NIGERIAN JOURNAL OF PUBLIC SECTOR MANAGEMENT (NJPSM)

Ethics and Excellence in Public Administration:The Artificial Intelligence Era

[1]Timothy I. Utile & [2]Joseph Terlumun Apav
[1]Department of Public Administration, Rev. Fr. Moses Orshio Adasu University Makurdi
[2]Department of Public Administration, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife
[1]**E-mail:** timutile1@gmail.com **GSM**: 08038642398
[2]**Email:** apavterjoseph@gmail.com **GSM:** 08155904735

Abstract
The rapid adoption of generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) in higher education has created both opportunities for academic support and ethical concerns about originality, critical thinking and academic responsibility. The study was anchored on the Technology Acceptance theory developed by Davis (1989), which explains technology adoption based largely on perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use. A mixed-method design was adopted. Data were obtained from (289) students selected from a population of 1,037 using proportional sampling, complemented by interviews with four departmental Staff. Quantitative data were analysed using frequency, percentage, mean and Pearson correlation, while interview responses were thematically analysed. The findings show high awareness and use of AI: 89.9% of respondents were aware of AI tools and 84.0% used them for academic activities. Ethical concerns were substantially raised particularly over-dependence on Artificial Intelligence that may weaken critical thinking (Mean = 4.20), plagiarism and weak referencing (Mean = 4.12), and the absence of clear institutional guidelines (Mean = 4.14). Responsible use was positively associated with self-reported academic performance ($r = 0.68$, $p < 0.01$), while 86.5% supported ethical AI training and 87.5% expressed willingness to follow guidelines. The study concludes that AI can support academic excellence when used as a tool to support intelligent thinking rather than a substitute for independent reasoning. The study recommends clear guidelines, student training workshops, verification practices and structured departmental sensitization for better Ai application and full implementation of Plagiarism check as well as Ai usage not exceeding 10%.

Keywords: Ethics, Excellence, Administration, Public Administration, Artificial Intelligence, Era.

Introduction

Artificial Intelligence began in the 1950sc, when Alan Turing proposed the Turing Test to measure machine intelligence and John McCarthy coined the term Artificial Intelligence in (1956). It has become an increasingly visible part of university learning, with generative applications such as: chatting/conversation Generative, Pre-trained, Transformer (ChatGPT), Gemini and related tools being used for searching, explaining concepts, drafting, summarizing and refining academic engagements. Generative Artificial Intelligence has therefore moved from being a specialised technological development to becoming part of everyday educational practice as UNESCO (2023) observes that generative AI is developing faster than many regulatory and institutional arrangements, creating both opportunities for learning and significant questions about how education systems should respond.

In higher educational institutions, the attraction and use of AI is understandable because students often face large volumes of reading, tight assessment deadlines and the need to understand complex concepts within limited periods. An AI tool can provide immediate explanation, suggest alternative formulations, organise ideas and assist with preliminary research. When used as a support to human reasoning, such tools can improve access to information and make learning more interactive. A systematic review and meta-analysis by Deng et al. (2025)

reveal that, the issue linking ethics and excellence in this study is the growing and dependence of students on AI, which may weaken the academic practices that are meant to be built on honesty, originality, acknowledgement of sources, fairness in assessment and responsibility for submitted work. The increasing use of generative AI creates new grey areas around authorship and acceptable assistance. Gruenhagen et al. (2024), in a survey of 337 Australian university students, found that more than one-third had used chatbots to assist with assessment and that students did not necessarily regard such use as a breach of academic integrity. The finding is important because it shows that the existence of a university rule is not sufficient; students must also understand the ethical meaning of the rule and the circumstances in which AI assistance becomes inappropriate.

Statement of the Problem

The growing availability of Artificial Intelligence in universities has created a problem that is both educational and ethical. On one hand, students can use AI to obtain explanations, organise information, improve language and explore alternative perspectives. On the other hand, the same technology can make it easier to produce assignments without sufficient personal engagement, reproduce inaccurate information, conceal the origin of academic work and weaken the distinction between assistance and substitution. The difficulty is that this result cannot be determined simply by asking whether a student uses AI. The purpose, frequency, manner and ethical context of use are equally important. There is also uncertainty about the relationship between AI use and academic excellence. Some evidence suggests positive learning outcomes when AI is integrated into educational activities, while other evidence raises concerns about dependence, reduced effort and inappropriate use. Deng et al. (2025) found generally positive effects in experimental studies, but they also identified weaknesses in study design and called for more objective and long-term assessment.

Objectives of the Study

The broad objective of the study is to examine: ethics and excellence in Public Administration in the Era of Artificial Intelligence among students: While the specific objectives are to:

i. Examine the use of Artificial Intelligence in Public Administration;
ii. Assess the major ethical issues associated with students' use of Artificial Intelligence in academic activities;
iii. Determine the relationship between responsible use of Artificial Intelligence and academic excellence among Public Administration students; and
iv. Identify measures that can promote ethical, responsible and educationally productive use of Artificial intelligence among public administration students.

Research Questions

The study is guided by the following research questions:

i. To what extent do students of Public Administration use Artificial Intelligence?
ii. What are the major ethical issues associated with students' use of Artificial Intelligence in academic activities?

iii. What relationship exists between responsible use of Artificial Intelligence and academic excellence among Public Administration students?
iv. What are the measures that would promote ethical, responsible and educationally productive use of Artificial intelligence among public administration students?

Conceptual Review

Artificial Intelligence: Artificial Intelligence refers to computational systems designed to perform functions that are ordinarily associated with human intelligence, including learning, reasoning, pattern recognition, language processing and decision support. AI can be viewed as an assistive technology rather than a replacement for intellectual activity. Students may use it to brainstorm research questions, obtain preliminary explanations, generate examples, identify areas that need further reading or receive feedback on drafts. Yet the technology can also produce false references, biased statements and plausible but inaccurate explanations. UNESCO (2023).

Ethics: Ethics is concerned with principles used to distinguish acceptable norms from unacceptable norms/conduct. In academic environments, ethical conduct includes honesty in presenting research work, respect for intellectual property, proper acknowledgement of sources, fairness in assessment and responsibility for the claims contained in submitted research work.

Academic Excellence: Academic excellence refers to the quality of students' educational achievements as reflected in knowledge, understanding, analytical ability, critical thinking, problem solving and performance in assessed academic activities. It should not be reduced entirely to examination scores. A student may obtain a high mark while demonstrating weak independent reasoning, if the assessment allows extensive unacknowledged external assistance.

Artificial Intelligence in Public Administration: Public Administration is affected by digital technologies. Governments use digital platforms, data systems, automated processes and algorithmic tools to support service delivery, policy analysis and administrative decision-making. Students of Public Administration consequently need a basic understanding of AI and its implications for public organisations. At the same time, they must appreciate that technological efficiency does not remove the need for accountability, transparency, fairness and human judgement. The educational use of AI should, therefore, prepare students with both dimensions. In public institutions, an inaccurate automated recommendation can have consequences for citizens wellbeing, just as an inaccurate AI-generated academic claim can mislead a student. Training students to verify information, disclose assistance where required and retain responsibility for their work is thus consistent with the broad values of responsible public Administration.

Theoretical Framework

The Technology Acceptance Model (TAM); the theory was propounded by Fred D. Davis in (1989) to explain users' acceptance and ease of information technology. Davis developed the model from the tradition of the theory of Reasoned Action and proposed that two central beliefs, perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use, are fundamental determinants of technology acceptance. Perceived usefulness refers to the degree to which a person believes that using a particular system will improve performance, while perceived ease of use refers to the degree to which the person believes that using the system will require little effort (Davis, 1989).

The crux of this theory is that people are more likely to accept and use a technology when they believe that it is useful and relatively easy to use. The theory provides a logical explanation for why students may adopt generative AI for academic work. If students believe that an AI system saves time, improves understanding, assists writing or supports research, they are more likely to use it. If the system is also easy to access and interact with, the likelihood of continued use increases. In the context of this study, these provide a basis for examining the extent of AI adoption among Public Administration students.

The assumptions of the theory are that: Users form beliefs about the usefulness of a technology before deciding whether to use it. On the other hand, ease of use influences acceptance because a technology that is difficult to operate imposes additional cognitive and practical costs. It also reflected in behavioural intention and actual use as well as external conditions that can shape the beliefs that users form about a technology. Despite its usefulness, TAM is criticised due to the fact that, technology acceptance theory does not fully explain ethical reasoning. A technology may be perceived as highly useful and easy to use while still being used inappropriately. It is also criticised on the grounds that, considerable emphasis is placed on individuals' perceptions and may understate institutional rules, peer influence, academic culture, moral values and unequal access.

The relevance of TAM to this study lies in perceived usefulness which can explain why students employ AI to simplify difficult academic tasks, while perceived ease of use can explain continued reliance on the technology. The theory also permits the study to distinguish acceptance from responsible use. A student may readily accept AI because it is useful, but responsible academic use requires additional considerations such as verification, transparency, originality and compliance with departmental rules.

Empirical Review

The empirical literature on AI and higher education is still developing rapidly. The studies reviewed below were selected because they address student use, academic performance, academic integrity or the conditions under which AI contributes to learning. Attention is given to the author and year, purpose, method, findings and the gap that the present study seeks to address.

Gruenhagen et al. (2024) examined students' perceptions and use of generative AI chatbots for assistance with university assessments. The study was motivated by the rapid adoption of tools such as ChatGPT that could disrupt conventional understandings of academic integrity. The researchers used a survey design involving 337 Australian university students and investigated the extent of chatbot use, students' perceptions of whether such use constituted an academic integrity violation, and psychosocial factors associated with use. The findings showed that more than one-third of respondents had used a chatbot for assessment assistance and that students did not necessarily interpret such assistance as a breach of academic integrity. The study concluded that higher education institutions need clearer guidance on academically honest AI use and may also need to reconsider assessment design.

Al-Mamary et al. (2025) investigated the factors associated with university students' academic performance when using ChatGPT in Saudi Arabia. The study adopted the technology-to-performance chain perspective and examined task characteristics, technology characteristics and individual characteristics as factors shaping the effectiveness of ChatGPT use. A survey of 257 respondents was conducted through an online questionnaire, while structural modeling was employed to examine relationships among the variables. The study reported important relationships between task characteristics, technology characteristics, individual characteristics and task-technology fit, with implications for student academic performance and technology adoption. The gap is that the study concentrated on technology-to-performance relationships rather than the ethical dimension of AI use. It also examined a Saudi Arabian context and therefore leaves room for evidence from Nigerian Public Administration students, particularly on whether responsible use and ethical conduct are associated with academic excellence.

Deng et al. (2025) conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis of experimental studies to determine whether ChatGPT enhances student learning. The researchers searched five databases and identified 69 relevant articles published between 2022 and 2024. Their synthesis showed that ChatGPT interventions were predominantly conducted at university level and generally improved academic performance, affective-motivational outcomes and higher-order thinking propensities, while reducing mental effort. However, the authors noted methodological limitations, including weaknesses in power analysis and concerns about post-intervention assessment, and recommended more objective and longer-term approaches. The present study builds on this evidence but addresses a different gap. The meta-analysis aggregates experimental evidence and therefore does not specifically capture how individual students perceive, accept and ethically use AI in a Public Administration department. The present study will provide primary survey evidence on those dimensions.

Apav et al. (2026) carried out a study on Artificial Intelligence adoption in Nigerian Tertiary institutions, the ethical challenges, critical thinking decline and its implications for sustainable development in Nigeria. Secondary sources of data were used as a means of generating data relating to the study. The paper through its findings reveal that Artificial Intelligence is one of the new technologies adopted in most organisations including schools and if used ethically would bring about effective and efficiency in the running of organisational tasks. The findings concluded that, Artificial Intelligence has largely brought about decline in critical thinking of students. The gap is that the paper was a qualitative which this present paper intends to cover by making this one quantitative.

Methodology

The paper drew its data from primary and secondary sources; primary sources were obtained from questionnaire, interviews and secondary source of information were obtained journals, such as Journal of: Applied research in higher education, text books such as: Generative Ai and its implications for academic intergrity and government official gazette as well as internet sources. This paper sampled (289) respondents and administered questionnaire correctly filled and returned by students across the levels geared towards their perception on the ethical use of Artificial Intelligence and how it has enhanced their excellence. On the level of measuring

academic excellence 4 staff were sampled for an interview in order to give their perception about the ethical and unethical use of Artificial intelligence by students.

Population of the Study

The study population comprised 1,037 students of the Department of Public Administration and 3 staff were selected to air their opinion about the ethical use of Artificial Intelligence in the department of Public Administration. The population of the students is thus: The population comprised 268 students at 100 Level, 277 at 200 Level, 140 at 300 Level and 352 at 400 Level.

Sample Size and Sampling Technique

The sample size was determined using Taro Yamane formula of 1967. This is based on the target population of 1,037 The formula is given as:

Where:
n = The Sample Size Sought
N = The population of the study
I = The constant
e = The level of significance (0.05)

$$n = \frac{1{,}037}{1+1037\ (0.05)^2} G$$

$$n = \frac{1{,}037}{1+1037*0.0025}$$

$$n = \frac{1{,}037}{3.5925}$$

n = 288.6
n=289

Sampling Technique

The study adopted proportional sampling in selecting the appropriate respondents for the study. The researcher purposively selected the respondents from the students and staff of the department to air their varying views on the use of Artificial intelligence and how it has enhanced excellence of students. The sample of 289 respondents was distributed proportionately as follows:

Table 1. The Table Showing Distribution of the Sampled Population

Respondents	Population	Distribution of sample size to the population	Proportionate Sample Size
100 Level	268	(268 x 289) /1037)	75
200 Level	277	(277 x 289) /1037	77
300 Level	140	(140 x 289) /1037	39
400 Level	352	(352x 289)/1037	98
Total			289

Source: Field Survey, (2026)

Table 2. Data Presentation Analysis and Discussion of Findings

This section presents data collected from 289 students of Public Administration, Rev. Fr. Moses Orshio Adasu University Makurdi, distributed as 100 Level (75), 200 Level (77), 300 Level (39), 400 Level (98) using proportional sampling. Data were collected using structured questionnaire and oral interviews with 4 staff. Data are analysed descriptively using frequency, percentage and mean (Likert scale threshold: Mean ≥ 3.0 = Agreed). Research questions are answered according to the three specific objectives

Table 2. The Use of Artificial Intelligence in Public Administration

S/N	Item	SA (5)	A (4)	N (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	Mean	Decision
	I am aware of AI tools (ChatGPT, Gemini,Grok etc)	168 (58.1%)	92 (31.8%)	15 (5.2%)	10 (3.5%)	4 (1.4%)	4.42	Agreed
	I use AI tools for academic activities	142 (49.1%)	101 (34.9%)	20 (6.9%)	18 (6.2)	8 (2.8%)	4.21	Agreed
	AI helps in explaining difficult Public Admin concepts	135 (46.7%)	110 (38.1%)	22 (7.6%)	15 (5.2%)	7 (2.4%)	4.22	Agreed
	I use AI mostly for assignment drafting & summarizing	121 (41.9%)	98 (33.9%)	35 (12.1%)	20 (6.9%)	15 (5.2%)	3.99	Agreed
	Frequency of AI use is at least weekly	108 (37.4%)	112 (38.8%)	30 (10.4%)	25 (8.7%)	14 (4.8%)	3.95	Agreed

Source: Field Survey, (2026)

Table 2 shows high awareness and adoption. Overall, (89.9%) of respondents indicated awareness they are aware of AI tools (Mean=4.42). (84.0%) use AI for academic activities (Mean=4.21). 84.8% affirm that AI helps in explaining concepts (Mean=4.22), indicating perceived usefulness (75.8%) use AI for drafting/summarizing and (76.2%) use AI at least weekly. This indicates that AI has become part of students' routine academic practice (UNESCO, 2023). The data implies deep integration of AI in students' learning routine. In an interview with a senior Lecturer in the Department of Public administration, it was admitted that "Virtually all project students admit using ChatGPT to clarify theories like New Public Management. The problem is not use, but blind copying." Interviewee further note that 300 and 400 level students use AI for literature search more than library."

Table 3: The Major Ethical Issues Associated with Students' Use of AI

S/N	Ethical Issue	SA	A	N	D	SD	Mean	Decision
	AI use encourages plagiarism & weak referencing	132 (45.7%)	105 (36.3%)	18 (6.2%)	22 (7.6%)	12 (4.2%)	4.12	Agreed
	Students submit AI-generated work as their own	118 (40.8%)	102 (35.3%)	28 (9.7%)	25 (8.7%)	16 (5.5%)	3.97	Agreed
	Over-dependence on AI reduces critical thinking	145 (50.2%)	95 (32.9%)	20 (6.9%)	18 (6.2%)	11 (3.8%)	4.20	Agreed
	Lack of institutional guideline creates grey areas	128 (44.3%)	110 (38.1%)	25 (8.7%)	16 (5.5%)	10 (3.5%)	4.14	Agreed
	AI outputs sometimes contain inaccurate/biased information	101 (34.9%)	118 (40.8%)	35 (12.1%)	20 (6.9%)	15 (5.2%)	3.94	Agreed

Source: Field Survey, (2026)

Objective Two: The findings indicate pronounced ethical concerns. (82.0%) agree that AI encourages plagiarism (Mean=4.12). 76.1% admit submitting AI work as personal effort (Mean=3.97). Highest mean is over-dependence reducing critical thinking (83.1%, Mean=4.20), 82.4% agree that lack of clear policy creates ethical confusion (Mean=4.14), while 75.7% noted that inaccuracy/bias (Mean=3.94). Overall grand mean 4.07 indicates ethical issues are significant.

This finding is further built on a Staff view whom unanimously noted that ethical risk issues faced with the students, in his opinion "I have caught verbatim AI essays without citation. That is academic dishonesty." "We have no departmental AI policy; students exploit the vacuum. "The decline in argumentation skill in exams is visible students can't defend what they submitted online. hence "Ethics is not that AI is used, but how we must teach responsible citation of AI in order to enhance ethical use of Artificial Intelligence" furthermore on the ethical use of AI the interviewee noted that, the correct use of AI should be enhanced by complimenting academic excellence.

Table 4. Relationship between Responsible Use of AI and Academic Excellence

S/N	Item	SA	A	N	D	SD	Mean	Decision
	Responsible AI use improves my understanding & grades	125 (43.3%)	108 (37.4%)	24 (8.3%)	18 (6.2%)	14 (4.8%)	4.08	Agreed
	AI used as support (not substitute) enhances excellence	138 (47.8%)	102 (35.3%)	22 (7.6%)	15 (5.2%)	12 (4.2%)	4.18	Agreed
	Students who verify AI outputs perform better	115 (39.8%)	112 (38.8%)	30 (10.4%)	20 (6.9%)	12 (4.2%)	4.03	Agreed
	Ethical AI training will improve academic integrity	152 (52.6%)	98 (33.9%)	18 (6.2%)	12 (4.2%)	9 (3.1%)	4.29	Agreed
	I am willing to follow guidelines for ethical AI use	148 (51.2%)	105 (36.3%)	16 (5.5%)	12 (4.2%)	8 (2.8%)	4.29	Agreed

Source: Field Survey, (2026)

The findings indicate a positive relationship between responsible AI use and academic excellence. (80.7%) agree responsible use improves understanding/grades (Mean=4.08). 83.1% agree AI as support enhances excellence (Mean=4.18), on positive effects under guided use. 78.6% agree verification leads to better performance (Mean=4.03). Notably, 86.5% support ethical AI training (Mean=4.29) and (87.5%) willingness to comply with guidelines (Mean=4.29), showing high perceived usefulness for regulation. This is in line with Technology Acceptance Theory students accept AI where usefulness is high and ethical clarity exists. The Pearson correlation computed between responsible use composite and self-reported GPA category is $r = 0.68$ ($p<0.01$), indicating strong positive relationship.

In an interview with staff of the department about the use of AI, the first interviewee reveals that, "When students use AI to brainstorm, then write in their own words, quality improves. Excellence comes from guided use." Furthermore, "The interviewee noted that Artificial Intelligence is the best technology that has come to the world but the excessive and

unethical use of it has brought about poor academic performance hence the students rely solely on AI and does not consult physical Books in the Library in order to carry out effective research. He further noted that the university and the department at large is yet to do enough in terms of educating the students about the ethical use of AI and, therefore, called for organization of symposium/workshops for the students in order to educate them about the correct use of Artificial Intelligence.

On the fourth objective which is hinged on identifying the measures that can promote ethical, responsible and educationally productive use of Ai among Public Administration students, they Unanimously opined on the side that the introduction of Artificial intelligence is supposed to enable students build on the already existing practice of studying, but the overreliance on the use has continued to resulted to their low performance, furthermore one of the lecturer interviewed noted that, he has stopped the idea of given Assignment he rather gives the class test in two phases, relatedly, the Head of the department further noted that, as a man of ethics he continues abiding with the NUC standard by given both the Class Test and take Home Assignment, but he also aligned to the fact that the students' performance has been very low since students no longer adopts the virtues of critical thinking as it use to be with the past students.

Conclusion

The study concludes that, Artificial Intelligence has become an important part of academic engagement among Public Administration students at Rev. Fr. Moses Orshio Adasu University, Makurdi. The findings show that students are highly aware of and actively use AI for explaining difficult concepts, preparing assignments, drafting and summarising academic materials. However, the study also establishes the fact that the increasing use of AI has created important ethical issues, particularly plagiarism, weak referencing, submission of AI-generated work as personal effort, over-dependence on technology and the possible decline of students' critical thinking. The concern is therefore not simply whether students use AI, but whether they use it in a manner that preserves academic integrity, independent reasoning and personal responsibility. The study further concludes that AI should not be treated as a replacement for students' intellectual effort, but as a supportive academic tool that can enhance learning when properly guided. The positive relationship found between responsible AI use and self-reported academic performance ($r = 0.68$, $p < 0.01$), together with the strong support for ethical AI training and institutional guidelines, shows the importance of creating a culture of responsible AI use. The responsibility therefore rests on the Department, lecturers and students to establish clear expectations, encourage verification of AI-generated information, strengthen students engagement with books and other credible sources and promote independent thinking. If these measures are consistently applied, AI can become a useful instrument for improving academic learning while preserving the ethical standards and intellectual qualities expected of future Public Administration professionals.

Recommendations

Students should be encouraged to use AI as a learning aid while maintaining engagement with textbooks, journals, library resources and other credible sources. They should

verify AI-generated claims and remain personally responsible for the accuracy and originality of submitted work;

Lecturers should redesign selected assessments to require explanation, defence of submitted work, source verification and evidence of individual reasoning, thereby reducing the possibility of submitting unverified AI-generated responses as personal work;

The Department should organise periodic practical AI ethical seminars or symposium for students, focusing on responsible prompting, verification of AI outputs, citation practices, plagiarism prevention and the preservation of critical thinking;

The Department should develop and communicate a clear AI-use guideline that defines acceptable assistance, disclosure, citation, verification and prohibited substitution of students' independent work;

Students should also imbibe the traditional culture of visiting the Library in order to read textbooks published by scholars in order to add to the information generated through Artificial Intelligence.

References

Al-Mamary, Y. H., Alfalah, A. A., Shamsuddin, A., & Abubakar, A. A. (2025). Artificial Intelligence powering education: ChatGPT's impact on students' academic performance through the lens of technology-to-performance chain theory. Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education, 17(5), 1661–1679. https://doi.org/10.1108/JARHE-04-2024-0179.

Apav, J.T, (2026). Utile,T.I., Oluwakemi F.A., Mayowa W. Artificial Intelligence adoption in Nigerian tertiary institutions. Ethical challenges, critical thinking decline and its implications for sustainable development. An international conference on AI in Social Sciences and humanities for sustainable development. 1st-4th June, 2026. MOAUM.

Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. MIS Quarterly, 13(3), 319–340. https://doi.org/10.2307/249008.

Deng, R., Jiang, M., Yu, X., Lu, Y., & Liu, S. (2025). Does ChatGPT enhance student learning? A systematic review and meta-analysis of experimental studies. Computers & Education, 227, 105224. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2024.105224.

Gruenhagen, J. H., Sinclair, P. M., Carroll, J.-A., Baker, P. R. A., Wilson, A., & Demant, D. (2024). The rapid rise of generative AI and its implications for academic integrity: Students' perceptions and use of chatbots for assistance with assessments. Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 7, 100273. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100273.

UNESCO. (2022). Recommendation on the ethics of Artificial Intelligence. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

UNESCO. (2023). Guidance for generative AI in education and research. United Nations Educational