

Список використаних джерел

1. Попович Н.В. Статеве виховання як педагогічна проблема. Медсестринство. 2019. №1. С.27–30.
2. Денисовець Т.М., Денисовець І.В., Пивовар Н.М., Квак О.В. Дослідження ціннісних установок молоді на шлюб і сімейне життя. Педагогічні науки. №79. 2022. С. 22–27.

DOI 10.70286/ISU-07.01.2026.011

**ETHICAL ASPECTS OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE
USAGE IN HIGHER EDUCATION**

Golub Tetiana

PhD, Associate Professor

Department of English Language for Engineering No 2

National Technical University of Ukraine

“Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute”, Ukraine

The integration of artificial intelligence into higher education represents a fundamental transformation requiring careful ethical navigation. This research has identified core ethical tensions including conflicts between academic integrity and pedagogical innovation, student autonomy and institutional oversight, efficiency and privacy, and equity and access. These tensions resist simple resolution and instead require ongoing negotiation balancing competing values and interests.

Analysis of current institutional approaches reveals that effective AI ethics frameworks move beyond binary prohibition or permission toward contextually differentiated policies grounded in educational principles. The most promising approaches combine clear institutional values with flexibility for disciplinary and pedagogical variation, comprehensive AI literacy education with faculty development support, authentic assessment redesign with transparent governance processes, and equity commitments with evidence-based practice. Institutions that have made progress on AI ethics share common characteristics including leadership commitment, adequate resource allocation, inclusive policy development, and recognition that addressing AI requires sustained effort rather than one-time solutions.

Tsai and Gasevic's (2017) study of student perspectives on learning analytics revealed significant discomfort with pervasive data collection practices, particularly when students lack clear information about what data is collected, how it is analysed, and who has access. Students expressed particular concern about predictive analytics that might limit educational opportunities based on algorithmic assessments of their potential, preferring systems that provide insights and recommendations while preserving student autonomy in decision-making.

Zeide's (2017) legal analysis of student privacy in the AI era examined how existing regulatory frameworks like FERPA (Family Educational Rights and Privacy

Act, 2007) prove inadequate for addressing contemporary data practices. She documented how AI systems often involve third-party vendors with ambiguous data handling practices and potential secondary uses that extend beyond direct educational purposes. Zeide argued for updated privacy legislation that recognizes the distinctive vulnerability of students and the power dynamics inherent in educational data relationships.

Chan's (2023) comparative analysis of institutional AI policies across major universities revealed significant variation in approaches, ranging from outright bans to permissive frameworks requiring only disclosure. He identified common elements in more effective policies including clear definitions of acceptable and unacceptable AI usage, differentiation by discipline and assignment type, educational resources for students and faculty, and regular policy review mechanisms acknowledging AI's rapid evolution. Chan argued that overly rigid policies risk becoming quickly outdated while excessively vague guidelines fail to provide needed clarity.

The work of Bearman and others (2022) on assessment integrity in the age of AI emphasized that effective responses require coordinated action across multiple levels: individual educators redesigning assessments, departments establishing discipline-specific guidelines, institutions creating support structures, and higher education sectors developing shared standards. Their research documented successful case studies of universities implementing comprehensive AI literacy programs, faculty development initiatives, and redesigned assessment strategies that reduce AI-induced integrity risks while preserving valid measurement of student learning.

Understanding diverse stakeholder perspectives is essential for developing legitimate and effective AI ethics frameworks in higher education.

Student Perspectives. Student perspectives on AI ethics reveal several important themes. First, many students perceive significant generational and normative gaps between their own views of AI as a standard productivity tool and institutional perspectives treating AI as an integrity threat. Students who have used AI throughout secondary education or in extracurricular contexts often struggle to understand why academic usage provokes such concern, viewing AI as comparable to calculators or search engines rather than as fundamentally different technologies.

Second, student's express frustration with perceived policy inconsistencies, noting that institutions encourage AI usage in some contexts (such as advising chatbots or career services) while prohibiting it in others (academic work). Students also observe that faculty AI usage for lecture preparation or grading is accepted while student usage for assignment completion is sanctioned, a double standard that undermines policy legitimacy in student eyes.

Third, students report significant anxiety about AI-related academic integrity accusations, particularly given detection tools' unreliability and the high stakes of misconduct findings for academic records and future opportunities. Some students avoid beneficial AI usage out of fear of false accusations, while others feel unfairly disadvantaged compared to peers who use AI and simply don't get caught.

Fourth, students from certain populations express particular concerns about AI ethics. International students and English language learners worry that AI detection

tools disproportionately flag their writing, while students with disabilities question why AI accommodations are permitted for some students but prohibited for others. First-generation college students report less familiarity with AI tools and less confidence about appropriate usage compared to peers from college-educated families.

These student perspectives suggest that effective AI ethics frameworks must take seriously student views about AI as normalized technology, provide clear and consistent institutional messaging, address legitimate concerns about false accusations and inequitable enforcement, and recognize that students approach AI ethics from diverse backgrounds and circumstances requiring differentiated support rather than uniform treatment.

Faculty Perspectives. Faculty perspectives on AI ethics reveal considerable heterogeneity based on disciplinary background, teaching philosophy, technological comfort, and career stage. Several common themes emerge across this diversity.

First, many faculties are unprepared to address AI ethics in their teaching, lacking training in either AI technologies themselves or pedagogical strategies for AI-integrated instruction. This knowledge gap creates anxiety and defensive responses, with some faculty defaulting to prohibition as the safest option given uncertainty about alternatives.

Second, faculty report tension between wanting to prevent academic misconduct and wanting to embrace pedagogical innovation. Educators recognize that AI offers potential learning benefits but fear that permissive policies will be exploited by students seeking to minimize effort. This tension manifests in faculty desire for institutional guidance that provides clear boundaries while allowing disciplinary and pedagogical flexibility.

Third, faculty in different disciplines hold divergent views about AI's implications. Writing instructors often express greatest concern about generative AI's impact on composition pedagogy and the development of students' authentic works. STEM faculty may be more comfortable with AI usage for certain applications like code debugging while remaining concerned about its use for problem-solving that should build foundational understanding. Arts and humanities faculty emphasize the irreplaceable value of human creativity and interpretation, though some see potential for AI to expand creative possibilities.

Fourth, faculty express concerns about workload implications of AI integration. Redesigning courses to be AI-resistant or to productively incorporate AI requires substantial time and effort. Evaluating AI-assisted work may be more complex than assessing traditional assignments. Addressing suspected AI misconduct creates additional administrative burden. Without institutional support through reduced teaching loads, professional development opportunities, or instructional design assistance, many faculties feel overwhelmed by AI-related demands layered onto existing responsibilities.

Fifth, faculty are divided on the question of enforcement responsibility. Some believe individual instructors should handle AI policy and misconduct in their courses, maintaining academic freedom and pedagogical autonomy. Others argue that institution-wide standards are necessary to ensure consistency and fairness, and that

placing enforcement responsibility on individual faculty creates unsustainable burden and potential legal liability.

These faculties perspectives indicate that effective institutional approaches must provide professional development opportunities, offer pedagogical support and instructional design resources, establish clear policies that balance guidance with flexibility, address workload implications of AI integration, and create forums for ongoing dialogue about AI's impact on teaching and learning across disciplines.

Administrative Perspectives. Administrators face distinct pressures in addressing AI ethics, balancing educational values with institutional risk management, competitive positioning, and resource constraints. From a risk management perspective, administrators must consider potential liability for inadequate AI policies, whether from students accused of misconduct based on unreliable detection tools, students harmed by biased algorithms, or failure to protect student data privacy. These concerns create pressure for comprehensive policies and clear procedures, even as administrators recognize that overly bureaucratic approaches may stifle innovation and frustrate faculty and students.

Administrators also face competitive pressures related to institutional positioning. Universities promoting cutting-edge AI integration may attract students and faculty interested in technological innovation, while those emphasizing traditional pedagogies may appeal to stakeholders concerned about educational quality and integrity. Administrators must make strategic choices about how their institution navigates these competing appeals, recognizing that different positioning strategies involve different ethical commitments and resource allocations.

Resource considerations significantly constrain administrative responses to AI ethics. Comprehensive approaches involving AI literacy programs, faculty development, instructional design support, technological infrastructure, and policy development require substantial investment during periods when many institutions face budget pressures. Administrators must prioritize among competing needs, sometimes choosing less resource-intensive AI policies even when more comprehensive approaches might be preferable.

Additionally, administrators must coordinate responses across multiple organizational units including academic affairs, information technology, legal counsel, student affairs, and institutional research. This coordination challenge is compounded by differing priorities and perspectives among these units, with academic leaders emphasizing pedagogical considerations, IT focusing on technological feasibility and security, legal counsel prioritizing risk mitigation, and student affairs concerned with student wellbeing and support.

Administrator perspectives suggest that effective AI ethics frameworks require adequate resource allocation, clear risk assessment and management procedures, strategic vision about the institution's positioning regarding AI, and mechanisms for coordination across organizational units with different but legitimate concerns and priorities.

Thus, to conclude, stakeholder perspectives from students, faculty, and administrators reveal both convergence and divergence in how different groups understand AI ethics challenges. All stakeholders recognize that AI technologies are

transforming higher education, but they differ in their assessments of appropriate responses, tolerance for ambiguity, and priorities among competing concerns. Effective institutional approaches must take seriously these different perspectives, creating spaces for dialogue and negotiation rather than imposing solutions that ignore legitimate stakeholder interests and concerns.

References

1. Tsai, Y.-S., & Gašević, D. (2017). Learning analytics in higher education - challenges and policies: A review of eight learning analytics policies. *ACM International Conference Proceeding Series*, 233–242. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3027385.3027400>.
2. Zeide, E. (2017). The structural consequences of Big Data-Driven education. *Big Data*, 5(2), 164–172. <https://doi.org/10.1089/big.2016.0061>.
3. Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). (2007). *Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics*, 2(1), 101. <https://doi.org/10.1525/jer.2007.2.1.10>.
4. Chan, C. K. Y. (2023). A comprehensive AI policy education framework for university teaching and learning. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 20(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00408-3>.
5. Bearman, M., Ryan, J., & Ajjaw, R. (2022). Discourses of artificial intelligence in higher education: a critical literature review. *Higher Education*, 86(2), 369–385. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-022-00937-2>.
6. ChatGPT, AI, and Academic dishonesty | Cal Poly Humboldt. (n.d.). Cal Poly Humboldt. <https://www.humboldt.edu/dean-students/quicklinks/chatgpt-ai-and-academic-dishonesty>.

DOI 10.70286/ISU-07.01.2026.012

METHODS USED FOR FOREIGN STUDENTS IN TRAINING ENGLISH

Lebedeva Olena

Senior Lecturer

Foreign Languages Department

National University “Odesa Polytechnic”

Odesa, Ukraine

Abstract. The paper deals with presenting the didactic and practical methods of teaching the English language to the Turkish students obtaining their education in one of the Universities of Ukraine. The basic aim is to teach to communicate English not only in different live situations but also in their future professional sphere.

Keywords: visual technique, audio methods, task, oral speech, speech memory.