

5. ЦИФРОВІ ОСВІТНІ ЕКОСИСТЕМИ

Skitsko V.,

Cand. Sc. (Economics), Associate Professor,
Kyiv National Economic University named after Vadym Hetman, Ukraine,

Pawlyszyn I.,

PhD.Eng., Assistant Professor,
Poznan University of Technology, Poland

RESPONSIBLE USE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN UKRAINIAN AND POLISH HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

Generative artificial intelligence in the form of various AI services (ChatGPT, Gemini, Copilot, and others) is increasingly being integrated into various spheres of life, including education. Participants of the educational process (students and teachers) are increasingly using various AI services for different purposes, including completing assignments, preparation for classes, research, skills development, and other academic activities. However, along with AI's potential and benefits, new challenges arise, such as the responsible use of AI, the accuracy of the results obtained, compliance with ethical principles, academic integrity concerns, and many others [1, 2]. Some aspects of these issues constituted the focus of this study.

The online survey included a set of questions to identify which AI services students use most often; for what purposes they employ AI services; how students assess the accuracy and usefulness of results obtained with the help of AI; the level of user competence; attitudes towards ethical issues related to using AI, the impact of AI on students' critical thinking.

The survey involved 54 students each from Kyiv National Economic University named after Vadym Hetman (KNEU) from Ukraine and Poznan University of Technology (PUT) from Poland.

The following results were obtained in response to the question of how often students use the proposed generative AI services (ChatGPT, Gemini, Claude, Grok,

Perplexity, Le Chat Mistral, Whisper, DeepSeek, Suno AI, ElevenLabs, Canva, Leonardo AI, Heygen, Runway, Midjourney, Gamma).

KNEU students who participated in the survey use ChatGPT (42.6%), DeepSeek (3.7%), and Canva (1.9%) on a daily basis. Students of PUT who participated in the survey use generative services such as ChatGPT (25.9%), Canva (5.6%), and Gemini (1.9%) daily. Le Chat Mistral and Heygen are not used at all by KNEU students, while Whisper, Leonardo AI, Heygen, and Midjourney are not used at all by PUT students. Assuming that «from time to time» means 2-3 days a week, KNEU students use 14 of the services listed in the survey in this mode (all except Le Chat Mistral and Heygen), whereas PUT students use 6 (ChatGPT, Canva, Gemini, DeepSeek, Grok, Perplexity). It can be concluded that ChatGPT is the most popular generative AI service at both universities, and Canva, Gemini, and DeepSeek can also be considered among the most commonly used generative AI services.

The survey revealed that at both educational institutions, students most frequently use generative AI services for information retrieval (see Table 1). In addition, writing essays, abstracts, and other written works, as well as idea generation, emerged as the most popular uses of generative AI at both universities.

Table 1. Ranking of areas of application of generative AI services by students of KNEU and PUT

KNEU		PUT	
1	information retrieval	1	information retrieval
2	writing essays, reports, and similar academic texts	2	idea generation
3	idea generation	3	writing essays, reports, and similar academic texts
4	software code development	4	solving routine and assessment tasks in academic disciplines
5	text translation	5	image generation
6	solving routine and assessment tasks in academic disciplines	6	searching for scientific sources and compiling bibliographies
7	searching for scientific sources and compiling bibliographies	7	text translation
8	image generation	8	software code development

The accuracy and usefulness of the results obtained using generative AI were assessed by students at both universities at a similar level – within a range of 3 to 4 points (where 1 point indicates very poor performance and 5 points indicates excellent performance). The number of KNEU students who assigned scores of «3» and «4» was approximately equal, whereas among PUT students, the number assigning a score of «3» was significantly higher than those assigning a score of «4». Additionally, several PUT students rated the usefulness of the AI-generated results as «2».

When working with generative AI services, critical thinking skills and the ability to adequately and expertly evaluate the outputs are essential. The students were asked to self-assess their level of proficiency with AI services. The distribution of students by self-assessed proficiency level is presented in Table 2. It is important to note that this distribution reflects the students' subjective self-evaluations. As the data indicate, KNEU students tend to rate their skills higher than PUT students. This finding highlights the potential need for the development of an objective assessment instrument, such as a test or certification exam, to reliably evaluate proficiency in the use of various generative AI services.

Table2. Distribution of students by level of proficiency in using AI services (as a percentage)

	User proficiency level	KNEU	PUT
1	Beginner	0,0	7,4
2	Novice	3,7	31,5
3	Intermediate	51,9	40,7
4	Advanced	38,9	20,4
5	Expert	5,6	0,0

Almost half of the surveyed students at both universities express uncertainty about whether they always use AI-generated results responsibly. At the same time, more than 30% of students at both institutions believe that they use the results obtained through AI fully responsibly (see Table 3).

Table 3. Distribution of students by response to the question: «Do you consider your use of AI in the educational process to be responsible?» (as a percentage)

		KNEU	PUT
1	I do not use AI in my studies	0,0	1,9
2	No, not responsible at all	1,9	5,6
3	Not entirely responsible	18,5	5,6
4	Yes, but I sometimes doubt whether it is always responsible	48,1	50,0
5	Yes, I use AI fully responsibly	31,5	37,0

Students from both universities place a high value on the importance of adhering to ethical principles when using AI, and more than half of them believe that the use of AI may have a negative impact on the development of their critical thinking skills.

The top advantages of using generative AI services, as identified by students from both universities, are time savings, access to new resources, and instant feedback (see Table 4). At the same time, students at both KNEU and PUT share the view that the main risk associated with the use of generative AI in education is the decline of critical thinking (see Table 5). However, the subsequent ranking of risks shows some differences. For example, for KNEU students, the next most important risk is related to breaches of academic integrity, whereas for PUT students, it is dependence on technology.

Table 4. Ranking of the advantages of using generative AI services, based on a survey of students from KNEU and PUT

KNEU		PUT	
1	time savings	1	time savings
2	access to new resources	2	instant feedback
3	instant feedback	3	access to new resources
4	enhanced learning accessibility	4	opportunity for big data-driven learning
5	improvement of learning outcomes	5	improvement of learning outcomes
6	personalized learning	6	enhanced learning accessibility
7	opportunity for big data-driven learning	7	interactivity and engagement
8	interactivity and engagement	8	personalized learning
9	development of critical thinking and creativity	9	development of critical thinking and creativity
10	preparation for the future	10	preparation for the future

Table 5. Ranking of the risks associated with the use of generative AI services, based on a survey of students from KNEU and PUT

KNEU		PUT	
1	decline of critical thinking	1	decline of critical thinking
2	breaches of academic integrity	2	dependence on technology
3	dependence on technology	3	limitation of creativity
4	insufficient context interpretation and misinterpretation of data	4	insufficient context interpretation and misinterpretation of data
5	limitation of creativity	5	breaches of academic integrity
6	privacy and security concerns	6	privacy and security concerns
7	excessive automation and interference in the educational process	7	excessive automation and interference in the educational process
8	unequal access to AI technologies	8	unequal access to AI technologies

It should be noted that all the results presented refer exclusively to the students who participated in the survey at the beginning of May 2025. If a larger sample of students were surveyed, both in Ukraine and in Poland, the results might differ from those presented here. This study can serve as a starting point for further large-scale research in both countries aimed at understanding the issue of responsible use of artificial intelligence in education and incorporating students' perspectives into the development of relevant AI usage guidelines – at the level of individual courses, universities, and national education policies.

References

1. Kovari, A. (2025). *Ethical use of ChatGPT in education – Best practices to combat AI-induced plagiarism*. *Frontiers in Education*. Vol. 9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1465703>
2. Williams, R.T. (2024). *The ethical implications of using generative chatbots in higher education*. *Frontiers in Education*. Vol. 8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2023.1331607>