**e-Portfolio Activity: Reflective Activity 1 – Ethics in Computing in the age of Generative AI**

After reviewing the article and reading how different countries across the world deal with the generative AI revolution, discuss your views on the subject and recommend what you think could be a suitable course of action. You should justify your stance by also reviewing any papers included in this study or other relevant literature (additional links to industry have been provided as ‘Other Resources’ to the module). Your discussion should also highlight the impact your actions would have on applicable legal, social and professional issues. Please note that there is no right or wrong answer here, this exercise is to help you evaluate the legal, social ethical and professional issues that affect computing professionals in industry.

Artificial intelligence has an undeniable place in our modern world, and its potential to solve complex global problems cannot be ignored. As Corrêa et al. (2023) found in their review of more than 200 global AI ethics frameworks, many countries are attempting to regulate AI in different ways — for example, the EU AI Act in Europe emphasises transparency and accountability, while others focus on content control or innovation-led approaches. [U.S. Department of Education+2Nature+2](https://www.ed.gov/sites/ed/files/documents/ai-report/ai-report.pdf?utm_source=chatgpt.com) These varied frameworks show the world recognises both the promise and the danger of the AI revolution—but they rarely address what happens when humans start to outsource their learning and thinking to machines.

Humans are creatures of habit, and learning is one of our most valuable habits. It requires repetition, effort, and discovery. When AI begins to provide instant answers, people risk losing the motivation to understand *why* and *how* something is true. Recent studies suggest this concern is well-founded: for example, a study found frequent use of AI tools was significantly negatively correlated with critical thinking skills, mediated by cognitive off-loading. [MDPI](https://www.mdpi.com/2075-4698/15/1/6?utm_source=chatgpt.com) Another research article argues that generative AI’s rapid capabilities demand what they call “adaptive governance” rather than traditional regulation alone. [arXiv](https://arxiv.org/html/2406.04554v1?utm_source=chatgpt.com) We already see signs of this shift: cursive writing is disappearing, attention spans are shrinking, and there is a growing sense that younger generations may ask, “Why learn math or science when AI can give me the answer instantly?” The comparison of AI to the industrial revolution may be accurate in scale, but this time the risk is that it replaces human thought rather than enhances it.

To control this transformation responsibly, we must set ethical and developmental boundaries. Age-based restrictions could protect developing minds: children under twelve should only use AI for creative storytelling or simple factual explanation, not for writing essays or doing math problems, so that they still build reasoning, logic, and discipline. Alongside this, we need legal frameworks that define how AI may be used in education, employment, and daily life, as well as professional standards that hold developers and educators accountable for how AI is integrated. For example, governance papers such as those by Papagiannidis (2025) outline structural, relational, and procedural practices needed for “responsible AI governance”. [ScienceDirect](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0963868724000672?utm_source=chatgpt.com) By embedding these controls, we make sure that innovation doesn’t undermine the human skills we value.

These measures carry meaningful legal, social and professional impacts. Legally, they would push nations to craft consistent policies around children’s digital protection, AI access, privacy and intellectual integrity. Socially, they could preserve curiosity, creativity and critical thinking—skills essential for human progress. Professionally, educators, developers and technologists would share accountability: it would no longer be enough to “just ship” an AI feature; one must consider how it influences learning, culture and human dignity. Used responsibly, AI can still revolutionise fields like medicine, science or even space exploration (for instance, developing intelligent robots to do dangerous tasks for us). But without ethical restraint, it risks eroding the very qualities that define us as humans.

Ultimately, there is no doubt that AI will shape our future—but we must continually ask: *is what we gain greater than what we lose?* The true challenge is not whether AI can think, but whether humans will continue to choose to think for themselves.
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