

Perspective

## Edu GPT: A prelude to its responsible embrace in higher education

Md. Saiful Alam<sup>1</sup>, Adelina Asmawi<sup>2,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of English, World University of Bangladesh, Dhaka 1230, Bangladesh

<sup>2</sup> Department of Language and Literacy Education, Universiti Malaya, Kuala Lumpur 50603, Malaysia

\* Corresponding author: Adelina Asmawi, [adelina@um.edu.my](mailto:adelina@um.edu.my)

### CITATION

Alam MS, Asmawi A. Edu GPT: A prelude to its responsible embrace in higher education. *Forum for Education Studies*. 2024; 2(3): 1444. <https://doi.org/10.59400/fes.v2i3.1444>

### ARTICLE INFO

Received: 13 June 2024

Accepted: 6 August 2024

Available online: 9 October 2024

### COPYRIGHT



Copyright © 2024 by author(s).  
*Forum for Education Studies* is published by Academic Publishing Pte. Ltd. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license.  
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

**Abstract:** The domains of artificial intelligence (AI) and the field of education have an extending history of complementary advances and a co-evolutionary trajectory. Following this trajectory, the contemporaneity of the cited co-evolution has been tracked down in the most recent introduction of Edu GPT for campuses. In this commentary, we offer some procedural considerations and sort out some prerequisites that would serve as the prelude to Edu GPT's embrace in higher education. As opposed to the wholesale adoption of this updated GPT in higher education, we advocate for a glocalized approach that relies on epistemic guidance to make historically informed decisions about welcoming or rejecting this GPT tool. The potentially catastrophic effects of blindly embracing of Edu GPT can be avoided by pragmatized alternative mechanisms for balanced and responsible uses of the tool. Besides, contextual diversities have to be especially considered while the approach further calls for a structural episodic implementation stages: (a) design, (b) development, (c) adoption, (d) monitoring, and (e) normalization. We further characterize the adoption method by criticality and decolonization as a reaction to Edu GPT's western-data-centric epistemic colonization. Furthermore, before implementing Edu GPT in higher education, it is imperative to establish an evidence-based AI proficiency framework and detection infrastructure. In the same vein, teachers' modeling is needed for students to follow when it comes to employing Edu GPT in academic activities as a norm.

**Keywords:** Chat GPT; Edu GPT; AI; higher education; AI in education

It is beyond doubt that there has been a significant co-evolutionary nexus between the continuous dynamics of education and the corresponding advancement in the sophistication of AI-driven educational methodologies. Throughout this co-evolution of digital technology and education, developmental updates are reported on the emergence of Ed-tech from time to time. The latest, for example, is Chat GPT which epitomizes a pivotal juncture in AI-driven education within the contemporary technology-integrated educational landscape. Immediately, research started to compass out the futuristic transformative direction of education with Chat GPT since its emergence late in 2022. It has already been highlighted in research that the AI modality of Chat GPT is a transformative force in educational delivery and experiences across the broader spectrum of education, with numerous utopian prospects and concurrent potential dystopian threats [1–10]. Drawing upon the exponential successes witnessed in the developmental trajectories of Chat GPT 3.5 and Chat GPT 4 within educational contexts, Open AI has embarked on a proactive pursuit of further advancement of Chat GPT's dedicated version for enhancing education. This endeavor has culminated in the most recent (May 2024) conception of Edu GPT which Open AI characterizes as a state-of-the-art iteration tailored specifically for the exigencies of higher education. This iteration reflects Open AI's

commitment to fostering adaptive, interactive, engaging, and productivity-enhancing educational experiences in academia. It is very positive that Open AI has introduced Edu GPT with a proactive dedication to fostering transparency and responsible integration of artificial intelligence within educational settings and acknowledging much attentiveness to potential drawbacks. While Open AI's proposition is "An affordable offering for universities to responsibly bring AI to campus", what constitutes the preparatory groundwork preceding the responsible adoption of this education-centric version of Edu GPT remains a big question.

In the contemporary era characterized by a predominant focus on technology-driven education and the utilization of artificial intelligence (AI) in educational practices, higher education institutions must adopt a glocalized approach. In doing so, it necessitates conceptualizing higher education as a complex system wherein education, technology, and societal dynamics are interwoven, rather than treated as discrete entities. Given this perspective, campuses that are characterized by either incapability or resistance towards AI integration must undergo a paradigm shift in the first place. That is, those campuses should take on a modernization and contemporization approach within their higher education premises before moving towards actively embracing AI in the campuses. Only then will integrating AI modalities such as Edu GPT within higher education serve as a contemporary imperative.

Besides the spirit of glocalization in AI integration in higher education, epistemic guidance is also important to consider in adopting AI on campuses. For this epistemic investigation, a historical examination is imperative to understand how AI has already been a catalyst for educational advancement, transformation, and modernization. That is, campuses may be urged to retrospectively analyze the trajectory of AI in education. This may, in return, result in an objective, historically informed decision about welcoming or rejecting Edu GPT on campuses. This historical contextualization of education intertwined with AI serves as a departure point for the reformation venture in higher education within an epistemic ecosystem of technological pedagogy and an ontology of educational technology. Thus, reviewing the historical positivity of AI (e.g., Edu GPT) in education can assist universities in resolving the Hamletian dilemma of whether or not to use Edu GPT in higher education. Scholars generally recommend a comprehensive review of AI tools in education [11].

In addition to the above ideological, historical, and epistemic considerations, the phenomenon of Edu GPT integration in higher education requires pragmatization with an alternative mechanism for maintaining a balanced and responsible use of this new Ed tech. Relying entirely on Edu GPT without contingency plans may lead to catastrophic consequences. Keeping in mind those catastrophic potentials, it is imperative to pragmatically position Edu GPT as a facilitator rather than a complete substitute for human involvement in education. To put it otherwise, achieving a harmonious balance between AI and human input in educational delivery and practices is essential for the meaningful integration of Edu GPT into education systems. This meaningfulness in responsible uses of Edu GPT can be achieved by ensuring the establishment of boundaries and systems within higher education integrated with AI. For instance, while the production of essays solely generated by Edu GPT without human student input is not advisable, essays crafted by students with the guidance and

support of Edu GPT up to a certain acceptable threshold may be considered. We must be consequentially aware that the overshadowing of human intelligence by artificial intelligence must not be allowed, and the necessity of maintaining human agency in educational processes must also be affirmed.

In contrast to the haphazard and unprepared integration of Edu GPT within campuses, a deliberate and cautious approach rooted in design principles may be advocated. This approach necessitates a structured and episodic implementation process. The process may be phased into (a) design, (b) development, (c) adoption, (d) ongoing monitoring, and (e) eventual normalization of Edu GPT as a standardized AI framework in higher education. During the development and design phases, attention must be given to policymaking, guideline establishment, literacy enhancement, ethical boundary delineation, regulatory framework creation, consequence management, and the provision of tools for protection and detection infrastructures. Upon completion of the design and development stages, educators and learners can commence institutional acclimatization of Edu GPT within the established regulatory framework. Any identified loopholes should be promptly addressed through the monitoring mechanism. The detected loopholes may be addressed in immediate and continuous phases dedicated to the re-evaluation and reinforcement of regulations.

It is not an accident that, due to its inherently non-human and non-feeling-based artificial nature, Edu GPT is supposed to lack sensitivity and consideration towards cultural, local, and regional value systems in education. Furthermore, it may lack discipline-specific precision and sensitivity. Consequently, universities should adopt a decolonial approach when integrating Edu GPT into their systems. More specifically, Edu GPT is primarily trained on West-centric data, which may serve as a tool for epistemic colonization. When Edu GPT generates knowledge and cultural specifics, it tends to reflect Western perspectives. Therefore, it is necessary to redirect Edu GPT towards the production of local knowledge and cultural specifics. In other words, users of Edu GPT in universities, particularly those in the global south, must actively steer towards decolonization by feeding Edu GPT with local data, which aims at fostering epistemic justice.

In addition to the aforementioned abstraction of epistemic justice, implementation infrastructure, and role modeling by university teachers are prerequisites for guiding and streamlining students' Edu GPT uses. Ideally, unmonitored personalized utilization of Edu GPT by university students should be aligned with institutional normative standards. In fulfilling this requirement, educators have the potential to shape students' subjective norms concerning the responsible application of Edu GPT. This could be realized through ongoing interactions, instructional methods, and dialogical exchanges between educators and their students. Practically speaking, educators serve as role models for students and 'their understanding of AI' [12], and other aspects play a transformative role in students' multi-dimensional development. Therefore, the day-to-day interactions between teachers and students may serve as opportunities to instill a mentality of adherence to institutional norms regarding using EDU GPT.

Embracing Edu GPT is heavily subject to contextual diversities. It is already evident that disparities in digital access, commonly referred to as digital divides, are manifest among university students of diverse socio-economic backgrounds. Given

this digital divide, before harnessing the educational potential of Edu GPT, it is imperative to establish frameworks that ensure accessibility and equity. As one of the major means toward this accessibility and equity framework, universities may thus be encouraged to develop systematic sponsorship provisions and explore various funding options to facilitate widespread access to Edu GPT for both students and faculty. Furthermore, beyond mere financial alleviation, efforts should be directed towards comprehensive training initiatives aiming to acquire students with Edu GPT. As a result, these measures can make students transition from novices in artificial intelligence (AI) to proficient practitioners and make them adept in both AI and their respective domains, as suggested by scholars [13].

An attitudinal focus is also a part of the proposed prelude to the Edu GPT embrace on campuses. A criticality is, for instance, an obvious need. The uncritical adoption of any AI tool such as Edu GPT within academic settings should be cautioned against because it risks reinforcing a consumerist attitude toward technological integration without due consideration for its broader implications in higher education. That is, a critical examination of the merits and demerits of Edu GPT is imperative. The uncritical, unfiltered integration of this new AI tool in higher education may cause disturbances to established academic conventions, particularly within those university contexts that adhere to No-AI principles. Consequently, it is incumbent upon stakeholders to assess the feasibility and asymmetry between the potential benefits and drawbacks inherent in the incorporation of Edu GPT within campus environments.

In conjunction with a critical approach to Edu GPT, developing detection infrastructure and resources is important for universities to have before integrating Edu GPT into their educational practices. For instance, the implementation of text detection systems may assist in determining whether a text is human-composed or AI-generated. Once such a system is in place, it must be guided by a set of operational policies. Furthermore, the delineation between “plagiarized” and “original” content necessitates the establishment of labeling systems. Additionally, universities have to set up tolerance limits for Edu GPT usage. Thus, addressing issues related to the misuse of Edu GPT and determining acceptable thresholds for its utilization constitute essential tasks for the development of a responsible detection and labeling framework and tolerance limit setting. This endeavor aligns with the broader mission of establishing mechanisms aimed at mitigating the criminalization of AI usage in higher education.

An evidence-based AI proficiency framework needs to be established before embracing Edu GPT in a broader higher educational framework. This proficiency entails a multifaceted understanding of user proficiency, critical evaluation of empirical evidence about Edu GPT, and the boundaries between artificial intelligence (AI) and human intelligence and how they complement or supplement each other. This process may correspond to what [14] is identified as the SWAT analysis of Chat GPT. This proficiency framing will play a pivotal role in assessing whether Edu GPT may facilitate skill enhancement or skill degradation.

From a pragmatic point of view, embracing Edu GPT on campuses may not be as naive and simple as that. It is not a once-off task. Rather, it demands continuous vigilance and adaptation in light of the rapid advancements in artificial intelligence (AI) technologies. More specifically, it is an ongoing obligation for universities to

address the uncertainties and concerns surrounding AI once it becomes an integral part of campus environments. As part of the continuous vigilance and tracking down of the evolution of AI, universities should make proactive efforts in problem-solving and collaborative engagement among stakeholders who are involved in establishing Edu GPT-affiliated campuses. This ongoing monitoring is essential for reevaluating and reorganizing existing systems to effectively mitigate any potential adverse implications stemming from new developments in AI.

We want to conclude that Edu GPT epitomizes the current epoch of AI integration within higher education. Open AI advocates for the responsible adoption of this advanced iteration within university campuses. In response, global universities must incentivize themselves to reconceptualize higher education as an intricately entertained phenomenon encompassing education, society, and technology. This theoretical shift necessitates foregrounding an AI-driven futuristic vision of higher education while contextualizing it within AI's historical trajectory of educational advancements. Rather than hastily embracing Edu GPT, universities should adopt an episodic approach, integrating it within a system characterized by institutional norms that align with students' personalized usage patterns and are guided by a decolonial framework. Additionally, the responsible implementation of Edu GPT within campus settings necessitates several key components. These include securing sponsorship and funding for its deployment, providing comprehensive training, conducting thorough evaluations to assess the balance between the positive and negative aspects of Edu GPT, establishing robust detection infrastructure and accompanying policies, implementing measures to decriminalize data usage, and actively seeking empirical evidence about Edu GPT and its evolving trends. In a word, there is a heavily responsible preparatory prelude to the embracing of Edu GPT in higher education that universities should consider before integrating this newest AI tool into their educational practices.

**Conflict of interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## References

1. Alam MdS, Asmawi A. Chat GPT in Constructivist Language Pedagogy: Exploring Its Potential and Challenges in Legal Vocabulary Acquisition. *AREL*. 2023; 12(4). doi: 10.22108/are.2024.139708.2188
2. Adeshola I, Adepoju AP. The opportunities and challenges of ChatGPT in education. *Interactive Learning Environments*. 2023; 1-14. doi: 10.1080/10494820.2023.2253858
3. Lo CK. What Is the Impact of ChatGPT on Education? A Rapid Review of the Literature. *Education Sciences*. 2023; 13(4): 410. doi: 10.3390/educsci13040410
4. Grassini S. Shaping the Future of Education: Exploring the Potential and Consequences of AI and ChatGPT in Educational Settings. *Education Sciences*. 2023; 13(7): 692. doi: 10.3390/educsci13070692
5. Rahman MdM, Watanobe Y. ChatGPT for Education and Research: Opportunities, Threats, and Strategies. *Applied Sciences*. 2023; 13(9): 5783. doi: 10.3390/app13095783
6. Yang Z, Wu JG, Xie H. Taming Frankenstein's monster: Ethical considerations relating to generative artificial intelligence in education. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*. 2024; 1-14. doi: 10.1080/02188791.2023.2300137
7. Labadze L, Grigolia M, Machaidze L. Role of AI chatbots in education: systematic literature review. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*. 2023; 20(1). doi: 10.1186/s41239-023-00426-1
8. Crompton H, Burke D. The Educational Affordances and Challenges of ChatGPT: State of the Field. *TechTrends*. 2024; 68(2): 380-392. doi: 10.1007/s11528-024-00939-0

9. Bobula M. Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) in higher education: a comprehensive review of challenges, opportunities, and implications. *Journal of Learning Development in Higher Education*. 2024; 30.
10. Gill SS, Kaur R. ChatGPT: Vision and challenges. *Internet of Things and Cyber-Physical Systems*. 2023; 3: 262-271. doi: 10.1016/j.iotcps.2023.05.004
11. Ray PP. ChatGPT: A comprehensive review on background, applications, key challenges, bias, ethics, limitations and future scope. *Internet of Things and Cyber-Physical Systems*. 2023; 3: 121-154. doi: 10.1016/j.iotcps.2023.04.003
12. Kizilcec RF. To Advance AI Use in Education, Focus on Understanding Educators. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*. 2023; 34(1): 12-19. doi: 10.1007/s40593-023-00351-4
13. Ali O, Murray PA, Momin M, et al. The knowledge and innovation challenges of ChatGPT: A scoping review. *Technology in Society*. 2023; 75: 102402. doi: 10.1016/j.techsoc.2023.102402
14. Farrokhnia M, Banihashem SK, Noroozi O, et al. A SWOT analysis of ChatGPT: Implications for educational practice and research. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*. 2023; 61(3): 460-474. doi: 10.1080/14703297.2023.2195846