Peer Response

by Fahad Abdallah - Monday, 30 June 2025, 7:06 PM

The post by Ali sheds light on the relevant philosophical and pedagogical issues associated with the integration of GPT-3, particularly, in the context of health care and literature writing. Emphasis on the erroneous moral judgment of GPT-3 and its probable ability to broadcast misinformation is backed by present-day literature. Nevertheless, the other dimension that is worth investigating is the infrastructure and governance issue related to such tools. Jagatheesaperumal et al. (2021) observe that the emergence of AI and big data in industrial and public areas, such as education and healthcare, usually goes far ahead of regulating. This leads to such tools as GPT-3 being released without proper safeguards and ethical boundaries, thereby raising the risk of being abused. An example is that in an absence of mechanisms of monitoring, the model can remain racially or gender biased during its subsequent outputs. The other key to note is the psychological intensity between the user and the technology brought about by the use of AI tools. Alqahtani et al. (2023) also address the issue of large language models in the higher education sector and emphasize that such tools are effective, but they need a variety of restrictions to prevent adverse usage. This is similar to the drooling about academic writing as diluted by too-much-rely-on-AI, which Ali posted. It also supports the necessity of specific training to give students AI literacy to separate support and substitution. Furthermore, Sarker (2022) also emphasizes increasing role of AI on changing decision-making and behaviour within smart systems. Although LLMs are not sentient yet, their output may sound authoritative. This is one of the reasons why the users tend to regard them as neutral professionals as opposed to tools. This misdirected confidence, especially in the medical or the legal field can be disastrous. The need by Ali to ensure innovation with regulation is important. Next time it would be useful to include proposals to audit datasets, enforce transparency into models or add model bias detection to real-time applications.

References

Alqahtani, T., Badreldin, H.A., Alrashed, M., Alshaya, A.I., Alghamdi, S.S., Bin Saleh, K., Alowais, S.A., Alshaya, O.A., Rahman, I., Al Yami, M.S. and Albekairy, A.M. (2023) 'The emergent role of artificial intelligence, natural language processing, and large language models in higher education and research', *Research in Social and Administrative Pharmacy*, 19(8), pp. 1236–1242. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sapharm.2023.04.004 (Accessed: 30 June 2025).

Jagatheesaperumal, S.K., Rahouti, M., Ahmad, K., Al-Fuqaha, A. and Guizani, M. (2021) 'The duo of artificial intelligence and big data for industry 4.0: Applications, techniques, challenges, and future research directions', *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, 9(15), pp.

12861–12885. Available at: https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/9667102 (Accessed: 30 June 2025).

Sarker, I.H. (2022) ‘AI-based modeling: techniques, applications and research issues towards automation, intelligent and smart systems’, *SN Computer Science*, 3(2), p. 158. Available at: https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s42979-022-01043-x (Accessed: 30 June 2025).

Peer Response

by Fahad Abdallah - Monday, 30 June 2025, 6:56 PM

These are some of the key points regarding the impact of GPT-3 on the world of education and educational standards. The author does not go wrong in his identification of the risks originated by the fact of GPT-3 possessing no real understanding. The model is capable of writing human-like text but it does not do it because of understanding but because of statistical guessing (Hutson, 2021). It is not only a constraint but a fatal drawback when the technology is implemented in high-stake settings. It presents threats of academic dishonesty, absence of creativity and weak critical thinking in the academic space. Another significant question that can be considered in detail concerns the impact of GPT-3 on the digital environment that ensures teaching and communication. Van Der Vlist, Helmond and Ferrari (2024) write on the reliance of AI systems such as GPT-3 on centralised clouds with their role in rendering digital resources effectively monopolised via Big Tech. This monopolisation may restrict the level of transparency and auditability which are quite important in the incorporation of these technologies in learning systems. A similar point of view is proposed by Gaševic, Siemens and Sadiq (2023), who state that despite the ability of LLMs to facilitate personalised learning experiences and to automate feedback, such advantages are to be traded in the danger of making the learner less agentic. The education systems must incorporate AI activities in a responsible manner as education must educate students on how to be critical of the AI-produced information and not passively accept it. The issue of bias with language models is reportedly not a bug but rather a systematic problem due to training sets on which they are trained (Ferrara, 2023). Devoid of regulations and morality, such models are capable of reproduction of malicious stereotypes and fallacies, including on academic level. A more robust response would propose certain policy measures, including institutional disclosures of AI use, mandatory audits of citations, and training of students in AI literacy.

References

Ferrara, E. (2023) 'Should chatgpt be biased? Challenges and risks of bias in large language models', *arXiv preprint*. Available at: https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2304.03738 (Accessed: 30 June 2025).

Gašević, D., Siemens, G. and Sadiq, S. (2023) 'Empowering learners for the age of artificial intelligence', *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 4, p. 100130. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2023.100130 (Accessed: 30 June 2025).

Van Der Vlist, F., Helmond, A. and Ferrari, F. (2024) 'Big AI: Cloud infrastructure dependence and the industrialisation of artificial intelligence', *Big Data & Society*, 11(1), p. 20539517241232630. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/20539517241232630 (Accessed: 30 June 2025).

Peer Response

by Fahad Abdallah - Monday, 30 June 2025, 7:01 PM

The post depicts the rational answer to the advantages and risks of using AI writing tools such as GPT-3. Although the automation process is a rewarding time-saving mechanism, the dangers of false information and lack of novelty should prove to be a major concern since it can only be managed by a less chaotic approach. One of the strongest aspects of this post is the part that is devoted to fabricated citations- a problem that has faced most academic writers who give excessive attention to generative tools. One more issue that proves this premise is the idea of the infodemic posed by De Angelis et al. (2023). They discuss the potential of generative AI as a tool to advance the fast transmission of misinformation, particularly when AI technology users believe that output is authoritative because of its professional style. This can seriously undermine the integrity of the student research work in the academic world and the integrity of the scholar. In addition, Saetra, Coeckelbergh and Danaher (2022) claim that ethical systems tend to be lagging behind in such technological advances, which makes the process of governance lag. This delay will give the malpractice a time to blossom without any serious regulation being put in place. The post agrees that the role of humans should not be dismissed, but at the same time, the fortification of ethical borders in the educational systems should be done through its structure. Ahmad et al. (2021) are another work to take into account since they discuss the role of AI in such sectors as education and energy. In their argument, they suggest that although AI increases efficiency, it may generate lower returns in case it replaces human judgment and innovativeness. Applying the same argumentation to the writing tools however proposes a blended approach, where AI can complement, but not substitute the human thinking process.

References

Ahmad, T., Zhang, D., Huang, C., Zhang, H., Dai, N., Song, Y. and Chen, H. (2021) 'Artificial intelligence in sustainable energy industry: Status quo, challenges and opportunities', *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 289, p. 125834. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/348251690_Artificial_Intelligence_in_Sustainable_Energy_Industry_Status_Quo_Challenges_and_Opportunities (Accessed: 30 June 2025).

De Angelis, L., Baglivo, F., Arzilli, G., Privitera, G.P., Ferragina, P., Tozzi, A.E. and Rizzo, C. (2023) 'ChatGPT and the rise of large language models: the new AI-driven infodemic threat in public health', *Frontiers in Public Health*, 11, p. 1166120. Available at: https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2023.1166120 (Accessed: 30 June 2025).

Sætra, H.S., Coeckelbergh, M. and Danaher, J. (2022) 'The AI ethicist's dilemma: fighting Big Tech by supporting Big Tech', *AI and Ethics*, 2(1), pp. 15–27. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-021-00123-7 (Accessed: 30 June 2025).