The rapid rise of Generative AI technologies, which has the ability to understand complex and varied human languages and generate structured human-like responses (Lim et al., 2023), such as ChatGPT, has come into the spotlight and arguably sparked a heated debate in higher education. Some have suggested that it should be banned in higher education because Generative AI poses a significant threat to academic integrity and educational development. Whereas it’s true that the presence of Generative AI has the potential on the revolution of the educational form. This essay explores both sides of the debate and makes the claim that Generative AI should not be banned totally, but it needs to be used wisely. By adopting some reasonable approach, higher education can use the power of Generative AI while safe guarding the integrity and quality of academic learning.

There are many reasons why many people insist that AI should be banned. To begin with, the rapid development of generative artificial intelligence is seen as a great challenge to student's academic integrity. After all, quick answers can be obtained through artificial intelligence instead of the human thought process, which is easy to tempt students to take risks and lead to academic misconduct. Eke (2023) believes that students only need to copy the assignment requirements to the AI to solve the problems they are struggling to solve, get important test answers, and get a decent paper. This presents a serious challenge for people to distinguish the originality of the operation. The integrity of academic assessment can hardly be guaranteed. The text given to the user by Generative AI looks adequate, but a careful reading can also reveal its fallacies. For example, Lim et al.(2023) claim that, although the AI answer is superficially plausible, it may contain subtle modifications or distortions of the real information. If students directly use the content submitted by AI, they will fall into information misunderstandings, which will reduce the quality of the education they receive.

Moreover, the potential negative effects of Generative AI do not stop there. It may also make people rely on quick and easy answers, reducing their ability to think deeply and solve complex problems on their own. Chan and Hu (2023) believe that students do not make proper use of AI, and instead of using AI for deep learning, they directly appropriate the content generated by AI. This practice undermines students' ability to develop critical analysis, logical reasoning, and creative problem solving, which are the most basic academic skills that are essential for students to receive high-quality higher education.

Last but not least, the rapid escalation and widespread use of Generative AI has raised ethical and legal concerns for many. Eke (2023) points out that the satisfactoryperformance of artificial intelligence depends on the huge database behind it, which is fundamental to its answer to the question. However, these messages are often personal. AI also has no clear procedures to confirm to users before using information, and the AI industry has not yet formed rules on privacy protection, which will reduce people's trust in AI and not conducive to the formation of a harmonious academic environment.At the same time, the issue of copyright ownership of the content created by artificial intelligence has also entered the public field of vision. Artificial intelligence not only refers to other people's works but also has its own creations when generating content, and its intellectual property boundary is very vague, which is easy to cause controversy (Dai, Liu and Lim, 2023). What’s more, this uncertainty will also create both ethical and legal challenges for the publication of AI works, further disrupting the existing educational environment.

However, many people believe that the Generative AI offers massive advantages in higher education course, and this is not groundless.One of the basic benefits is the ability of Generative AI to improve or even change the learning experience in higher education. For instance, Generative AI can provide personalized learning project. According to Lim et al. (2023), Generative AI can tailor study content to meet individual needs, it also can offer feedback and resources depending on the student's progress and habits on time. This individualized tool helps students to be better engaged in their own learning process and facilitates them to get some sense of achievement from the process. It also enables students to better understand the knowledge they are learning, which make knowledge more accessible and effective for learners.

Moreover, Generative AI can significantly improve some learning ability as a guide. Chan and Hu (2023) highlight that students believe AI will not only improve their ability to innovate but will also enable them to learn to analyse problems from more than one aspect when students have some limitations in thinking, which means that Generative AI will lead to a more dynamic and creative educational environment.

In addition, Generative AI also has the potential to improve the efficiency of educational work. Dai, Liu, and Lim (2023) note that Generative AI can assist with research by quickly processing large datasets. What’s more, Generative AI can make initial drafts of reports and provide help that might take considerable time to finish.If complex and procedural work can be done by Generative AI, the instruction can focus mainly on training students’ critical thinking.

Despite the drawbacks of Generative AI cannot be neglected, it is not the most optimal choice to ban it completely in higher education. A more balanced rule that addresses these issues well while also uses strengths of Generative AI is urgently needed for us todevelop. Firstly, Lim et al. (2023) suggest that complete ban on Generative AI deprives students of access to this powerful learning counsellor. This tool is extremely helpful for students to learn if used in a reasonable manner. Educational institutions should focus on developing clear and sensible rules of use, rather than just banning Generative AI.

Moreover, Eke (2023) argues that threats posed by Generative AI, such as academic integrity issues, can be improved through optimizing assessment methods. For example, educators can undermine the effectiveness of content produced by Generative AI through more in-depth and complex forms of assessment. We can also build courses on critical awareness of Generative AI so that students can be conscious of the limitations of Generative AI.

Finally, setting up firm supervisory structure is an effective way to address the ethical and legal challenges associated with Generative AI use. Dai, Liu and Lim (2023) propose that higher education institutions, policymakers, legal experts and AI developers should work together closely to establish clear regulations that protect privacy, ensure data security, and clarify intellectual property rights.

The argument about whether Generative AI should be banned in higher education depends on the consideration of risk and potential benefits. Though Generative AI pose great threats to academic integrity, educational quality, ethical and legal implication, it still has enormous potential to better experience on learning, improving learning ability and efficiency. Compared to banning the Generative AI completely, It would be better to make AI participate in higher education in a more reasonable way by establishing a comprehensive system of rules.
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