Limiting Artificial Intelligence in Academia and Safeguarding Integrity in the Age of Technology

by Avani Kashyap

King's Policy Journal

KCL Policy Research Centre

Centre for Technology & Artificial Intelligence

Word Count: 2,286

January 2026

Limiting Artificial Intelligence in Academia and Safeguarding Integrity in the Age of Technology

by Avani Kashyap

Introduction

The rise of generative chatbots such as ChatGPT, Gemini, and NotebookLM has severely impacted how students, professors, and academics access, process, and produce information. These tools promise efficiency and perhaps innovation but have led to co-dependency. Their unregulated use within educational institutions poses significant challenges to critical thinking, skill development, academic integrity, and equitable learning.

The arrival of new technologies and the struggle to contextualize them in modern times is something that educational institutions have always grappled with, historically having to adapt to technologies like calculators, online search engines, and research databases. However, AI tools are fundamentally different; the speed, accessibility, and sophistication of these tools allow them to perform tasks requiring deep understanding and even creativity—truly blurring the lines between learning and outsourcing.

Recent data from 2024 indicates that 74% of students aged 16–24 regularly use generative AI tools, and 79% of children aged 7–12 have experimented with them, with 40% of this younger group doing so regularly (OIT & DOE). The proportion of students using tools like ChatGPT for assessments has soared from 53% last year to 88% this year, while those who have not used AI in any form for their coursework have dropped to just 12% (Freeman, 2025). The most common uses include asking AI to explain complex concepts, summarise readings, and suggest research ideas—seemingly harmless actions that, over time, shift responsibility for understanding away from the learner and onto a machine.

This paper argues that academia must adopt restrictive yet balanced AI policies that preserve the authenticity of education and the intellectual capabilities of future scholars, as well as promote digital literacy and equitable policies. It is unreasonable to eliminate AI entirely—both unenforceable and impractical. Rather, we must regulate its use to complement human learning rather than replace it.

The Case Against Unregulated AI in Academia:

Erosion of Academic Integrity

Academic integrity, the foundation of scholarly work, is under tremendous strain as the use of AI becomes normalized. This widespread use of AI in assessments reflects not only malpractice but also an overreliance on automation that threatens the authenticity of evaluation. Students are increasingly delegating analytical and creative tasks to AI, and educators are losing the ability to accurately assess their comprehension and skills. Over time, this undermines the reliability of academic qualifications and devalues genuine intellectual effort.

AI is also giving rise to novel forms of academic misconduct. The fabrication of information, citations, and references—generating highly polished essays complete with what seems like authentic research—eliminates the human component entirely. This also renders traditional plagiarism detection tools ineffective. Unlike old-school academic misconduct, such as copying from peers or books, AI-generated content is both highly unique and entirely unoriginal in its reasoning. It borrows from countless sources available on the internet, fabricating information wherever necessary, raising questions about intellectual property and copyright infringement. When AI generates text or code, who owns the output? How can students take credit for work primarily produced by machines?

Recently, OpenAI and Google have lobbied the U.S. government to classify AI training on copyrighted material as “fair use,” arguing that restrictions would harm national security and allow China to gain an AI advantage (Berger, 2025). Their push comes amid major copyright controversies, including lawsuits against Meta for allegedly using pirated books and growing international resistance from authors and publishers. In November 2025, a Munich regional court ruled that OpenAI infringed copyright by “memorizing” song lyrics within ChatGPT during training, allowing users to recreate those lyrics through prompts. The court held that EU text and data mining exceptions do not permit this kind of reproduction in model outputs, drawing a line between permissible data preparation and impermissible storage of copyrighted works in model parameters (Rauer, 2025).

These legal battles highlight a critical tension at the heart of generative AI: How can we distinguish between learning from existing data and simply reproducing it? If courts and institutions determine that AI systems improperly “memorize” copyrighted works, then the seemingly original work of students using these tools may, in fact, become unintentional copyright violations. In that case, generative AI not only diminishes intellectual capabilities but also places students in precarious ethical and legal positions.

These developments show that AI is not a neutral tool; it raises serious ethical, legal, and educational challenges. The line between original thought and AI-generated content is increasingly blurred, placing students and institutions in uncertain territory. Without clear guidelines, reliance on AI

risks normalizing work that is ethically ambiguous and legally problematic, undermining authorship, accountability, and intellectual growth. Institutions must therefore establish guidelines for responsible AI use, promote transparency, and educate students on these issues to ensure AI supports learning rather than compromises it.

Decline in Critical Thinking and Creativity

Beyond integrity, unregulated AI use has subtler yet equally worrying consequences: declining creativity and critical thought. Learning is a process of struggle, reflection, and discovery. Particularly in tertiary education, it is more than a pathway to employability or a means of learning technical skills—it is about cultivating the capacity to question, analyze, and form independent judgments. Education, therefore, is not a private investment but rather a public good; it promotes participation in society and sustains social responsibility.

Critical thinking is not an innate ability; it must be taught, practiced, and continually strengthened. Without opportunities to grapple with complex academic voices, conflicting opinions, and the discomfort of uncertainty, students risk becoming what Foucault famously termed "docile bodies"—individuals shaped by systems yet unempowered to question them. The provision of instant answers by AI eliminates this struggle; it circumvents the process of self-discovery, tempting students to accept neatly formatted conclusions instead.

This tendency is not uniform across disciplines. While the temptation to rely on AI affects students broadly, its impact is amplified in fields where efficiency is prioritized over originality. Data indicates that students in STEM fields—where precision and efficiency are prioritized—are more likely to adopt AI tools quickly, partly because originality is less emphasized. By contrast, students in the arts, humanities, and social sciences are trained to value argumentation, intuition, independent reasoning, and original thought. This divide demonstrates that as AI use expands, education risks becoming homogenized, reducing opportunities for students to develop and defend their perspectives.

Learning must remain a process of discovery, struggle, and reflection—not a search for instant answers. We must not let AI become the default medium for problem-solving, or else students risk losing the ability to think critically and creatively beyond algorithmic suggestions.

Counterarguments and Rebuttals

Many proponents argue that unregulated AI use has benefits. It does save time, enhance productivity, and support students with disabilities or language barriers. Furthermore, AI usage reflects professional practices where technology-assisted problem-solving is increasingly common.

While these points hold merit, they overlook long-term consequences. Time saved by outsourcing thinking can lead to gaps in cognitive skills, analytical reasoning, and ethical judgment. Accessibility challenges should be addressed through inclusive AI literacy programs rather than unrestricted use. Moreover, workplace AI use presupposes a foundation of critical thinking—assuming that students have already acquired this before relying on technological aids. Without a balance between AI assistance and independent thought, educational outcomes may prioritize efficiency over intellectual competence. In the long term, this erodes not only individual competence but also the credibility of academic qualifications and the broader integrity of the entire education system.

Policy Recommendations:

Completely banning AI is neither feasible nor desirable. It is a useful tool for many students and teachers. Instead, educational institutions must adopt a comprehensive, multi-layered, long-term strategy that regulates AI use while promoting digital literacy.

1. ***AI Literacy Training:***

Universities and secondary schools should offer structured courses on ethical and practical use of generative AI models, ensuring students understand both potential and risk. These programs should cover:

- Capabilities and limitations of AI tools
- Ethical considerations of research and content generation
- Guidelines for acceptable use in coursework and assessments

2. ***Faculty Training and Support:***

Educators need clear guidance on identifying and responding to AI-assisted academic malpractice. They must receive training on detecting AI use and integrating AI awareness into curricula. By equipping both students and teachers with clear knowledge, institutions can foster responsible AI use.

3. ***Data Privacy Education:***

Equally important is educating students on data privacy, safety, and intellectual property laws governing AI use. This includes the implications of sharing personal information with generative systems and the responsibilities that come with reproducing AI-generated content in assessments or publications.

4. ***Mandatory AI Disclosure:***

Requiring students to declare all instances of AI use in academic work—from homework to dissertations—is a simple yet effective way to enforce regulations and reduce dependence on AI. Undeclared use should be treated as academic misconduct. Enforcement could include:

- Integrating disclosure forms into submission portals
- Treating undeclared AI use as plagiarism

5. ***AI-Free Assessment Zones:***

A mixed assessment system combining online assessments (where technology is permitted) and in-person examinations (where it is prohibited) helps students develop a balanced set of skills. A suggested structure could include:

- In-person exams and assignments where AI is prohibited
- Mixed models combining AI-free and AI-allowed projects
- Assignments encouraging responsible AI use

6. ***Equitable Access:***

A socioeconomic divide is forming in AI availability across educational institutions, with private schools having more access than their public counterparts. This disparity risks worsening existing inequalities. Policymakers must prioritize equitable access to approved AI tools through strategies such as:

- Subsidized AI platforms
- Centralized digital libraries
- Institutional licenses for AI software

7. ***Regular Policy Review:***

The rapid evolution of AI necessitates continual reassessment. Institutions should regularly evaluate:

- Effectiveness of AI literacy programs
- Student adherence to disclosure requirements
- Risks associated with emerging technologies

By implementing a structured, multi-faceted policy framework, educational institutions can strike a balance between innovation and integrity. AI can enhance research, analysis, and creativity—so long as its use is guided by transparency, accountability, and equitable access.

Ethical Responsibility of AI Developers and Educational Institutions

Discussions of AI misuse in academia often place responsibility squarely on students, framing the issue as one of individual misconduct. And sometimes on educators for their perceived inadequacy for not teaching their students to contend with this new tool. However, such an approach overlooks the ethical obligations of both AI developers and educational institutions in shaping the environments in which these tools are used.

AI companies play a significant role in normalizing generative tools as effortless solutions to complex intellectual tasks. Marketing narratives that seek to emphasize productivity, speed and "smarter learning" conceal the cognitive trade-offs involved and rarely address educational ethics. Developers have a responsibility to provide transparency about model limitations, training data, and appropriate use cases, particularly when targeting educational markets. Because these tools directly influence how students understand knowledge and authority. Without these clear disclosures, AI systems are being mistaken for reliable and objective sources rather than tools prone to error, bias, and fabrication.

Transparency about model limitations would help prevent outright reliance by clarifying that AI does not possess understanding or judgment and can produce confident albeit incorrect outputs. Openness about training data is of utmost importance, as many of the datasets used to train generative AI models are trained on vast, opaque datasets that may include copyrighted material, biased sources and culturally narrow perspectives. Students and institutions must be aware of the ethical implications of using such systems, so as to not unknowingly reproduce them .

Finally, developers must articulate when their use is appropriate. Tools marketed as study aids or writing assistants should include clear guidance distinguishing acceptable support (such as brainstorming or conceptual clarification) from uses that compromise learning or academic integrity. They must also step away from marketing AI as a productivity enhancer because it incentivizes the outsourcing of cognitive and critical thinking skills.

Case Study: ChatGPT-Assisted Programming Education at the University of Maribor, Slovenia

A compelling example of both the promise and risks of generative AI in higher education emerges from a recent study conducted at the University of Maribor in Slovenia. The research examined 182 first-year Computer Science students in a foundational programming course, splitting them into two groups: one permitted to use ChatGPT for weekly assignments and one instructed not to.

The findings were striking. Across all major components of the course—weekly programming assignments, laboratory assessments, a handwritten midterm examination, and the overall final grade—there was no statistically significant difference between students who used ChatGPT and those

who did not. Eight students in the “no ChatGPT” group admitted to using the model and were removed from the dataset.

These results challenge assumptions that AI inherently erodes learning outcomes or produces unearned academic advantage. They also indicate that banning AI is ineffective. Educators report that bans simply push students to find covert ways to use AI, making misuse more common and harder to detect. In contrast, students allowed to use ChatGPT tended to do so cautiously, mainly to refine or compare code rather than generate full assignments.

Conclusion

We must challenge the notion that students become “more efficient” by relying on AI. This perception illustrates how students mistake AI-produced, oversimplified information for genuine understanding, undermining cognitive development. This study underscores the need for explicit AI literacy training that teaches students not only how to use AI but how to evaluate it critically and avoid conflating AI performance with personal mastery.

It is important to recognize that AI does not generate new knowledge—it recombines and reproduces existing information, and an overreliance on it risks undermining originality and critical inquiry, which would be detrimental to the advancement of academic research.

By implementing structured AI literacy programs, clear usage guidelines, mandatory disclosure policies, equitable access initiatives, and periodic policy reviews, educational institutions can ensure that AI complements human intellect rather than replaces it. Safeguarding the integrity of learning in the age of AI is an administrative necessity and an imperative to prepare future scholars for a world where human judgment, creativity, and ethical reasoning must remain indispensable.

Bibliography

Abbas, M., Jam, F. A., & Khan, T. I. (2024). *Is it harmful or helpful? Examining the causes and consequences of generative AI usage among university students. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 21*(10). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00444-7

AIPRM. (2024, July 11). *AI in Education Statistics*. https://www.aiprm.com/en-gb/ai-in-education-statistics/

Berger, V. (2025, March 15). *The AI copyright battle: Why OpenAI and Google are pushing for fair use. Forbes*. https://www.forbes.com/sites/virginieberger/2025/03/15/the-ai-copyright-battle-why-openai-and-google-are-pushing-for-fair-use/

Freeman, J. (2025). *Student Generative AI Survey.* Higher Education Policy Institute. https://www.hepi.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2025/02/HEPI-Kortext-Student-Generative-AI-Survey-2025.pdf

Kosar, T., Ostojić, D., Liu, Y. D., & Mernik, M. (2024). Computer science education in ChatGPT era: Experiences from an experiment in a programming course for novice programmers. *Mathematics, 12*(5), 629. https://doi.org/10.3390/math12050629

Rauer, N. (2025, November 13). *OpenAI loses copyright case in Germany.* Pinsent Masons. https://www.pinsentmasons.com/out-law/news/openai-loses-copyright-case-germany

The Open Innovation Team & Department for Education. (2024, January). *Generative AI in education: Educator and expert views*. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/65b8cd41b5cb6e000d8bb74e/DfE_GenAI_in_education_-_Educator_and_expert_views_report.pdf