ChatGPT in Education: A Critical Overview of Breakthroughs and Challenges

Christos Troussas[0000-0002-9604-2015], Akrivi Krouska[0000-0002-8620-5255], Phivos Mylonas[0000-0002-6916-3129] and Cleo Sgouropoulou[0000-0001-8173-2622]

Department of Informatics and Computer Engineering, University of West Attica
Egaleo 12243, Greece
{ctrouss, akrouska, mylonasf, csgouro}@uniwa.gr

Abstract. This paper presents a critical examination of ChatGPT's role in education during the formative period from 2022 to 2025. It selectively analyzes key breakthroughs and enduring challenges associated with the integration of Generative Artificial Intelligence (Generative AI) into educational settings. Drawing from recent developments in pedagogy, educational technology, and institutional practice, the study identifies five major areas of innovation: AI-assisted tutoring, instructional content generation, feedback automation, support for creative inquiry, and just-in-time learning facilitation. These pedagogical advances are contextualized within the broader technological embedding of ChatGPT into learning management systems, productivity tools, and purpose-built educational applications. In parallel, the paper investigates critical risks, including threats to academic integrity, the erosion of critical thinking, epistemic dependence on AI-generated content, privacy concerns, and equity gaps in access to high-quality AI tools. The analysis demonstrates that while ChatGPT offers substantial benefits when thoughtfully integrated into pedagogical workflows, it also introduces systemic tensions that challenge traditional educational values and assessment practices. The paper concludes by arguing that future adoption of generative AI in education must be accompanied by institutional policies, AI literacy initiatives, and ethical frameworks that preserve the integrity of human-centered learning.

Keywords: ChatGPT in Education, Generative Artificial Intelligence, Educational Technology, Academic Integrity, AI Literacy, Large Language Models, LLM in Education.

1 Introduction

The public release of ChatGPT [1] by OpenAI in November 2022 initiated a substantial shift in the educational landscape, foregrounding generative artificial intelligence as a practical and immediate influence on teaching and learning [2]. Unlike earlier academic experiments with conversational agents or domain-specific intelligent tutoring systems,

ChatGPT introduced a general-purpose, scalable, and linguistically sophisticated language model accessible to both educators and learners without the need for technical configuration [3]. Its adoption across a wide range of formal and informal educational contexts has been rapid and largely organic, driven more by user experimentation than by institutional policy or pedagogical frameworks [4]. Within less than three years, its presence has evolved from an emerging curiosity to an embedded tool in student workflows and instructional practice.

This paper undertakes a critical examination of the educational impact of ChatGPT from 2022 to 2025, with particular emphasis on breakthroughs in pedagogical application and the structural challenges its use has introduced. Its objective is to distill the most salient developments—those that have demonstrably altered educational practices, provoked institutional responses, or triggered sustained academic debate. The focus is therefore on high-impact use cases, representative dilemmas, and structural implications, viewed through the dual lenses of computer science and education.

From a computational standpoint, ChatGPT represents a significant application of transformer-based architectures in a high-stakes, user-facing domain [5]. Its capacity to model human-like language, adapt to prompts, and simulate conversational depth positions it as both a tool and a proxy for human cognitive tasks. From an educational perspective, this capability creates affordances for content generation, dialogic learning, self-regulated tutoring, and administrative assistance [6]. However, the very same affordances also present notable risks: they challenge traditional notions of authorship, compromise the validity of written assessments, and create new dependencies that may attenuate learner agency and critical thinking.

One of the most urgent issues facing educators during this period has been the question of academic integrity [7]. With ChatGPT able to generate coherent essays, solve mathematical problems, and write executable code on demand, distinguishing between original student work and AI-generated submissions has become increasingly difficult. This problem is compounded by the limitations of current detection tools and the ambiguous ethical status of AI-assisted work in many educational policies. The response from institutions has been uneven—ranging from prohibitionist measures to integration-focused approaches that emphasize transparency and AI literacy [8]. This heterogeneity reflects both the novelty of the technology and the absence of consensus regarding its pedagogical legitimacy.

At the same time, there is growing evidence that, when appropriately scaffolded, ChatGPT can enhance learning outcomes, particularly in domains that benefit from iterative explanation, feedback, and revision [9]. Empirical studies have begun to document cases where ChatGPT functions effectively as a writing tutor, a programming assistant, or a conceptual interlocutor, supporting learners in developing ideas, troubleshooting errors, and engaging with subject content [10-13]. In these contexts, the tool serves not as a replacement for instruction, but as an augmentative resource—particularly valuable in large-scale or resource-constrained educational settings.

The integration of ChatGPT into educational technologies has also intensified during this period. Several prominent platforms—including learning management systems, educational coding environments, and writing support tools—have introduced GPT-

powered features, such as auto-generated feedback, adaptive content delivery, and context-aware assistance [14]. These integrations mark a shift from standalone AI tools to embedded components within the digital infrastructure of education, raising important questions about data governance, user transparency, and pedagogical alignment.

However, the pace of adoption has often outstripped the pace of critical scrutiny. Many educators have adopted ChatGPT without clear frameworks for evaluating its pedagogical effectiveness or ethical implications [15]. Meanwhile, students increasingly rely on the tool not just for support but as a default mechanism for completing assignments, sometimes with limited understanding of the underlying content [15]. These dynamics necessitate a more rigorous examination of the conditions under which ChatGPT contributes positively to learning, and those under which it undermines key educational goals.

This paper responds to that need by offering a structured analysis of ChatGPT's educational trajectory over a three-year period. The contribution is twofold: first, to identify and explicate the major pedagogical breakthroughs that have emerged from its use; second, to delineate the core challenges—technical, ethical, and pedagogical—that have surfaced as a result. By focusing on these two dimensions, the analysis aims to support the development of more principled approaches to AI integration in education, informed by both empirical evidence and theoretical insight.

2 Pedagogical Breakthroughs and Innovations

The integration of ChatGPT into educational contexts between 2022 and 2025 has led to a series of notable pedagogical innovations that redefined how knowledge is accessed, generated, and communicated [16]. While early discourse centered on concerns over misuse, it soon became evident that, under appropriate instructional scaffolding, ChatGPT could significantly augment both teaching and learning practices. This section presents a critical analysis of the most prominent pedagogical breakthroughs facilitated by ChatGPT, with emphasis on its use as a tool for personalized learning, instructional design, formative assessment, and collaborative learning support. Table 1 summarizes the core pedagogical innovations examined in this section, along with their key features, benefits, and associated risks.

Table 1. Pedagogical Innovations.

Pedagogical Innovations	Key Features	Pedagogical Benefits	Risks and Limitations
AI as Personal Tutor	Conversational, adaptive scaffolding for learners	Enhances understanding, especially in self-paced learning	May encourage over-reliance or shallow engagement
Instructional Design Assistance	Automated generation of lesson plans, quizzes, rubrics	Reduces preparation time for educators	Risk of generic or pedagogically weak content

Formative Feedback Automation	Instant, personalized feedback on writing and code	Promotes iterative learning and self-evaluation	Feedback may lack nuance or context awareness
Support for Creative & Critical Thinking	Idea generation, argument simulation, perspective-taking	Fosters higher-order thinking when used reflectively	Users may mistake fluent output for correctness
Just-in-Time Learning Support	Immediate explanations and interactive Q&A	Supports learning continuity outside class time	Accuracy and critical assessment depend on learner AI literacy

2.1 AI as a Personal Tutor and Scaffolding Tool

Perhaps the most immediately observable pedagogical innovation introduced by ChatGPT lies in its role as a personalized tutoring agent [17]. While prior educational technologies offered rule-based or template-driven assistance [18], ChatGPT's open-ended dialogue capability allowed learners to engage in fluid, natural language exchanges—replicating aspects of human tutoring with notable success. This has proven particularly effective in helping students explore new ideas, clarify misunderstandings, and iterate on their work.

In writing-intensive disciplines, students used ChatGPT to receive iterative feedback on thesis structure, argument coherence, and grammar refinement [19, 20]. In STEM education, the model has been employed to walk students through algorithmic logic, debug code, and explain mathematical procedures step-by-step [21, 22]. Unlike traditional static resources, ChatGPT provided responsive, context-aware explanations, allowing learners to revisit complex concepts as many times as needed—an affordance especially valuable in large classroom settings with limited instructor availability.

Empirical findings from several recent exploratory studies support the claim that ChatGPT can function effectively as a scaffold for metacognitive regulation [23-25]. For example, students who employed the model for self-questioning and reflection reported increased confidence in their understanding, particularly when prompts were used to stimulate critical engagement rather than elicit direct answers. This aligns with Vygotskian principles of mediated learning, where tools serve to bridge the learner's zone of proximal development. The dynamic nature of ChatGPT's responses means that, when guided appropriately, it can tailor explanations in ways that match the learner's current cognitive state.

Nonetheless, these benefits are not uniformly distributed. The degree to which ChatGPT enhances learning depends heavily on the quality of the prompts, the learner's ability to evaluate AI-generated content critically, and the instructor's integration of the tool into the learning ecosystem [26]. Without explicit guidance, some students tend to treat the model as an answer-generator rather than a dialogic partner—leading to superficial engagement and potential misconceptions.

2.2 Redefining the Educator's Role: Instructional Design and Content Generation

The pedagogical utility of ChatGPT is not limited to student-facing applications. For instructors, the model has become an increasingly valuable assistant in instructional design, automating time-consuming tasks such as the creation of quizzes, lesson plans, syllabi, case studies, and formative feedback [27]. These functions, while not new to educational technology, have been significantly enhanced in terms of speed, flexibility, and linguistic variety through ChatGPT's natural language capabilities.

In particular, educators in higher education have leveraged the tool to rapidly prototype classroom materials tailored to specific learner profiles [11]. By inputting a topic, learning objective, and level of difficulty, instructors could receive draft content in seconds, which could then be refined, contextualized, and embedded into curricula. This has led to a notable increase in agile pedagogical development—allowing for real-time adjustment of instruction in response to class dynamics or student performance.

Moreover, ChatGPT's support for multilingual generation has enabled educators to produce content in multiple languages or adapt explanations for learners from diverse linguistic backgrounds [28]. This capacity is especially relevant in international and cross-border educational programs, where instructors may need to communicate subject matter across language divides.

However, the incorporation of ChatGPT into instructional design is not without its caveats. Generated content, while syntactically correct, occasionally lacks pedagogical coherence or conceptual accuracy, necessitating careful review and editorial intervention. There is also a risk that overreliance on AI-generated materials may disincentivize reflective curriculum planning, particularly among educators who treat the tool as a shortcut rather than as a collaborator [29]. As a result, institutions have increasingly begun to recommend a "co-design" approach—where AI outputs are treated as drafts subject to critical curation by pedagogical professionals.

2.3 ChatGPT and the Democratization of Formative Feedback

Another area in which ChatGPT has delivered significant pedagogical value is the democratization and scaling of formative feedback. Traditional feedback mechanisms are limited by instructor time and attention [30]. Particularly in large-class settings or massive open online courses (MOOCs), the provision of personalized, timely, and constructive feedback is often impractical. ChatGPT has emerged as a scalable solution to this problem.

Students have used the tool to evaluate drafts of essays, code, or problem sets prior to submission, receiving feedback on structure, style, logic, and clarity. In programming courses, ChatGPT has been employed to analyze code snippets, suggest improvements, and explain bugs in an interpretable manner [21]. In language learning environments, it has been used to simulate conversational practice and correct grammar in real-time, thereby reinforcing linguistic accuracy and fluency [6].

The pedagogical significance of this development is twofold [31]. First, it allows students to engage in iterative learning cycles independently, experimenting and revising their work before receiving instructor evaluation. Second, it promotes a form of self-directed learning in which learners are encouraged to develop metacognitive strategies—learning to question, critique, and improve their work proactively.

Nonetheless, this breakthrough must be viewed in balance. AI-generated feedback, while prompt and linguistically fluent, does not possess pedagogical intentionality. It lacks an understanding of curriculum alignment, individual student history, or affective tone—all elements that human feedback naturally incorporates. Thus, while ChatGPT can effectively complement formative feedback processes, it should not be seen as a substitute for instructor engagement, particularly in feedback-intensive disciplines.

2.4 Supporting Creative and Critical Thinking Tasks

Contrary to early concerns that ChatGPT would encourage rote learning or shortcut problem-solving, evidence has begun to emerge that, when used appropriately, it can stimulate higher-order thinking [32]. Educators across multiple disciplines have adapted ChatGPT to support tasks requiring synthesis, evaluation, and creativity—cognitive domains aligned with the upper tiers of Bloom's taxonomy.

In literature and philosophy courses, for example, students have engaged ChatGPT in simulated debates, asking it to adopt particular ideological or historical perspectives [33]. In design education, it has been used to brainstorm alternative concepts, generate artistic prompts, or simulate user personas [34]. In software engineering education, learners have used it to conduct comparative analysis of algorithmic approaches, generate pseudocode for complex systems, or write test cases for hypothetical use scenarios [25].

These applications reflect a shift from using ChatGPT as a producer of answers to using it as a collaborator in critical inquiry. This reframing has pedagogical significance, as it enables learners to treat AI not as an authority but as a participant—one whose contributions can be analyzed, challenged, and improved upon. Such use cases have been particularly successful when embedded in assignments that require students to critique or annotate the outputs of the model, rather than submit them directly.

However, the successful integration of ChatGPT into creative and critical thinking tasks presupposes a certain level of AI literacy on the part of both students and instructors [8]. Without awareness of the model's limitations—such as its tendency to "hallucinate" facts or its lack of genuine understanding—learners may misattribute confidence or correctness to plausible but flawed content. This has prompted a new instructional imperative: to teach students not only how to use ChatGPT but how to interrogate it.

2.5 Enabling Just-in-Time and Situated Learning

One of the most distinctive pedagogical affordances of ChatGPT is its capacity to support just-in-time learning—providing immediate explanations or resources in the mo-

ment of need [3]. In contrast to traditional textbooks or static content, ChatGPT responds to learner queries in real time, tailoring information to the learner's phrasing, level of understanding, and intended use.

This has been especially impactful in self-paced or asynchronous learning environments, where instructor feedback is delayed or absent [35]. Learners working on projects, assignments, or skill development tasks have used ChatGPT as an always-available resource, enabling them to continue progressing without interruption. This immediacy supports fluid learning trajectories and reduces cognitive friction associated with delayed clarification.

Furthermore, ChatGPT supports situated learning by enabling learners to simulate real-world communication tasks [36]. Language learners practice conversation; business students simulate negotiation; computer science students interact with AI agents mimicking client dialogue. These simulations, while imperfect, offer valuable experiential learning opportunities, especially when debriefed through structured reflection.

Yet, these affordances again carry risks [37]. Just-in-time learning facilitated by ChatGPT can foster dependency and superficiality if not integrated within broader instructional strategies. Additionally, without validation mechanisms, students may absorb inaccuracies or oversimplified explanations. Hence, the pedagogical challenge lies not in access, but in integration—designing learning ecosystems where AI-facilitated just-in-time knowledge serves as a complement to structured, critical, and cumulative learning processes.

3 Technological Embedding in Educational Tools

The pedagogical innovations enabled by ChatGPT cannot be understood in isolation from the broader technological ecosystems in which they are situated. The deployment of ChatGPT across educational environments has not been confined to its standalone use via the OpenAI interface or basic web-based experiments. Rather, a significant trajectory of development has involved the integration of ChatGPT's capabilities into existing educational platforms, learning management systems, productivity tools, and purpose-built applications, forming a layer of ambient AI support within the digital infrastructure of learning [38].

This section critically examines the modes, implications, and limitations of these technological embeddings. It highlights how ChatGPT has been operationalized within education technology (EdTech), the ways in which this has influenced educational workflows, and the broader consequences for pedagogical control, student autonomy, and institutional strategy. Table 2 outlines the primary contexts in which ChatGPT has been technologically embedded in education, highlighting implementation examples, pedagogical effects, and associated risks.

Table 2. Technological Embedding.

Embedding Context	Implementation Examples	Educational Impact	Challenges and Risks

Learning Management Systems (LMS)	AI-generated feedback, quiz creation, student Q&A bots	Improved scalability of instruction and feedback	Instructor overreliance; reduction in pedagogical discretion
Productivity Tools (e.g., MS Word, Excel)	GPT-powered writing suggestions, summarization, rephrasing	Enhanced student and staff productivity	Blurring authorship; increased passive content generation
Purpose-Built Educational Tools	Khanmigo, GrammarlyGO, GitHub Copilot for Education	Targeted support for specific skills or subjects	Black-box behavior; limited transparency and oversight
Custom GPT Applications by Educators	GPTs trained on course materials or institutional guidelines	Localized alignment with pedagogical goals	Quality assurance and maintenance burdens
System-Level Infrastructure	Integration across platforms; interoperability challenges	Redefines control, access, and authorship in education	Dependence on commercial platforms; equity concerns

3.1 Integration into Learning Management Systems and Classroom Platforms

A key vector for the institutionalization of ChatGPT in education has been its integration into Learning Management Systems (LMS) such as Moodle, Canvas, Blackboard, and Google Classroom. While these systems traditionally functioned as content repositories and assessment hubs, the addition of generative AI functionality has significantly expanded their role.

By 2024, multiple LMS providers began offering AI-powered features directly within their user interfaces [39]. These included capabilities such as:

- Automatic question generation from course materials
- Intelligent feedback suggestions on student submissions
- Summarization of lecture notes or discussion threads
- AI-generated rubrics and grading comments
- ChatGPT-based virtual TAs that answer common course queries

Such features aimed to alleviate instructor workload and enhance student engagement, particularly in large-enrollment courses where personalized interaction is limited. From a software architecture perspective, these integrations were enabled via API-based access to GPT models, often layered with institutional controls that limited access to specific features or ensured data anonymization.

However, the pedagogical efficacy of these LMS integrations is not self-evident [40]. On the one hand, they offer scalability and efficiency, making formative feedback and support more available. On the other hand, their opacity raises questions about instructor agency. When LMS platforms begin to generate suggestions for grades, comments, or activity design, instructors may be nudged into AI-guided decisions, potentially diminishing their pedagogical discretion. This tension between automation and instructional autonomy must be acknowledged and addressed through governance frameworks and user-centered design.

Moreover, student interaction with LMS-embedded AI features has been heterogeneous. While some learners engage deeply with AI-generated summaries and assistance, others either ignore them or rely on them uncritically. The variability in student engagement emphasizes the need for digital literacy support and curricular scaffolding to guide effective use of these tools.

3.2 Embedding in Productivity Tools and Workflow Applications

Beyond educational platforms per se, ChatGPT has also been embedded into mainstream productivity tools that form the backbone of academic work [41]. Microsoft's integration of GPT-4 into its Office suite (Word, Excel, Outlook) via "Copilot" functionalities represents a paradigmatic example. These features allow users to generate, edit, summarize, or rephrase text; extract insights from documents; and automate routine correspondence—all within the user's existing workflow.

For students, this has transformed how assignments, reports, and communication are approached. Instead of externalizing the use of ChatGPT (e.g., by copying and pasting content into a web interface), learners can now invoke generative assistance within the same environment where they write essays or create slides [42]. The frictionless nature of this embedding increases usage and subtly normalizes AI co-authorship in academic production.

For instructors, similar tools have been adopted for drafting syllabi, formulating announcements, responding to student inquiries, or developing feedback templates [43]. In administrative contexts, they support agenda writing, email correspondence, and documentation generation—enhancing institutional productivity but also raising new questions about the boundary between human and machine authorship in academic communication [44].

The implication of this trend is significant: as ChatGPT becomes a layer embedded into the productivity software that undergirds modern education, its presence is no longer contingent on user intent [45]. It becomes infrastructural—always available, always suggested, and increasingly integrated into cognitive labor. This infrastructuralization necessitates a reevaluation of the epistemic status of work produced within these environments. What constitutes student authorship when AI drafts are the first point of contact? What are the implications for assessment validity, originality checking, and academic honesty policies?

3.3 Purpose-Built Educational Tools Powered by GPT Models

In addition to platform-level integrations, the educational market has seen a proliferation of purpose-built tools explicitly designed around GPT-powered interaction [46]. These include AI tutors, writing assistants, code generation platforms, debate simulators, and language learning bots, many of which are tailored to specific age groups, disciplines, or learning styles.

Notable examples include:

- Khanmigo (from Khan Academy) [47], which uses GPT-4 to serve as a Socratic tutor guiding students through math and science concepts;

- GrammarlyGO [48], which provides advanced writing suggestions and contextual tone adjustments for academic writing;
- GitHub Copilot for Education [49], supporting code completion, debugging, and software engineering tutorials;
- Elsa Speak [50], using GPT-based feedback to support real-time spoken language assessment.

These tools differ from general-purpose interfaces by embedding GPT capabilities within structured pedagogical designs—with defined learning objectives, content boundaries, and user progression pathways [51]. As a result, they offer a hybrid model: the generative fluency of ChatGPT is bounded by instructional frameworks that reduce the risks of hallucination, misalignment, or misuse.

From a computer science perspective, this represents a shift from unbounded prompt-response dynamics to fine-tuned interaction models, where the GPT architecture is modulated by curated datasets, pre-specified system prompts, or reinforcement learning protocols aligned with educational outcomes [52].

However, these purpose-built systems also introduce challenges. First, their proprietary nature makes it difficult for educators to inspect or critique the underlying model behavior. Second, many of these tools collect granular data on user interactions to optimize personalization—raising questions about data privacy, surveillance, and algorithmic transparency. Finally, the pedagogical validity of such tools often depends on how well their designers understand both AI capabilities and learning science—an alignment not always guaranteed in fast-moving EdTech startups.

3.4 API-Driven Innovation by Educators and Institutions

An important but less visible dimension of ChatGPT's embedding in education has been the development of custom GPT applications by educators, instructional designers, and institutional IT teams [41, 53]. OpenAI's release of API access and, later, GPT custom instructions and fine-tuning capabilities enabled the creation of localized, domain-specific, and policy-compliant educational agents.

Examples include:

- Department-specific writing tutors trained on institutional style guides;
- Interactive ethics simulations using GPT role-play capabilities;
- Course-specific Q&A bots trained on lecture slides, reading materials, and discussion posts;
- GPT-powered academic advising systems for navigating course registration, degree requirements, or career options.

These innovations reflect an important trend: rather than relying solely on commercial implementations, educators are increasingly customizing ChatGPT to reflect their pedagogical contexts, disciplinary expectations, and institutional norms. This decentralization of AI design in education has been facilitated by tools such as OpenAI's GPT Builder, LangChain, and Hugging Face pipelines, which allow technically literate educators to create bespoke models with modest programming expertise [54].

From a pedagogical perspective, this marks a shift toward co-design paradigms—where instructors are not merely users of AI tools but active participants in shaping how

AI mediates learning. It also supports institutional sovereignty, enabling schools and universities to retain control over how AI is deployed, what data it accesses, and how it aligns with academic values.

Nonetheless, these applications raise concerns regarding governance, quality assurance, and maintenance. Custom GPTs, while flexible, may propagate errors, reflect the biases of their designers, or require constant updating as curricula evolve. Their deployment also assumes a level of technical infrastructure and staff support not available in all educational institutions—exacerbating the digital divide between well-resourced and under-resourced settings.

3.5 System-Level Implications and Educational Infrastructure

As ChatGPT becomes increasingly embedded across the educational technology landscape, it is essential to consider the system-level implications of this transformation. These go beyond individual tool usage and speak to the restructuring of educational infrastructure.

First, the widespread embedding of generative AI has implications for interoperability and standardization [55]. As different tools adopt GPT models with varying levels of customization, institutions face the challenge of integrating these systems into coherent learning environments. Questions arise about data compatibility, user identity management, and the alignment of AI-generated outputs with accreditation standards.

Second, there is an emerging tension between platformization and pedagogical diversity [56]. Large EdTech vendors tend to offer "one-size-fits-all" solutions that prioritize usability and scale. This may inadvertently narrow the range of pedagogical approaches that can be supported, particularly for disciplines that require interpretive nuance, ethical reflection, or epistemological pluralism.

Third, the infrastructural embedding of GPT models prompts a reconsideration of educational labor [57]. As generative tools assume more of the tasks traditionally performed by educators—feedback provision, content generation, even elements of advising—there is a need to rearticulate the unique human contributions to education. These include mentorship, judgment, empathy, and the curation of meaning in response to learners' lived experiences.

Finally, the technological embedding of ChatGPT necessitates policy development at the institutional and governmental levels [58]. Decisions must be made about AI procurement, responsible use guidelines, accessibility standards, and long-term cost implications. The transition from ad hoc adoption to system-wide embedding demands governance structures capable of balancing innovation with accountability.

4 Core Educational Challenges and Risks

While ChatGPT's integration into education has been marked by notable pedagogical breakthroughs and technological innovations, it has also revealed a host of significant educational challenges and risks that demand critical reflection [15]. As with any dis-

ruptive technology, the widespread use of ChatGPT in learning environments has exposed vulnerabilities in pedagogical design, assessment practices, institutional readiness, and student cognitive development. These risks are not incidental, nor are they merely transitional effects of a new technology's adoption cycle. Rather, they point to structural tensions between the logic of generative AI and the core goals of education—tensions that must be carefully examined if the use of AI in educational settings is to be ethically grounded, pedagogically sound, and socially responsible.

One of the most prominent and widely debated challenges associated with ChatGPT's presence in education is the erosion of academic integrity [7]. As an advanced language model capable of producing grammatically correct and stylistically polished text on virtually any topic, ChatGPT has fundamentally altered the dynamics of student authorship. The line between legitimate assistance and academic dishonesty has become increasingly blurred, particularly in writing-intensive disciplines where students can input a prompt and receive essay-length responses in seconds. Traditional plagiarism detection tools, which rely on matching submitted content to existing sources, are largely ineffective against AI-generated text, which is original in form but unoriginal in origin. As a result, educators have struggled to identify when and how students are using ChatGPT in ways that contravene the principles of independent academic work.

The response to this issue has varied across institutions and regions. Some have implemented bans or strict limitations on the use of generative AI in coursework, often enforced through policy statements and declarations of academic honesty. Others have attempted to redesign assignments to make them less susceptible to AI-based cheating—for example, by incorporating oral presentations, in-class writing tasks, or reflective commentaries on the use of AI. A smaller subset of educators has embraced ChatGPT as a legitimate tool, encouraging its use while focusing assessment on the student's ability to critically evaluate and revise AI-generated outputs. Each of these responses carries its own risks: prohibitive approaches may drive usage underground and cultivate mistrust; permissive approaches may undermine the development of core academic skills; and integrative approaches require significant pedagogical effort and institutional support.

Closely related to the integrity issue is the concern that ChatGPT may contribute to a decline in critical thinking and cognitive effort among students [37]. The model's ability to produce coherent explanations, summaries, and even problem solutions on demand creates an environment in which learners may outsource cognitive tasks to the AI rather than engage with them directly. This phenomenon, sometimes referred to as "cognitive offloading," is not new in the age of digital information, but it is intensified by the fluency and immediacy of ChatGPT's responses. Whereas search engines provide references that require synthesis, ChatGPT offers synthesized content directly—removing not only the need to search, but also the need to integrate. Over time, this may diminish students' ability to independently construct arguments, solve problems, or navigate ambiguity—skills that are central to higher-order learning.

In addition, the accuracy of ChatGPT's responses remains a persistent concern [25]. While the model is often able to produce plausible and well-articulated answers, it is not grounded in real-time factual knowledge or reasoning. It generates content based

on probabilistic associations derived from its training data, which can lead to factual errors, fabricated references, or misleading simplifications—phenomena commonly referred to as "hallucinations." In educational contexts, such errors can have serious consequences. Students relying on ChatGPT for scientific, historical, or technical explanations may inadvertently internalize misconceptions or falsehoods. Educators who use ChatGPT to generate instructional materials may propagate content that appears authoritative but lacks accuracy or depth. The risk is compounded by the model's rhetorical confidence; its outputs are rarely tentative or qualified, even when incorrect. This creates an epistemic hazard: the illusion of knowledge without its substance.

Another critical issue concerns the role of instructors in the AI-augmented classroom [43]. As ChatGPT assumes more of the functions traditionally associated with teaching—such as explaining concepts, providing feedback, or assisting with language use—there is a danger that the relational and interpretive dimensions of education will be devalued. Teaching is not merely the transmission of information; it involves the cultivation of curiosity, the fostering of dialogue, the modeling of critical inquiry, and the ethical formation of learners. These dimensions are difficult, if not impossible, to automate. If educational institutions come to view AI as a cost-saving replacement for instructional labor, particularly in contexts with budgetary constraints or staffing shortages, the quality of education may suffer in subtle but profound ways. The presence of ChatGPT in the classroom should not be seen as a replacement for the teacher's role, but rather as a challenge to rearticulate that role in light of new technological affordances.

Equity and access present additional concerns in the context of ChatGPT's educational deployment [56]. While the base version of ChatGPT has been made available to the public at no cost, more powerful models (such as GPT-4) are subscription-based, and many advanced educational tools built on GPT architecture require paid access. This creates a tiered system in which some students—those with financial resources or institutional support—can access higher-quality AI assistance than others. In low-resource settings, where access to devices, connectivity, or digital literacy is already limited, the introduction of AI tools may exacerbate existing educational inequalities. Furthermore, ChatGPT's performance is optimized for English and performs variably across other languages and dialects, raising issues of linguistic justice in global educational contexts. Students who are not proficient in the model's preferred language or who operate in local pedagogical traditions may find the tool less useful or even alienating.

In addition to access, there are ethical and legal concerns related to data privacy, surveillance, and consent [56]. ChatGPT-based tools, especially those integrated into third-party platforms or institutionally managed systems, may collect, process, and store large volumes of user data. This includes student queries, writing samples, feedback, and behavioral patterns. While these data can be used to personalize learning or improve system performance, they also raise questions about informed consent, data ownership, and the potential for misuse. In educational settings, where power asymmetries are present and participation is often compulsory, the ethical use of data requires stringent oversight and transparency—standards that are not consistently applied across

commercial AI providers. There is a pressing need for educational institutions to develop and enforce robust data governance policies that protect students from undue surveillance and ensure that AI tools comply with privacy regulations such as the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) or equivalent local frameworks.

The introduction of ChatGPT has also highlighted gaps in digital and AI literacy among both students and educators [59]. Effective use of generative AI requires a set of meta-skills that go beyond basic technical proficiency. These include understanding how the model works, recognizing its limitations, crafting effective prompts, evaluating the credibility of outputs, and reflecting on the ethical implications of its use. Without these competencies, users are more likely to rely on the tool uncritically or to misuse it unintentionally. Educational institutions have been slow to incorporate AI literacy into their curricula, leaving many students to learn through trial and error. Likewise, educators vary widely in their familiarity with AI tools, with some adopting them enthusiastically and others expressing skepticism or avoidance. This unevenness in AI literacy creates pedagogical inconsistencies and may disadvantage certain student populations. There is an urgent need for professional development programs, curricular integration, and institutional leadership in fostering AI fluency as a core component of 21st-century education.

Finally, the long-term implications of ChatGPT's normalization in education are still uncertain [3, 60]. There is a risk that the convenience and fluency of AI-generated content may lead to a devaluation of process-oriented learning. When students can generate acceptable outputs quickly and with minimal effort, the motivation to engage deeply with material may wane. This challenges educators to design learning experiences that go beyond the production of correct answers—experiences that emphasize inquiry, iteration, collaboration, and reflection. At the same time, the presence of ChatGPT prompts a broader societal conversation about what it means to be educated in an age of artificial intelligence. If certain forms of knowledge work can be automated, what should learners focus on? What kinds of human capacities should education cultivate? These are not merely pedagogical questions; they are philosophical ones that touch on the purposes of schooling, the nature of expertise, and the future of human agency.

In conclusion, while ChatGPT has introduced considerable pedagogical potential, it has also surfaced profound challenges that educators, institutions, and policymakers must confront. These challenges are multi-dimensional, involving not only technical limitations but also epistemological concerns, ethical dilemmas, and structural inequalities. Addressing them requires more than tool-specific training or reactive policy adjustments; it demands a critical reimagining of how educational systems define learning, assess understanding, and support human development. As the next and final section of this paper will argue, meeting these challenges will require collaborative, interdisciplinary, and values-driven strategies that preserve the integrity of education while embracing the possibilities of technological innovation.

5 Conclusion and Future Outlook

The integration of ChatGPT into education between 2022 and 2025 has been both rapid and consequential, catalyzing a series of pedagogical shifts while simultaneously exposing systemic challenges across the educational spectrum. This paper has critically examined the dual nature of this transformation—highlighting key innovations in personalized tutoring, instructional design, and feedback systems, as well as the technological embedding of ChatGPT into learning management systems and educational applications. At the same time, it has drawn attention to serious concerns regarding academic integrity, overreliance, misinformation, equity, and the erosion of critical thinking. These developments suggest that ChatGPT is neither a temporary novelty nor a uniformly beneficial tool; it is a complex sociotechnical system that mediates new relationships between learners, educators, and knowledge. The central insight from this period is that the value of generative AI in education depends less on the technology itself and more on the pedagogical frameworks, institutional policies, and critical literacies that shape its use.

Looking ahead, the future of ChatGPT in education will be determined not by its technical evolution alone, but by the decisions made by educators, researchers, designers, and policymakers in response to its growing presence. If deployed thoughtfully, ChatGPT can serve as a catalyst for pedagogical renewal—encouraging reflective curriculum design, fostering metacognitive skills, and supporting more inclusive access to learning resources. However, if adopted uncritically, it risks undermining essential dimensions of education, including ethical inquiry, creative struggle, and meaningful human interaction. As generative AI becomes increasingly infrastructural, the educational community must develop coherent strategies that align technological affordances with pedagogical values. This includes investing in AI literacy, designing assessment systems resilient to automation, and preserving the human elements of teaching that no model can replicate. The coming years will not only test the adaptability of educational institutions but also challenge the field to define what it means to learn—and to teach—in an age of artificial intelligence.

References

1. OpenAI. *ChatGPT* (April 13 version) [Large language model]. https://chat.openai.com/chat (accessed May 5, 2025).
2. Pedersen, I.: Generative AI Adoption in Postsecondary Education, AI Hype, and ChatGPT's Launch. *Open/Technol. Educ. Soc. Scholarsh. Assoc. J.* **4**(1), 1–19 (2024). https://doi.org/10.18357/otessaj.2024.4.1.59.
3. Zhong, Y., Lian, J., Huang, H. *et al.* Affordances, constraints, and implications of ChatGPT in education from a social-ecological perspective: A data mining approach. *Educ Inf Technol* (2025). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-13237-2
4. Al-kfairy, M.: Factors Impacting the Adoption and Acceptance of ChatGPT in Educational Settings: A Narrative Review of Empirical Studies. *Appl. Syst. Innov.* **7**(6), 110 (2024). https://doi.org/10.3390/asi7060110

5. Kovari, A.: Explainable AI chatbots towards XAI ChatGPT: A review. *Heliyon* **11**(2), e42077 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2025.e42077
6. Kohnke, L., Moorhouse, B.L., Zou, D.: ChatGPT for Language Teaching and Learning. *RELC J.* **54**(2), 537–550 (2023). https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882231162868
7. Balalle, H., Pannilage, S.: Reassessing academic integrity in the age of AI: A systematic literature review on AI and academic integrity. *Soc. Sci. Humanit. Open* **11**, 101299 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2025.101299
8. An, Y., Yu, J.H. & James, S. Investigating the higher education institutions' guidelines and policies regarding the use of generative AI in teaching, learning, research, and administration. *Int J Educ Technol High Educ* **22**, 10 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-025-00507-3
9. Deng, R., Jiang, M., Yu, X., Lu, Y., Liu, S.: Does ChatGPT enhance student learning? A systematic review and meta-analysis of experimental studies. *Comput. Educ.* **227**, 105224 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2024.105224
10. Jeikner, A.: Saving Writing Classes from Extinction: ChatGPT as Part of the Teaching Pedagogy. In: *Proc. of the 17th Int. Conf. on Computer Supported Education (CSEDU 2025)*, vol. 1, pp. 500–511. SCITEPRESS – Science and Technology Publications, Lda., (2025). https://doi.org/10.5220/0013351000003932
11. Naznin, K., Al Mahmud, A., Nguyen, M.T., Chua, C.: ChatGPT Integration in Higher Education for Personalized Learning, Academic Writing, and Coding Tasks: A Systematic Review. *Computers* **14**(2), 53 (2025). https://doi.org/10.3390/computers14020053
12. Mai, D.T.T., Da, C.V., Hanh, N.V.: The use of ChatGPT in teaching and learning: a systematic review through SWOT analysis approach. *Front. Educ.* **9**, (2024). https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1328769
13. Deng, X.: An Empirical Study on the Application of ChatGPT in Writing Learning for English Major Students. *J. Educ. Res. Policies* **7**(1), 37–41 (2025). https://doi.org/10.53469/jerp.2025.07(01).08
14. Liu, S., Guo, X., Hu, X., Zhao, X.: Advancing Generative Intelligent Tutoring Systems with GPT-4: Design, Evaluation, and a Modular Framework for Future Learning Platforms. *Electronics* **13**(24), 4876 (2024). https://doi.org/10.3390/electronics13244876
15. García-López, I.M., González González, C.S., Ramírez-Montoya, M.S., Molina-Espinosa, J.M.: Challenges of implementing ChatGPT on education: Systematic literature review. *Int. J. Educ. Res. Open* **8**, 100401 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2024.100401
16. Gill, S.S., Xu, M., Patros, P., Wu, H., Kaur, R., Kaur, K., Fuller, S., Singh, M., Arora, P., Parlikad, A.K., Stankovski, V., Abraham, A., Ghosh, S.K., Lutfiyya, H., Kanhere, S.S., Bahsoon, R., Rana, O., Dustdar, S., Sakellariou, R., Uhlig, S., Buyya, R.: Transformative effects of ChatGPT on modern education: Emerging Era of AI Chatbots. *Internet Things Cyber-Phys. Syst.* **4**, 19–23 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iotcps.2023.06.002
17. Jo, H. From concerns to benefits: a comprehensive study of ChatGPT usage in education. *Int J Educ Technol High Educ* **21**, 35 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00471-4
18. Papakostas, C., Troussas, C., Krouska, A., Sgouropoulou, C. (2024). A Rule-Based Chatbot Offering Personalized Guidance in Computer Programming Education. In: Sifaleras, A., Lin, F. (eds) Generative Intelligence and Intelligent Tutoring Systems. ITS 2024. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol 14799. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-63031-6_22
19. Ataş, A.H., Cengiz, B.C., Çelik, B.: Evaluating ChatGPT in Generating Feedback on Content and Organization Components of EFL Compare and Contrast Essays. *Sakarya Univ. J. Educ.* **14**(3), 515–538 (2024). https://doi.org/10.19126/suje.1475474

20. Wang, C. Exploring Students' Generative AI-Assisted Writing Processes: Perceptions and Experiences from Native and Nonnative English Speakers. *Tech Know Learn* (2024). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10758-024-09744-3
21. Troussas, C., Papakostas, C., Krouska, A., Mylonas, P., Sgouropoulou, C.: Evaluating ChatGPT-driven Automated Test Generation for Personalized Programming Education. In: *Proc. of the 2nd Int. Conf. on Foundation and Large Language Models (FLLM 2024)*, pp. 194–200. IEEE, Dubai, United Arab Emirates (2024). https://doi.org/10.1109/FLLM63129.2024.10852510.
22. Troussas, C., Krouska, A., Papakostas, C., Mylonas, P., Sgouropoulou, C.: Assessing the Impact of Integrating ChatGPT as an Advice Generator in Educational Software. In: *Proc. of the 9th South-East Europe Design Automation, Computer Engineering, Computer Networks and Social Media Conf. (SEEDA-CECNSM 2024)*, pp. 127–133. IEEE, Athens, Greece (2024). https://doi.org/10.1109/SEEDA-CECNSM63478.2024.00031
23. Wang, J., Fan, W. The effect of ChatGPT on students' learning performance, learning perception, and higher-order thinking: insights from a meta-analysis. *Humanit Soc Sci Commun* **12**, 621 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-025-04787-y
24. Jalon, J.B., Chua, G.A., Torres, M.L.: ChatGPT as a learning assistant: Its impact on students' learning and experiences. *Int. J. Educ. Math. Sci. Technol. (IJEMST)* **12**(6), 1603–1619 (2024). https://doi.org/10.46328/ijemst.4471
25. Troussas, C., Krouska, A., Mylonas, P., Sgouropoulou, C., Voyiatzis, I.: Fuzzy Memory Networks and Contextual Schemas: Enhancing ChatGPT Responses in a Personalized Educational System. *Computers* **14**(3), 89 (2025). https://doi.org/10.3390/computers14030089
26. Arbulú Ballesteros, M.A., Acosta Enríquez, B.G., Ramos Farroñán, E.V., García Juárez, H.D., Cruz Salinas, L.E., Blas Sánchez, J.E., Arbulú Castillo, J.C., Licapa-Redolfo, G.S., Farfán Chilicaus, G.C.: The Sustainable Integration of AI in Higher Education: Analyzing ChatGPT Acceptance Factors Through an Extended UTAUT2 Framework in Peruvian Universities. *Sustainability* **16**(23), 10707 (2024). https://doi.org/10.3390/su162310707
27. Žáková, K., Urbano, D., Cruz-Correia, R. *et al.* Exploring student and teacher perspectives on ChatGPT's impact in higher education. *Educ Inf Technol* **30**, 649–692 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-13184-y
28. Athanassopoulos, S., Manoli, P., Gouvi, M., Lavidas, K., Komis, V.: The use of ChatGPT as a learning tool to improve foreign language writing in a multilingual and multicultural classroom. *Adv. Mob. Learn. Educ. Res.* **3**(2), 818–824 (2023). https://doi.org/10.25082/AMLER.2023.02.009
29. Costa, K., Mfolo, L.N., Ntsobi, M.P.: Challenges, Benefits and Recommendations for Using Generative Artificial Intelligence in Academic Writing – A case of ChatGPT. OSF Preprints (2024). https://doi.org/10.31222/osf.io/7hr5v
30. Sideris, P., Koliou, M.: The Role of Timely Actionable Student Feedback in Improving Instruction and Student Learning in Engineering Courses. In: *Proc. of the 2020 ASEE Virtual Annu. Conf.*, pp. 1–6. ASEE, Virtual Online (2020). https://doi.org/10.18260/1-2--35368
31. Chen, DL., Aaltonen, K., Lampela, H. *et al.* The Design and Implementation of an Educational Chatbot with Personalized Adaptive Learning Features for Project Management Training. *Tech Know Learn* (2024). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10758-024-09807-5
32. Oates, A., Johnson, D. ChatGPT in the Classroom: Evaluating its Role in Fostering Critical Evaluation Skills. *Int J Artif Intell Educ* (2025). https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-024-00452-8
33. Kindenberg, B.: The Role of AI in Historical Simulation Design: A TPACK Perspective on a French Revolution Simulation Design Experience. *Educ. Sci.* **15**(2), 192 (2025). https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15020192

34. Feng, W.B., Hélie, S., Panchal, J.H. (2025). Using Personas to Increase the Diversity of Design Concepts Generated by Large Language Models. In: Gero, J.S. (eds) Design Computing and Cognition'24. DCC 2024. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-71922-6_5
35. Deep, P.D., Martirosyan, N., Ghosh, N., Rahaman, M.S.: ChatGPT in ESL Higher Education: Enhancing Writing, Engagement, and Learning Outcomes. *Information* **16**(4), 316 (2025). https://doi.org/10.3390/info16040316
36. Zhang, Z.: New Communicative Language Teaching Methods: How ChatGPT is Used in English Teaching and Its Impacts. *J. Educ. Humanit. Soc. Sci.* **32**, 74–78 (2024). https://doi.org/10.54097/c7x09e25
37. Wu, Y.: Critical Thinking Pedagogics Design in an Era of ChatGPT and Other AI Tools — Shifting From Teaching "What" to Teaching "Why" and "How". *J. Educ. Dev.* **8**(1), (2024). https://doi.org/10.20849/jed.v8i1.1404
38. Halachev, P.: Integration of ChatGPT in e-Learning Systems: Comprehensive review. *Period. Eng. Nat. Sci.* **12**(1), 169–182 (2024). https://doi.org/10.21533/pen.v12.i1.28
39. Zhao, M., Kumari, P., Madhavan Perumal, E. *et al.* Developing generative AI functionalities in a social LMS. *Discov Artif Intell* **4**, 99 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1007/s44163-024-00168-7
40. Hatmanto, E.D., Rahmawati, F., Sorohiti, M., Alfatha, B.R.: Exploring the Pedagogical Integration of ChatGPT: Fostering Meaningful Learning Environments and Amplifying Student Engagement in Elementary Education. In: *Proc. of the 5th Int. Conf. on Education for All (ICEDUALL 2024)*, pp. 33–53. Atlantis Press (2025). https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-386-3_4
41. Mohebi, L. Empowering learners with ChatGPT: insights from a systematic literature exploration. *Discov Educ* **3**, 36 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-024-00120-y
42. Johnston, H., et al.: Discovering how students use generative artificial intelligence tools for academic writing purposes. *J. Learn. Dev. High. Educ.* **34** (Preprint), (2025). https://doi.org/10.47408/jldhe.vi34.1301
43. Krouska, A., Troussas, C., Voyiatzis, I., Mylonas, P., Sgouropoulou, C.: ChatGPT-based Recommendations for Personalized Content Creation and Instructional Design with a Tailored Prompt Generator. In: *Proc. of the 2nd Int. Conf. on Foundation and Large Language Models (FLLM 2024)*, pp. 295–299. IEEE, Dubai, United Arab Emirates (2024). https://doi.org/10.1109/FLLM63129.2024.10852487
44. Söllner, M., Arnold, T., Benlian, A. *et al.* ChatGPT and Beyond: Exploring the Responsible Use of Generative AI in the Workplace. *Bus Inf Syst Eng* **67**, 289–303 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1007/s12599-025-00932-8
45. Elbanna, S., Armstrong, L.: Exploring the integration of ChatGPT in education: Adapting for the future. *Manag. Sustain. Arab Rev.* **3**(1), 16–29 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1108/MSAR-03-2023-0016
46. Marquis, Y.A., Oladoyinbo, T.O., Olabanji, S.O., Olaniyi, O.O., Ajayi, S.A.: Proliferation of AI Tools: A Multifaceted Evaluation of User Perceptions and Emerging Trend. *Asian J. Adv. Res. Rep.* **18**(1), 30–55 (2024). https://doi.org/10.9734/ajarr/2024/v18i1596
47. Khan Academy: Khanmigo – AI-powered learning guide. https://www.khanacademy.org/khan-labs (accessed 2025/05/05)
48. Grammarly: GrammarlyGO – Generative AI writing assistance. https://www.grammarly.com/grammarlygo (accessed 2025/05/05)
49. GitHub: GitHub Copilot for Education – AI pair programmer for student learning. https://github.com/features/copilot/education (accessed 2025/05/05)

50. ELSA: ELSA Speak – AI-powered English speaking coach. https://www.elsaspeak.com (accessed 2025/05/05)
51. Shetye, S.: An Evaluation of Khanmigo, a Generative AI Tool, as a Computer-Assisted Language Learning App. *Stud. Appl. Linguist. TESOL* **24**(1), 38–53 (2024). https://doi.org/10.52214/salt.v24i1.12869
52. Matarazzo, A., Torlone, R.: A Survey on Large Language Models with Some Insights on Their Capabilities and Limitations. arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.04040 (2025). https://arxiv.org/abs/2501.04040
53. Troussas, C., Krouska, A., Mylonas, P., Sgouropoulou, C.: Personalized Learner Assistance Through Dynamic Adaptation of Chatbot Using Fuzzy Logic Knowledge Modeling. In: *Proc. of the 18th Int. Workshop on Semantic and Social Media Adaptation & Personalization (SMAP 2023)*, pp. 1–5. IEEE, Limassol, Cyprus (2023). https://doi.org/10.1109/SMAP59435.2023.10255169
54. Elhussein, G., Hasselaar, E., Lutsyshyn, O., Milberg, T., Zahidi, S.: *Shaping the Future of Learning: The Role of AI in Education 4.0*. Insight Report, World Economic Forum (2024). https://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_Shaping_the_Future_of_Learning_2024.pdf
55. Al-Busaidi, A.S., Raman, R., Hughes, L., Albashrawi, M.A., Malik, T., Dwivedi, Y.K., Al-Alawi, T., AlRizeiqi, M., Davies, G., Fenwick, M., Gupta, P., Gurpur, S., Hooda, A., Jurcys, P., Lim, D., Lucchi, N., Misra, T., Raman, R., Shirish, A., Walton, P.: Redefining boundaries in innovation and knowledge domains: Investigating the impact of generative artificial intelligence on copyright and intellectual property rights. *J. Innov. Knowl.* **9**(4), 100630 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2024.100630
56. Adel, A., Ahsan, A., Davison, C.: ChatGPT Promises and Challenges in Education: Computational and Ethical Perspectives. *Educ. Sci.* **14**(8), 814 (2024). https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14080814
57. Alier, M., García-Peñalvo, F.-J., Camba, J.D.: Generative Artificial Intelligence in Education: From Deceptive to Disruptive. *Int. J. Interact. Multimed. Artif. Intell.* **8**(5), 5–14 (2024). https://doi.org/10.9781/ijimai.2024.02.011
58. Stahl, B.C., Eke, D.: The ethics of ChatGPT – Exploring the ethical issues of an emerging technology. *Int. J. Inf. Manag.* **74**, 102700 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2023.102700
59. Al-Abdullatif, A.M., Alsubaie, M.A.: ChatGPT in Learning: Assessing Students' Use Intentions through the Lens of Perceived Value and the Influence of AI Literacy. *Behav. Sci.* **14**(9), 845 (2024). https://doi.org/10.3390/bs14090845
60. Tan, X.: The Impact of ChatGPT on Education and Future Prospects. *Highl. Sci. Eng. Technol.* **61**, 138–143 (2023). https://doi.org/10.54097/hset.v61i.10285