

# Leveraging ChatGPT for Higher Education Course Offerings

Lionel Mew  
University of Richmond  
lmew@richmond.edu  
University of Richmond  
Richmond VA

William H. Money  
wmoney@citadel.edu  
The Citadel  
Charleston, SC

## Abstract

Since it was released on November 30, 2022, ChatGPT has offered numerous opportunities for higher education professors to improve their course offerings. However, not all information provided by the application is accurate. The application has been known to yield highly inaccurate information with high confidence. Yet, with that knowledge, ChatGPT can still save education practitioners hours of time and improve their courses. By January, 2023, ChatGPT was the fastest growing consumer software application in history, with over 100 million users. Despite any misgivings, it is here to stay. This paper investigates how ChatGPT can be used help IS faculty more easily and effectively prepare and present their courses, and discusses potential opportunities and threats from its use. The emerging ethical and intellectual property issues associated with ChatGPT are also discussed.

**Keywords:** ChatGPT, Academics, Chat Bots. Artificial Intelligence, Information Systems, Education, Information Security.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This paper investigates how ChatGPT can be used to help Information Systems faculty more easily and effectively prepare and present their courses, as well as addresses associated ethical and intellectual property issues. Since it was released on November 30, 2022, ChatGPT has offered numerous opportunities for professors to improve their course offerings. However, is believed to sometimes yield highly inaccurate information with high confidence. There may be biases which are difficult to determine, but which are intuitively obvious. Even with that knowledge, ChatGPT can still save professors hours of time. Although it is not perfect, it is suggested that ChatGPT can help instructors develop organized materials.

This paper provides background on ChatGPT, examines the literature on use in Academia, discusses and how it can help instructors prepare courses. It also discusses issues regarding ethics and intellectual property associated with ChatGPT and AI generative applications.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature suggests that ChatGPT may offer value in all aspects of planning, organizing, providing content, assessing, and offering courses in higher education.

### ChatGPT

Ofgang (2023) found using ChatGPT to prepare for class to be easier than anticipated, although they would not personally use it due to fear of

violating institutional policies, fear of plagiarism and preference for human content. The author suggested that the freeware version of ChatGPT was an easy way for educators to prepare for and create course materials. They suggest it can help to quickly generate syllabi, lesson plans, homework assignments and quizzes.

In a 2023 article, Abramson suggests that rather than ban ChatGPT in the classroom, professors use it to encourage critical thinking in liberal arts courses in a similar fashion to calculators helping students learn mathematics.

### **Ethics and Intellectual Property**

Falati (2023) discusses ongoing issues and litigation concerning AI and intellectual property rights, as well as numerous associated issues. These concerns include biases, privacy violations, copyright infringement, misrepresentation, cheating, and direct plagiarism (Ryan, 2023). Liebrecht, Schleifer, Buadze, Bhugra, and Smith (2023) identify concerns in copyright, attribution, plagiarism, and authorship in the medical field. Wang, Liu, Yang, Guo, Wu, and Liu (2023) address ethical concerns in the healthcare environment.

Ray (2023) addresses ethical concerns in the computer science field. Krügel, Ostermaier, and Uhl (2023) discuss ethical issues in the context of the moral judgment and decisions of users. Zhuo, Huang, Chen, and Xing, (2023a) discuss how AI and ChatGPT have report summarizations, produce software, and perform highly beneficial copywriting functions.

Mhlanga (2023) conducted a literature review investigating 2022 and 2023 literature in education and finds that successful use of ChatGPT requires respect for privacy, fairness, non-discrimination and transparency. Crawford, Cowling, and Allen (2023) describe how ChatGPT has impacted higher education, suggesting that practitioner users want to verify authenticity of student work and detect the use of Chat/GPT using LLMs. Fuchs (2023) argues that in higher education there may be significant benefits from AI tools for personalized learning and on-demand products.

## **3. BACKGROUND**

### **Introduction of AI and ChatGPT**

Chat Generative Pre-trained Transformer, or ChatGPT, is a model known as a chatbot. It is formed from a combination several technologies including Artificial intelligence, natural language processing, and Neural Networks (machine

learning models composed of interconnected processing nodes trained by adjusting the strengths of connections between them (Bishop, 1994). ChatGPT works because it has extensive stored data and is capable of interpreting user requests and generating a suitable response as if it were human.

The application uses components that can trained or be parameterized, and data that can be collected and examined using user input scenarios (Biswas, 2023). The output data include analyses, interpretations, developed stories or generated scenarios, generation, and assessed models. Chat GPT is capable of "learning," and taking direction from prompts to improve its output (McGee, 2023).

The growth and popularity of the system is enormous. ChatGPT, the recent version GPT-3, has reached 1 million users only in 5 days. For comparison, major technology companies, Facebook, Netflix, Instagram, and Twitter could reach this number in 300, 1200, 75, and 720 days respectively (Firat, 2023).

A preview of the AI chatbot created by OpenAI created a media sensation in December 2022. It is based on GPT-3.5, the newest version from OpenAI (Roose, 2022). The most current version, GPT-4 was released on March 14, 2023. It includes an API for the product (Olson, 2023).

### **What the Model Does**

The model is composed of several modules that enable it to train on a set of inputs. OpenAI has developed a Generative Pre-Trained Transformer (GPT) language model that can create responses in a text form that appears to be human language (Dale, 2021). Two forms of AI are used to create the outputs. Unsupervised learning is used for pretraining with unlabeled data to generate the associations in the data. Supervised (guided) AI learning is used to fine-tuning and improve the output on specific prompts or tasks (Erhan, Bengio, Courville, Manzagol, & Vincent, 2010).

### **How components Work to Produce a Product**

ChatGPT works by attempting to understand user prompt and then produce (non-random) strings of words that it predicts (based on weights given to the parameters) will best answer the user's question. To do this, the data it was trained on is critical to the result. It human like learning allows it to GPT to learn patterns and relationships and to create what might be human-like responses (Guinness, June 2, 2023).

### Understanding the bias potential

Lund (2023) states that use of the GPT data can maintain biases and stereotypes present in the data. This is logical since the generative model is trained on a data set. It will incorporate what it has encountered in its response. McGee (2023) observed (by accident) that ChatGPT tendered to generate a biased response to a request that it write Irish Limericks. The outputs from ChatGPT appeared to be positively biased for liberal politicians and negatively biased for conservative politicians. He constructed a test with a sample of 80 limericks and compared the probability of the results showing that the AI was biased to favor liberal politicians and disfavor conservatives. The generative method employed was to instruct ChatGPT to: "Write an Irish Limerick using the word X. "In each instance, X was the name of an individual that was the target of the Limerick. Was this a pattern, or a random occurrence? The sentiment would be one of three results, either positive, negative, or neutral. The Limerick generated outcomes indicated that there is "...strong probability of bias in favor of liberals and against conservatives" (McGee, 2023, pg. 2).

### 4. HIGHER EDUCATION APPLICATION

The literature suggests that AI chatbots such as ChatGPT may be useful for all aspects of preparing and presenting courses in higher education. Ofgang (2023) suggested several ways that educators could easily use ChatGPT for preparing their courses, including generating lesson plans, creating quizzes, developing homework assignments, and developing syllabi. Ofgang uses the ChatGPT freeware version to generate those documents, using various example courses.

### Syllabus Generation

In the case of syllabus generation, Ofgang uses the example of a survey journalism course on basic news writing. To make the work of the current paper more relevant to Edsig, it was decided to use an Information Security Social Engineering example. The authors signed up for the open access version of ChatGPT, and did not practice or partake of any training. Immediately after joining the application, the chat playground was queried with the prompt, *Create a Syllabus for a 12-session social engineering course*. Within a few seconds, the following output was received:

Course Title: Introduction to Social Engineering

Instructor: \_\_\_\_\_

### Course Description:

This course is an introduction to the vast and dynamic field of social engineering. In this course, students will gain an understanding of the psychological mechanisms underlying how social engineering works, and will also gain the technical skills needed to properly identify and defend against social engineering attacks. Upon completion of the course, students will have a working knowledge of social engineering techniques and be able to identify the most common vectors used in social engineering attacks.

### Instructor's Contact Information:

Email: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

### Course Objectives:

- Learn the fundamentals of social engineering
- Develop the ability to recognize common tactics and strategies used in social engineering attacks
- Create strategies for defense against social engineering attacks
- Develop an understanding of the psychological and technical mechanisms behind social engineering

### Course Materials:

- Textbook: Social Engineering: The Art of Deception (By Christopher Hadnagy, Wiley, 2010)
- Compilation of supplemental materials and readings

### Course Requirements:

- Active participation in discussion
- Completion of reading assignments
- Mid-term and final examinations

### Session Overview:

#### Session 1: Introduction

- Introduction to Social Engineering
  - Overview
  - Social Engineering Techniques
  - Human Psychology - Overview

#### Session 2: Building Trust

- Introduction to Human Psychology
  - Establishing and Maintaining Trust
  - Influence and Persuasion

#### Session 3: Pretexting

- Tactics of Pretexting
  - Common Types of Pretexting
  - Social Engineering Techniques Used in Pretexting

Contribution: 50%

Textbook:  
Social Engineering: The Art of Deception  
(By Christopher Hadnagy, Wiley, 2010)

- Session 4: Phishing
- Tactics of Phishing
    - Common Types of Phishing
    - Social Engineering Techniques Used in Phishing

Campus Resources

- Academic Resource Center
- Library
- Student Success Center
- Technology Support Center
- Writing Center

- Session 5: Vishing
- Tactics of Vishing
    - Common Types of Vishing
    - Social Engineering Techniques Used in Vishing

Session 6: Midterm Exam

- Session 7: Human Psychology - Advanced
- Building Rapport
  - Understanding Cognitive Biases

It was immediately thought impressive that within a few seconds, the ChatGPT application generated a useable syllabus. Upon reflection, it was seen that the application selected a book to be used as the course text. The assumption may be that the course description, objectives and lessons would be drawn from the text, with housekeeping such as tests, grading, resources, etc. inserted based on typical syllabi, or a standardized syllabus.

- Session 8: Social Engineering in the Real World
- Practical Social Engineering Scenarios
  - Social Engineering Mitigation Strategies

It was found in later investigation, however, that the application not only listed the title of the text incorrectly, but that the sessions did not correspond to the chapters in the text. So, the question is, how was the syllabus generated? Like Google, the search algorithms used are not easily available. Despite this, the application generated in seconds, something that would likely take a professor much longer to develop. It is suggested that the generated syllabus may be used as a starting point, with verification, due diligence and modification, to yield a definitive course syllabus.

- Session 9: Spamming
- Tactics of Spamming
    - Common Types of Spamming
    - Social Engineering Techniques Used in Spamming

The syllabus was not used for the actual course. The syllabus used was constituted from relevant subjects contained in various texts, and updated over a number of years. However, it would have been okay to use the generated syllabus as it covered most, if not all of the objectives expected of a social engineering course.

- Session 10: Defending Against Social Engineering Attacks
- Tactics to Neutralize Social Engineering Threats
  - Principles of Defending Against Social Engineering

For comparison, the syllabus actually used in the course contained the following topics:

- Session 11: Detection Strategies
- Common Social Engineering Detection Strategies
  - Understanding Social Engineering Vectors

Session 12: Final Exam

Grading:  
Grades will be based on participation, exams, assigned readings, and class contribution. The final grade will be calculated as follows:

- Participation: 10%
- Exams: 40%
- Reading Assignments and Class

Introduction  
Elicitation  
Pretexting  
Mind Tricks  
Persuasion & Influence  
Physical Tools  
Software Tools  
Targeting  
Information Gathering

## Scenarios Prevention & Mitigation

As a comparison shows, the generated topics are more specific in some areas, where the actual syllabus is more holistic in nature.

### Test/Quiz Generation

Ofgang suggests that ChatGPT may be used to quickly generate quizzes, further noting that in liberal arts courses not using a textbook, creating quizzes can be a time-consuming endeavor (2023). Once again using a journalism example, Ofgang asks ChatGPT to generate a writing exercise using the inverted pyramid. Interestingly, instead of a writing exercise, the application generates five multiple choice questions, each with four answers. It is interesting because when the application is questioned using a Social Engineering example, ChatGPT returns a series of short-answer questions. Using the query:

*Create a quiz for the following session: Session 1: Introduction*

- *Introduction to Social Engineering*
- *Overview*
- *Social Engineering Techniques*
- *Human Psychology - Overview*

The application returns:

- 1) What is social engineering?  
A) Social engineering is a type of exploitation that relies on human interactions and psychological manipulation to gain access to confidential information, assets, or sensitive data.
- 2) What are some of the techniques used in social engineering?  
A) Common social engineering techniques include phishing attacks, impersonation attacks, and pretexting.
- 3) What is the role of human psychology in social engineering?  
A) Human psychology plays an important role in social engineering as it is used to manipulate people into giving away confidential information or assets.

A few more attempts at quiz generation were made using trial-and-error (remember, these queries were made without training, and just minutes after signing up for the app). The revised queries were to make it 10 questions, to make the quiz multiple choice with four answers per

question, and to provide correct answers in addition to the choices. The final query used is:

*Create a 10-question multiple choice quiz with correct answers for the following session:*

*Session 1: Introduction*

- *Introduction to Social Engineering*
- *Overview*
- *Social Engineering Techniques*
- *Human Psychology - Overview*

The resultant quiz returned is:

1. What is the definition of Social Engineering?  
a. The use of physical tools to physically gain access to an organization  
b. The process of attempting to convince people to do something, give away something, or believe something  
c. The study of how humans interact with computers  
d. The use of malware to invade a system

Answer: b. The process of attempting to convince people to do something, give away something, or believe something

2. What is a primary goal of social engineering?  
a. To gain mental control of a system  
b. To maliciously circulate false information  
c. To gain physical access to a building or company  
d. To gain control of system resources

Answer: c. To gain physical access to a building or company

3. What is one example of a social engineering technique?  
a. Lifting a security badge from an employee  
b. Creating a computer virus  
c. Writing a program to infiltrate a system  
d. Posing as a service technician

Answer: d. Posing as a service technician

4. What is the goal of social engineering techniques?  
a. To gain physical access to an organization  
b. To damage the reputation of an organization

- c. To gain control of a computer system
- d. To spread malicious software

Answer: a. To gain physical access to an organization

5. What is an example of human psychology that can be used to aid in social engineering?
- a. The use of fear tactics
  - b. The use of complicated technical jargon
  - c. The use of encryption algorithms
  - d. The use of false identities

Answer: a. The use of fear tactics

6. How can human psychology be used to help prevent social engineering?
- a. By educating people about the potential risks
  - b. By investing in advanced security systems
  - c. By implementing strict access control policies
  - d. By using encryption algorithms

Answer: a. By educating people about the potential risks

7. What is one way to detect a social engineering attack?
- a. Monitoring employee emails
  - b. Analyzing system logs
  - c. Installing antivirus software
  - d. Limiting physical access

Answer: b. Analyzing system logs

8. What is one way to protect yourself against social engineering attacks?
- a. Keeping confidential information secure
  - b. Limiting physical access
  - c. Using strong passwords
  - d. Installing antivirus software

Answer: c. Using strong passwords

9. What is a basic rule of social engineering?
- a. Never accept files from strangers
  - b. Never click on suspicious links
  - c. Always trust people
  - d. Always give out personal information

Answer: b. Never click on suspicious links

10. What is an example of a physical

security measure to prevent social engineering?

- a. Installing antivirus software
- b. Using strong passwords
- c. Limiting physical access
- d. Monitoring employee emails

Answer: c. Limiting physical access

Many of these questions show up in Social Engineering test banks, and are apparently well-designed questions. The application quickly generated the questions, answers and correct answers. While the caution to use due diligence and verification remains, the application again proves to be a quick quiz generator which, with those caveats, may be a great help to professors.

With respect to traditional guidelines for developing and assessing multiple choice questions, such as using plausible distractors, avoiding clues and negatives, having only one correct answer, etc., the application does a good job of creating basic questions to good effect.

In summary, the ease with which the application generated multiple choice questions cannot be overrated. Especially with increased specificity of the question content, the application easily and quickly generated usable questions. As anyone who has developed questions for a quiz at the last minute can attest, this is not the easiest of endeavors, and the tool is helpful in this regard.

The authors have since used the application to generate questions for various subjects, courses and chapters, all with varying content. These were often used, as those with experience will understand how difficult it is to self-generate multiple choice questions. By providing the application with the specific content from which to generate the questions and answers, concerns about reliability and correctness are diminished.

### Lesson Plans

Ofgang notes that while it takes experienced educators a significant amount of time to organize and coherent lesson plans, ChatGPT can generate one in short order. Ofgang (2023) again used a Journalism example, but this work used the same Social Engineering scenario used for previous generations. The prompt is:

*Create a lesson plan for the following session:*

*Session 1: Introduction*

*- Introduction to Social Engineering*

*- Overview*

*- Social Engineering Techniques*

- *Human Psychology - Overview*

The result is:

Objective: By the end of the session, students will understand the basics of social engineering, several of the most common social engineering techniques, and the psychological principles upon which social engineering relies.

Time: 60 minutes

Materials Needed:  
Whiteboard/Blackboard, Markers/Chalk,  
Handouts

Activity 1: Introduction (10 minutes)  
- Instructor introduces the topic of social engineering and its ethical and legal framework (5 minutes)  
- Instructor explains the reasons why social engineering is a problem and the types of attackers who use it (5 minutes)

Activity 2: Overview of Social Engineering Techniques (20 minutes)  
- Instructor reviews common social engineering attack techniques, such as phishing, vishing, baiting, and tailgating (10 minutes)  
- Instructor provides examples of each type of attack (10 minutes)

Activity 3: Human Psychology Overview (30 minutes)  
- Instructor explains the psychology which drives social engineers, including how to manipulate emotions, predict behavior, gain trust, and take advantage of cognitive biases (15 minutes)  
- Instructor reviews tactics used by social engineers to build relationships and earn trust (15 minutes)

Activity 4: Summary/Questions (10 minutes)  
- Instructor summarizes the lesson objectives (5 minutes)  
- Students ask any remaining questions (5 minutes)

These results are impressive, since given the task, the application sequentially organizes the material, with not only the material to be covered, but the time it takes to cover each area. Although the instructor must make changes to this lesson plan to achieve the specific results desired, this is a good starting point which is anticipated to save

the instructor a significant amount of time. As with test generation, increased specificity yields more specific results.

**Homework Assignments**

Ofgang used the example of the inverted pyramid to ask ChatGPT to devise a short homework assignment. In this work, the same Social Engineering example previously used was used again. The query is:

*Create a homework assignment for the following session:*

*Session 1: Introduction*

- Introduction to Social Engineering*
- Overview*
- Social Engineering Techniques*
- Human Psychology - Overview*

The results are:

Homework Assignment:

1. Research the three models of social engineering (Cialdini Model, Social Engineering Triangle, and Integrated Model). Create an overview of the three models and write a brief essay comparing and contrasting them.
2. Read an article or watch a video on human psychology related to social engineering and summarize the key points.
3. Think of an example of an effective social engineering technique and explain what made it successful.
4. Prepare a short presentation for the next session summarizing the key points you have learned about social engineering and human psychology.

As in the previous examples, while the results may have to be modified, the application quickly provides a sound basis for the instructor to build on. As with previous use cases, the more specific the input, the better the output.

**Critical Thinking and Other Uses**

In a 2023 article, Abramson suggests that rather than ban ChatGPT in the classroom, professors use it to encourage critical thinking, thus helping students prepare for life as they leave academia. In the same way as calculators help students learn mathematics, ChatGPT may be used to help students think critically about liberal arts

assignments. One example of this is using ChatGPT to generate the first draft of an essay, then critically reviewing and editing it as a second draft.

Others suggest it can be used for brainstorming, content creation, translating and tutoring. Liberman (2023) provides examples where ChatGPT is used for generating and analyzing text with varying tone, generative email, grading and finding resources

### **Ethical Issues and Intellectual Property**

Generative AI applications have great potential benefits for many industries and business problems. However, a number of authors and researchers have raised significant ethical questions about the use of AI, and the issues that surface when it is used to solve problems or influence decisions, answer detailed or complex questions, and recommend solutions.

### **Concerns**

A big question is whether Generative AI process information on the Internet, taking information from proprietary, copyrighted sources to synthesize and generate its own material. If that is the case, is it then liable for copyright infringement? Falati (2023) suggests that, "AI technologies may infringe on others' copyrights by being deemed infringing derivatives of a copyrighted source they used to generate their output" (Pg. 1). So, who owns the output? Falati raises other issues, such as whether ChatGPT output is biased or discriminatory, whether someone who uses it incurs liability for misinformation generated, who is responsible for generation of offensive or defamatory content and how ChatGPT fits into the scheme of data protection laws.

These ethical considerations have been categorized in different ways that are associated with both specific uses of Generative AI as well as broad ethics categorizations. The ethical issues can be most readily recognized and described as problems that may be encountered when AI is introduced or applied in a specific use case or within a specific industry or environment. The broadest implications found across many application areas and environments are often categorized as content-focused concerns.

These concerns include biases or incorrect data (incorporated within an AI response); privacy violations (because of the associate relationships identified from the huge amount of data accessible); copyright infringement; and misrepresentation, cheating, and direct

plagiarism (Ryan, 2023). Liebrezn, Schleifer, Buadze, Bhugra, and Smith (2023) identify similar concerns in a narrow medical field where they state that ethical considerations abound in its use concerning copyright, attribution, plagiarism, and authorship. Wang, Liu, Yang, Guo, Wu, and Liu (2023) also address ChatGPT in the healthcare environment. They too note that potential harm can be done if ethical issues are not addressed proactively.

### **Assessment**

The assessments considered ChatGPT ethical challenges from legal, humanistic, algorithmic, and informational perspectives. The allocation of responsibility when patient harm occurs (from the use of ChatGPT) or when breaches of patient privacy occur with regard to patient data collection. They state that rules and legal boundaries are required to allocate liability and protect users. Other ethical concerns include possible disruptions of the physician-patient relationship, AI undermining compassion and integrity based upon transparency, and a loss of trust. Other medical-related issues include possible algorithmic bias, responsibility, transparency, explain ability, and evaluation.

Many authors have recognized and expanded these topics to develop longer and more explicit lists that are related to some field of work (and not others). longer lists of ChatGPT limitations and issues. For example, Ray (2023) expands on these basic ethical issue categorizations and identifies 16 challenges for ChatGPT that apply to the scientific domain, and 14 closely associated concerns that should be addressed when employing this technology. Ray (2023) also discussed 10 areas where AI technology use has been deemed controversial from ethical perspectives, 26 ethical concerns when it is used in the computer science field, and 24 considerations where bias may be introduced through the application of ChatGPT AI. However, the "solutions" or methods of limiting and resolving these many issues and concerns are not identified or described.

Krügel, Ostermaier, and Uhl (2023) advance the ethics concern by questioning the moral judgment and decisions of users who may receive moral direction, but who hold contradictory moral beliefs. They question ChatGPT's consistency as a moral advisor and observe that it influences users' moral judgment with an experiment that individuals underestimate how much they are influenced even when they know that the influencing agent is a chatbot. Their conclusion is that ChatGPT threatens to corrupt rather than



improve users' judgment and note that though transparency has been offered as the way to ensure that the Chatbot is responsibly used, it appears ineffective (and proposed training is needed to address the concern).

Zhuo, Huang, Chen, and Xing, (2023:1) discuss how AI and ChatGPT large language models (LLMs) have complete report summarizations, produce software, and perform copywriting functions that are highly beneficial. They observe that LLMs social prejudice and toxicity, and dangerous social consequences may result in irresponsible uses of these programs and models. The call for the development of large-scale benchmarks that could be applied to the LLMs. They note that systematic examination and user study of current LLM usage is not available. The risks and damages are not known and further efforts to construct ethical LLMs responsibly are needed. An analysis of 1) bias 2) reliability 3) robustness and 4) toxicity was performed via rRed teams on ChatGPT1. This process assessed the alignment between selected benchmarks and the Bot outputs. They found that a significant number of ethical risks cannot be addressed by existing state-of-the-art (SOTA) LLM baselines when they are evaluated with five in-context ground-truth examples (Zhuo, et.al., 2023).

One of the fields where the responsible and ethical usage of AI and LLMs is of critical importance is education. As an example, Mhlanga's (2023) study of the 2022 and 2023 literature in the ChatGPT/AI education literature finds that use of ChatGPT in education requires respect for privacy, fairness and non-discrimination, transparency in the use of ChatGPT, and a several other factors. The concerns are receiving great attention, but the question of how to accomplish and ensure that these things occur is not adequately specified in the literature.

Crawford, Cowling, and Allen (2023) describe how Chat Generative Pre-Trained Transformer has impacted the field of higher education. The educators (in this case, the practitioners) want to verify the detect authenticity of student work and detect the use of Chat/GPT or other bots using LLMs. The goal of these efforts is to construct supportive learning environments. This is qualified by requiring that the students who have good character and know how to use ChatGPT for good. This requires that the students utilize the ChatGPT application effectively. They note that the issue of plagiarism and academic integrity are important and depend upon leadership, character development, and authentic assessment. They

posit that it can be used to support deeper learning and can improve the student's learning outcomes.

Fuchs (2023) discusses the challenges and opportunities regarding natural language processing (NLP) models like Chat GPT and Google Bard. The author argues that in higher education there may be significant benefits from these AI tools for personalized learning and on-demand learning plans, feedback, and as-needed/on-demand resources. The risks from AI are identified included a possible loss of human interaction, bias, and ethical implications. The article proposes that NLP be used as a supplement to human interaction instead of replacing the human component of learning, and that guidelines and ethical frameworks for its use be developed. Fuchs (2023) states that guidelines should ensure student privacy, and minimal bias. The guidance also includes a recommendation for student involvement in the development and implementation of NLP models, and investments in both faculty and student training in the use effective use of the models.

A summary of the ethical issues seems inappropriate given the newness of this technology and the changes it will likely introduce into many workplaces, industries, and businesses. However, it is enormously clear that as AI tools, ChatGPT, and LLMs are integrated into academic situations all stakeholders (administrators, instructors, students, and researchers) should exercise great caution. It will be critical to be aware and prepared for the ethical issues that are now recognized (but perhaps not resolved), and ensure that this technology enhances rather than detracts for the the academic experience and learning environment of students.

## 5. CONCLUSION

There is no question that ChatGPT adds value and saves time for faculty developing and generating courses. It can quickly generate syllabi, homework assignments, quizzes and lesson plans and much, much more. However, it has been demonstrated to display biases, and to confidently generate incorrect information. As a program, it is unable to capture insight the instructor may have through knowledge, experience, critical thinking or the integration of those processes. Like any tool, it can add value when its outputs are validated, checked and massaged to yield savings of time and effort. Of great concern are ethical and intellectual property issues, and it will be interesting to see how these

resolve in the future.

## 6. REFERENCES

- Abramson, A. (2023). How to use ChatGPT as a learning tool. *Monitor on Psychology*, 54(4), 67.
- Bishop, C. M. (1994). Neural networks and their applications. *Review of Scientific Instruments*, 65, article 1803. <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.1144830>
- Biswas, S. S. (2023). Potential use of chat gpt in global warming. *Annals of biomedical engineering*, 51(6), 1126-1127.
- Coldewey, D. OpenAI shifts from nonprofit to 'capped-profit' to attract capital. (March 11, 2019). *TechCrunch Disrupt*. Last Retrieved January 4, 2023.
- Crawford, J., Cowling, M., & Allen, K. A. (2023). Leadership is needed for ethical ChatGPT: Character, assessment, and learning using artificial intelligence (AI). *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 20(3), 02.
- Dale, R. (2017). NLP in a post-truth world. *Natural Language Engineering*, 23(2), 319-324.
- Erhan, D., Bengio, Y., Courville, A., Manzagol, P., & Vincent, P. (2010). Why does unsupervised pre-training help deep learning. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 11, 625- 660.
- Falati, S. (2023). How ChatGPT Challenges Current Intellectual Property Laws.
- Firat, M. (2023). How chat GPT can transform autodidactic experiences and open education. Department of Distance Education, Open Education Faculty, Anadolu Unive.
- Fuchs, K. (2023, May). Exploring the opportunities and challenges of NLP models in higher education: is Chat GPT a blessing or a curse? In *Frontiers in Education* (Vol. 8, p. 1166682). Frontiers.
- Guinness, H. (June 2, 2023). How does ChatGPT work? *Zapier*. Last retrieved June 10, 2023.
- Krügel, S., Ostermaier, A., & Uhl, M. (2023). The moral authority of ChatGPT. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.07098*.
- Liberman, M. (2023). What Is ChatGPT and How Is It Used in Education. *Education Week*.
- Liebrenz, M., Schleifer, R., Buadze, A., Bhugra, D., & Smith, A. (2023). Generating scholarly content with ChatGPT: ethical challenges for medical publishing. *The Lancet Digital Health*, 5(3), e105-e106.
- Lund, B. D., & Wang, T. (2023). Chatting about ChatGPT: how may AI and GPT impact academia and libraries? *Library Hi Tech News*, 40(3), 26-29.
- Manning, C., & Schütze, H. (1999). *Foundations of statistical natural language processing*. MIT Press.
- McGee, R. W. (2023). Is chat gpt biased against conservatives? an empirical study. *An Empirical Study* (February 15, 2023).
- Mhlanga, D. (2023). Open AI in education, the responsible and ethical use of ChatGPT towards lifelong learning. *Education, the Responsible and Ethical Use of ChatGPT Towards Lifelong Learning* (February 11, 2023).
- Ofgang, E. (April 4, 2023). 4 Ways to Use ChatGPT to Prepare for Class. *Tech & Learning*. <https://www.techlearning.com/how-to/4-ways-to-use-chatgpt-to-prepare-for-class>
- Olson, P. (March 16, 2023). GPT-4 Could Turn Work Into a Hyperproductive Hellscape. *Bloomberg*. Last Retrieved January 4, 2023.
- Ray, P. P. (2023). ChatGPT: A comprehensive review on background, applications, key challenges, bias, ethics, limitations and future scope. *Internet of Things and Cyber-Physical Systems*.
- Roose, K. (December 5, 2022). The Brilliance and Weirdness of ChatGPT. *The New York Times*. Last Retrieved June 10, 2023.
- Ryan, E. (2023, August 15). Scribbr – Ethical Implications of ChatGPT. Scribbr. <https://www.scribbr.com/> Last accessed September 2, 2023.
- Van Dis, E. A., Bollen, J., Zuidema, W., van Rooij, R., & Bockting, C. L. (2023). ChatGPT: five priorities for research. *Nature*, 614(7947), 224-226.

Vance, Ashlee (June 11, 2020). Trillions of Words Analyzed, OpenAI Sets Loose AI Language Colossus. *Bloomberg News*. Last Retrieved June 11, 2023

Wang, C., Liu, S., Yang, H., Guo, J., Wu, Y., & Liu, J. (2023). Ethical Considerations of Using

ChatGPT in Health Care. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 25, e48009.

Y Zhuo, T. Y., Huang, Y., Chen, C., & Xing, Z. (2023). Exploring ai ethics of chatgpt: A diagnostic analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.12867*.