International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation.

Academic Integrity and AI-Dependence of Tertiary Students under College of Education in University of Cabuyao: Basis for School Policy Recommendation

Mary Gwyneth L Secreto [1]*, Marjorie T Bartolome [2], Debrah Marie D Gonzales [3], Hazel Grace E Merciales [4], Zenelly P Vierneza [5]
College of Education in University oF Cabuyao, Philippines

* Corresponding Author: **Mary Gwyneth L Secreto**

Article Info

ISSN (online): 2582-7138
Volume: 06
Issue: 03
May - June 2025
Received: 12-04-2025
Accepted: 14-05-2025
Published: 09-06-2025
Page No: 1853-1864

Abstract
The study investigated the correlation between academic integrity and AI dependence among students from the College of Education at the University of Cabuyao, focusing on behaviors such as cheating, plagiarism, direct source duplication, and paraphrasing. A quantitative descriptive-correlational research design was employed, involving three-hundred-ten (310) selected respondents from first-year to fourth-year levels. The aim was to analyze students' engagement with AI tools in completing academic tasks and examined how this engagement relates to their academic integrity and learning effectiveness. Descriptive correlational statistics were utilized, incorporating a four-point Likert scale, weighted mean, and Pearson correlation to determine the significance of relationships between variables. Findings revealed that a majority of College of Education students demonstrated high levels of AI dependence, often engaging in various forms of academic dishonesty. The correlation between academic integrity and AI dependence in terms of reasoning showed a low correlation, with significant relationship observed in cheating, direct source duplication, and paraphrasing, but not in plagiarism. The analytical aspect, however, showed significant relationship across all variables. In terms of grammar-checking, there was a very low correlation with direct source duplication, indicating minimal association. Similarly, the writing aspect showed a very low correlation with direct source duplication, suggesting no significant relationship. The study underscored the urgent need for comprehensive institutional policies that regulate the ethical use of AI and promote responsible digital behavior. It also highlighted the importance of teacher-led educational frameworks to guide students in maintaining academic integrity. The research recommended the implementation of evidence-based policies aimed at fostering ethical AI usage and upholding academic honesty within higher education institutions.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.54660/.IJMRGE.2025.6.3.1853-1864

Keywords: Academic Integrity, AI-Dependence, Cheating, Plagiarism, Source Paraphrasing, Direct Source Duplication, Reasoning, Analytical, Grammar-checking, Writing Construction

Introduction

The Philippine schools continually adopt the progressive changes introduced and embraced in the education system, particularly the integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI), according to the statement of DepEd Undersecretary and Chief of Staff Atty. Fatima Panontongan (2025) stated that AI should be empowered, not replaced. She encouraged its proper usage and ensure the future that technology amplified human potential rather than diminished it (DepEd, 2025). The rapid development of AI has changed several facets of education, such as academic integrity, assessment methods, and learning strategies.

Although AI-powered tools have many benefits, like increasing the effectiveness of research and writing abilities, they have also raised worries about academic dishonesty and learners' dependence on AI-generated content.

In connection with the integration of AI in academic fields, the issue of academic dishonesty and students' dependence on AI had become part of the modern world. According to DepEd Secretary Sonny Angara (2024), there were many benefits to using AI in the academic field. Still, they were also aware that many irresponsibilities were made by the student, mainly cheating issues, which result in redesigning the existing curriculum under Section 8 of RA 11713 or Excellence Teachers Education that justifies the necessity of the study's output (Marcelo, 2024) [23].

To emphasize the differences of ethical and unethical use of AI tools, the study of Mwita, K. & Mwilong, N. (2025) [28] categorized ethical and unethical uses of AI tools in academic settings. Ethical practices include using AI for brainstorming research ideas, identifying relevant models and theories, reading AI-generated concepts for understanding, and tasks like editing, proofreading, data analysis, and translation. These applications enhance academic productivity and learning outcomes. Conversely, unethical practices involve failing to acknowledge AI assistance, overreliance on AI-generated content without critical evaluation, and using AI to fabricate data. Such behaviors compromise academic integrity and underscore the importance of responsible AI usage as a supplement to, not a substitute for, human effort.

Today's learning mode incorporates technology in various ways, validating that education and technology were inseparable. Technology may provide convenience, efficiency, and accessibility, but the most significant risk lies in utilization. The 21st-century learners who frequently struggle to manage academic demands were the principal adherents of exploiting the proper use of AI tools (Aguilar, 2021) [1].

Due to significant concerns about students' academic performance and integrity in their learning journey, the researchers proposed a standard foundation for students and teachers towards successful guided learning with AI tools. The study's proposal for an AI School Policy aimed to provide a framework that explains guidelines for using AI tools most appropriately. The policy offered multiple advantages for the school and its stakeholders, as the university requires a school policy regarding the adequate use of technology-related tools in the academe.

Principles aimed to help the students comprehend the relevant function of the issue. If the school policy was approved, teachers could observe the assurance of well-managed usage of AI tools, as students' misuse of technology-based tools could have possible consequences. Based on the study made by the Instructure Vice President for Global Strategy Ryan Lufkin (2023), about 46% of the respondents who were either students, teachers, or administrators stated that their institutions had already introduced light guidelines regarding the usage of generative AI, 28% reported that strict guidelines were in place, and the remaining do not have guidelines (Pascual, 2023) [33].

Considering these concerns, educational establishments needed to implement thorough policies and procedures to manage the use of AI in the classroom. Achieving the proposed AI School Policy required highly emphasizing teachers' support for its classroom implementation. Practical teacher assistance was essential for AI instruction. Teachers needed more training, preparation time, and an adaptable curriculum even when AI modules improved their expertise. Utilizing the right tools enabled educators to effectively mentor students in the safe use of AI (Ravi *et al*., 2023) [36]. The findings served as a basis for formulating recommendations for school policies that promote ethical AI integration while preserving academic integrity.

Literature

The concept of AI, explained by Ambrosio (2023) [3], which is the simulation of human intelligence in machines designed to think and behave like people, is known as artificial intelligence (AI). Some examples were when AI is used daily in things like Google Maps, social networking, face ID to unlock phones, computers and phone auto-correct, and customer support chatbots.

The discussion of Rebelo (2024) [37] explained that AI chatbots helped popularize artificial intelligence and let users connect with big language models. These chatbots shine at answering questions, reasoning, code authoring, and mathematical computation. However, the question arises that would come with the general acceptance of job losses and dependence on artificial intelligence for cognitive and judgment faculties.

As for Putra *et al*. (2023) [35], ChatGPT is now accessible in educational settings. AI's educational use mirrors advancements in other industries, like academia, healthcare, and research. It is essential to recognize that AI functions to augment, not replace, human researchers. ChatGPT's integration into education mirrors AI's general application in several industries. AI support in research and learning must be recognized rather than diminishing the role of critical thinking

Furthermore, Taylor (2025) [42] inferred that students increasingly use ChatGPT and other AI technologies for schoolwork and found that 26% of teenagers used AI in 2024, which increased from 13% the year before. According to this expanding trend, AI is increasingly playing a significant role in students' academic lives by assisting them with writing and research assignments and improving their acquaintance with emerging technology. It draws attention to how AI increasingly influences how students approach learning and accomplish their schoolwork.

In looking at the positive side of AI tools, the School Division of Meycaueño (2023) [39] explored how AI might improve learning outcomes by providing more individualized education and easier access to resources. On the other hand, Slagg (2024) [40] confirmed that AI in education is growing but remains underused. Although 97% of educational leaders see its potential, only 35% have implemented AI, and 56% of educators actively use it.

The article of The University of Western Australia (2021) [44] categorized the severity of breaches of academic conduct according to the three levels, particularly Level 1 Minor Breach, Level 2 Moderate Breach, and Level 3 Major Breach. In Level 1 (Minor), violations were usually attributed to the inability to understand proper academic conduct or errors. Then, Level 2 (Moderate) violations show a more serious lack of respect for research ethics. Level 3 (Major) offenses include intentional and major breaches of academic integrity. Moreover, Markley's article (2024) [24] showed how fast students use AI tools. According to the survey, an average of 56% of college students have utilized AI for assignments or examinations. Similarly, Nerdynav's study revealed that 43%

of students acknowledged using ChatGPT and that 89% used it for homework, 53% for essays, and 48% for tests taken at home. This extensive use indicates the importance that educational institutions must address the use of these tools in academic environments.

Additionally, the data presented in the study of Joshi (2024) [21] showed an alarming representation of academic integrity in the age of readily available AI tools. An average student spends almost eight minutes editing one page of plagiarized content. Most of the results were that 17% turn in tasks that AI had completed without revisions, 30% rely on it for the majority, and 50% utilize it partly while completing the majority of the work. Students spend considerable time revising work with plagiarism, indicating they were aware of the problem but still engaged.

In terms of direct-duplication issue, Yomiuri Shimbun (2024) [49] stated that academic integrity is seriously happening, and almost 30% of high school and college students who use generative AI have turned to AI-generated content instead of their original work. This finding underscores the ease with which students could misuse these powerful tools and highlights a potential disconnect between the rapid advancement of AI technology and the development of pedagogical strategies to address its implications.

In line with this, ProctorEdu (2022) [34] highlighted that academic environments were seeing an increase in dishonest paraphrasing, in which students neglect to cite their sources. The result infers that 36% of students paraphrase without giving due credit, which adds to the more significant issue of academic dishonesty as it misrepresents the work of others and impedes students' growth in research and writing abilities, thus compromising academic integrity.

In defining AI dependence, on the research of Huang *et al*. (2024) [20] defined AI dependence as excessive use of AI technologies that could result in relying too much on tools and an addictive trend, which could have adverse effects such as interpersonal issues and mental health distress. Technology dependence links to a variety of adverse outcomes, such as sleep issues, poor task performance, physical pain, mental health issues, and a disruption of relationships in real life.

Marshall (2023) [25] proposed a classification system that defines varying levels of reliance on artificial intelligence, ranging from near-total dependence to minimal and unintentional. When AI systems were the primary factors, the term "AI-generated" (90% AI dependent) indicates a situation of almost total dependency. Although human input is still essential, "AI-assisted" (50%-90% AI dependent) indicates a strong dependence, with AI playing a large part in task completion. The term "AI-enhanced" (10%-49% AI dependent) refers to a more limited use of AI, which users employ to enhance human capabilities. Finally, "AI-lite" (10% AI dependent) describes scenarios where AI is used minimally, often without conscious awareness, highlighting the prevalent yet sometimes subtle influence of these technologies

As emphasized by Goteka (2024) [17], engaging the student in an excessive AI solution for the problem stunt the provision of critical thinking and independent learning development skills in the learner. It would deny students the chance to solve problems, learn to think logically and experience the satisfaction of finding a solution independently. Thus, by recognizing the negative implications of AI, this could devise more sophisticated meant of implementing it into K-12 education.

Building on this, Putra *et al*. (2023) [35] stated that they were concerned that reliance on AI may counteract the development of high-order thinking skills, which involve analysis, evaluation, and creation. They collectively agree that an equilibrium must be reached whereby AI should serve as a second resort for instructional guidance instead of being the first line.

In expanding the prior idea, Kelly (2024) [22] pointed out that almost 42% of students utilize AI tools solely for grammar checks in their coursework. Students could increase their writing correctness and efficiency using tools like Grammarly. However, relying too much on grammar checkers could hinder students' ability to grasp grammatical rules and become self-sufficient writers. It might also cause them to write less creatively and critically.

Furthermore, the article Home of Dissertations (2024) [18] inferred that the impact of AI on academic writing skills may neglect to develop their writing abilities, including critical and analytical skills, and learning to express their unique ideas. Additionally, students may be less likely to reflect carefully on the subject, look for fresh viewpoints, or develop original ideas independently when relying solely on AI-generated answers.

In figuring out this issue, the University College Cork (2024) reported that, based on the International Center for Academic Integrity, academic integrity is based on six core values: courage, honesty, responsibility, fairness, respect, and trust. Promoting academic integrity, which emphasizes constructive behavior, provided important incentives for student involvement. A developmental and educational approach that strongly emphasizes academic integrity also highlights the importance of standing behind those words and taking pride in them, as well as the value of skill development and the learning process.

As a result, Fabro *et al*. (2023) [15] believed that the solution of the prior problem was the need for policymakers to create policies and regulations that encourage AI's ethical and responsible application. He noted that they must guarantee fair access to AI resources for every student, irrespective of socio-economic context, and promote collaborations among government bodies, educational organizations, and tech firms to incorporate AI into education.

The National Education Association (2024) also promoted ethical AI integration, placing a significant value on equity, moral application, and teacher participation in decision-making. To avoid student harm and maximize the benefits of AI, NEA President Becky Pringle emphasizes the necessity of professional development and safeguards. These findings imply that ethical standards, appropriate training, and teacher input should be given top priority in AI legislation. Schools need to provide teachers with the skills they need to employ AI efficiently while also allowing for human oversight.

Overall, these studies provide a comprehensive foundation on academic dishonesty, AI dependence, and their implications for cognitive development, ethical behavior, and institutional policy. They also highlight the urgent need for academic institutions to respond through education, monitoring, and policy reform.

Methods

In this study, the researchers utilized a correlational research design, to evaluate the prevalence of academic dishonesty and reliance on Artificial Intelligence (AI) at the University

of Cabuyao. In this approach, data was collected in a setting without altering the environment, ensuring that no manipulation occurred. The objective was to gather data for evaluation of several important aspects, including the integration of AI tools into its teaching methods, which offered a suitable setting for measuring how these tools influence the behavior of students.

This research utilized a simple random sampling technique to allow students from first-year to fourth-year under College of Education to be the study's respondent. Moreover, since respondents generally encountered AI tools, this ensured a more holistic consideration and unbiased selection. This technique helped to obtain high external validity representing the characteristics of the larger population. Along with ensuring a low risk of bias, determining respondents was random regardless of their conveniency (Thomas, 2022) [43]. In selecting the respondents, researchers administered the surveys by sending the instrument through their online group chats.

The main research instrument used in the study was an online survey questionnaire designed by the researchers to gather the necessary data to measure the student's academic integrity and AI dependence. The researchers chose this tool as the study targets 21st-century students currently using AI tools that could provide precise conclusions through the issue of academic deception (Cherry, 2024) [10]. It consists of adapted and modified questions by the researchers that revealed students' frequency level in the issue of academic integrity using AI integration in academic institutions.

Part I and Part II contained the question that distinguished the level of the frequency usage of AI tools while acknowledging academic integrity and AI-dependence in accomplishing educational tasks. In formulating the main questions about academic integrity, the researchers reconstructed the questions about the usage of AI in cheating, plagiarism, replication, and paraphrasing (Capinding, 2024) [8]. The adaptation of the instrument also includes questions regarding the aspects affected by AI dependence (Chan, 2023) [9].

The researchers also considered survey fatigue bias, acquiescence bias and social desirability bias in the construction of the instrument to minimize biases from the responses. The tool was composed of 20-item cap to avoid overwhelming the respondents. As well as using randomized items order to reduce predictability with balance distribution. Lastly, use of neutral words to avoid emotional influence in answering the survey. The modified tool minimized biases using reverse-coded items which scored reversely. The research instrument was also validated by three industry experts in AI, namely a language expert, a pedagogy expert, and an AI expert.

In the data collection, researchers constructed a written consent letter to endorse and ensure the study's approval. The stated letter was designated to the school heads, research advisers, and respondents in the sample population. On the other hand, in analyzing the collected data, the researchers used descriptive correlational statistics to interpret the responses provided by the respondents in the data set. To protect privacy, the researchers applied codes to anonymize respondent identities, and every respondent's data was gathered and kept confidential under Republic Act No. 10173, or the Data Privacy Act of 2012 (DPA),

The study analyzed the data using descriptive correlational statistics, which summarized the responses from the respondents' data set. The statistical procedures used were the weighted mean and four-point Likert scale to calculate the level of students' academic integrity and AI-dependence in using AI-assisted technology. Moreover, the Pearson Product Moment Correlation was used to determine the significant relationship in the level of academic integrity and level of AI-dependence.

Results and Discussion

Table 1: Level of Academic Integrity in Using AI-Assisted Technology in Terms of Cheating

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Level of Academic Integrity in terms of Cheating
I use AI tools to assist in answering online evaluations, tests or assignments.	2.86	High
I search for specific answers using AI tools only when not taking assessments or tests.	2.68	High
I consult AI tools when I struggle to understand unfamiliar questions in my coursework.	3.16	High
Grand Mean	2.90	High

Table 1 showed the level of academic integrity among students in terms of cheating when using AI-assisted technology. The overall result was interpreted as High, with a grand weighted mean of 2.90. Among the three indicators, the highest mean was 3.16 which was observed in the statement, I consult AI tools when I struggle to understand unfamiliar questions in my coursework indicating that students often rely on AI for academic support when facing difficult content, showing an unethical purpose. The findings supported Taylor's (2025) [42] assertion that students were increasingly turning to ChatGPT and other AI technologies to assist with their academic work. In particular, data showed that 26% of teenagers used AI tools in 2024, up from just 13% in the previous year. This upward trend highlighted the growing influence of AI in students' academic lives, particularly in supporting writing and research tasks.

In addition, students reported frequent use of AI tools to complete online evaluations, tests, or assignments, which was also interpreted as High with weighted mean of 2.86, reinforcing concerns about academic dishonesty. In justifying the claim, Markley (2024) [24] provided evidence that students were rapidly integrating these tools into their academic routines, particularly for completing tasks and preparing for exams. Survey results cited in the article revealed that a significant proportion of college students have already used AI for such purposes.

Interestingly, Indicator 2 I use AI to search for specific answers outside of assessment contexts had a slightly lower mean of 2.68 but still fell within the High category. This behavior may reflect more ethical usage, as it involves the application of AI tools for learning or clarification rather than direct academic misconduct. The article Home of Dissertations (2024) [18] provided a potential effect if indicator three was not considered. The paper inferred that an

overreliance on AI tools may hinder students' development of essential academic writing skills such as critical thinking, analysis, and the ability to articulate original ideas.

Table 2: Level of Academic Integrity in Using AI-Assisted Technology in Terms of Plagiarism

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Level of Academic Integrity in terms of Plagiarism
I use AI tools as a reference for my academic writing with proper acknowledgment.	2.86	High
I integrate AI-generated content into my academic work without proper citation.	2.68	High
Grand Mean	2.77	High

Table 2 showed the level of academic integrity in terms of paraphrasing was high. The statement I use AI tools as a reference for my academic writing with proper acknowledgment obtained a higher mean of 2.86,, showing that students ethically use AI tools as a basis for their writing while ensuring proper citation. Srivastava (2025) [41] supported this view by emphasizing the importance of understanding and applying proper citation practices when incorporating AI tools in higher education.

In contrast, the second indicator contradicted the prior statement by revealing that students highly integrate generated content from AI tools in their coursework without proper acknowledgment with weighted mean of 2.68. This suggested a divided approach, where some students unethically use AI tools as a guide, while others rely on them with less honest intentions. In supporting this claim, Eaton (2023) [14] asserted that academic dishonesty, particularly plagiarism, could lead to serious repercussions when students misuse AI tools to complete assignments. They no longer absorb the material and assist reluctant writers in producing preliminary texts for changes.

Table 3: Level of Academic Integrity in Using AI-Assisted Technology in Terms of Direct Source Duplication

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Level of Academic Integrity in terms of Direct Source Duplication
I generate content on complex topics using AI tools instead of writing independently.	2.62	High
I avoid replicating AI tools generated-content on my academic works.	3.01	High
I use AI tools to extract information from sources and present it as my own.	2.21	High
Grand Mean	2.61	High

As shown in Table 3, the data revealed the respondents' level of academic integrity in terms of direct source duplication. Out of the three listed indicators, the claim I avoid replicating AI tools generated content on my academic works attained the highest mean of 3.01, pointing out that students refrain from copying AI-generated content, emphasizing their ethical purpose of using AI tools. In line with the findings, Nelson *et al*. (2024) [31] concurred that using ChatGPT to write and copy content for academic papers constitutes academic dishonesty. A range of 23.2%, when asked about the consequences of utilizing AI dishonestly in their writing, chose the option that would hinder the growth of their writing skills. This was higher than the risk of being caught and facing academic penalties. This highlighted the notion that the ethical use of AI largely depends on the individual student.

Meanwhile, the remaining two indicators also received relatively high mean scores, presenting an inconsistent response from the previous result. The statement I generate content on complex topics using AI tools instead of writing independently received a mean of 2.62. Supporting these concerns, Niloy *et al*. (2024) [32] identified AI chatbots as a potential threat to academic integrity. He argues that overreliance on these tools could lead to increased content duplication, reduced critical thinking, academic complacency, and diminished memory retention. When students submit AI-generated work as their own, they violate core educational principles.

Then, I use AI tools to extract information from sources and present it as my own scored 2.21. The result inferred that AI content duplication, while many students claim to avoid it, still engages in academically dishonest practices, which raised concerns about the integrity of independent writing. Chan (2023) [9] also acknowledged the rapid advancement of generative AI tools that seriously threaten academic integrity. Students often misuse AI tools by producing essays, research reports, or even entire theses, presenting the AI-generated work as their own. This improper use could change the goal of the learning process from acquiring, applying, and critiquing to simply making the output that may be incorrect.

Table 4: Level of Academic Integrity in Using AI-Assisted Technology in Terms of Source Paraphrasing

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Level of Academic Integrity in terms of Source Paraphrasing
I use AI-powered paraphrasing tools to rephrase sentences in my written work.	3.01	High
I avoid relying on AI paraphrasing tools and instead, rephrase content using my own words.	2.91	High
Grand Mean	2.96	High

As indicated in Table 4, the level of academic integrity in using AI for source paraphrasing showed varied responses. The first indicator received a relatively high mean score of 3.01, suggesting that many students used AI-powered paraphrasing tools to rephrase their work, aiming to refine it an which showed an unacceptable academic conduct. Mukasa *et al*. (2023) [27] reported that more than 36% of undergraduate students paraphrase or copy text without proper attribution,

which undermines academic integrity.

In contrast, another indicator revealed a mean score of 2.91, indicating that some students preferred to practice their paraphrasing skills rather than rely on AI tools. This suggested that while some students depend on AI assistance, others demonstrate the ability to work independently in their academic tasks with integrity. The article of ProctorEdu (2022) [34] emphasized the importance of practicing independent thinking as he observed a rise in dishonest paraphrasing within academic settings, where students often neglect to credit their sources. This behavior exacerbates the larger issue of academic dishonesty as it distorts the contributions of others and impedes students' development of essential research and writing skills.

Table 5: Level of AI-dependence in Using AI-Assisted Technology in Terms of Reasoning/ Logical Aspect

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Level of AI dependence in terms of Reasoning Aspect
I rely on AI tools when I lack knowledge in a specific subject area.	2.92	High
I prioritize my logical reasoning in structuring arguments instead of depending on AI tools.	3.19	High
Grand Mean	3.06	High

Table 5 showed the perspective on students' dependence on AI tools in terms of their reasoning and logical thinking. Overall, the results showed a high level of reliance, with a grand weighted mean of 3.06. Notably, indicator 2, with the highest mean of 3.19, revealed that students typically prioritize their logical thinking rather than solely depending on AI to construct arguments. This implied that students still understand the value of using their cognitive abilities to create convincing arguments despite the accessibility of AI, where the system does not have full control over them. To support the findings, the result that students still value their logic in arguments offered a different perspective from Zhai *et al*. (2024) [50]. The claim was while AI could help with learning, a huge reliance on technology could impede students' ability to think critically and solve problems because they were not as interested in independent analysis and active thinking; the results suggest that students, at least in this aspect, still see the importance of their reasoning.

However, the data on indicator 1 showed that students often turn to AI tools when they feel they lack knowledge on a particular subject with weighted mean of 2.92. In simpler terms, when students face topics they find challenging or difficult to understand, they see AI as a helpful resource to catch up which was considered as unethical. Taylor (2025) [42] highlighted the growing usage of AI tools for school-related work, where there was a tendency to use AI when students lacked knowledge. This draws attention to how AI increasingly influences how students approach learning and accomplish their schoolwork. It certainly made sense that students use AI to fill in knowledge disparities as it becomes more integrated into academic life.

Table 6: Level of Students' AI-dependence in Using AI-Assisted Technology in Terms of Analytical Aspect

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Level of AI dependence in terms of Analytical Aspect
I feel uncertain about using AI tools to analyze complex information.	2.79	High
I use AI tools to evaluate different perspectives on a topic.	2.95	High
I explore deeper meanings of information with the help of AI tools.	3.12	High
Grand Mean	2.95	High

The data in Table 6 presented insights into the student's analytical abilities and their connection to dependence on AI. A high level of AI dependence in this area was shown with a grand mean of 2.95. The statement with the highest mean of 3.12 was when students explored deeper meanings of information with the help of AI tools. The reliance on AI to explore deeper meanings aligned with the Anthropic article, which discussed AI tools and AI's ability to understand complex topics in education, determining that it consistently generated more complex and creative worksheets and more dependable answer keys. It stated that the tool distinguished itself via its accuracy, rapidity, and capacity to comprehend complex educational concepts.

Additionally, AI tools were often used to evaluate different perspectives on a topic with weighted mean of 2.95, which obtained the second highest mean. This suggested that students found AI as a tool to provide an interpretation of an in-depth topics than practiced their own analytical skills which showed reliance. Cabuquin *et al*. (2024) [7], recognized the value of AI in academic research, including idea generation and writing support. Although its capacity to impart knowledge and enhance writing skills was advantageous to students, problems, including erroneous content, accessibility concerns, and plagiarism hazards, still exist.

However, it was important to note that students expressed uncertainty when employing AI tools to analyze complex information with weighted mean of 2.79, which showed an opposing side to the previous findings. Therefore, despite certain doubts, they still believed AI should not much be used in analyzing different viewpoints and gaining a deeper comprehension of the topic or subject matter, prioritizing the essence of ethical use of AI tools. This was connected with Von and Mayer's work (2023), which warned that AI tools could produce flawed or misleading results. They claimed that AI tools could produce false, misleading, unethical, discriminatory, or socially unacceptable results, which could result from existing prejudices during technical development, poor data quality, or inadequate modeling, which made uncritical and unreflective use of AI tools in the field of study & teaching was risky.

Table 7: Level of Students' AI-dependence in Using AI-Assisted Technology in Terms of Grammar-Checking Aspect

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Level of AI dependence in terms of Grammar-Checking Aspect
I use AI tools to check grammar and improve the clarity of my written work.	3.15	High
I use AI tools when I am uncertain about my language structure.	2.98	High
I am confident in producing quality academic work without using AI grammar tools.	2.92	High
Grand Mean	3.02	High

The data in Table 7 examined students' dependence on AI for grammar checking. The grand weighted mean of 3.02 indicated a high level of AI dependence in this area. Students used AI tools primarily to check grammar and enhance the clarity of their written work with weighted mean of 3.15. The common use of AI grammar checkers was related to a study by Agustina and Damanik (2024) [2], which showed that students find these tools useful. By using these resources, students could make their writing accurate and clear. It's a useful tool for improving their work. Although many students find these resources helpful in improving their grammar, some question the recommendations' applicability.

Furthermore, AI tools were frequently used when students were unsure about their language structure with weighted mean of 2.98. This demonstrated how AI had emerged as the most common technique for improving writing but due to its beneficial function, unethical motives became prevalent. Sandy (2024) [38] supported the given outcomes, noting the increased use of AI writing tools due to their easy access. Since most of these tools were available online and were either cheap or free, most students could use them. Students who want to quickly write essays, fix grammatical errors, or even complete entire assignments find AI writing tools incredibly tempting due to their efficiency and simplicity.

Interestingly, students also expressed confidence in their ability to produce quality academic work without AI grammar tools with weighted mean of 2.92. This suggested that despite the function of AI for an immediate grammar assistance, students ethically maintain confidence in their writing abilities. This implied that they still have confidence in their writing skills even though they utilize AI for grammar. To support the significance of the reversed statement in indicator 3, Kelly (2024) [22] noted the possible effects of continual reliance that a lot of students utilize AI just for grammar checks; almost 42% of students utilize AI tools solely for grammar checks in their coursework. Although these tools increase writing accuracy, there was concern that relying too much on them could make it more difficult for students to pick up grammar rules on their own.

Table 8: Level of Students' AI-dependence in Using AI-Assisted Technology in Terms of Writing Construction Aspect

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Level of AI dependence in terms of Writing Construction Aspect
I rely on AI writing tools to generate complete written pieces, such as essays or reflections.	2.43	High
I carefully apply AI tools to refine and enhance my writing while maintaining originality.	3.16	High
Grand Mean	2.80	High

As given in Table 8, the results explored the level of students' AI dependence in the aspect of writing construction. The grand weighted mean of 2.8 indicated a High level of AI dependence. Particularly, learners showed a high tendency to use AI tools carefully to enhance and refine their writing while maintaining originality with weighted mean of 3.16. This highlighted how AI could improve the quality of student writing but ethically considering the balance usage. In the study of Widiati *et al*. (2023) [48], tools such as Quillbot, Wordtune, and Grammarly were determined to cultivate a holistic learning environment and enhance students' overall academic performance. The research revealed an overwhelming consensus among educators regarding the beneficial impact of AI writing tools on improving the clarity and logical coherence of students' writing. The general agreement among educators indicates that these tools were beneficial teaching resources rather than just shortcuts.

However, some students demonstrated a significant dependence on AI writing tools to produce finished written assignments, including essays or reflections with weighted mean of 2.43. This showed how much they depend on AI to provide written material that neglects the value of integrity. According to Nam (2023) [29], millennial students were more likely to use AI tools like ChatGPT for writing tasks, which was consistent with the dependence on AI to produce entire written pieces. However, they were also more likely to view AI use as cheating or plagiarism. This contradictory point of view undoubtedly indicates that there had been increased integration of AI into education.

Table 9: Summary of Test of Relationship Between the Level of Academic Integrity and Level of AI dependence in terms of Reasoning/ Logical Aspect

Variables	Pearson r value	Degree of correlation	*p-value*	DECISION
Cheating	0.20	Low Correlation	0.004	Reject Ho
Plagiarism	0.06	Very Low Correlation	0.13	Failed to reject Ho
Direct Source Duplication	0.33	Low Correlation	0.005	Reject Ho
Source Paraphrasing	0.26	Low Correlation	0.002	Reject Ho

Table 9 presented the summary of the test of the relationship between the level of academic integrity and the level of AI dependence in terms of the reasoning or logical aspect. The results showed that cheating had a Pearson r value of 0.20. indicating a low positive correlation and a p-value of 0.004, which was statistically significant. Thus, the null hypothesis

was rejected, suggesting that there was a substantial relationship between cheating and AI dependence in reasoning tasks. For plagiarism, the Pearson r value was 0.06, showing a very low correlation, and the p-value was 0.13, which was not statistically significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected, and it was concluded that there was no significant relationship between plagiarism and AI dependence in logical reasoning.

Meanwhile, direct source duplication showed a low correlation with a Pearson r of 0.33 and a significant p-value of 0.005, indicating a substantial relationship with AI dependence. Lastly, source paraphrasing had a Pearson r of 0.26 with a p-value of 0.002, also suggested a low but statistically significant correlation, thus confirming a meaningful relationship between this aspect of academic integrity and AI use in reasoning.

Rebelo (2024) [37] explained that generative AI tools were often invoked for reasoning-oriented tasks in answering complex questions, coding, and computation. Convenient access to AI sometimes causes situations of over-reliance, obstructing students' cognitive engagement and critical thinking. In the same way, Torgerson (2024) [45] noted how AI tools could alter the ways of engaging students in digital reasoning tasks and cautioned that such tools could undermine intellectual rigor even when used irresponsibly.

Moreover, Gerlich (2025) [19] also takes the same side that the correlation between AI tool use and critical thinking was strongly negative, suggesting that greater reliance on AI tools is associated with a decline in critical thinking skills. This result is in line with the cognitive offloading theory, which holds that AI reduces the need for users to perform independent problem-solving and strong analytical reasoning. The decreased practice of these skills could result in a long-term decline of critical thinking capabilities, a finding supported by previous studies highlighting the risks of over-reliance on technology for decision-making and information evaluation.

Table 10: Summary of Test of Relationship Between the Level of Academic Integrity and Level of AI dependence in terms of Analytical Aspect

Variables	Pearson r value	Degree of correlation	*p-value*	DECISION
Cheating	0.36	Low Correlation	0.001	Reject Ho
Plagiarism	0.17	Very Low Correlation	0.002	Reject Ho
Direct Source Duplication	0.21	Low Correlation	0.008	Reject Ho
Source Paraphrasing	0.12	Very Low Correlation	0.002	Reject Ho

As shown in Table 10 regarding the relationship between the level of academic integrity and AI dependence in terms of analytical aspect, correlation coefficients vary according to the type of variable. The data showed that cheating had a low positive correlation with a Pearson r value of 0.36 and a p-value of 0.001 which was considered statistically significant where the null hypothesis was rejected, signifying that cheating and AI dependence have a significant relationship in terms of analytical practices. Then, plagiarism with a very low positive correlation with r value of 0.17 and a p-value of 0.002, giving evidence for statistical significance, presenting that even a very little engagement in plagiarism was meaningfully related to the use of AI tools for analytical thinking purposes.

Similarly, direct source copying showed a low positive correlation with r value of 0.21 and a p-value of 0.008, which was also statistically significant. Students who replicate sources probably used AI tools for their analytical activities. Lastly, source paraphrasing had a very low correlation r value of 0.12 with a p-value of 0.002, which was still statistically significant. This highlighted that even retelling AI-generated materials was associated with the levels of AI dependence in analytical processes.

A claim by Basha (2024) [6] indicated that overdependence on AI tools hindered students' problem-solving and critical thinking skills, crucial components in analytical ability. Cotton *et al*. (2024) [12] similarly warned that while AI enabled access to competing perspectives and organized analysis, it also could obscure comprehension of the extent of information if students omit the cognitive work involved in delving deeply into their learning.

In addition, Putra *et al*. (2023) [35] and McGehee (2024) [26] revealed that AI might increase analytical efficiency but raise ethical issues between them currently being students: substituting authentic analytical experiences for automated output. These issues have also emerged from empirical findings that revealed many students engage in AI use without disclosure, thus indulging in subliminal forms of academic dishonesty (Gonsalves, 2024) [16]. Therefore, the statistical weight of reasoning-related consistency, though labeled “good,” prompts the need for intervention because such tools may cause harm to authentic reasoning activities.

Table 11: Summary of Test of Relationship Between the Level of Academic Integrity and Level of AI dependence in terms of Grammar-Checking Aspect

Variables	Pearson r value	Degree of correlation	*p-value*	DECISION
Cheating	0.21	Low Correlation	0.002	Reject Ho
Plagiarism	0.26	Low Correlation	0.007	Reject Ho
Direct Source Duplication	0.18	Very Low Correlation	0.007	Reject Ho
Source Paraphrasing	0.32	Low Correlation	0.006	Reject Ho

Based on the statistical analysis in Table 11, all four variables, cheating, plagiarism, direct source duplication, and source paraphrasing, exhibited statistically significant relationships with AI dependence in the grammar-checking aspect, as all p-values were less than 0.05, rejecting the null hypothesis. The findings suggested that many students heavily rely on AI grammar-checking tools to improve the clarity, coherence, and grammatical accuracy of their written outputs.

Cheating with r value of 0.21 and p value of 0.002 displayed a low correlation and significant relationship with AI dependence, suggesting that students who frequently use AI

grammar tools might also exhibit tendencies toward dishonest academic behavior. Meanwhile, plagiarism with r value of 0.26 and p value of 0.007 also reflected a low correlation and had a significant relationship with AI dependence, indicating that AI tools were sometimes utilized to refine or rephrase unoriginal content without addressing its academic dishonesty.

On the other hand, direct source duplication with r value of 0.18 and p value of 0.007 showed a very low correlation and the same significant relationship, revealing that AI grammar tools could even assist in presenting directly copied content in a more acceptable format. In contrast, source paraphrasing with r value of 0.32, p value of 0.006 had the same low correlation and relationship among the variables, suggesting that students often depend on AI to paraphrase source texts.

This practice was consistent with Widiati *et al.* (2023) [48], who emphasized that Filipino students viewed these tools as beneficial for improving the quality of academic writing. Likewise, Andre (2025) [4] highlighted that these applications contribute to student performance by offering real-time grammar corrections and stylistic suggestions. However, these results also indicated a growing overdependence, which may limit students' ability to apply grammatical rules independently and hinder authentic learning.

Supporting these findings, Corcuera (2024) [11] and Agustina & Damanik (2024) [2] argued that while AI grammar assistance could enhance technical aspects of writing, foundational grammar skills and critical language understanding remain essential. They recommended reinforcing language instruction to ensure students do not become overly reliant on AI for writing correctness and credibility.

Table 12: Summary of Test of Relationship Between the Level of Academic Integrity and Level of AI dependence in terms of Writing Construction Aspect

Variables	Pearson r value	Degree of correlation	*p-value*	DECISION
Cheating	0.37	Low Correlation	0.008	Reject Ho
Plagiarism	0.51	Moderate Correlation	0.008	Reject Ho
Direct Source Duplication	0.02	Very Low Correlation	0.61	Failed to reject Ho
Source Paraphrasing	0.22	Low Correlation	0.004	Reject Ho

As presented in Table 12, the findings revealed that a significant number of students relied on AI-powered tools for academic writing. Based on the statistical test results, there was a significant relationship between academic integrity and AI dependence in writing construction that rejects the null hypothesis except in direct source duplication. Specifically, cheating with r value of 0.37 and p value of 0.008 and source paraphrasing with r value of 0.22 and p value of 0.004 showed the same low correlations, indicating that students who rely more on AI were more likely to engage in dishonest practices. This supported the claims by Home of Dissertations (2024) [18] and Cotton *et al.* (2024) [12] that overdependence on AI could blur the lines of originality and encourage unethical behaviors.

On the other hand, direct source duplication with r value of 0.02 and p value of 0.61 showed no significant relationship and very low correlation, suggesting students were less likely to copy content to commit to reliance on AI tools directly. However, plagiarism with r value of 0.51 and p value of 0.008 showed a moderate correlation but significant relationship with academic integrity, implying that students use AI to rephrase content instead of writing independently.

Additionally, scholars such as Chan (2023) [9] cautioned that generative AI tools could erode students' authentic writing and thinking abilities, as learners may overly depend on these technologies to complete assignments. AI tools may offer advantages in writing assistance, but their misuse threatens academic integrity. Guided instruction, balanced usage, and institutional safeguards were necessary to ensure AI serves as a support, not a substitute, for students' original thinking and ethical writing.

Researchers' Proposed Output

Based on the outcomes of the gathered data, the researchers developed a booklet aimed at providing guidelines among College of Education Students at the University of Cabuyao in recognizing the importance of academic integrity in general academe and proper usage of AI tools. The title of the booklet was "Proposal of AI-demics Integrity (AI) Framework and Guidelines: A Quick Guide for Responsible Use of AI Tools in General Academe at the University of Cabuyao. It includes (1) The University of Cabuyao's Mission, Vision, and Core Values, outlining its guiding principles. (2) An introduction to the issue about AI tools in acknowledging the essence of the proposed policy. (3) The booklet's objectives and policy guidelines. (4) Continuous review and development of the policy about academic integrity. (5) Definition of terms of unfamiliar terminologies for comprehension and clarity. (6) Ethical guidelines for the use of AI in academic activities. (7) Compliance and enforcement of the stakeholders. (8) Sanctions and penalties given based on the committed academic misconduct.

Conclusion

After an in-depth analysis of the data collected, the following were the findings of the study in summarized form.

The result of the study revealed that the majority of College of Education students at the University of Cabuyao were committed to academic deceit in all forms. Moreover, they exhibited a high level of AI dependence, using AI tools in reasoning, analysis, grammar-checking, and writing.

Additionally, The relationship between academic integrity and AI dependence in the reasoning aspect showed a low correlation with significant relationship in cheating, direct source duplication, and paraphrasing but not in plagiarism, which had a very low correlation.

In the analytical aspect, it showed a significant relationship in all variables, while cheating and direct source duplication obtained a low correlation, then plagiarism and source paraphrasing obtained a very low correlation.

There was a very low correlation between academic integrity and AI dependence in terms of the grammar-checking aspect with direct source duplication and the remaining variables indicated a very low correlation. Therefore, there was a significant relationship among all the variables.

In terms of direct source duplication and writing, there is a very low correlation, indicating that there was no significant relationship. Then, the relationship with plagiarism showed a

moderate correlation, while cheating and source paraphrasing signified a low correlation, which implied having an important relationship.

Since there was a low, moderate, and very low correlation between the sub-variables of academic integrity and AI dependence, the suggested school policy booklet focused on all of the sub-variables to reinforce standard guidelines promoting academic integrity among the College of Education at the University of Cabuyao to finally prioritized and considered the key components of academic integrity in the academe. It must promote a culture grounded in courage, honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility to guide students toward ethical academic behavior.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions drawn from this study, the following recommendations were made:

Teachers may adopt the booklet for student assessment to reduce opportunities for AI misuse and see its effectiveness. Teachers could also be trained to recognize AI-generated content and to mentor students in maintaining academic honesty.

School institutions may review and update academic integrity policies to address AI usage specifically. Based on the significant relationships found in the study, institution may clarify acceptable AI tools, provide usage guidelines, and introduce AI-integrity monitoring systems.

School administrators may use the booklet to improve the application of strict and clear instructions regarding the use of AI in their institutions. Additionally, administrators may emphasize responsible innovation and academic integrity to foster a culture of ethical AI use.

Policymakers may implement the policy which incorporates guidelines that addresses the ethical use of AI in education, ensuring equity, accessibility, and quality. These frameworks could be employed for implementing district-level policies and allocate resources to train teachers on how to properly monitor the classroom and use AI tools in their teaching strategies.

Legal experts may validate the proposed school policy to ensure that the provided contents were fair and acceptable in human's right and dignity. They may provide suggestions to enhance and revise the prior policy in a more legally accepted way.

Future researchers may pursue further and more in-depth studies on this topic across different research locales and with various respondents. They could progressively examine the ethical implications of AI in education, including issues related to bias, privacy, and potential academic dishonesty.

References

1. Aguilar M. Academic dishonesty in the Philippines: the case of 21st century learners and teachers. Int J Manag Technol Soc Sci (IJMTS). 2021;6(1):306-13. https://doi.org/10.5281
2. Agustina N, Damanik E. Students' perception of using the AI Grammar Checker application in learning English for high school students. Indones EFL J. 2025;11(1). https://doi.org/10.25134/ieflj.v10i2.10340
3. Ambrosio L. How to Use AI in School Without Cheating: The Line Between Helpful Study Tools and Academic Dishonesty. Penn Foster. 2023. Available from: https://www.pennfoster.edu/blog/is-using-ai-to-write-an-essay-cheating
4. Andre D. Best AI Tools for Students in Philippines [Free & Paid]. All about Ai. 2025. Available from: https://www.allaboutai.com/ph/best-ai-tools/writing/students/#:~:text=In%20the%20quest%20to%20find%20the%20best%20AI,enhance%20the%20depth%20and%20quality%20of%20academic%20work
5. Anthropic case study. MagicSchool transforms K-12 education for 3M teachers with Claude AI. Anthropic case study. Available from: https://www.anthropic.com/customers/magicschool
6. Basha J. The negative impacts of AI tools on students in academic and real-life performance. Int J Soc Sci Commer. 2024;1(3):1-16. https://doi.org/10.51470/IJSSC.2024.01.03.01
7. Cabuquin J, *et al*. The role of ChatGPT on academic research: perspectives from Filipino students across diverse educational levels. Salud Cienc Tecnol Ser Conf. 2024;3:1205. https://doi.org/10.56294/sctconf2024.1205
8. Capinding A. Students' AI Dependency in 3R's: Questionnaire Construction and Validation. Int J Inf Educ Technol. 2024;14(11). https://doi.org/10.18178/ijiet.2024.14.11.2184
9. Chan C. A comprehensive AI policy education framework for university teaching and learning. Int J Educ Technol High Educ. 2023;20(38). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00408-3
10. Cherry K. How Do Cross-Sectional Studies Work? Very Well Mind. 2024. Available from: https://www.verywellmind.com/what-is-a-cross-sectional-study-2794978
11. Corcuera L. Uncovering QuillBot: Filipino Senior High School Students' Experiences and Factors Influencing Its Use in Enhancing Language Writing Skills. Int J Scholars Educ. 2024;7(2):67-81. https://doi.org/10.52134/ueader.1497368
12. Cotton D, *et al*. Chatting and cheating: Ensuring academic integrity in the era of ChatGPT. Innov Educ Teach Int. 2024;61(2):228-39. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2023.2190148
13. Department of Education. Brightening the Future of Philippine Education. Department of Education. 2025. Available from: https://www.deped.gov.ph/2025/01/24/brightening-the-future-of-philippine-education/
14. Eaton S. Artificial intelligence and academic integrity, post-plagiarism. University World News. 2023. Available from: https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20230228133041549
15. Fabro R, *et al*. Perceptions and Extent of Utilization of Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) among Filipino Students. Int J Educ Res. 2024;12(7). Available from: https://ijern.com/journal/2024/July-2024/09.pdf
16. Gonsalves C. Addressing student non-compliance in AI use declarations: Implications for academic integrity and assessment in higher education. Assess Eval High Educ. 2024. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2024.2415654
17. Goteka P. Negative effects of artificial intelligence in education. Mobile Guardian. 2024. Available from: https://www.mobileguardian.com/blog/negative-

effects-of-artificial-intelligence-in-education
18. Home of Dissertations. Writing Skills. Home of Dissertations. 2024. Available from: https://www.dissertationhomework.com/blogs/adverse-effects-of-artificial-intelligence-on-students-academic-skills-raising-awareness
19. Gerlich M. AI Tools in Society: Impacts on Cognitive Offloading and the Future of Critical Thinking. Societies. 2025;15(1). https://doi.org/10.3390/soc15010006
20. Huang S, *et al*. AI Technology panic—is AI Dependence Bad for Mental Health? A Cross-Lagged Panel Model and the Mediating Roles of Motivations for AI Use Among Adolescents. Natl Libr Med. 2024;17:1087–1102. https://doi.org/10.2147/PRBM.S440889
21. Joshi. 30+ Plagiarism Statistics and Facts You Need to Know in 2025. Tech. 2024. Available from: https://learn.g2.com/plagiarism-statistics
22. Kelly R. Survey: 86% of students already use AI in their studies -- campus technology. Campus Technology. 2024. Available from: https://campustechnology.com/articles/2024/08/28/survey-86-of-students-already-use-ai-in-their-studies.aspx
23. Marcelo E. DepEd studying policy on use of AI in schools. PhilStar. 2024. Available from: https://www.philstar.com/headlines/2024/10/26/2395424/deped-studying-policy-use-ai-schools
24. Markley T. The Rise of AI and the Growing Concern of Cheating in Higher Education. Kaltman Law. 2024. Available from: https://www.kaltmanlaw.com/post/ai-cheating-in-higher-education
25. Marshall B. Labeling your AI dependency. Medium. 2023. Available from: https://medium.com/@brandeismarshall/labeling-your-ai-dependency-9828194877a3
26. McGehee N. AI in Education: Student Usage in Online Learning. Michigan Virtual. 2024. Available from: https://michiganvirtual.org/research/publications/ai-in-education-student-usage-in-online-learning/
27. Mukasa J, *et al*. Academic dishonesty by students of bioethics at a tertiary institution in Australia: an exploratory study. Int J Educ Integr. 2023;19(1). https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-023-00124-5
28. Mwita K, Mwilong N. The Use of Artificial Intelligence in Academic Writing: What is Ethical and What is Not. J Digit Learn Educ. 2025;5(1):17-27. https://doi.org/10.52562/jdle.v5i1.1318
29. Nam J. 56% of college students have used AI on assignments or exams. BestColleges.com. 2023. Available from: https://www.bestcolleges.com/research/most-college-students-have-used-ai-survey/
30. National Education Association. Teaching in the age of AI | NEA. 2024. Available from: https://www.nea.org/nea-today/all-news-articles/teaching-age-ai?utm_source=chatgpt.com
31. Nelson A, *et al*. Students' Perceptions of Generative AI Use in Academic Writing. Innov Lang Learn Int Conf. 2024. Available from: https://conference.pixel-online.net/files/ict4ll/ed0017/FP/9587-ICT7002-FP-ICT4LL17.pdf
32. Niloy A, *et al*. AI chatbots: A disguised enemy for academic integrity? Sci Direct. 2024. Available from: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2666374024000785
33. Pascual J. PH schools adopting AI; UP among first in Asia: group. ABS-CBN. 2023. Available from: https://www.abs-cbn.com/business/11/16/23/ph-schools-adopting-ai-up-among-first-in-asia-group
34. ProctorEdu. Academic dishonesty statistics. ProctorEdu. 2022. Available from: https://www.google.com/url?q=https://proctoredu.com/blog/tpost/5dk67zrns1-academic-dishonestystatistics%23:~:text%3DCollege%2520degree/Universities
35. Putra F, *et al*. ChatGPT in the higher education environment: perspectives from the theory of high order thinking skills. J Public Health. 2023;45(4):e840–e841. https://doi.org/10.1093/pubmed/fdad120
36. Ravi P. Understanding Perspectives and Experiences after Deployment of AI Literacy Curriculum in Middle-school Classrooms. ICERI Proc. 2023;1:6875–84. https://doi.org/10.21125/iceri.2023.1716
37. Rebelo M. The best AI productivity tools in 2025. Zapier. 2024. Available from: https://zapier.com/blog/best-ai-productivity-tools/
38. Sandy. The Impact of AI on Academic Writing: Challenges and Solutions for Students. CocoFax Blog. 2024. Available from: https://cocofax.com/blog/the-impact-of-ai-on-academic-writing-challenges-and-solutions-for-students/
39. School Division of Meycaueño. Exploring the Pros and Cons of AI in Education: A Critical Analysis. Govph. 2023. Available from: https://sdo-meycauayan.com/2023/04/13/exploring-the-pros-and-cons-of-ai-in-education-a-critical-analysis/
40. Slagg A. AI in Education in 2024: Educators Express Mixed Feelings on the Technology's Future. Technol Solut Drive Educ. 2024. Available from: https://edtechmagazine.com/k12/article/2024/09/ai-education-2024-educators-express-mixed-feelings-technologys-future-perfcon?amp
41. Srivastava D. Navigating AI in education: challenges, ethics, and the need for comprehensive policies. The Hindu. 2025. Available from: https://www.thehindu.com/education/ai-policies-are-a-must-in-education-to-flesh-out-where-help-ends-and-plagiarism-begins/article69167636.ece
42. Taylor M. What Teens Say They Do and Don't Use ChatGPT For. Parents. 2025. Available from: https://www.parents.com/teens-using-chatgpt-for-school-8778832
43. Thomas L. Simple Random Sampling | Definition, Steps & Examples. Scribbr. 2022. Available from: https://www.scribbr.co.uk/research-methods/simple-random-sampling-method/
44. The University of Western Australia. University policy on: Academic conduct. The University of Western Australia. 2021. Available from: https://www.uwa.edu.au/students/-/media/Project/UWA/UWA/Students/Docs/UWA-Academic-Conduct-Policy.pdf
45. Torgerson D. Gemini: Revolutionizing AI in education. Alludo Learning. 2024. Available from: https://blog.alludolearning.com/gemini-revolutionizing-ai-in-education

46. University College Cork. Academic Integrity. University of College Cork, Ireland. 2024. Available from: https://www.ucc.ie/en/ethical-use-of-generative-ai-toolkit/academic-integrity/
47. Von Garrel J, Mayer J. Artificial Intelligence in studies—use of ChatGPT and AI-based tools among students in Germany. Humanit Soc Sci Commun. 2023;10(1). https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-02304-7
48. Widiati U, *et al*. The impact of AI writing tools on the content and organization of students' writing: EFL teachers' perspective. Cogent Educ. 2023;10(2). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186x.2023.2236469
49. Yomiuri Shimbun. 30% of Students Copy, Paste AI-Generated Answers for Schoolwork; Majority of Students Do Not Know How Fact-Check Answers. Yomiuri.co.jp; The Japan News. 2024. Available from: https://japannews.yomiuri.co.jp/society/general-news/20240915-211275/
50. Zhai C, *et al*. The effects of over-reliance on AI dialogue systems on students' cognitive abilities: a systematic review. Smart Learn Environ. 2024;11(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-024-00316-7