

UDC 37.018.43:004.8:17

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/apv/2025.6.15>**Tetiana GOLUB**

PhD in Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor, Associate Professor at the Department of English Language for Engineering No. 2, National Technical University of Ukraine "Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute", Beresteyskyi Ave., 37, Kyiv, Ukraine, 03056

ORCID: 0000-0002-7757-880X

To cite this article: Golub, T. (2025). Etychni problemy intehratsii sztuchnoho intelektu u vyshchu osvitu [Ethical tensions in artificial intelligence integration in higher education]. *Acta Paedagogica Volynienses*, 6, 104–111, doi: <https://doi.org/10.32782/apv/2025.6.15>

ETHICAL TENSIONS IN ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE INTEGRATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

The rapid integration of artificial intelligence technologies into higher education has created unprecedented ethical challenges that demand immediate scholarly attention and institutional response. This article examines four fundamental ethical tensions arising from AI adoption in academic contexts: the conflict between academic integrity and pedagogical innovation, the balance between student autonomy and institutional oversight, the imperative of educational equity within unequal access to AI resources, and the trade-off between operational efficiency and student privacy protection. The research demonstrates that traditional conceptions of academic integrity, designed for pre-AI educational environments, prove inadequate when AI tools offer assistance ranging from clearly appropriate to clearly problematic. Similarly, AI-enabled surveillance capabilities create tensions between legitimate institutional responsibilities for educational quality and students' rights to privacy and autonomous learning. The study further represents how AI integration threatens to extend existing educational inequalities through differential access to premium tools, uneven distribution of AI literacy, and algorithmic bias embedded in educational systems. Finally, the analysis reveals how efficiency gains from automated assessment and learning analytics depend on extensive data collection practices that raise profound privacy concerns, particularly when students lack meaningful consent options or transparency about data usage. The article argues that effective ethical AI integration requires moving beyond prohibitive or permissive extremes toward principle-based frameworks emphasizing transparency, proportionality, equity, and student participation in governance. These findings contribute to emerging scholarship on educational technology ethics while providing practical guidance for institutions navigating the complex landscape of AI-augmented learning environments. The research underscores that addressing AI ethics in higher education is not merely a technical or policy challenge but fundamentally involves reimagining educational values, power relationships, and the purposes of learning in an AI-integrated world.

Key words: artificial intelligence, higher education, ethics, academic integrity, educational equity, data privacy, pedagogical innovation.

Тетяна ГОЛУБ

кандидат педагогічних наук, доцент, доцент кафедри англійської мови технічного спрямування № 2, Національний технічний університет України «Київський політехнічний інститут імені Ігоря Сікорського», просп. Берестейський, 37, м. Київ, Україна, 03056

ORCID: 0000-0002-7757-880X

Бібліографічний опис статті: Голуб, Т. (2025). Етичні проблеми інтеграції штучного інтелекту у вищу освіту. *Acta Paedagogica Volynienses*, 6, 104–111, doi: <https://doi.org/10.32782/apv/2025.6.15>

ЕТИЧНІ ПРОБЛЕМИ ІНТЕГРАЦІЇ ШТУЧНОГО ІНТЕЛЕКТУ У ВИЩУ ОСВІТУ

Швидка інтеграція технологій штучного інтелекту у вищу освіту створила безпрецедентні етичні виклики, які вимагають негайної уваги науковців та інституційного реагування. У цій статті розглянуто чотири фундаментальні етичні суперечності, що виникають внаслідок впровадження штучного інтелекту в академічному контексті: конфлікт між академічною доброчесністю та педагогічними інноваціями, баланс між студентською автономією та інституційним наглядом, імператив освітньої рівності в умовах нерівного доступу до ресурсів штучного інтелекту та компроміс між операційною ефективністю та захистом конфіденційності студентів.

Дослідження демонструє, що традиційні концепції академічної доброчесності, розроблені для освітніх середовищ до появи штучного інтелекту, виявляються непридатними, коли інструменти ШІ пропонують допомогу, починаючи від явно доцільної та закінчуючи явно проблематичною. Аналогічно, можливості спостереження на основі штучного інтелекту створюють суперечності між інституційними обов'язками щодо якості освіти та правами студентів на конфіденційність та автономне навчання. У дослідженні також досліджено, як інтеграція ШІ загрожує поширити існуючу нерівність в освіті через диференційований доступ до преміальних інструментів, нерівномірний розподіл грамотності в галузі штучного інтелекту та алгоритмічне упередження, вбудоване в освітні системи. Зрештою, дослідження показує, як підвищення ефективності від автоматизованого оцінювання та аналітики навчання залежить від масштабних практик збору даних, що викликає серйозні проблеми з конфіденційністю, особливо коли студенти не мають вибору опцій згоди або прозорості щодо використання даних. У статті стверджується, що ефективна етична інтеграція штучного інтелекту вимагає переходу від заборонних або дозвільних крайнощів до принципових рамок, що підкреслюють прозорість, пропорційність, рівність і участь студентів в управлінні. Ці висновки сприяють розвитку наукових досліджень з етики освітніх технологій, водночас надаючи практичні рекомендації для установ, які функціонують у складному ландшафті навчальних середовищ, доповнених штучним інтелектом. Дослідження підкреслює, що вирішення питань етики штучного інтелекту у вищій освіті – це не просто технічний чи політичний виклик, він фундаментально включає переосмислення освітніх цінностей, відносин та цілей навчання у світі, в якому інтегровано штучний інтелект.

Ключові слова: штучний інтелект, вища освіта, етика, академічна доброчесність, освітня рівність, конфіденційність даних, педагогічні інновації.

Problem statement. The ethical challenges posed by artificial intelligence (AI) in higher education are neither temporary disruptions awaiting technical solutions nor simple policy problems requiring straightforward rules. Rather, they represent fundamental tensions between competing values that have always existed in educational contexts but are now dramatically intensified and made visible by artificial intelligence capabilities. Universities must simultaneously maintain academic integrity standards while enabling pedagogical innovation, protect student autonomy while fulfilling institutional oversight responsibilities, advance educational equity while managing resource constraints, and improve operational efficiency while assuring student privacy. These tensions cannot be resolved through simple choices between opposing positions but instead require sophisticated frameworks that acknowledge complexity and enable contextual judgment.

This article examines four critical ethical tensions of AI integration in higher education. First, the tension between academic integrity and pedagogical innovation reflects fundamental questions about what constitutes authentic student work when AI tools can provide assistance ranging from clearly legitimate to clearly problematic. Second, the tension between student autonomy and institutional oversight highlights competing perspectives on the appropriate scope of educational survey enabled by AI-powered monitoring systems. Third, the tension surrounding educational equity reveals how AI integration threatens to extend existing inequalities while simultaneously offering

potential pathways to greater educational justice. Fourth, the tension between efficiency and privacy demonstrates how operational gains from AI systems depend on data collection practices that raise profound questions about student rights and institutional responsibilities.

Understanding these tensions is essential for developing ethical AI frameworks that are simultaneously principled and pragmatic, addressing immediate concerns while establishing foundations for longer-term adaptation as AI capabilities and educational contexts continue developing. By illuminating the complexity of ethical tensions rather than offering oversimplified solutions, this article aims to support more sophisticated institutional decision-making and contribute to ongoing scholarly dialogue about AI's role in education.

The aim of the article is to critically examine the ethical tensions arising from artificial intelligence integration in higher education, synthesize current perspectives and institutional approaches, that can be used for creating ethical AI frameworks that address academic integrity, algorithmic bias, data privacy, pedagogical equity, and the transformation of learning objectives.

Analysis of recent research and publications. The scholarly literature on AI ethics in higher education has expanded dramatically since 2022, reflecting the field's urgent attempts to understand and respond to generative artificial intelligence's disruptive impact. This research reveals several interconnected themes that illuminate the complexity of ethical challenges facing contemporary institutions.

Cotton, Cotton, and Shipway's (2023) research examining ChatGPT's performance on university assessments demonstrated that the artificial intelligence system could achieve passing grades on various undergraduate assignments, fundamentally questioning traditional assessment design. Their work highlighted how conventional essay assignments particularly vulnerable to AI completion, prompting calls for assessment redesign emphasizing process documentation, oral components, and unique contextual applications. Similarly, Rudolph, Tan, and Tan's (2023) comprehensive review of ChatGPT implications for higher education identified academic misconduct as the predominant concern among educators, noting that existing honour codes and integrity policies were drafted without anticipating AI capabilities and require substantial revision.

Baker and Hawn's (2021) research on algorithmic bias in educational AI systems revealed systematic patterns of discrimination affecting minoritized student populations. Their analysis of learning analytics platforms demonstrated that predictive algorithms often eternalize historical inequities by incorporating biased training data reflecting prior discriminatory patterns. For instance, early warning systems predicting student success frequently mark students from underrepresented backgrounds at disproportionate rates, potentially triggering interventions that stigmatize rather than support these students.

Prinsloo and Slade's (2017) research on student data ethics in learning analytics established foundational principles for responsible data governance in higher education. They articulated concerns about the expanding surveillance infrastructure created by AI-powered monitoring systems that track student behaviour with unprecedented granularity. Their framework emphasized that students have rights to privacy, transparency, and agency regarding their educational data, challenging institutional assumptions about data ownership and appropriate usage.

Baidoo-Anu and Ansah's (2023) literature review on AI in education synthesized research on how generative AI might transform traditional teaching and learning paradigms. They identified potential benefits including personalized feedback, adaptive content delivery, and expanded access to educational resources, while simultaneously cataloguing risks such as intellectual atrophy, reduced

student-teacher interaction, and the potential devaluation of human expertise. Their analysis highlighted the importance of maintaining human judgment as central to educational processes even as AI capabilities expand.

Guidance for generative AI in education and research (2023) on generative artificial intelligence in education provided internationally relevant principles for ethical AI governance in educational settings. The framework emphasized human-centred design, transparency, accountability, and the preservation of human agency as fundamental principles. UNESCO advocated for multi-stakeholder governance involving students, faculty, administrators, and external experts in developing AI policies, recognizing that purely top-down approaches risk missing important perspectives and unintended consequences.

This synthesis of recent research reveals that the ethical challenges of artificial intelligence in higher education are neither temporary disruptions nor simple technical problems requiring straightforward solutions. Rather, they represent fundamental tensions between competing educational values, requiring ongoing negotiation, adaptive governance, and sustained scholarly attention as AI capabilities continue advancing.

Research results. The integration of artificial intelligence into higher education creates several fundamental ethical tensions that resist simple resolution and require careful contextual balancing. The most visible ethical tension involves maintaining academic integrity while enabling pedagogical innovation through artificial intelligence tools. Traditional conceptions of academic integrity emphasize original student work completed without unauthorized assistance. However, AI tools complicate these boundaries by offering assistance that ranges from clearly appropriate (grammar checking, research assistance) to clearly problematic (submitting AI-generated work as one's own) with vast ambiguous territory between these extremes.

This tension manifests in debates about whether using AI for brainstorming ideas constitutes intellectual dishonesty, whether AI-assisted outlining differs meaningfully from human tutoring, and whether students should disclose all AI interactions regardless of their nature. Some educators (ChatGPT, Artificial Intelligence, and Academic Integrity, 2025; ChatGPT, AI, and Academic dishonesty; Cotton et al., 2023) argue that any undis-

closed AI usage constitutes academic misconduct, as it misrepresents the work as purely the student's intellectual product. Others (Mollick & Mollick, 2023; Mollick & Mollick, 2024) contend that such rigid boundaries are unsustainable in an AI-integrated world and that education should instead focus on developing critical judgment about when and how AI usage enhances rather than replaces learning. Their framework emphasizing AI as "a supportive tool rather than a replacement".

The pedagogical innovation dimension recognizes that artificial intelligence tools offer genuine educational benefits including immediate feedback, personalized learning pathways, accessibility accommodations for students with disabilities, and opportunities to practice skills with AI assistance before attempting independent performance. Prohibiting all artificial intelligence usage may deny students valuable learning experiences and fail to prepare them for professional environments where AI collaboration is normative. This creates pressure to develop more nuanced approaches that distinguish between artificial intelligence usage that supports learning processes versus AI usage that circumvents them.

Resolving this tension requires moving beyond binary permitted or prohibited frameworks toward context-dependent guidelines that consider learning objectives, assignment design, disciplinary norms, and developmental appropriateness. For introductory courses building foundational skills, more restrictive AI policies may be justified to ensure students develop core competencies. For advanced courses applying established knowledge to novel problems, collaborative AI usage might be encouraged as it mirrors professional practice. The key ethical principle is alignment between artificial intelligence usage policies and educational purposes rather than blanket prohibitions or permissions.

AI technologies enable unprecedented institutional oversight of student learning behaviours through learning analytics platforms, AI-powered proctoring systems, and continuous assessment monitoring. While these systems offer potential benefits for early intervention and personalized support, they also raise ethical concerns about student autonomy, privacy, and the power dynamics inherent in educational surveillance.

The student autonomy perspective emphasizes that adult learners have rights to privacy and

self-determination in their educational pursuits. Continuous monitoring of learning behaviours, particularly when students are unaware of data collection practices or lack meaningful consent options, treats students as objects of institutional management rather than autonomous individuals. This approach risks creating compliance-focused learning environments where students perform for algorithmic observers rather than engaging authentically with material.

The institutional oversight perspective argues that universities have responsibilities to ensure educational quality, prevent academic misconduct, and provide support for struggling students. AI systems that identify at-risk students, detect potential integrity violations, or personalize interventions can serve these legitimate institutional functions. From this view, appropriate oversight represents responsible management rather than overreach, particularly when implemented with student welfare as the primary objective.

Ethical AI implementation requires balancing these perspectives through principles of transparency, proportionality, and student participation in governance. Transparency means clearly communicating what data is collected, how it is used, and who has access. Proportionality requires that data collection and analysis are justified by specific educational purposes and do not exceed what is necessary for those purposes. Student participation involves including student voices in decisions about data governance and respecting student preferences where feasible. Additionally, institutions should distinguish between data collection necessary for providing educational services versus optional analytics that students should be able to decline without penalty.

AI integration threatens to increase educational inequalities through multiple mechanisms. First, premium artificial intelligence tools with advanced capabilities often require paid subscriptions, creating tiered access based on financial resources. Students from rich backgrounds may get sophisticated AI assistance while peers from less privileged circumstances face restrictions or surveillance when using free alternatives. Second, artificial intelligence literacy itself represents a form of cultural capital that is unevenly distributed, with students from technology-rich educational backgrounds better positioned to effectively use AI tools than peers from under-resourced schools. Third, algo-

rhythmic bias in AI systems may perpetuate discrimination against minoritized students through biased predictions, recommendations, or assessments.

The equity imperative in higher education requires that AI implementation does not worsen existing disparities and ideally contributes to greater educational justice. This principle suggests several ethical obligations for institutions. Universities should provide equitable access to AI tools either through institutional licenses or free alternatives of comparable quality, ensuring that students are not disadvantaged by inability to afford premium services. Institutions should invest in AI literacy education that reaches all students, recognizing that simply providing access without supporting effective usage maintains rather than reduces inequality. And universities must conduct equity audits of AI systems, examining whether algorithms produce disparate impacts on different student populations and addressing identified biases.

However, equity considerations also complicate AI policy development. Holstein and Doroudi (Holstein & Doroudi, 2021; Holstein & Doroudi, 2022) argue that restricting artificial intelligence usage to ensure equal access may deny all students valuable learning opportunities, representing a form of “levelling down” that serves no one’s interests. Others (AI Competency Framework for Students, 2025; The Challenges of AI in Higher Education and the Imperative for Competency Frameworks, 2025) note that professional contexts increasingly expect AI competency, and preventing students from developing these skills may disadvantage them in post-graduation competition. These arguments suggest that equity requires enabling effective AI usage across student populations rather than restricting it for all, though this approach demands substantial institutional investment in infrastructure and support.

AI systems offer significant efficiency gains for both students and institutions. Automated assessment provides immediate feedback that would be impractical for human instructors to deliver at scale. Learning analytics identify struggling students earlier than traditional grade-based indicators. Administrative AI streamlines advising, course registration, and student support services. These efficiency benefits are particularly attractive for resource-constrained institutions seeking to improve outcomes without proportional budget increases.

However, these efficiency gains depend on extensive data collection and analysis that raise privacy concerns. AI systems function by processing large quantities of student data including demographic information, academic performance, learning behaviours, social network patterns, and sometimes biometric data. This information creates detailed student profiles that persist across courses and semesters, potentially influencing future opportunities through predictive algorithms. Moreover, institutions often contract with third-party vendors to provide AI services, creating data sharing relationships with commercial entities whose data practices and security measures may be not clear to students.

The ethical challenge involves determining what efficiency gains justify what privacy costs, and who makes these determinations. Institutions may perceive substantial value in learning analytics that predict student success, but students may find such survey depressive or stigmatizing. Automated proctoring systems offer convenience and cost savings compared to in-person observation, but they require invasive monitoring of students’ private spaces and have documented accuracy problems that disproportionately affect certain populations. Individual faculty may want granular data about student engagement with course materials, but students may find such monitoring chilling to their intellectual exploration.

Ethical AI implementation requires meaningful consent mechanisms, data minimization principles, and student rights to access and correct their data. Meaningful consent means students understand what data is collected and have realistic alternatives to services involving surveillance if they find such monitoring unacceptable. Data minimization means collecting only information necessary for specific educational purposes rather than comprehensive datafication of all student behaviours. Access and correction rights enable students to review their profiles and challenge inaccurate or misleading algorithmic assessments. Additionally, institutions should establish clear data retention and deletion policies, ensuring that student data does not persist indefinitely beyond its educational purpose.

Thus, to sum up, the ethical tensions examined in this article reveal that artificial intelligence integration in higher education represents far more than a technological upgrade requiring policy

adjustments. Rather, AI adoption fundamentally challenges established assumptions about academic integrity, student autonomy, educational equity, and institutional responsibilities in ways that demand sophisticated ethical frameworks capable of balancing competing values and enabling contextual judgment. The analysis demonstrates that none of these tensions admits simple resolution through choices between opposing positions. Instead, effective responses require nuanced approaches that acknowledge complexity, respect multiple legitimate perspectives, and remain adaptable as AI capabilities and educational contexts continue evolving.

The tension between academic integrity and pedagogical innovation illustrates how traditional definitions of unauthorized assistance prove inadequate when AI tools offer capabilities ranging across a spectrum from clearly appropriate support to clearly problematic work substitution. Institutions cannot simply prohibit all AI usage without denying students valuable learning experiences and failing to prepare them for AI-integrated professional environments. Nor can they adopt fully permissive approaches without risking the destruction of educational standards and authentic learning. The path forward requires context-dependent frameworks that align AI policies with specific learning objectives, and develop student capacity for ethical judgment about appropriate AI collaboration rather than just enforcing compliance with rules.

The tension between student autonomy and institutional oversight highlights how AI-enabled surveillance capabilities intensify longstanding questions about the appropriate scope of institutional authority over student learning. While universities have legitimate responsibilities for educational quality and student support, the extensive monitoring enabled by learning analytics and AI supervision systems risks treating students as objects of management rather than autonomous learners. Ethical implementation requires transparency about data practices, proportionality in collection and analysis, meaningful student consent, and genuine student participation in governance decisions. Institutions must distinguish between data collection necessary for educational operations and optional surveillance that students should be able to decline without penalty.

The examination of educational equity reveals how AI integration threatens to extend existing

inequalities through multiple mechanisms including differential access to premium tools, uneven distribution of AI literacy as cultural capital, and algorithmic bias embedded in educational systems. The equity imperative therefore requires not restricting AI usage but rather ensuring equitable access to quality tools, comprehensive AI literacy education reaching all students, and systematic auditing of AI systems for discriminatory impacts. This approach demands substantial institutional investment but represents the only pathway to AI integration that serves rather than destroys educational justice.

The tension between efficiency and privacy demonstrates how operational achievements from AI systems depend on extensive data collection practices that raise profound concerns about student rights and institutional power. While automated assessment, learning analytics, and administrative AI offer legitimate benefits, particularly for resource-constrained institutions, these systems create detailed student profiles that persist across educational experiences and may influence future opportunities through predictive algorithms. Ethical implementation requires meaningful consent mechanisms, data minimization principles limiting collection to information necessary for specific purposes, student rights to access and correct their data, and clear retention and deletion policies preventing indefinite data persistence.

Across all four tensions, several common principles emerge as essential for ethical AI integration in higher education. First, transparency must govern both AI usage policies and data practices, ensuring that students and faculty understand expectations and can make informed decisions. Second, proportionality requires that institutional responses match the actual stakes involved, avoiding both excessive surveillance and inadequate oversight. Third, equity considerations must be central rather than peripheral to AI implementation, with proactive attention to how different policies and practices affect various student populations. Fourth, student participation in governance provides both ethical legitimacy and practical wisdom, as those most affected by AI policies bring valuable perspectives to decision-making processes. Fifth, adaptability is essential given AI's rapid evolution, requiring mechanisms for regular policy review and revision based on accumulated experience.

Conclusions and prospects for further research. The analysis presented in this article suggests that effective institutional responses to AI ethics cannot rely on one-time policy development followed by stable implementation. Rather, addressing AI's ethical challenges requires ongoing institutional commitment including sustained investment in institutional development and pedagogical support, continuous evaluation of AI systems' impacts on different student populations, regular review and revision of policies as technologies and contexts change, maintenance of dialogue among stakeholders with different perspectives and interests, and contribution to broader scholarly and practical discourse on AI in education. Institutions that treat AI ethics as dynamic engagement rather than static problem will be better positioned to navigate continuing technological evolution while

maintaining commitment to core educational values.

The path forward requires neither uncritical usage of AI innovation nor defensive resistance to technological change. Instead, it demands thoughtful engagement with complexity, willingness to balance competing values through contextual judgment, commitment to core educational principles including integrity, equity, and human development, and recognition that ethical AI integration represents ongoing work rather than achieved solution. Higher education institutions that approach these challenges with intellectual strictness, ethical seriousness, and practical wisdom can navigate this transformative period successfully, emerging with clearer sense of purpose and more effective educational practices than existed before confronting AI's disruptive impact.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

1. AI competency framework for students. (2025, August 18). UNESCO. URL: <https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/ai-competency-framework-students>.
2. Baidoo-Anu D., Ansah L. O. Education in the Era of Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI): Understanding the potential benefits of ChatGPT in promoting teaching and learning. *Journal of AI*. 2023. Vol. 7(1). P. 52–62. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.61969/jai.1337500>.
3. Baker R. S., Hawn A. Algorithmic bias in education. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*. 2021. Vol. 32(4). P. 1052–1092. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-021-00285-9>.
4. ChatGPT, AI, and Academic dishonesty. Cal Poly Humboldt. URL: <https://www.humboldt.edu/dean-students/quicklinks/chatgpt-ai-and-academic-dishonesty>.
5. ChatGPT, Artificial Intelligence, and academic integrity. Office of Academic Integrity. 2025. URL: <https://oai.missouri.edu/chatgpt-artificial-intelligence-and-academic-integrity/>.
6. Cotton D. R., Cotton P. A., Shipway J. R. Chatting and cheating: Ensuring academic integrity in the era of ChatGPT. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*. 2023. Vol. 61 (2). P. 228–239. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2023.2190148>.
7. Guidance for generative AI in education and research. *UNESCO eBooks*. 2023. URL: <https://doi.org/10.54675/ewzm9535>.
8. Holstein K., Doroudi S. *Equity and artificial intelligence in education: Will "AIED" amplify or alleviate inequities in education?* URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2104.12920>.
9. Holstein K., Doroudi S. (2022). Equity and artificial intelligence in education. *The Ethics of Artificial Intelligence in Education*. P. 151–173. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429329067-9>.
10. Mollick E. R., Mollick L. Assigning AI: Seven Approaches for Students, with Prompts. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. 2023. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4475995>.
11. Mollick E. R., Mollick L. Instructors as Innovators: a Future-focused Approach to New AI Learning Opportunities, With Prompts. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. 2024. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4802463>.
12. Prinsloo P., Slade S. Ethics and Learning Analytics: Charting the (UN)Chartered. *Society for Learning Analytics Research (SoLAR) eBooks*. 2017. P. 49–57). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18608/hla17.004>.
13. Rudolph J., Tan S., Tan S. ChatGPT: Bullshit spewer or the end of traditional assessments in higher education? *Journal of Applied Learning & Teaching*. 2023. 6(1). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2023.6.1.9>.
14. The challenges of AI in higher education and the imperative for competency frameworks. 2025. URL: <https://www.iesalc.unesco.org/en/articles/challenges-ai-higher-education-and-imperative-competency-frameworks>.

REFERENCES:

1. *AI competency framework for students*. (2025, August 18). UNESCO. <https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/ai-competency-framework-students>.
2. Baidoo-Anu, D., & Ansah, L. O. (2023). Education in the Era of Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI): Understanding the potential benefits of ChatGPT in promoting teaching and learning. *Journal of AI*, 7(1), 52–62. <https://doi.org/10.61969/jai.1337500>.
3. Baker, R. S., & Hawn, A. (2021). Algorithmic bias in education. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, 32(4), 1052–1092. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-021-00285-9>.
4. *ChatGPT, AI, and Academic dishonesty | Cal Poly Humboldt*. (n.d.). Cal Poly Humboldt. <https://www.humboldt.edu/dean-students/quicklinks/chatgpt-ai-and-academic-dishonesty>.
5. *ChatGPT, Artificial Intelligence, and academic integrity*. (2025). Office of Academic Integrity. <https://oai.missouri.edu/chatgpt-artificial-intelligence-and-academic-integrity/>.
6. Cotton, D. R., Cotton, P. A., & Shipway, J. R. (2023). Chatting and cheating: Ensuring academic integrity in the era of ChatGPT. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 61 (2), 228–239. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2023.2190148>.
7. Guidance for generative AI in education and research. (2023). In *UNESCO eBooks*. <https://doi.org/10.54675/ewzm9535>.
8. Holstein, K., & Doroudi, S. (2021, April 27). *Equity and artificial intelligence in education: Will “AIED” amplify or alleviate inequities in education?* arXiv.org. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2104.12920>.
9. Holstein, K., & Doroudi, S. (2022). Equity and artificial intelligence in education. In *The Ethics of Artificial Intelligence in Education* (pp. 151–173). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429329067-9>.
10. Mollick, E. R., & Mollick, L. (2023). Assigning AI: Seven Approaches for Students, with Prompts. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4475995>.
11. Mollick, E. R., & Mollick, L. (2024). Instructors as Innovators: a Future-focused Approach to New AI Learning Opportunities, With Prompts. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4802463>.
12. Prinsloo, P., & Slade, S. (2017). Ethics and Learning Analytics: Charting the (UN)Charted. In *Society for Learning Analytics Research (SoLAR) eBooks* (pp. 49–57). <https://doi.org/10.18608/hla17.004>.
13. Rudolph, J., Tan, S., & Tan, S. (2023). ChatGPT: Bullshit spewer or the end of traditional assessments in higher education? *Journal of Applied Learning & Teaching*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2023.6.1.9>.
14. *The challenges of AI in higher education and the imperative for competency frameworks*. (2025, September 2). International Institute for Higher Education in Latin America and the Caribbean. <https://www.iesalc.unesco.org/en/articles/challenges-ai-higher-education-and-imperative-competency-frameworks>.

Дата першого надходження рукопису до видання: 25.11.2025
Дата прийнятого до друку рукопису після рецензування: 22.12.2025
Дата публікації: 30.12.2025