RE-EXAMINING THE FUTURE PROSPECTS OF ARTIFICIAL GDPR AND ChatGPT

Dr. John Y. H. BAI, Dr. Olaf ZAWACKI-RICHTER, Dr. Wolfgang MUSKENS | (2024)

1. Executive Summary

This paper re-examines AI in education futures by analyzing GDPR implications from an e-proctoring case and ChatGPT's impact on assessment, emphasizing student participation in AI integration.

2. Purpose & Research Question

• The purpose is to re-examine and expand previous discussions on AI in education futures by considering two recent events: a GDPR-related e-proctoring case and the release of ChatGPT. *(Explicitly Stated)*

• The rationale is that these events highlight gaps in prior work, raise questions about assessment integrity and data governance, and underscore the need for educational perspectives on AI developments. *(Explicitly Stated)*

• RQ: How do the GDPR e-proctoring case and ChatGPT's capabilities reshape understanding of data governance, assessment purposes, and student roles in AIEd futures? *(Inferred)*

3. Theoretical Framework

• The study uses future-planning methods and strategic scenario development from future management literature, but no explicit theoretical framework is mentioned. *(Explicitly Stated)*

4. Methodology

• The research employs a qualitative, discursive approach, re-examining previous work through analysis of recent events and literature, without new empirical data collection. *(Explicitly Stated)*

• Key techniques include case analysis of the Garante GDPR decision, capability testing of ChatGPT with prompts, and synthesis of academic and policy literature on AI ethics and education. *(Explicitly Stated)*

• Data consists of legal documents, academic papers, media reports, and direct outputs from ChatGPT, with no specific sample or population beyond these sources. *(Explicitly Stated)*

• Analysis involves critical discourse analysis, thematic synthesis of ethical and practical implications, and comparative analysis against previous future scenarios. *(Inferred)*

5. Major Findings & Contributions

• Finding 1: The GDPR e-proctoring case reveals greater legal complexity than previously acknowledged, showing consent issues, data transfer risks, and multiple GDPR violations in AIEd implementations. *(Explicitly Stated)*

• Finding 2: ChatGPT challenges traditional assessment by generating human-like text that evades detection, raising fundamental questions about the purpose of essays and the role of writing in learning. *(Explicitly Stated)*

• Contribution: The paper extends AIEd future scenarios by highlighting the critical importance of active student participation, the risks of adversarial approaches, and the need for multi-stakeholder dialogue involving legal, technical, and educational perspectives. *(Explicitly Stated)*

6. Study Limitations & Gaps

• Limitations include reliance on secondary sources for the GDPR case analysis, lack of direct legal expertise, and absence of new empirical data from educators or students. *(Explicitly Stated)*

• Gaps remain in understanding how different cultural contexts shape AIEd adoption, how students actually use generative AI tools, and what pedagogical models best integrate AI while preserving critical thinking. *(Inferred)*

7. Study Implications

• For Research: Future studies should involve participatory research with students, interdisciplinary collaboration with legal scholars, and exploration of AI's impact on critical thinking and writing practices. *(Explicitly Stated)*

• For Practice/Policy: Educators and institutions should adopt student-centric approaches, build trust rather than surveillance, and develop policies that explicitly value writing as a learning process, not just assessment. *(Explicitly Stated)*