studies published from 2001 to 2020. Computers, Informat-

ics, Nursing. 40(12), 814–824. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1097/CIN.0000000000000897

[29] Meskó, B., 2019. The real era of the art of medicine begins with artificial intelligence. Journal of Medical Internet Research. 21(11), 1–16. DOI: https://doi.org/10.2196/16295

[30] Rios-Campos, C., Cánova, E.S.M., Zaquinaula, I.R.A., et al., 2023. Artificial intelligence and education. South Florida Journal of Development. 4(2), 641–655. DOI: https://doi.org/10.46932/sfjdv4n2-001

[31] Fui-Hoon Nah, F., Zheng, R., Cai, J., et al., 2023. Generative AI and ChatGPT: Applications, challenges, and AI-human collaboration. Journal of Information Technology Case and Application Research. 25(3), 277–304. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/15228053.2023.2233814

[32] Feuerriegel, S., Hartmann, J., Janiesch, C., et al., 2024. Generative ai. Business and Information Systems Engineering. 66, 111–126. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s12599-023-00834-7

[33] Köbis, N., Mossink, L.D., 2021. Artificial intelligence versus Maya Angelou: Experimental evidence that people cannot differentiate AI-generated from human-written poetry. Computers In Human Behavior. 114, 1–13. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2020.106553

[34] Bullock, J., Luengo-Oroz, M., 2019. Automated speech generation from UN general assembly statements: Mapping risks in AI generated texts. Cornell University: Ithaca, NY. DOI: https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1906.01946

[35] Hu, G., 2023. Challenges for enforcing editorial policies on AI-generated papers. Accountability in Research. 38(7), 978–980. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/08989621.2023.2184262

[36] Meunier, F., Pikhart, M., Klimova, B., 2022. New perspectives of L2 acquisition related to human-computer interaction (HCI). Frontiers in Psychology. 13, 1–2. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1098208

[37] Zhai, X., 2022. ChatGPT user experience: Implications for education. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4312418.

[38] Stokel-Walker, C., 2023. ChatGPT listed as author on research papers: many scientists disapprove. Available from: https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-023-00107-z (cited 7 March 2024).

[39] Chrysafiadi, K., Troussas, C., Virvou, M., 2022. Personalised instructional feedback in a mobile-assisted language learning application using fuzzy reasoning. International Journal of Learning Technology. 17(1), 53–76. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1504/IJLT.2022.123676

[40] Troussas, C., Krouska, A., Sgouropoulou, C., 2022. Enriching mobile learning software with interactive activities and motivational feedback for advancing users' high-level cognitive skills. Computers. 11(2), 1–12. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3390/computers11020018

[41] Wong, K., Gallant, F., Szumacher, E., 2021. Perceptions of Canadian radiation oncologists, radiation physicists, radiation therapists and radiation trainees about the impact of artificial intelligence in radiation oncology–national survey. Journal of Medical Imaging and Radiation Sciences. 52(1), 44–48. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmir.2020.11.013

[42] Klimova, B., Pikhart, M., Kacetl, J., 2023. Ethical issues of the use of AI-driven mobile apps for education. Frontiers in Public Health. 10, 1–8. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2022.1118116

[43] Sidiropoulos, D., Anagnostopoulos, C.N., 2024. Applications, challenges and ethical issues of AI and ChatGPT in education. Cornell University: Ithaca, NY. DOI: https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2402.07907

[44] Kay, J., Kummerfeld, B., 2019. From data to personal user models for life-long, life-wide learners. British Journal of Educational Technology. 50(6), 2871–2884. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12878

[45] Borenstein, J., Howard, A., 2021. Emerging challenges in AI and the need for AI ethics education. AI and Ethics. 1, 61–65. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-020-00002-7

[46] Rudolph, J., Tan, S., Tan, S., 2023. ChatGPT: Bullshit spewer or the end of traditional assessments in higher education? Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching. 6(1), 342–363. DOI: https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2023.6.1.9

[47] Azaria, A., 2022. ChatGPT usage and limitations. Preprints. 1–9. DOI: https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/5ue7n

[48] Zhang, B., 2023. Preparing educators and students for chatgpt and ai technology in higher education. University of Hartford: West Hartford, CT. DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.32105.98404

[49] Huallpa, J.J., 2023. Exploring the ethical considerations of using Chat GPT in university education. Periodicals of Engineering and Natural Sciences. 11(4), 105–115. DOI: https://doi.org/10.21533/pen.v11i4.3770

[50] Zhou, C., Li, Q., Li, C., et al., 2023. A comprehensive survey on pretrained foundation models: A history from bert to chatgpt. Cornell University: Ithaca, NY. DOI: https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2302.09419

[51] Yadava, O.P., 2023. ChatGPT—a foe or an ally? Indian Journal of Thoracic and Cardiovascular Surgery. 39(3), 217–221. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s12055-023-01507-6

[52] Chan, C.K.Y., Hu, W., 2023. Students' voices on generative AI: Perceptions, benefits, and challenges in higher education. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education. 20, 1–18. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00411-8

[53] Yu, H., 2023. Reflection on whether Chat GPT should be banned by academia from the perspective of education and teaching. Frontiers in Psychology. 14, 1–12.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1181712

[54] Wang, X., Lu, Z., Yin, M., 2022. Will you accept the ai recommendation? predicting human behavior in ai-assisted decision making. In: Laforest, F., Troncy, R., (Eds.). In Proceedings of the ACM web conference 2022. Association for Computing Machinery: New York, NY, USA. pp. 1697–1708. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1145/3485447.3512240

[55] Lai, V., Tan, C., 2019. On human predictions with explanations and predictions of machine learning models: A case study on deception detection. In Proceedings of the conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency. Association for Computing Machinery: New York, NY, USA. pp. 29–38. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1145/3287560.3287590

[56] Rechkemmer, A., Yin, M., 2022. When confidence meets accuracy: Exploring the effects of multiple performance indicators on trust in machine learning models. In: Barbosa, S., Lampe, C., Appert, C., et al. (Eds.). In Proceedings of the 2022 chi conference on human factors in computing systems. Association for Computing Machinery: New York, NY, USA. pp. 1–14. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1145/3491102.3501967

[57] Zhang, Y., Liao, Q.V., Bellamy, R.K., 2020. Effect of confidence and explanation on accuracy and trust calibration in AI-assisted decision making. In Proceedings of the 2020 conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency; 27–30 January 2020; Barcelona, Spain, pp. 295–305. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1145/3351095.3372852

[58] Liu, H., Lai, V., Tan, C., 2021. Understanding the effect of out-of-distribution examples and interactive explanations on human-ai decision making. In Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction, 5(CSCW2). pp. 1–45. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1145/3479552

[59] Poursabzi-Sangdeh, F., Goldstein, D.G., Hofman, J.M., et al., 2021. Manipulating and measuring model interpretability. Proceedings of the 2021 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems; 8–13 May 2021; Yokohama, Japan. pp. 1–52. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1145/3411764.3445315

[60] Agarwal, R., Prasad, J., 1997. The role of innovation characteristics and perceived voluntariness in the acceptance of information technologies. Decision Sciences. 28(3), 557–582. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5915.1997.tb01322.x

[61] Dietvorst, B.J., Simmons, J.P., Massey, C., 2015. Algorithm aversion: People erroneously avoid algorithms after seeing them err. Journal of Experimental Psychology: General. 144(1), 114–126. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000033

[62] Nazaretsky, T., Ariely, M., Cukurova, M., 2022. Teachers' trust in AI-powered educational technology and a professional development program to improve it. British Journal of Educational Technology. 53(4), 914–931. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13232

[63] Tsai, Y.S., Gasevic, D., 2017. Learning analytics in higher education—challenges and policies: A review of eight learning analytics policies. Proceedings of the Seventh International Learning Analytics and Knowledge Conference; 13–17 March 2017; Vancouver British Columbia, Canada. pp. 233–242. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1145/3027385.3027400

[64] Wolff, A., Moore, J., Zdrahal, Z., et al., 2016. Data literacy for learning analytics. Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on Learning Analytics & Knowledge; 25–29 April 2016; Edinburgh, UK. pp. 500–501. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1145/2883851.2883864

[65] Ahmad, S.F., Han, H., Alam, M.M., et al., 2023. Impact of artificial intelligence on human loss in decision making, laziness and safety in education. Humanities and Social Sciences Communications. 10(1), 1–14. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-01787-8

[66] Gocen, A., Aydemir, F., 2020. Artificial intelligence in education and schools. Research on Education and Media. 12(1), 13–21. DOI: https://doi.org/10.2478/rem-2020-0003

[67] Chavez, J., 2022. Narratives of bilingual parents on the real-life use of English language: Materials for English language teaching curriculum. Arab World English Journals. 13(3), 1–14. DOI: https://doi.org/10.31235/osf.io/mgce3

[68] Chavez, J.V., Libre, J.M., Gregorio, M.W., et al., 2023. Human resource profiling for post-pandemic curriculum reconfiguration in higher education. Journal of Infrastructure, Policy and Development. 7(2), 19–75. DOI: https://doi.org/10.24294/jipd.v7i2.1975

[69] Chavez, J.V., Anuddin, F.O., Mansul, H.H., et al., 2024. Analyzing impacts of campus journalism on student's grammar consciousness and confidence in writing engagements. Environment and Social Psychology. 9(7), 1–14. DOI: https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v9i7.6106

[70] Ponjuán, L., Hernández, S., 2021. Different yet similar: The educational experiences of Latinx male students at Texas PWI, HSI, and HBCU institutions. Journal of Hispanic Higher Education. 20(4), 453–465, DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/1538192719896330

[71] Jager, J., Putnick, D.L., Bornstein, M.H., 2017. II. More than just convenient: The scientific merits of homogeneous convenience samples. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development. 82(2), 13–30. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/mono.12296

[72] Kallio, H., Pietilä, A.M., Johnson, M., et al., 2016. Systematic methodological review: Developing a framework for a qualitative semi-structured interview guide. Journal of Advanced Nursing. 72(12), 2954–2965. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.13031

[73] Naz, N., Gulab, F., Aslam, M., 2022. Development of qualitative semi-structured interview guide for case

study research. Competitive Social Science Research Journal. 3(2), 42–52. Available from: https://cssrjournal.com/index.php/cssrjournal/article/view/170

[74] Chavez, J.V., Ceneciro, C.C., 2023. Discourse analysis on same-sex relationship through the lens of religious and social belief systems. Environment and Social Psychology. 9(1), 1–10. DOI: https://doi.org/10.54517/esp.v9i1.1912

[75] Burck, C., 2005. Comparing qualitative research methodologies for systemic research: The use of grounded theory, discourse analysis and narrative analysis. Journal of Family Therapy. 27(3), 237–262. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6427.2005.00314.x

[76] Chavez, J.V., Del Prado, R.T., 2023. Discourse analysis on online gender-based humor: Markers of normalization, tolerance, and lens of inequality. Forum for Linguistic Studies. 5(1), 55–71. DOI: https://doi.org/10.18063/fls.v5i1.1530

[77] Goodman, S., 2017. How to conduct a psychological discourse analysis. Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis Across Disciplines. 9(2), 142–153. Available from https://www.lancaster.ac.uk/fass/journals/cadaad/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/09-Goodman.pdf

[78] Stahl, B.C., Eke, D., 2024. The ethics of ChatGPT–Exploring the ethical issues of an emerging technology. International Journal of Information Management. 74, 1–14. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2023.102700

[79] Eke, D.O., 2023. ChatGPT and the rise of generative AI: Threat to academic integrity? Journal of Responsible Technology. 13, 1–4. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrt.2023.100060.

[80] Stokel-Walker, C., 2022. AI bot ChatGPT writes smart essays-should academics worry? Nature. Available from: https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-022-04397-7 (cited 28 March 2024).

[81] Fyfe, P., 2023. How to cheat on your final paper: Assigning AI for student writing. AI & SOCIETY. 38(4), 1395–1405. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-022-01397-z

[82] Sweeney, S., 2023. Who wrote this? Essay mills and assessment–Considerations regarding contract cheating and AI in higher education. The International Journal of Management Education. 21(2), 1–7. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2023.100818

[83] Nguyen, H.M., Goto, D., 2024. Unmasking academic cheating behavior in the artificial intelligence era: Evidence from Vietnamese undergraduates. Education and Information Technologies. 29, 1–27. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-12495-4

[84] Bakar-Corez, A., Kocaman-Karoglu, A., 2024. E-dishonesty among postgraduate students and its relation to self-esteem. Education and Information Technologies. 29(7), 8275–8300. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-12105-9

[85] Li, L., Ma, Z., Fan, L., et al., 2023. ChatGPT in education: A discourse analysis of worries and concerns on social media. Education and Information Technologies. 29, 10729–10762. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-12256-9

[86] Vyt, D., Jara, M., Mevel, O., et al., 2022. The impact of convenience in a click and collect retail setting: A consumer-based approach. International Journal of Production Economics. 248, 1–7. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2022.108491

[87] Zeqiri, J., Ramadani, V., Aloulou, W.J., 2023. The effect of perceived convenience and perceived value on intention to repurchase in online shopping: the mediating effect of e-WOM and trust. Economic research-Ekonomska Istraživanja. 36(3), 1–21. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/1331677X.2022.2153721

[88] Ivanova, A., Noh, G., 2022. Mobile banking service in Mongolia: The role of online convenience on the acceptance and use behavior. Asia Marketing Journal. 24(2), 51–61. DOI: https://doi.org/10.53728/2765-6500.1588

[89] Song, G., Zhang, C., Xiao, L., et al., 2022. Influence of varied ambient population distribution on spatial pattern of theft from the person: the perspective from activity space. International Journal of Geo-Information. 11(12), 1–14. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3390/ijgi11120615

[90] Brown, S., Hammond, K., 2022. Plagiarism in higher education: Navigating a perfect storm. European Journal of Education and Pedagogy. 3(5), 100–103. DOI: https://doi.org/10.24018/ejedu.2022.3.5.452

[91] Foltýnek, T., Meuschke, N., Gipp, B., 2019. Academic plagiarism detection: a systematic literature review. ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR). 52(6), 1–42. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1145/3345317

[92] Klingbeil, A., Grützner, C., Schreck, P., 2024. Trust and reliance on AI—An experimental study on the extent and costs of overreliance on AI. Computers in Human Behavior. 160, 1–10. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2024.108352

[93] Lee, J.D., See, K.A., 2004. Trust in automation: Designing for appropriate reliance. Human Factors. 46(1), 50–80. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1518/hfes.46.1.50.30392

[94] Kohn, S.C., De Visser, E.J., Wiese, E., et al., 2021. Measurement of trust in automation: A narrative review and reference guide. Frontiers in psychology. 12, 1–23. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.604977

[95] Zhai, C., Wibowo, S., Li, L.D., 2024. The effects of over-reliance on AI dialogue systems on students' cognitive abilities: A systematic review. Smart Learning Environments. 11(1), 1–37. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-024-00316-7

[96] Kolber, M., 2022. Learned helplessness of young people during the COVID-19 Distance Learning. A Research Report. Lubelski Rocznik Pedagogiczny. 41(1),

41–52. DOI: https://doi.org/10.17951/lrp.2022.41.1.41-52 (in Polish)

[97] Boddez, Y., Van Dessel, P., De Houwer, J., 2022. Learned helplessness and its relevance for psychological suffering: A new perspective illustrated with attachment problems, burn-out, and fatigue complaints. Cognition and Emotion. 36(6), 1027–1036. DOI:

https://doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2022.2118239

[98] Niknam, M., Karimi, G. Z., Amiri, F., 2023. Effectiveness of training to overcome the learned helplessness on academic procrastination and self-efficacy of adolescent girls. Journal of Adolescent and Youth Psychological Studies. 4(4), 71–80. DOI: https://doi.org/10.61838/kman.jayps.4.4.8