

Navigating Fairness and Integrity: Exploring AI Regulations in Education

Camryn Toth

School of Information, University of Michigan

SI 410: Ethics and Information Technology

Professors Katie LaPlant and Matthew Bui

April 13, 2025

Abstract

With the advancement of artificial intelligence in education, there are significant opportunities and challenges that polarize educators about its impact on learning. Despite AI's potential for personalizing instruction and increasing efficiency, discourse has focused on academic integrity implications. However, debates in the existing research often overlook the crucial perspectives of students. This study addresses this gap by exploring how student insights can be integrated into policy-making to create supportive and effective educational environments. This mixed-methods study combines surveys of undergraduate students and interviews of aspiring educators to examine students' awareness, attitudes, and experiences with AI in academic settings. By analyzing these findings through the lenses of contractual ethics and care-based ethics, the study reveals that regulatory approaches often designed without student input tend to foster distrust and hinder effective collaboration. By highlighting successful models, such as Oak National Academy and College Unbound, which involve students in co-creating policies, this study underscores the potential for more balanced and ethical integration of AI into education. Ultimately, the study advocates for prioritizing student voices in AI strategy development, positioning AI as a transformative tool rather than contentious.

Introduction

The rapid advancement of artificial intelligence presents both opportunities and challenges in education. While students globally utilize AI's capabilities, educators and institutions have mixed views. Some regard AI as a tool akin to the calculator for enhancing learning (Lieberman, 2024), while others are concerned about its impact on academic integrity and potential plagiarism (Evangelista, 2025). As a result, methods such as AI-resistant

assignments, detection software, and entire bans have been implemented (Lieberman, 2024), yet their effectiveness and trustworthiness are uncertain. This study aims to address the research question: In what ways are student perspectives currently overlooked in AI regulation strategies and how can these insights be better integrated to foster a more supportive environment for AI usage in educational settings? The study will evaluate current strategies and explore alternative solutions that keep pace with AI developments while addressing ethical concerns.

Review of the literature

Varying Perspectives

In exploring how to effectively regulate or incorporate AI in educational settings, scholars have weighed the promising benefits of this innovative technology for students and educators with the potential concerns regarding academic integrity and critical thinking skills. One prominent perspective in this debate is that AI should be embraced for its ability to provide personalized learning experiences, adapt to different learning paces, and “provide immediate feedback to students” (Oriane Pierrès et al., 2024; Iffat Sabir Chaudhry et al., 2023). It can also help educators gain student insights and reduce workloads (Oriane Pierrès et al., 2024; Gecker, 2023). Furthermore, AI’s capacity for idea generation and brainstorming has the potential to enhance student efficiency and provide support in the absence of teacher assistance (Donnell et al., 2024). Broadly speaking, numerous scholars contend that AI has the potential to enable students and teachers to “act in relevant and meaningful ways in the world” (Swindell et al., 2024).

Conversely, other scholars express significant concerns about issues like plagiarism and cheating. Worries often include the usage of tools like ChatGPT to potentially cheat on

“assessment tasks” (Parker et al., 2024). This poses not only a risk to the principles of academic integrity but also to the development of students’ critical thinking skills. Michael Gerlish from SBS Swiss Business School further highlights this, noting that AI reliance is “linked to diminished critical thinking abilities” through “cognitive offloading” (Jackson, 2025). These issues spark an important discourse on how to oversee and regulate students’ use of AI in educational settings, aiming to utilize its benefits while mitigating its potential drawbacks.

Current Solutions

In light of these growing concerns about academic integrity violations, potential for plagiarism, and the impact on critical thinking skills, scholars have proposed various strategies for moving forward. This trend has accelerated with recent AI advancements and the pressing need for immediate solutions to these challenges. Additionally, traditional plagiarism detection methods are inadequate for new technologies like ChatGPT, which generate unique, varied responses with similar content (Lieberman, 2024). Ben Green similarly notes that human oversight often fails to match AI’s pace (Green, 2021). This underscores how AI is progressing in ways that traditional human oversight methods struggle to keep pace with. To address this, some institutions and educators have already begun adopting new practices to tackle this issue.

To start with the most extreme example, some schools have implemented complete bans of platforms like ChatGPT with New York City Public Schools and Los Angeles Unifies, the two largest school districts in the country, leading the way (Lieberman, 2024; Ta & West, 2023). As previously discussed, the most glaring issue with this approach is how easily students can bypass these restrictions by using the banned AI tools outside of the classroom to complete their assignments. Schools also may struggle to keep up with the growing number of generative AI

applications, making a blanket ban of all of them “impractical” (Ta & West, 2023). Moreover, these policies can simply be “band-aid solutions” that distract from the “root causes of inefficacy in our school systems” (Ta & West, 2023). Advocates for AI usage also argue that such methods do a disservice to students and teachers by denying them “potential opportunities” to leverage these technologies for instructional purposes and to enrich “educational experiences” with personalized support, quick feedback, and improved efficiency (Ta & West, 2023; Donnell et al., 2024). These shortcomings highlight the ineffectiveness of imposing blanket bans on AI tools.

Another common method in preventing cheating seen across varying institutions has been the implementation of AI detection software. This approach is on a similar level to bans as it discourages the use of AI tools and sometimes penalizes their use. Nonetheless, such software has been frequently employed to identify AI written assignments and code generated by AI in an attempt to maintain academic integrity. In terms of detecting AI generated code, there has been some success in accurately distinguishing AI from human work. However, challenges remain due to factors like “code complexity and writing style variations” (Wei Hung Pan et al., 2024).

When it comes to AI generated writing, AI detection software still faces “considerable variability” in correctly determining whether text was produced by AI. The accuracy particularly declines when attempting to identify generated by GPT-4 compared to GPT-3.5, highlighting the limits of current detection methods (Elkhatat et al., 2023, p. 14). This illustrates that as AI tools evolve and improve, detection software becomes less and less effective. Detection, particularly “anomaly detection,” has been especially shown to harm minority groups by frequently misidentifying them with high error rates, while “baked” in biases in training data further undermine the effectiveness of this regulatory approach (Barocas, Hardt, & Narayanan, 2023; Selwyn, 2022). Furthermore, given the rapid advancements in AI technologies, detection

technologies are likely to struggle in keeping pace with this “fast-paced world of AI evolution” (Elkhatat et al., 2023, p. 14). These combined issues make the long-term viability of detection software in academic settings questionable and unreliable.

Another approach adopted by educators that some scholars have recommended involves modifying assignments and assessment strategies to be less susceptible to AI generated responses. Edmund De Leon Evangelista from Zayed University specifically suggests designing assessments that emphasize “higher-order cognitive skills” that would require deeper analysis (Evangelista, 2025). This then is a more significant challenge for AI to replicate and produce authentic answers. However, as the Center for Excellence in Teaching, Learning, and Innovation at University of Pennsylvania explains, although some assessment designs are more resistant to AI use, very few are “truly AI-proof” (Assignment Design: Is AI in or Out?, 2024). Moreover, this may lead to an atmosphere of mistrust and damage the relationship between students and educators. Overall, methods focused on punishing and preventing students from using AI are rooted in skepticism about students’ honesty and can damage the trust between students and educators, ultimately negatively impacting academic environments.

Overlooked Perspectives

A recurring issue in the suggestions put forth by scholars and educators on addressing AI’s influence on academic integrity is its impact on the student experience, especially concerning the erosion of trust between students and teachers. The integration of AI tools in classrooms has led to an environment where educators may be more suspicious of students’ work, worried that submissions may not reflect genuine effort or understanding. The responsive restrictions on AI usage and consequential punishments has only further added to this doubtful

environment. Such a climate of mistrust can hinder open communication and collaboration, which are essential for effective learning.

Additionally, students express a strong desire to integrate AI into their studies, seeing it as a tool to enhance learning and prepare them for the future. A poll by the Deliberative Democracy Lab at Stanford University revealed that many students opposed bans and agreed that “using AI in schools will prepare students for the job market” (Verma & Ciesla, 2024). This highlights the need for educational systems to keep pace with technological advancements and integrate AI into the curriculum. Schools must be dynamic, reflecting changes in the outside world. This necessitates continuous re-evaluation of teaching methods and policies. By incorporating student perspectives, educational frameworks can cultivate trust and collaboration, better equipping students to face current and future challenges.

Methodology

To understand these persisting issues further, this study will examine student perspectives on artificial intelligence in education, an area often marginalized in broader discussions on AI integration. The first dataset to analyze this comes from a survey conducted by PhD student Gianina-Maria Petraşcu on 91 undergraduate students to gauge their perceptions of AI’s role in education. The survey included 16 questions of both qualitative and quantitative natures, yet this analysis concentrates on seven questions that directly address students’ awareness, attitudes, and perceived advantages and disadvantages of AI in educational settings (Questions 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 9, and 11). Questions less pertinent to education and student perspectives were excluded to maintain focus on the research objective¹.

¹ The data extracted from this survey is available in the data appendix

The seven target questions' responses were extracted and organized into a table. This setup allowed for easy data sorting and aligned each response with a participant number, enabling cross-question comparisons to be made. For questions two, five, and seven, responses were compared to question one to explore the relationship between perceived information levels and specific attitudes or perceptions. Percentages of responses to questions eight, nine, and eleven were calculated to determine which advantages and disadvantages participants emphasized the most. Finally, each question was analyzed independently for general response trends among participants.

The second dataset derives from a qualitative study conducted by Jiahui Luo, Assistant Professor of Education Policy and Leadership at the University of Hong Kong. This study recruited eleven student participants, primarily aspiring educators, to explore trust dynamics between students and teachers (Jiahui Luo, 2024). The participants were first interviewed one-on-one with a researcher on Zoom to gain background information on their experiences. They were then asked to draw a concept map based on a central theme, "Trust-building between Teachers and Students: The Use of GenAI in Assessment." Finally, followup interviews were conducted with the participants to clarify the content of the participant generated concept maps. This approach that combined interviews with visual data yielded nuanced insights into how students perceive trust, transparency, and ethical responsibility in AI use.

The combined analysis of these two datasets provides a comprehensive view of student perspectives. The survey data captures measurable trends in student attitudes through statistical analysis. Meanwhile, the concept mapping study explores the deeper issues around trust with AI in education. Interpreting the findings through two ethical frameworks further enriches the analysis. First, contractual ethics, which emphasizes principles of fairness, transparency, and

mutual benefit, will be applied to examine the student-teacher relationship in the context of AI use in classrooms. This ensures decisions about AI integration are made with accountability and mutual advantage in mind. Second, care-based ethics highlights the significance of relationships and well-being, emphasizing environments built on trust. This framework will help assess the impact of AI policies and regulations on student well-being and student-teacher interactions. By using these ethical lenses, the analysis collectively investigates not only the functional implications of AI, but also its moral alignment with student needs and educational values.

Results

Dataset 1: Student Awareness and Perceptions of AI in Education

The first dataset highlighted important trends in students' awareness and perceptions regarding AI in education. Participants were first asked to rate their level of informedness about artificial intelligence on a scale from one, not informed at all, to ten, extremely informed. In response, 21.98% of participants rated themselves at a four or below, while an equal 21.98% rated themselves an eight or above. Subsequently in the second question, participants were asked where they primarily learned about AI, choosing from options like the internet, books and scientific papers, social media, discussions with family and friends, or indicating that they do not actively seek information. When comparing these responses to the first question, those who cited books and scientific papers reported an average informedness level of 6.81. In contrast, those relying on the other resource options had a lower informedness of 5.41. This suggests the limited reliability of non-scholarly sources in providing comprehensive knowledge and underscores the need for proper education on the topic.

The fifth survey question inquired about participants' emotions when thinking of AI, offering the choices of "curiosity," "fear," "indifference," and "trust." Here, 68.13% of students expressed curiosity, while 13.19% chose fear, 10.99% felt indifferent, and just 7.69% reported trust. Interestingly, those expressing trust felt more informed, with an average informedness score of 6.71, compared to 5.89 for curiosity, 5.08 for fear, and 5.9 for indifference. Furthermore, question seven asked the participants to rate their opinion of how useful AI would be in educational processes on a scale from one, not useful at all, to ten, extremely useful. This revealed that 53.85% rated it at least an eight or higher, while only 12% rated it at a four or below. Those rating AI usefulness as an eight or above had an average informedness of 6.37, while those rating it at a four or below had an average informedness of 4.72. This indicates a positive correlation between being informed about AI and maintaining trust and favorable opinions towards it.

The eighth question then prompted participants to select what they believed was the primary advantage of AI in teaching, presenting four predefined options, including an "Other" choice that received no responses. The first option, assistance with teaching lessons and rapid student feedback, received the highest acknowledgement at 42.39%. The second option, more efficient teacher time management, then was the least chosen at 21.74%. Lastly, the choice of interactive and engaging lessons garnered 35.16%. These results suggest that students primarily value AI for its capabilities in lesson planning and instant feedback.

In question nine, students were prompted to consider AI's primary advantage in learning, with options for personalized lessons, universal access and special needs inclusion, interactive lessons, or other, which was again unfilled. Universal access and inclusion was the favored option by 52.17% of students, emphasizing AI's role in educational accessibility. Personalized

lessons were chosen by 29.35%, and interactive lessons by 17.39%. The last question then focused on potential disadvantages of AI in education, with the highest concern being the deterioration of teacher-student relationships, chosen by 36.96% of participants. When combined with the selection for reduced student-teacher interactions, 61.96% of responses pointed to relationship concerns. Internet addiction followed at 26.09% and potential loss of information rated least concerning at 10.87%. This showcases the value students place on teacher-student engagement in this matter.

Dataset 2: Student-Teacher Trust and AI

The secondary dataset identified four major themes regarding trust-building with teachers, each labeled by student quotes. The first, “I’m scared, so I turned off all AI tools when I do my assignments,” highlighted shared experiences among students unjustly accused of using AI content in their work. Three students admitted using AI detection tools as a precaution, fearing being wrongfully flagged. Many felt vulnerable due to unclear guidelines on AI use, risking crossing “over the line” inadvertently. These regulatory practices clearly influence student experiences by instilling a fear of wrongful accusations.

The second theme, anchored by the quote “If I acknowledge my use of AI, who knows I won’t be penalized in the marking?” focused on the perceived requirement to submit an “AI declaration” with assignments. Trust in professors varied, with concerns that disclosed AI use might be seen as excessive or might place a student “at a disadvantage compared to those who did not use [AI].” One student noted their trust depended on professors’ communication about AI declarations. The student specifically stated that the emphasis on penalties for not

acknowledging AI use reinforced a view of AI as “inherently bad,” undermining trust in their professors.

The third theme, encapsulated by the quote “There is no trust because the professor doesn’t know me as a person,” underscored the importance of personal connections in fostering trust. One student intentionally engaged with professors outside class to build better relationships and hopefully get the “benefit of doubt if her assignment is flagged by the AI detection system.” Other students felt “anonymised” in large classes, with one participant specifically mentioning how some professors barely know their name, thereby making it “easier for them (teachers) to assume the worst of [them].” These accounts indicate that a lack of personal connection heightens student-teacher distrust.

Lastly for the fourth section, captured by the quote “I now have more expectations for the teacher,” discussed the evolving expectations of teachers amid AI advancements. Students expressed a desire for teachers to “demonstrate a sophisticated understanding of AI technologies” to guide them effectively. Some students also expected teachers to integrate AI into assessments to leverage its potential. One student additionally highlighted distrust in the perceived hypocrisy of penalizing AI usage while their teachers themselves used AI. These student perspectives emphasize a desire for AI to be integrated into their education, alongside a call for a more accountable and mutually beneficial environment between students and educators.

Discussion & Conclusions

Analysis of student perspectives along with a review of current regulatory strategies reveal that existing regulations and the perceptions surrounding AI fail to meaningfully improve

student experiences. Future strategies for incorporating AI in education should therefore prioritize student concerns and perspectives to create a more beneficial and accountable learning environment. This requires solutions with a dual focus: educating students about the ethical use of AI while also fostering collaboration between students and teachers. Such approaches better align technological integration with pedagogical needs and student wellbeing.

The Oak National Academy serves as an example of how AI can improve teacher-student relationships (Walton, 2024). The UK government's investment in incorporating AI into the academy's resources has shown positive impacts on teachers' time allocation. By reducing the time spent on lesson planning and administrative tasks, AI has enabled teachers to dedicate more attention to their students, thereby improving their relationship. Incorporating AI in this manner leverages its capabilities to create a more trustworthy and mutually beneficial classroom environment.

Another innovative approach taken by College Unbound was to develop an AI policy collaboratively created by students and faculty. This policy moves away from surveilling student work and instead provides guidance on using AI as a supportive tool while maintaining academic integrity. One student involved expressed pride and confidence in contributing to a policy that emphasizes "transparency and accountability," which she believes is crucial for "fostering a thriving academic community" (College Unbound Announces Groundbreaking Generative AI Policy Crafted by Students, 2023). This initiative reinforces the importance of involving students directly in AI policy making, aligning with the broader need for educational environments that prioritize student perspectives and trust. By empowering students and educators with clear, ethical guidelines, College Unbound's approach exemplifies how collaborative efforts can enhance both the educational experience and the perception of AI in academia.

The findings of this study underscore the urgent need to reframe AI integration from a punitive model to a collaborative one. By centering student perspectives and concerns about trust, transparency, and pedagogical value, institutions can develop ethical frameworks that balance academic integrity with technological innovation. Models like Oak National Academy and College Unbound demonstrate that when AI policies are co-created with students and grounded in contractual and care-based ethics, they foster environments where AI enhances rather than undermines learning relationships. Moving forward, educational stakeholders must prioritize transparent guidelines, AI literacy training, and flexible implementation strategies tailored to disciplinary needs. Such an approach not only addresses current tensions, but positions AI as a transformative tool for equitable, future-ready education.

Reference List

Assignment Design: Is AI In or Out? (2024, March 20). Center for Excellence in Teaching, Learning and Innovation.

<https://cetli.upenn.edu/resources/generative-ai/assignment-design-is-ai-in-or-out/>

College Unbound Announces Groundbreaking Generative AI Policy Crafted by Students. (2023).

Collegeunbound.edu. <https://www.collegeunbound.edu/apps/news/article/1911138>

Donnell, F. O., Porter, M., & Fitzgerald, D. S. (2024). The Role of Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education. *Irish Journal of Technology Enhanced Learning*, 8(1).

<https://doi.org/10.22554/szwjfy54>

Elkhatat, A. M., Elsaid, K., & Al-Meer, S. (2023). Evaluating the efficacy of AI content detection tools in differentiating between human and AI-generated text. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 19(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-023-00140-5>

Evangelista, E. D. L. (2025). Ensuring academic integrity in the age of ChatGPT: Rethinking exam design, assessment strategies, and ethical AI policies in higher education.

Contemporary Educational Technology, 17(1), ep559.

<https://doi.org/10.30935/cedtech/15775>

Gecker, J. (2023, February 14). *Amid ChatGPT outcry, some teachers are inviting AI to class*. AP NEWS.

<https://apnews.com/article/chatgpt-ai-use-school-essay-7bc171932ff9b994e04f6eaefc09319f>

Green, B. (2021). The Flaws of Policies Requiring Human Oversight of Government Algorithms. SSRN Electronic Journal. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3921216>

Iffat Sabir Chaudhry, Sarwary, A. M., Ghaleb, & Habib Chabchoub. (2023). Time to Revisit Existing Student's Performance Evaluation Approach in Higher Education Sector in a New Era of ChatGPT — A Case Study. *Cogent Education*, 10(1).

<https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186x.2023.2210461>

Introduction. Barocas, Hardt, Narayanan. *Fairness and Machine Learning: Limitations and Opportunities*. MIT Press, 2023.

Jackson, J. (2025, January 13). *Increased AI use linked to eroding critical thinking skills*.

Phys.org. <https://phys.org/news/2025-01-ai-linked-eroding-critical-skills.html>

Jiahui Luo. (2024). How does GenAI affect trust in teacher-student relationships? Insights from students' assessment experiences. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 1–16.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2024.2341005>

- Lieberman, G. (2024). The Use and Detection of AI-Based Tools in Higher Education. *Journal of Instructional Research*. <https://doi.org/10.9743/jir.2024.13.4>
- Oriane Pierrès, Christen, M., Schmitt-Koopmann, F., & Alireza Darvishy. (2024). Could The Use Of AI In Higher Education Hinder Students With Disabilities? A Scoping Review. *IEEE Access*, 12, 1–1. <https://doi.org/10.1109/access.2024.3365368>
- Parker, L., Sokkar, A., Karakas, A., Carter, C., & Loper, J. (2024). Graduate Instructors Navigating the AI Frontier: The Role of ChatGPT in Higher Education. *Computers and Education Open*, 6, 100166. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeo.2024.100166>
- Selwyn, N. (2022). The Future of AI and education: Some Cautionary Notes. *European Journal of Education*, 57(4). <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12532>
- Swindell, A., Greeley, L., Farag, A., & Verdone, B. (2024). Against Artificial Education: Towards an Ethical Framework for Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) Use in Education. *Online Learning*, 28(2). <https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v28i2.4438>
- Ta, R., & West, D. (2023, August 7). *Should schools ban or integrate generative AI in the classroom?* Brookings; The Brookings Institution.
<https://www.brookings.edu/articles/should-schools-ban-or-integrate-generative-ai-in-the-classroom/>

Walton, M. (2024, September 12). AI for Learning: Oak National Academy. Substack.com; Product For Learning.

<https://productforlearning.substack.com/p/ai-for-learning-oak-national-academy>

Wei Hung Pan, Ming Jie Chok, Leong, J., Yung Xin Shin, Yeong Shian Poon, Yang, Z., Chun Yong Chong, Lo, D., & Mei Kuan Lim. (2024). Assessing AI Detectors in Identifying AI-Generated Code: Implications for Education. *ArXiv (Cornell University)*.

<https://doi.org/10.1145/3639474.3640068>

Verma, S., & Ciesla, E. J. (2024, September). Fact sheet: Artificial intelligence in education. California School Boards Association.

<https://www.csba.org/-/media/CSBA/Files/GovernanceResources/AI/Fact-Sheet-AI-Education-2024.ashx?la=en&rev=0707b4b16f10485794564ae0c2f99bcb>

Data Appendix

Dataset 1: Student Awareness and Perceptions of AI in Education

ID	Q1 AI knowledge	Q2 AI sources	Q241 Internet	Q242 Books/Papers	Q243 Social media	Q244 Discussions	Q245 NotInformed	Q3 Feelings	Q7 Utility grade	Q8 Advantage, teaching	Q9 Advantage, learning	Q11 Disadvantage, educational process
1	Internet/Books/Scientific papers (physical/online format)		1	1	0	0	0	1	9	9	1	9
2	Internet/Social media		1	0	1	0	0	1	6	2	3	3
3	Internet/Books/Scientific papers (physical/online format)		1	1	0	0	0	1	6	3	3	4
4	Internet/Social media		1	0	1	0	0	1	9	1	2	4
5	Internet		1	0	0	0	0	1	8	3	2	4
6	Internet/Discussions with family/friends		1	0	0	1	0	2	6	1	2	1
7	Books/Scientific papers (physical/online format)/Social media/Discussions with family/friends		0	1	1	1	0	1	10	1	2	3
8	Internet		1	0	0	0	0	1	8	3	3	3
9	Internet/Books/Scientific papers (physical/online format)/Discussions with family/friends		1	1	0	1	0	1	8	3	2	1
10	Internet		1	0	0	0	0	1	7	1	1	1
11	Internet/Discussions with family/friends		1	0	0	1	0	1	10	2	2	3
12	Internet		1	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	2	2
13	Internet/Books/Scientific papers (physical/online format)/Social media		1	1	1	0	0	4	10	3	1	3
14	Books/Scientific papers (physical/online format)		0	1	0	0	0	1	9	1	1	2
15	Internet		1	0	0	0	0	3	10	3	1	4
16	Internet/Books/Scientific papers (physical/online format)		1	1	0	0	0	3	4	2	2	1
17	I don't inform myself about AI		0	0	0	0	1	3	3	1	2	4
18	Internet/Social media		1	0	1	0	0	2	8	1	1	1
19	Internet/Social media/Discussions with family/friends		1	0	1	1	0	1	6	1	1	2
20	Social media		0	0	1	0	0	1	5	1	3	2
21	Internet/Social media		1	0	1	0	0	1	6	1	2	3
22	Internet/Social media/Discussions with family/friends		1	0	1	1	0	3	4	2	2	1
23	Internet/Books/Scientific papers (physical/online format)/Social media/Discussions with family/friends		1	1	1	1	0	1	7	3	1	2
24	Internet		1	0	0	0	0	1	7	3	3	2
25	Internet/Social media/Discussions with family/friends		1	0	1	1	0	1	6	1	2	3
26	Books/Scientific papers (physical/online format)		0	1	0	0	0	1	8	3	1	1
27	Internet/Books/Scientific papers (physical/online format)/Discussions with family/friends		1	1	0	1	0	1	9	3	2	3
28	Internet		1	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	1	2
29	Internet/Social media/Discussions with family/friends		1	0	1	1	0	1	10	3	2	3
30	Internet		1	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	2	1
31	Internet		1	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	1	3
32	Internet		1	0	0	0	0	1	6	2	3	1
33	Books/Scientific papers (physical/online format)		0	1	0	0	0	1	5	1	2	1
34	Internet/Books/Scientific papers (physical/online format)		1	0	0	0	0	1	8	3	2	3
35	Internet/Social media		1	0	1	0	0	1	7	3	2	2
36	Internet		1	0	0	0	0	3	9	3	3	3
37	Internet/Books/Scientific papers (physical/online format)		1	1	0	0	0	1	4	1	2	2
38	Internet/Books/Scientific papers (physical/online format)/Social media/Discussions with family/friends		1	1	1	1	0	1	10	2	2	3
39	Books/Scientific papers (physical/online format)		0	1	0	0	0	2	7	1	2	2
40	Internet/Social media/Discussions with family/friends		1	0	1	1	0	1	8	1	1	3
41	Social media		0	0	1	1	0	1	2	2	2	1
42	Internet/Books/Scientific papers (physical/online format)/Social media		1	1	1	0	0	1	8	1	2	4
43	Internet/Books/Scientific papers (physical/online format)		1	1	0	0	0	1	9	1	2	3
44	Internet		1	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	1	1
45	Internet/Social media/Discussions with family/friends		1	0	1	1	0	1	10	1	2	1
46	Internet/Books/Scientific papers (physical/online format)		1	1	0	0	0	1	10	3	1	1
47	Internet/Social media		1	0	1	0	0	2	9	1	2	1
48	Internet		1	0	0	0	0	4	10	3	1	4
49	Internet/Books/Scientific papers (physical/online format)		1	1	0	0	0	1	10	2	1	4
50	Internet/Social media		1	0	1	0	0	1	8	3	1	1
51	Internet/Social media		1	0	1	0	0	1	8	3	1	1
52	Internet/Books/Scientific papers (physical/online format)/Social media/Discussions with family/friends		1	1	1	1	0	1	5	1	3	1
53	Internet/Social media		1	0	1	0	0	2	6	2	2	2
54	Internet		1	0	0	0	0	4	9	2	2	4
55	Internet		1	0	0	0	0	1	7	1	3	2
56	Internet/Books/Scientific papers (physical/online format)		1	1	0	0	0	1	10	1	2	1
57	Internet		1	0	0	0	0	1	8	3	2	1
58	Internet/Books/Scientific papers (physical/online format)/Social media/Discussions with family/friends		1	1	1	1	0	3	8	1	2	2
59	I don't inform myself about AI		0	0	0	0	1	1	10	1	2	4
60	Internet/Books/Scientific papers (physical/online format)/Social media		1	1	1	0	0	4	10	2	2	2
61	Internet/Books/Scientific papers (physical/online format)/Social media		1	1	1	0	0	1	10	2	2	2
62	Internet/Social media		1	0	1	0	0	1	10	3	1	3
63	Internet/Social media/Discussions with family/friends		1	0	1	1	0	1	9	1	2	3
64	Internet		1	0	0	0	0	1	6	1	2	3
65	Internet/Books/Scientific papers (physical/online format)/Social media		1	1	1	0	0	1	8	1	1	1
66	Internet/Books/Scientific papers (physical/online format)/Social media		1	1	1	0	0	1	3	3	3	1
67	Internet/Books/Scientific papers (physical/online format)/Social media/Discussions with family/friends		1	1	1	1	0	2	8	1	1	1
68	Internet		1	0	0	0	0	2	10	1	1	2
69	Internet		1	0	0	0	0	1	9	3	3	2
70	Internet/Social media		1	0	1	0	0	2	8	1	2	3
71	Internet/Social media		1	0	1	0	0	1	10	3	2	1
72	Internet/Social media		1	0	1	0	0	4	10	3	3	3
73	Internet		1	0	0	0	0	1	10	1	1	1
74	Internet		1	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	2	1
75	I don't inform myself about AI		0	0	0	0	1	3	5	2	2	1
76	Internet		1	0	0	0	0	1	7	2	2	3
77	Internet/Books/Scientific papers (physical/online format)/Social media		1	1	1	0	0	1	10	2	1	2
78	Internet		1	0	0	0	0	1	8	2	3	1
79	I don't inform myself about AI		0	0	0	0	1	3	7	1	2	1
80	Internet/Books/Scientific papers (physical/online format)/Social media		1	1	1	0	0	3	8	3	1	3
81	Internet/Books/Scientific papers (physical/online format)/Social media		1	1	1	0	0	1	8	3	2	3
82	Internet		1	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	2	2
83	Internet/Social media		1	0	1	0	0	1	8	3	1	2
84	Social media		0	0	1	0	0	3	7	2	3	3
85	Internet/Books/Scientific papers (physical/online format)		1	1	0	0	0	1	6	1	3	1
86	I don't inform myself about AI		0	0	0	0	1	2	8	1	2	1
87	Internet		1	0	0	0	0	1	7	2	2	1
88	Internet/Social media		0	0	1	0	0	1	7	3	1	2
89	Books/Scientific papers (physical/online format)		0	1	0	0	0	4	10	1	2	1
90	I don't inform myself about AI		0	0	0	0	1	2	2	2	3	2
91	Discussions with family/friends		0	0	0	1	0	4	2	3	3	4

AI Appendix

Citation: University of Michigan. (2025). U-M GPT [Generative AI model].

<https://www.umich.edu>, 3/24/25

Input: Can you help me find out what keywords to search to find sources related to my research question:

To what extent are current AI regulation methods effective for creating equitable learning spaces and what improvements could be made?

Output: Certainly! To find sources related to your research question on the effectiveness of current AI regulation methods in creating equitable learning spaces, you might consider using the following keywords and phrases:

1. ****AI regulation in education****
2. ****AI and equitable learning****
3. ****Effectiveness of AI regulation****
4. ****Equity in educational technology****
5. ****AI in educational settings****
6. ****Regulating AI for educational equity****
7. ****AI ethics in education****
8. ****Improving AI for equitable education****
9. ****Educational technology policy****
10. ****Bias in AI educational tools****
11. ****Creating equitable learning environments with AI****
12. ****Challenges in AI regulation for education****

13. ****AI governance in schools****

14. ****Ethical AI in learning environments****

15. ****AI impact on educational equality****

Additionally, it might be useful to combine some of these to create more targeted searches, such as "AI regulation effectiveness in education" or "improvements in AI governance for equitable learning."

When searching, consider looking into academic databases like JSTOR, Google Scholar, and university library resources, as well as policy reports from educational and tech organizations. These sources can provide both theoretical insights and practical case studies related to your research question.

Citation: University of Michigan. (2025). U-M GPT [Generative AI model].

<https://www.umich.edu>, 3/28/25

Input: Can you help me find some reliable places to look for datasets relating to AI regulation in educational settings?

Output: Certainly! Finding datasets related to AI regulation in educational settings can be challenging due to the specificity of the topic, but there are several resources where you might find useful data:

1. ****Government and Institutional Portals****:

- ****U.S. Department of Education****: Check their website for datasets and reports that might touch on AI and technology use in education.

- **European Union Open Data Portal**: They may have data related to educational policy and technology.

2. **Research Institutions and Think Tanks**:

- **Pew Research Center**: Known for its data on technology and society, which may include aspects of AI in education.

- **RAND Corporation**: They often publish research on education policy which might include AI topics.

- **JRC Science Hub**: The European Commission's Joint Research Centre offers datasets relevant to technology regulation and education.

3. **Academic Databases and Libraries**:

- **Harvard Dataverse**: A repository of datasets that might include relevant academic research.

- **ICPSR (Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research)**: They provide access to a vast collection of datasets in the social sciences, including education and policy.

4. **Online Dataset Platforms**:

- **Kaggle**: While more frequently used for data science competitions, it sometimes hosts datasets concerning AI and education.

- **Google Dataset Search**: A tool to search across various dataset repositories.

5. **Conference Proceedings and Journals**:

- Keep an eye on recent conferences and journals focusing on AI in education, such as the International Conference on Artificial Intelligence in Education (AIED).

6. **Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and Advocacy Groups**:

- **EDUCAUSE**: An organization that might discuss technology and policy in education settings.

- **OECD iLibrary**: Offers data and analysis about various educational topics, including technology use.

7. **Technology and Policy Think Tanks**:

- **Brookings Institution**: Regularly discusses AI within policy frameworks, including education.

- **Data & Society**: An independent nonprofit research organization focusing on the social implications of data-centric technologies.

When exploring these resources, you may need to adjust your search terms to align with the specific aspects of AI regulation and educational settings you are interested in. Additionally, contacting researchers or institutions directly can sometimes yield access to data not widely published.

Citation: DeepSeek. (2024). DeepSeek Chat (Version 1.0) [Large language model].

<https://www.deepseek.com>

Input: Can you explain to me how I could put comma separated data into a google sheet to have one column each section and each row has one value?

Output: To put this data into a single column in **Google Sheets**, follow these steps:

Method 1: Copy-Paste Directly

1. **Copy** the extracted column data (from above).
2. **Open Google Sheets** (sheets.google.com).
3. **Click on cell `A1`** (or any starting cell).
4. **Paste (Ctrl+V or Cmd+V)**.

- The values will automatically fill into a single column, one per row.

Method 2: Use a Formula (If You Have Raw Text)

If you have the data as a raw string (e.g., `8,7,5,5,4,...`), you can split it into a column using:

1. **Paste the comma-separated values into cell `A1`**.
2. **In cell `B1`, enter this formula:**

`=TRANSPOSE(SPLIT(A1, ","))`

- This will split the values into a vertical column.

Method 3: Import from CSV (If Needed)

If you have the CSV file:

1. **Go to File → Import → Upload** the CSV.
2. **Select "Replace spreadsheet"** or "Insert new sheet."
3. **Choose "Comma"** as the separator.
4. **Delete unnecessary columns**, keeping only the second one.

Result

You'll have a clean column like this:

| A |

|----|

| 8 |

| 7 |

| 5 |

| 5 |

| 4 |

| ...|

Let me know if you need further adjustments!

Input: Can you give me an APA citation for DeepSeek?

Output: Certainly! Here's an APA-style citation for **DeepSeek Chat** as a software/reference:

Reference Entry:

DeepSeek. (2024). **DeepSeek Chat** (Version 1.0) [Large language model].

<https://www.deepseek.com>

In-Text Citation:

(DeepSeek, 2024)

Notes:

- Since DeepSeek Chat is an AI model without a traditional "author," the developer (DeepSeek) is listed as the author.

- The year (2024) is an approximation—check the official website for the exact release date.

- If you're citing a specific response, you may treat it as ****personal communication**** (not recoverable by readers) and cite it only in-text.

Let me know if you need any modifications!

Citation: University of Michigan. (2025). U-M GPT [Generative AI model].

<https://www.umich.edu>, 4/12/25

Input: What general tips for writing and improving an IMRD paper would you have for me to double check before submitting one for my class?

Output: Writing an IMRD (Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion) paper can be a structured yet demanding task. Here are some general tips to help you improve your paper before submission:

Introduction

1. ****Clearly Define the Problem****: Ensure that the problem you are addressing is clearly stated and understandable to your readers.
2. ****Literature Review****: Briefly discuss previous research relevant to your study, identifying gaps or limitations that your study aims to address.
3. ****State Your Objectives****: Clearly outline the objectives or hypotheses of your study.
4. ****Engage the Reader****: Make sure your introduction is engaging and lays the groundwork for the significance of your research.

Methods

1. **Detail the Procedures**: Describe your methodology with enough detail that another researcher could replicate your study.
2. **Logical Sequence**: Present your methods in a logical and chronological order.
3. **Justify Choices**: Explain why you chose particular methods or tools; provide insight into your decision-making process.
4. **Include Materials and Participants**: Clearly describe any materials used, as well as the participant selection process.

Results

1. **Be Clear and Concise**: Present your findings clearly without interpretation – save the interpretation for the Discussion section.
2. **Use Visuals Effectively**: Include tables, graphs, and figures where appropriate to make complex data easier to understand.
3. **Follow a Logical Order**: Ensure that your results are presented in a sequence that aligns with your methods or objectives.
4. **Report Negative Results**: Negative or non-significant results should also be reported. They are often valuable and informative.

Discussion

1. **Interpret Results**: Discuss what your results mean in the context of the research question and existing literature.
2. **Discuss Implications**: Highlight the implications of your findings for the field.

3. **Acknowledge Limitations**: Be honest about the limitations of your study and how they might affect your results.
4. **Suggest Further Research**: Provide suggestions or questions for future research based on your findings.

General Tips

1. **Consistency**: Ensure that terminology and formatting are consistent throughout the paper.
2. **Clarity and Precision**: Use clear and precise language; avoid jargon unless necessary.
3. **Proofread and Edit**: Check for grammar, spelling, and punctuation errors. Reading your paper aloud can help catch mistakes.
4. **Seek Feedback**: If possible, have peers or mentors review your paper and provide feedback.
5. **Follow Guidelines**: Make sure you adhere to any specific guidelines provided by your class or instructor, including citation style and formatting.
6. **Check for Plagiarism**: Make sure all sources are properly cited and that your work is original.

By carefully reviewing your paper with these tips in mind, you can enhance its clarity, coherence, and impact, ultimately improving its quality before submission.