JOURNAL OF CULTURAL ANALYSIS AND SOCIAL CHANGE

Journal of Cultural Analysis and Social Change,
2025, 10(4), 2734-2745
ISSN: 2589-1316

Artificial Intelligence and the Human Mind: Academic Achievement, Ethical Practice, and Equity in Higher Education

Musadhique Kottaparamban[1*], Elsadig Hussein Fadlalla Ali[2], Saima Usmani[3], Fawzi Eltayeb Yousuf Ahmed[4*]

[1] *Applied College (Tanumah), King Khalid University, Saudi Arabia, mkottapparamban@kku.edu.sa, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2637-9456*
[2] *Applied College (Tanumah), King Khalid University, Saudi Arabia, alsadighssn@yahoo.com, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2002-0290*
[3] *Applied College (Tanumah), King Khalid University, Saudi Arabia, Sothman@kku.edu.sa, https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3091-4420*
[4] *Applied College (Tanumah), King Khalid University, Saudi Arabia, feltayb12@gmail.com, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8492-5654*

*__Corresponding Author:__ alsadighssn@yahoo.com, mkottapparamban@kku.edu.sa

Citation: Kottaparamban, M., Ali, E. H. F., Usmani, S. & Ahmed, F. E. Y. (2025). Artificial Intelligence and the Human Mind: Academic Achievement, Ethical Practice, and Equity in Higher Education, *Journal of Cultural Analysis and Social Change*, 10(4), 2734-2745. https://doi.org/10.64753/jcasc.v10i4.3309

Published: December 15, 2025

ABSTRACT

Artificial intelligence, generally known as AI, has now become increasingly popular in transforming the educational arena, and it helps shape the intellectual well-being of the student and teacher community to excel in their academic performance in schools and colleges. In this paper, we have tried to study the impact of AI-enabled tools on the students' academic achievements, ethical considerations, and creativity in performing their academic duties and responsibilities. We have done an extensive data collection to study how AI systems, which include ChatGPT, Grammarly, and DeepL, positively impact students' overall performance, including their academic engagement, fairness outlook, and understanding of the subject. We have concluded that the AI tools have positively influenced students' overall performance, such as efficiency, self-regulation, and accessibility in their learning, though they also raise some concerns about ethical dilemmas, such as academic integrity, data privacy, and authorship. The increasing use of AI in education impacts creativity and critical thinking. This study reveals that AI-related tools should be viewed as intellectual partners to assist the institution in achieving its planned goals, policies, and digital literacy programs.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Academic Performance, Higher Education, Digital Pedagogy, Ethics, Personalized Learning, AI Literacy

INTRODUCTION

The introduction of artificial intelligence in the academic landscape has changed the total educational system. Thus, artificial intelligence has revolutionized the understanding and distribution of knowledge. The widespread use of AI tools like ChatGPT, DeepSeek, and others has transformed the previous conception of the educational system. It now becomes a necessary part of our educational system (Yeruva, 2023). The human educators have lost their charm in shaping the academic engagement with the introduction of various AI tools, which offer more relevant roles in enhancing academic engagement, facilitating adaptive learning, and automating feedback mechanisms. According to O'Neil (2016), AI plays important roles as a "cognitive amplifier" and a "learning

partner," which ultimately help the students make a suitable gesture with personalized content that adjusts dynamically to their evolving needs.

Artificial intelligence, which is popularly known as AI, has received wide application in transforming the education sector that consequently induces intellectual growth in students and teachers, thereby promoting academic performance of schools and universities. This paper analyzes the effect of AI-enhanced tools on students' performance, ethical implications, and creativity in meeting academic duties. We have been doing extended data gathering to explore the ways in which a novel use of AI-based tools, including ChatGPT, Grammarly, and DeepL, can positively influence students' generic performance (i.e., academic engagement, sense of fairness, and understanding of the curriculum). Our findings have indicated opportunities for AI tools with respect to the impact on student performance, namely efficiency, self-regulation, and access to learning; however, they also raise ethical concerns regarding academic integrity, data ownership, and authorship. The increasing use of AI in education enhanced the concerns regarding creativity and critical thinking. The study reported here suggests that technologies associated with AI should be the institution's very intellectual partners assisting in achieving strategic goals, policies, and its digital literacy.

We have collected data from students in several global universities for the academic performance prediction. The intellectual contributions based on some scientific papers (Zhang, Z. (2021); Terzopoulos, G., & Satratzemi, M. (2019); El Sadiq et al. (2024); Jain, S., & Alam, M. A. (2020)) which investigated the effect of AI systems such as ChatGPT, Grammarly, or DeepL on students' academic engagement, understanding, and equity in their universities. The reality here is that it changes students' relationship to school.

The arrival of new instruments in the academy involved a series of academic issues, as well as questions of ethics and pedagogy. Floridi and Cowls (2022) claim that the central ethical challenges created by contemporary AI systems are coterminous with a growing reliance on machine-driven reasoning and text generation, which blurs established demarcations between authorship, originality, and intellectual property. Certainly, these AI tools are aiding our verbal precision and analysis in concept understanding. They also encourage debate around academic integrity, considering future teachers' duties and the necessary independence of the ivory tower in an AI-supported classroom (Hwang, Y. S., & Vrongistinos, K. (2012).

Rationale and Significance

With the increasing use of AI techniques, it is important to analyze how they impact the education sector, as many academic organizations have announced their concerns about the urgency of bringing up reflections about the implications for academia that AI proposes. At German institutions of higher education, Berger and von Garrel (2023) found that as many as two out of three students resort to different types of AI-based software in order to conduct research or learn. Students around the world use AI tools to do problem-solving, idea generation, research, and writing assignments (including academic papers), Elondou says. (Fitria, 2021). The most benefit of AI technologies is sustained for students with access to good internet connectivity and digital literacy. AI finally comes up with inequality and injustice in education.

We need to understand how AI is being used in our education system so that we can create regulations that allow it to be deployed appropriately in education. Moreover, academic-related challenges and AI usage have sparked some ethical debates such as dependence on machine-generated material, data privacy violations by governments and companies, algorithmic discrimination, etc. The intellectual and ethical implications of deploying AI in education are yet an untrodden path. The present study fills a research void and aims to complement this by integrating strong empirical field evidence. The study provides a comprehensive theoretical basis for understanding AI tools' impact on worldwide student academic performance. We are relying on theories such as the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), sociocultural learning, and constructivism to make our own assumptions.

Problem Statement

While AI has been used in education for many years, only a few research studies have addressed the various difficulties faced by it. There has been little empirical research on AI's effect among students, specifically regarding its impact on learning and ethical thinking. Much research has been conducted to demonstrate that using AI tools has a significant effect on student performance in schools. Zhang (2021) argues that scant attention has been given to students' perceptions, ethical considerations, and related themes in academia. Notwithstanding the pressure that exists for AI and education integration, it seems as if academia has largely accepted AI use in its domain. In this paper we study the impoverishment aspect and analyze how AI solutions can enhance learning practices by detecting students' justice, honesty, and originality in academic environments.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Conceptual Foundations of Artificial Intelligence in Education

Klamma et al. (2020) attempted to define the concept of artificial intelligence (AI). They assert that AI can be defined as a computer simulation of human cognition, including the cognitive abilities of any given human being. Cognitive processes that may be modelled include problem solving, observational learning, and reasoning. Jain, S et al. (2022) argued that artificial intelligence (AI), including natural language processing (NLP), deep learning, machine learning (ML), and similar techniques, offers to support learner-created context for education in a unique way. Holmes and Fadel (2023), describe the development of AI since the 1960s, starting with rule-based systems and leading to today's generative models. This paradigm shift leads to the one in which AI helpers are deeply coupled with human cognition, thus benefiting both.

Saima Usmani et al. point out that dramatic linguistic changes are being observed, strongly influenced by technological progress and namely artificial intelligence. As a result, we have seen different language preferences and standards from those younger generations (mainly millennials and Gen Z) compared to the older generations. The use of these AI generative tools to help personalize content and deliver instant feedback can support learner activities. In Alan Bundy's recent position paper, he raises several ethical concerns related to AI-aided products, among which are algorithmic fairness, data residues, student agency, and open data (Alan Bundy E 2017). And as AI models such as OpenAI's GPT-4 become more and more involved with academic content enhancement, problem-solving, reasoning, and creating multimodal content, there are also concerns (Abney K, 2012).

Historical Development of AI in Educational Contexts

Sleeman and Brown claim that intelligent tutoring systems (ITSs), developed from the 1970s onwards, are the first large-scale AI in education endeavor. ITS pursued the goal of mimicking personalized human teaching via rule-based algorithms (Sleeman & Brown, 1982). In subsequent years, learning analytics (LA) and educational data mining (EDM) were propounded in the domain of education for improving students' performance in academic activities, generating tips for disinterested students, and easing the way to design courses in terms of education. (2022). Kottaparamban et al. (2024) argue that alternative media is crucial to modern social activity and frequently functions as the communication channels upon which networks are formed.

The proliferation of cloud-based AI tools introduced by platforms such as Coursera and Khan Academy in the 2010s changed everything in education. Such tools support AI-empowered adaptive learning and automated assessment (Abney K 2012). Additionally, AI models are starting to utilize natural language interactions between humans and machines. The latest developments in the field of education have led to a shift in learning's paradigm, as it began involving dialogic interaction when developing concepts (Araujo et al., 2020). Thanks to AI, and especially to generative systems, the use of which has become increasingly common in education during the last years, students from academic life have never felt so motivated! (Alan, 2017).

The uptake of modern technology by pupils, endorsing algorithmic reasoning instead of thinking meditatively, has generated numerous ethical challenges, such as those relating to academic honesty and "epistemic outsourcing," where students over-use AR solutions within decision-making at the expense of personal reflection (Floridi & Cowls, 2022). Many academics have introduced warnings regarding the overreliance on AI in academic works to prevent skill loss (e.g., originality, problem-solving, and critical thinking), which stems from computer use across academia (Bin & Mandal 2019).

Empirical Insights: AI and Academic Performance

This study explores the impact of AI in education, and our research found conflicting results. It is also remarkable that in the German institutions two out of three (in total) of the students' academic work has been performed using tools with AI support (Birte Keller et al., 2019). The algorithms use AI to create writing that's clear and substantive. Firaina and Sulisworo (2022) found that chatbot usage was positively related to self-efficacy, which has a direct effect on Indonesian undergraduate student performance in the study of AI.

As part of a large-scale research by Gael and Weber (2022), 55% of respondents believed that in the future education will gradually be replaced by artificial intelligence. AI doesn't have the right kind of empathy to teach well—leaving a gap between the student and teacher. AI may impede metacognitive regulation and, at the same time, foster procedural knowledge and efficiency (Klamma et al., 2020).

Studies have found that AI negatively impacts a range of human dimensions, such as digital literacy, gender, and technological access to education—thus creating an 'unequal student.' As the survey designed by Prinsloo and Slade (2017) clearly shows, students with limited abilities to engage AI for whatever reasons are less certain about how to interpret what AI tells them, thus affecting their learning outcomes. In this respect, stronger AI implementation in education is necessary, and ensuring the quality of AI tools is crucial for their application within academia.

Ethical and Pedagogical Dimensions of AI

Responsible AI Policy Development in Academia:

Several academic publications have demonstrated the necessity of including this, highlighting the role that digital AI in higher education establishments is having when it comes to understanding bias, developing critical consciousness/critical thinkers and problem solvers, and promoting ethically minded use (Wirtz et al., 2018).

The previous discussion exposes concerns related to algorithmic bias, data leakage, authorship, and data privacy. Scholars like Prinsloo and Slade (2017) have thoroughly scrutinized the harms of AI systems' data making in schools.

Many AI tools overload students with unlimited data, which winds up actually decreasing the quality of education. Compliance with rules (e.g., GDPR or other frameworks) is essential to use it in a more compliant and ethical way (European Union, 2023).

AI has evolved from an individual source of data to a tool that facilitates the renewal and enhancement of the nature of interactions between teachers and learners by acting as a mediator between them (Prinsloo & Slade 2017). To fully understand the potential role of AI in education, new practices and concepts that reinvent how students interact with tools powered by AI are essential.

Theoretical Framework

To investigate the impact of AI on students' learning effectiveness, we were grounded mainly in three theories (e.g., Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), Sociocultural Learning Theory, and Constructivism and so on) to articulate the correlation between AI performance and academic performance. In 1970, Piaget first introduced constructivism, and later in 1996, Bruner redefined this theory. Students develop understanding through the active use of their thinking and involvement in scholarly activities (Piaget, 1970; Bruner, 1996). Lukin (1998) coined the phrase "machine-mediated constructivism" to compare AI to 'traditional' constructivist theory.

Based on the later released works by Vygotsky (a well-known sociologist), the sociocultural learning theory emerged in 1978. Putting the idea into practice in an emergent AI-driven landscape of pedagogy reveals that AI as a cultural artifact enables students' cognitive development through hands-on and interactive learning. Holmes et al. expanded upon this theory.

There are many VAs and chatbots that optimize successful communication in students' ZPD and thereby offer opportunities for active peer engagement (Koufaris, M. (2002).

Davis' (1989) contemporary theory, the technology acceptance model (TAM), also describes AI as a predictive technology for which the focus is on its usefulness in education. Gael and Weber have also extended the understanding of technology in academia to include a new variable: ethical trust. The addition of the variable makes it possible for researchers to clarify justice, accountabilities, transparency, and data privacy (Dasgupta 2002). These three concepts explained the influence of AI on students' learning performance.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

We combined quantitative and qualitative data in this study, which we have called a mixed-methods descriptive design. This model simplifies the study of AI's impact on students' creativity, ethical judgment, and academic achievement.

This approach was selected because it allows the collection of measurable information about the effect of AI technologies on student performance. We attempted to explore 'reliability, validity, method comprehension,' and selected issues related to the interpreting of the consequences with these learners' technologies as enacted by Cresswell and Plano in their research (Cresswell and Plano, 2023).

Two research methods were used in this study.

We used a quantitative approach to measure to what extent learners use AI, the usefulness of AI tools, and the expected benefits of these tools. By contrast, we have used the qualitative approach to explore the ethics challenges formed by AI adoption and analyze cognitive conversions derived from this AI incorporation in

academia. Thus, these two methods of analysis helped us in the study of quantitative and interpretative insights, which led to a more holistic understanding of the problem space.

Research Setting and Participants

It involved university students in higher education institutions, which used AI-based educational tools for digital teaching and learning. The target sample was made of all students, undergraduate and postgraduate, coming from diverse study backgrounds (i.e., science, social sciences, business, and humanities) to grant variance in curricula. We deliberately chose respondents based on their effect on educational outcome using AI-based instruments (ChatGPT, Grammarly, and DL).

This ensured that subjects had previous AI-supplemented learning experience, an attribute needed for validity in exploratory research. The study included 55 students, aged 18-35 years, of which 51% were female (N=28) and 49% were male (N=27). Undergraduate students were 68%, and postgraduate students were 32%. There were 50,000 students from the sciences (31%), social sciences (29%), humanities (25%), and business areas (15%).

Data Collection Instruments

The semistructured questionnaire included open-ended questions to obtain qualitative data. The instrument comprised four sections:

1. ***Socio-Demographic Data:*** Age, gender, grade level attended, and faculty.
2. ***Usage of AI Behavior:*** How often, why, and who uses AI tools based on the different categories.
3. ***Academic Perceptions:*** Demand anxiety (comprehension, creativity, writing ability), time.
4. ***Moral and Attitudinal Issues:*** Fairness and prejudice; privacy; scholarship and honesty.

The Likert scale ranged from 1 to 5, with low numbers meaning strong disagreement and high numbers meaning strong agreement, and the scores demonstrated attitudes and experiences as was standard in educational technology research (Babbie, 2020). In addition, the prompts allowed participants to voice their nuanced views on the morality and knowledge implications of AI, thereby producing qualitative data amenable to thematic analysis.

Validity and Reliability

Validity of the Instrument the questionnaire was validated by three experts (one in research methods and two in educational technology). The panel rated the pertinence, clarity, and representativeness of the content. Five students completed a pilot study using the questionnaire to provide feedback on item wording and usability.

Data Collection Procedure

Three weeks of data collection ensued, where the online survey was made publicly available using Google Forms to maximize accessibility and confidentiality. Participants were selected via institutional email and academic social networks, and all participants signed the consent form. The cover letter described the aims of the study and assured participants of their right to voluntary participation and to confidentiality. Manually coded qualitative analysis was performed on responses to open-ended items.

Data Analysis Techniques

Quantitative data: For quantitative data, descriptive and inferential statistics were used. Categorical variables and use (including frequency), as well as demographic characteristics, were reported as frequencies and percentages or means, respectively, and the relationship between perceived academic impact of AI use and use frequency was explored using correlation tests.

Qualitative data was thematically analyzed using Brown and Clarke's (2006) six stages.

1. Developing preliminary codes
2. Identifying themes
3. Analyzing themes
4. Articulating and designating topics
5. Generating the report

The key themes that were identified included empowerment, ambivalence about ethical aspects, and standing for AI literacy. The juxtaposing of these threads in the analysis provided much triangulation, as statistical trends were reinforced by experiential testimony.

Ethical Considerations

This fact-finding was, essentially, based on human decency.

Participation was voluntary, and the participants could drop out at any time. Confidentiality and protection of data were assured. No personal information was gathered. All electronic data were stored in enciphered files available only to the study team. The focus on AI has helped shift the focus toward ethical aspects of algorithmic use of data. AI tools were not used for analysis (due to the potential for misleading machine interpretation or redundancy in content).

Methodological Limitations

In spite of the methodological strength, limitations existed. Indeed, the number of participants (n = 55) is small, limiting the ability to extend our findings to other populations. Second, because the data consists of completely self-reported information, there is a potential concern with response bias, as individuals could be exaggerating their use of or benefits from AI relative to how they experience it. Limitations: The cross-sectional nature of the study does not allow us to conclude that AI use is associated with differences in academic achievement. However, preliminary mixed-methodological designs are crucial to support large-scale longitudinal or experimental studies.

This method provides a solid empirical benchmark to be improved upon in the future.

FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

Overview of Data Presentation

This section presents the results of the study based on the quantitative and qualitative phases. Descriptive statistics are used to summarize the quantitative data from close-ended questions, and inferential statistics are employed to examine bivariate relationships. An inductive theme analysis of the qualitative open-ended responses is conducted, this paper employing mixed methods research and qualitative triangulation as a methodology for rigor. Through triangulating across data sources, we build a nuanced picture of how AI technologies impact student academic achievement, ethical sensibilities, and cognitive engagement.

Findings are reported in relation to five thematic constructs, corresponding to the research objectives:

1. Demographic attributes of participants
2. Trends in AI Utilization
3. Anticipated academic repercussions
4. Ethical and equity considerations
5. Adoption Difficulties and Pitfalls of AI Tool Use for Adopters.

The Respondents' Demographic Characteristics

After several modifications, the researchers included over 50 selected students from different nations. These students came from a variety of academic, cultural, and sociographic origins. They also made sure the chosen children included an almost equal number of both boys and girls. The ages of the respondents ranged from 18 to 35, and 68% were undergraduates, while 32% were postgraduates.

Disciplinary spread was 31% and 29% from science and social science, respectively, and meanwhile 25% from humanities and 15% from business. This variety testifies to the cross-sectoral embedding of AI tools in higher education. The specialists have looked over dozens of academic studies from universities across the country. Studies by Ali et al. at German and South Asian universities suggest that the use of AI as a tool does not only apply to academia boundaries. Demographics would make the case for AI literacy itself across disciplines, thereby making proficiency in digital adaptability a precondition for engaging in academic work today.

Students' Use of AI Patterns

Pattern of Use:

87% of participants used at least 1 academic AI model. The most popular tools were ChatGPT (83%), Grammarly (76%), DeepL (45%), and AI summarizers. Notion AI - 32%.

The most common purposes for which the students applied AI:

1. Investigation and data acquisition (71%)
2. Composition and revision (66%)
3. Grammar and structure polishing (64%)
4. concepts, explaining, and exam assistance (58%)
5. Programming and algorithmic problem-solving (22%)

Sixty-one percent of respondents use AI tools on a daily basis, with the rest reporting weekly use, highlighting that the incorporation of AI into research methods is widespread.

The exploratory factor analysis showed that postgraduate students were more likely to use AI technology than undergraduates, perhaps reflecting their greater participation in research activities with demands for analytic support. Nevertheless, we integrate introductory mixed methods to supplement extensive large-scale longitudinal and experimental research. This method is of empirical strength for further research.

Perceived Academic Impacts of AI

The quantitative responses reflect the support around the academic potential of AI technologies. On average, students' evaluations of comprehension, creativity, and production with AI tools were at the level of 4.0–4.3 points out of 5 on a Likert scale, according to Son et al.

Principal discoveries encompassed:

Improved Understanding:

78% of users said AI explained challenging academic concepts by breaking them down in conversational language and with examples.

- Improved writing: 81% said their writing had improved and become more organized as a result of AI feedback programs like Grammarly or ChatGPT.
- Creativity & Ideation: 64% of the researchers agreed that AI supported the generation of concepts, like brainstorming or argument building (though some emphasized concerns about ideas merging into one uniform set).

Seventy-two percent strongly agreed that AI increased their time efficiency for academic activities.

The Link study reported a moderate positive association for the relationship of frequency of AI use with self-reported academic benefit. This implies that while AI use is associated with better performance, we can't claim it is the cause.

The results of this study support the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), that perceived usefulness and ease both have a positive effect on users' intention to use, as well as their pleasure. Furthermore, our results support that AI provides a cognitive model for the constraining of meta-cognitive tasks in terms of real-time adaptable feedback.

Ethical and Fairness Perceptions

Some of those involved had questioned whether AI chanced to favor students who were more digitally literate or with better internet connections. Sixty-three percent were unsure about the resources and school rules related to ethical use of AI, while thirty-five percent thought they could be accused of cheating.

Challenges and Risks of AI Use

Attendees identified several perennial challenges relating to the adoption of AI.

1. Overt dependence and abdication of cognition (62%): Students have fears about losing authenticity or inactivity in their thinking.
2. Inconsistency and reliability (48 percent): Some incorrect data generated by AI was repudiated.
3. Not enough internet (39%): From uneven access, especially in developing regions, consistent usage was stunted.
4. Authorship[real or computer-generated]—Attribution(41%):
   Students found it difficult to determine what is real and what is not.
5. Fear of cheating (35%): Doubt about what AI can be used for has made people nervous.

Such results provide evidence that confusion may be compounded by the absence of precise institutional guidance as well as students' ethical stress.

The quantitative findings were confirmed by the qualitative patterns. Powerful and unnerving sensations were felt by some of the responders.

"AI is there to help you learn, but pretty often it feels like a crutch."

"At present, I'm afraid that an AI for grammar checking would mark me," he said.

Thematic Insights from Qualitative Analysis

Three primary themes emerged from the thematic analysis of open-ended responses:

Efficiency becomes empowerment; students thought that AI can help reduce workload, improve feedback quality, prevent failure, and increase their confidence in academic writing. Here is how multimedia tutors are described: AI serves as a digital tutor that can provide personalized scaffolding (Vialardi et al., 2009).

The lack of ethics and guilt: Some students have mentioned 'to feel intellectually responsible for (AI),' which questions the cornerstone principles of authorship in education and moral agency in learning.

The perfect storm of AI literacy and institutional guidance--Most respondents called for some level of training/education regarding ethical AI.

Synthesis of Findings

Together, these findings suggest that AI is good for grades and bad for ethics.

Its use, quantitatively, strongly predicts the level of restate the academic growth and learning efficiencies.

But it presents moral and intellectual questions about dependence, ownership, and equity. These are evidence that alternative coverage exists among students of the educational value of AI; however, it must be supported by their institution in the ethical use.

The results provide empirical evidence for the theoretical basis of this work that effectiveness in AI education depends on technical affordance as well as constructivist engagement, sociocultural mediation, and ethical trust within the institutional ecosystem.

DISCUSSION

Interpretation of Findings

Our study highlights two sides of AI being applied in education: the accelerating of learning speed, understanding, and composition quality on one hand and the production of novel ethical dilemmas and cognitive dependencies on the other. This binary contrasts with surrounding discussions around "augmented ambivalence" about AI in education, emphasizing how digital technologies need to augment learners and disrupt traditional academic identities.

The findings confirmed the applicability of the Technology Acceptance Model and revealed usefulness and ease of use are important predictors for students' acceptance of AI. High satisfaction rates from the participants ($M = 4.1 – 4.3$) indicate that it is a positive experience when AI systems provide immediate and individualized feedback; if precise, student learning performance will be better, and they will feel more confident too. However, a term had been extended based upon the third dimension, moral trust, to reflect the continued use (Albayati, 2024). The conclusion to be drawn is that student focus on institutional rules and fairness means that trust has both technical and moral components.

Furthermore, a strong relationship between AI use and perceived academic gains supports findings from other research that suggest that AI contributes to students' metacognitive development through real-time adaptive guidance and feedback (Albayati, 2024). find that an overdependence on this strategy could hamper critical thinking and creative thinking, while the unsupervised AI might transfer learning from knowledge building to knowledge consumption.

AI as a Constructivist Scaffold

In a constructivist sense, then, AI offers a digital cognitive tool or scaffolding to enable the learner's exploration, experimentation, and reflection (Bruner, 1996; Luckin, 2018). In the context of constructivist pedagogy, students could recognize how AI technologies help in simplifying complex concepts and provide opportunities for self-initiated learning. These results are consistent with Piaget's (1970) suggestion that knowledge is developed as a result of the interplay between previous information and new input.

However, constructivism does imply active learning, and there is a risk some students may become consumers of AI-generated content rather than creators of meaning. This paper questions the notion that readily accessible AI-generated answers suppress the intellectual struggle necessary for deep learning. Downplay these tensions and highlight teaching designs informed by a view of the AI as something other than an automatized teacher, that is to say, as an AI who learns with (and sometimes from) the human co-teacher: a crucial distinction for maintaining substantial intellective interplay.

Sociocultural Mediation and Collaborative Learning

The results further support Vygotsky's (1978) sociocultural perspective on learning as a social dialogical interaction in the ZPD. AIs, like ChatGPT and DeepL, are mediating artifacts that can enrich learners' ZPD by providing dialogic interaction and contextual feedback. It allows for a 24/7 "machine collaboration" that can be helpful for those students out there with no direct access to tutors or mentors.

However, the qualitative data indicate their perception of AI as an independent tool, not a partner. It does not realize its full instructional potential in this setting.

It is in reconceptualizing human-AI interaction as distributed cognition—a cooperation whereby cognitive meaning emerges through the conjoint action of both artificial and human agency—that sociocultural learning through AI holds strong promise.

To accomplish this, we need to have teachers who will endorse the use of AI-supported collaboration, which allows students to collaboratively review and refine auto-generated outputs. This paper discusses how social and communicative discourse enables the shift of AI from a personal assistant to a dialogic interactive agent, with an emphasis on ways in which one learns as well as ethical engagement.

Ethical Trust and Responsible Innovation

The ethical implications derived from the analysis show that "ethical trust" must be a basis for future AI that is both sustainable and integrable. Heavy users were unsure about data privacy, algorithmic fairness, and corporate policy in more than 60 percent of cases. The challenge for students struggling with the realities of authorship, given the cloak-and-dagger nature of black markets and academic integrity, is anticipatory morality in AI governance.

Without such policies in place, they are vulnerable to making misstatements and being punished when they try to clear it from their personal computer. The advent of AI in education demands ethical AI ecosystems based on responsibility, transparency, and inclusivity. The moral void is that of social class recognition. The online students came across as confident and independent with anxiety and confusion. other representation of online students.

Students who mostly participated via an online medium emerged: Independent and confident Anxious and confused. This is in line with Ekowo and Palmer's assertion that AI adoption could widen the digital divide, which would require literacy programs and address issues concerning disparate access.

Cognitive Dependency and the Paradox of Autonomy

A relevant outcome of this study is psychological dependence: with the ease and convenience of these AI-based responses, there is a reduction in mental challenge. More than 60 percent say they are heavily dependent on AI for academic writing and conceptualization.

It's this dependence that makes up the autonomy paradox: as we achieve greater freedom to twist away from established social structures via AI technology, we grow increasingly vulnerable to a deeper psychological attachment to automation.

This requirement makes us reconsider the AI-augmented learning boundaries. AI will be a "cognitive prosthesis," enhancing human thought rather than replacing it. Instead, as educators, we need to focus on developing learning contexts that require the development of meta-AI literacy—knowing when and how to responsibly use AI in an ethical and critically informed way.

Policy and Pedagogical Implications

1. The implications for institutional policy and practice are at several levels:
2. ***Embed AI Literacy into Undergraduate Curriculum:*** Universities should develop short AI literacy modules that can be inserted into general education coursework. These should ideally include the so-called wide abilities [four non-technical abilities].
3. ***Ethical Standards in the Open:*** Universities are looking for clear rules on A.I. use, which can clarify what constitutes acceptable assistance and what amounts to cheating. Vialardi et al. recommended developing AI codes of honor to promote integrity and consistency in multiple sectors.
4. ***Faculties Reoriented:*** Faculty staffing is key to orienting faculty as co-learners with AI and not in the way. Teacherlearning must equip teachers tothink critically about AI, collectively produce assessments, a nd engage in interdisciplinary investigation.
5. ***Equity and Access:*** Leaders should ensure that AI technologies are equitably made available to all through institution-wide contracts or grants in order to avoid a two-tier system of technology haves and have-nots.
6. ***Regulation all the Way Down:*** Institutions should set up committees to oversee AI for ethics that give a voice to emerging technical innovations that may be monitored, engage with students, and revise regulation.

Integration with Global Research Trends

Theoretical Contributions

As well as making a novel empirical contribution, it also adds tothe growing literature relating student views of AI and higher education through experimental connection to constructivism, sociocultural mediation, and the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM). Compared with other previous meta-analyses (Zhang, Z. (2021);

Terzopoulos, G., & Satratzemi, M. (2019); El Sadiq et al. (2024)), the work shows that AI effectiveness can be improved if integrated with context-aware ethical governance.

The latest study (Zhang, 2021) has shown that IUAI is not an extra value but a necessity to confirm academic authority. This article also synthesizes and extends existing scholarship, in part, by treating AI as an educational tool and cultural force that problematizes our understandings of cognition, ethics, and equity.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Study Limitations

Although our study provides important evidence on the implications of AI on students' academic achievement, we also acknowledge some limitations.

The sample (n = 55) was small and non-representative of HEIs in general. While this focus is conducive to intensive studies, it also reduces the generalizability of findings in different educational contexts and cultures at large. Larger multi-institution samples are needed in future studies to increase statistical power and generalizability.

Second, the data were cross-sectional and based on self-reporting, which might cause recall bias or socially desirable bias. Empirical and longitudinal approaches are better suited for establishing the causality between AI usage adopted and long-term learning results obtained.

Third, research design was driven by the students and not perceived beliefs of teachers or administrators in relation to survey questions. Local authorities and practitioners in education systems might offer a more fine-grained view of institutional dynamics and pedagogical innovation.

(Note that they did not actually measure objective performance (e.g., gains in GPA, task-based assessments) in their studies. Learning analytics supplemented by qualitative feedback provide a more nuanced picture of the effects of AI on education systems.

Directions for Future Research

There are some important outstanding questions that this work could be extended by:

1. ***Timeline:*** The project will investigate the long-term effects of exposure to AI tools for cognition and motivation. Chronology.
2. ***Inter-Institutional Research:*** Look at arts and humanities as opposed to STEM education to see how AI is entering these professions.
3. ***Perceptions of Teachers:*** Evaluate teachers' perceptions towards AI use across multiple dimensions, such as assessment strategies, workload, and the trust in automation.
4. ***Policy Implications:*** Examine the impact of AI governance directives at the institutional level on academic integrity.
5. ***Cross-National Studies:*** Examine how AI is being used in the developed and developing countries to pinpoint differences and identify best practices that are specific to culture.
6. AI-Integrated Educational Frameworks Creation and design of AI-supported frameworks for co-creative learning situations in which AI is the dialogic sparring partner (not just thematic support systems).
7. In following these lines of inquiry, educators and academics can work toward a more inclusive and ethical sense of what AI 'can' or 'shouldn't' do in education.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of Key Findings

This mixed-methods investigation analyzes how artificial intelligence integration in teaching and learning affects the academic performance, creativity, and ethical orientation of students at the higher education level. The findings indicate that AI might be used to enhance the effectiveness, understanding, and confidence in learning but also raise some ethical, cognitive, and societal challenges. AI tools are perceived as having high utility by the students, and such strong perceived usefulness supports TAM; however, this ethical ambiguity points towards an increased emphasis on moral trust and legitimacy regulation.

AI plays the role of a constructivist scaffolding system that can provide aid to personalized learning as well as act as a social/cultural mediator between learners to enhance their cognitive interaction zone. At the same time, it's an open invitation to cognitive seduction and groupthink, particularly if we take it without understanding of what is at work and with ethical attention. The results endorse the claim that we should not consider AI as being 'intelligence per se' but rather an intelligent partner along with human intelligence.

POLICY AND EDUCATIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations for practice the current study provides some recommendations of potential value to institutions, policymakers, and educators that can be implemented now:

1. ***Create Holistic AI Literacy Programs:*** Embed coursework on algorithmic bias, data ethics, and responsible AI use into university curricula.
2. ***Develop Explicit Ethical Guidelines:*** Develop explicit policies on when and how to use AI in classrooms (to avoid their ambivalence and the possibility of teachers' inappropriate practices).
3. ***Teach Teachers how to be Partners with AI:*** Teach teachers to create exams and projects involving AI.
4. Level the digital playing field: Offer institutional subscriptions—and/or endowments of AI tools.
5. ***Human Rights Watch CONDUCT PERIODIC ETHICAL AUDITS:*** Create dedicated AI ethics bodies to audit applications, judge fairness, and refresh norms every few years.
6. ***Encourage AI as a Meditative and Contemplative Tool:*** Support critique of its outputs (now and to come) so that we don't lose touch with collaborators who contribute uniquely creative or metacognitive styles.

Broader Implications

This is in addition to the immediate educational impacts of our work, which we believe constitutes a major contribution to international debate on ethical and equitable AI integration into higher education. It's a wonderful reminder to strive for the right balance between technical prowess and human tradition.

AI will increasingly become a critical intellectual partner in the creation of knowledge as higher education itself transforms into an analytics-inductive, hybrid experience. Yet the extent of its impact will rely on how institutions develop a culture of empathy, cultural competency, and digital inclusion. The new frontier of education lies in the tension between replacing human reasoning with our technology and the quest to re-humanize AI by rebuilding the moral and intellectual base on which learning is founded.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors extend their appreciation to the Deanship of Research and Graduate Studies at King Khalid University for funding this work through the Large Research Project under grant number RGP2/234/46

Conflicts of Interest

The authors stated that there are no conflicts of interest.

REFERENCES

Abney, K. (2012). Robotics, ethical theory, and metaethics: A guide for the perplexed. In P. Lin, K. Abney, & G. A. Bekey (Eds.), *Robot ethics: The ethical and social implications of robotics* (pp. 35–54). MIT Press.

Albayati, H. (2024). Investigating undergraduate students' perceptions and awareness of using ChatGPT as a regular assistance tool: A user acceptance perspective study. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 6*, Article 100203. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100203

Araujo, T., Helberger, N., Kruikemeier, S., & de Vreese, C. H. (2020). In AI we trust? Perceptions about automated decision-making by artificial intelligence. *AI & Society, 35*, 611–623. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-019-00931-w

Bin, Y., & Mandal, D. (2019). English teaching practice based on artificial intelligence technology. *Journal of Intelligent & Fuzzy Systems, 37*(3), 3381–3391. https://doi.org/10.3233/JIFS-179141

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101.

Bundy, A. (2017). Preparing for the future of artificial intelligence. *AI & Society, 32*, 285–287.

Dasgupta, S., Granger, M., & McGarry, N. (2002). User acceptance of e-collaboration technology: An extension of the technology acceptance model. *Group Decision and Negotiation, 11*, 87–100.

Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly, 13*(3), 319–340.

Ekowo, M., & Palmer, I. (2017). *Predictive analytics in higher education: Five guiding practices for ethical use.*https://na-production.s3.amazonaws.com/documents/Predictive-Analytics-GuidingPractices.pdf

Fitria, T. N. (2021). QuillBot as an online tool: Students' alternative in paraphrasing and rewriting of English writing. *Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities, 9*(1), 183–196. https://doi.org/10.22373/ej.v9i1.10233

Hwang, Y. S., & Vrongistinos, K. (2012). Using Blackboard and Skype for mentoring beginning teachers. *American Journal of Distance Education, 26*(3), 172–179.

Jain, S., & Alam, M. A. (2020). Comparative study of artificial intelligence-based teaching with human interactive teaching. In E. C. Idemudia (Ed.), *Advances in business strategy and competitive advantage* (pp. 68–100). IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-3351-2.ch005

Keller, B., Baleis, J., Starke, C., & Marcinkowski, F. (2019). *Machine learning and artificial intelligence in higher education: A state-of-the-art report on the German university landscape.*

Klamma, R., de Lange, P., Neumann, A. T., Hensen, B., Kravcik, M., Wang, X., & Kuzilek, J. (2020). Scaling mentoring support with distributed artificial intelligence. In *Intelligent tutoring systems* (pp. 38–44). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-49663-0_6

Koufaris, M. (2002). Applying the technology acceptance model and flow theory to online consumer behavior. *Information Systems Research, 13*(2), 205–223.

Kottaparamban, M., Usmani, S., Abdallah, N. M. M., Begum, T., Hamed, S. O. E., & Ali, E. H. F. (2024). Art, literature and performance in the age of social media: Exploring alternative aesthetics in home cinemas of Malabar. *Research Journal in Advanced Humanities, 5*(4). https://doi.org/10.58256/70jrp738

Luckin, R., Holmes, W., Griffiths, M., & Forcier, L. (2022). *Intelligence unleashed: An argument for AI in education*(Updated ed.). Pearson Education.

O'Neil, C. (2016). *Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy*. Crown Publishing Group.

OECD. (2024). *Artificial intelligence in education: Policy perspectives and ethical guidelines.* OECD Publishing.

Prinsloo, P., & Slade, S. (2017). Big data, higher education and learning analytics: Beyond justice, towards an ethics of care. In B. K. Daniel (Ed.), *Big data and learning analytics in higher education: Current theory and practice* (pp. 109–124). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-06520-5

Terzopoulos, G., & Satratzemi, M. (2019). Voice assistants and artificial intelligence in education. In *Proceedings of the 9th Balkan Conference on Informatics* (pp. 1–6). https://doi.org/10.1145/3351556.3351588

Usmani, S., Kottaparamban, M., Ali, E. H. F., & Jabir, M. K. (2025). The evolution of social media language: Slang, emojis, and linguistic shifts across platforms. *Research Journal in Advanced Humanities, 6*(2). https://doi.org/10.58256/kfq43733

Vialardi, C., Braver, J., Shaftr, L., & Ortiaosa, Á. (2009). Recommendation in higher education using data mining techniques. In *EDM'09: 2nd International Conference on Educational Data Mining* (pp. 190–199).

Wirtz, B. W., Weyerer, J. C., & Geyer, C. (2018). Artificial intelligence and the public sector: Applications and challenges. *International Journal of Public Administration, 42*(7), 596–615. https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2018.1498103

Yeruva, A. R. (2023). Providing a personalized healthcare service to the patients using AIOps monitoring. *Eduvest – Journal of Universal Studies, 3*(2), 327–334.

Zhang, W., & Fadel, C. (2024). Generative AI as a cognitive partner: Redefining human–AI collaboration in higher education. *Computers & Education: Artificial Intelligence, 6*, Article 100298.

Zhang, Z. (2021). The impact of digital technologies on entrepreneurship education. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 448–452. https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.210407.088

