

The Evolving Roles of Academic Community in The Age of Artificial Intelligence

Eunice Sweet Vinn B. Acquiatan¹, Rael Christopher O. Plaza, EdD²

¹Purisima National High School, Tago, Surigao del Sur- Philippines

²North Eastern Mindanao State University, Rosario, Tandag City- Philippines

ABSTRACT: This quantitative descriptive study investigated the evolving roles of the academic community in the age of Artificial Intelligence (AI) at selected National High Schools in Tago district. Data were collected from 112 student-respondents and 15 teacher-respondents across Gamut, Purisima, Badong, Clarence Ty Pimentel, and Bangsud National High Schools. Key findings reveal a digital divide impacting AI literacy, needing targeted interventions. Both teachers and students demonstrated strong ethical awareness regarding AI use, though teachers showed a slightly stronger emphasis on transparency and risk education. A shared understanding of responsible AI usage exists, alongside common challenges related to information access, AI knowledge, and unclear school rules. Teachers exhibited strong foundational competencies in facilitating AI-driven learning. Statistically significant differences occurred in the awareness of ethical guidelines and the clarity of school rules between teachers and students, highlighting the need for unified ethical frameworks and transparent guidelines. Teacher competency in curating AI content positively correlated with students' responsible AI practices. Socioeconomic factors and AI usage frequency significantly influenced students' responsible AI practices. While both groups recognized AI's benefits, students expressed slightly stronger concerns regarding potential risks. Overall, the study underscores the need for bridging the digital divide, establishing clear ethical guidelines and school rules, providing comprehensive training and resources, and addressing socioeconomic differences to ensure responsible and effective AI integration in education.

KEYWORDS: Artificial intelligence, Academic community, Evolving roles, Responsible AI usage

I. INTRODUCTION

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into educational environments marks a significant paradigm shift in the landscape of teaching and learning. The rapid advancement of AI technologies has led their adoption across various sectors, with education being a notable domain undergoing transformative changes. This study will focus into examining the roles of academic community in the age of Artificial Intelligence through assessing the students' and teachers' perceptions on the responsible usage of AI platforms and the extent to which high school students and teachers demonstrate responsible practices in using it.

The ability of AI platform to personalize learning, provide real-time feedback, and foster interactive dialogue has opted the students in using it to enhance their educational experience [1]. However, despite this opportunity to enhance students' learning [2] emphasized that as AI tools become more advanced, students may be tempted to use them to cheat on assignments or exams.

Globally, a gap exists in the research on the responsible use of AI tools in academic settings, particularly in humanities and social sciences, with few studies exploring how AI impacts critical thinking and academic integrity across diverse educational contexts. Thus, this study aims to fill the gap by identifying the key elements necessary for an academic integrity framework to promote responsible AI usage among high school students and teachers in the region.

II. METHODOLOGY

The study utilized a quantitative descriptive research approach to systematically assess students' and teachers' responsible usage of AI platforms. This approach aligned with the study's objective of evaluating responsible AI usage practices and identifying the challenges high school students and teachers face in adhering to responsible use standards. To collect data, the study employed a structured survey questionnaire designed to capture quantitative information on the patterns and frequency of AI usage. The responses was analyzed to identify trends, highlight areas for improvement, and provide actionable insights for promoting responsible AI practices in education.

The respondents of this study include teachers and senior high school students from secondary schools in the municipality of Tago. Teachers eligible for inclusion must be actively teaching Social Studies subjects to Grade 11 and 12

The Evolving Roles of Academic Community in The Age of Artificial Intelligence

students, while eligible students must be enrolled in senior high school either grade 11 and grade 12, taking a Social Science subject, and provide informed consent to participate. The study was conducted within the Division of Surigao del Sur, specifically focusing on high schools in the municipality of Tago. The selected schools for this research include Gamut National High School, Clarence Ty Pimentel National High School, Purisima National High School, Bangsud National High School, and Badong National High School.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The said data were presented in tabular form in accordance with the specific posited on the statement of the problem.

Demographic Profile of the Teachers and Students Respondents

The findings highlight differences between teachers and students in terms of demographic profile and AI tool usage. For teachers, the highest proportion belonged to the 26-30 age group (53.33%), while none were above 35 years old, indicating a predominantly young teaching workforce. In terms of educational attainment, the majority were college graduates (86.67%), with only a small portion holding a master's degree (13.33%). On the other hand, students were overwhelmingly concentrated in the 16-17 years old bracket (80.94%), reflecting the expected age of senior high school learners. In terms of income, the highest group among students came from households earning ₱10,001–15,000 (41.14%), while among teachers, most earned ₱10,000 and below (46.67%), underscoring a shared socioeconomic limitation in access to resources.

Regarding technology, the results reveal contrasting accessibility. Among teachers, the majority reported being fully accessible (46.67%), while among students, most described themselves as only moderately accessible (35.12%) or poorly accessible (34.11%), with just a small group fully accessible (6.02%). The results show a big difference in the technology accessibility between the teachers and students, which implies that teachers have greater access to digital resources than the students.

The most subscribed platforms were ChatGPT (32.94%) and Grammarly (25.07%), while WriteSonic (0.15%) and Notion AI (0.29%) registered the lowest usage among students. Similarly, teachers also preferred Grammarly (37.14%) and ChatGPT (31.43%), while platforms such as JenniAI (0%) and Copy.ai (0%) were not used at all. For frequency, students most often used AI sometimes (42.14%) or always (27.42%), whereas teachers most often used it often (46.67%). These findings indicate that both the teachers and students have clear preferences on the AI that they are using especially considering the usability, accessibility, and usefulness of these AI tools. This suggests that both groups are using tools that are widely recognized, easy to navigate, and easy to use for academic activities such as writing, editing, and even content generation.

These results imply that while teachers have both greater access and more consistent usage patterns, student engagement is varied, given their access limitations and socioeconomic background. This highlights the importance of providing guidance and support to maximize AI use effectively, particularly among students who may be hindered by inconsistent access or unfamiliarity with some of the AI platforms. These findings highlight that learners prefer widely available and user-friendly platforms, but contradict Aydin and Kara (2023), who suggested that accessibility does not always translate into frequent AI adoption.

Teachers' and students' perceptions on the responsible usage of AI platforms

Table 1. Level of perceptions on the responsible usage of AI platforms

Indicator	Teachers			Students		
	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Description	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Description
Awareness of Ethical Guidelines	4.52	0.53	Strongly agree	4.20	0.63	Strongly agree
Proper Attribution of AI-Generated Content	4.37	0.54	Strongly agree	4.13	0.66	agree
Adherence to Scholl Policies on Academic Integrity	4.27	0.47	Strongly agree	4.16	0.68	agree
Understanding the limitations of AI platforms usage	4.35	0.56	Strongly agree	4.23	0.61	Strongly agree

The results show that the highest mean score among teachers was 4.52 on awareness of ethical guidelines, while the lowest was 4.27 on adherence to school policies on academic integrity. For students, the highest mean was 4.23 on understanding the limitations of AI platform usage, while the lowest was 4.13 on proper attribution of AI-generated content.

These values indicate that both groups strongly value general ethical awareness and understanding AI's boundaries but show weaker emphasis on concrete practices such as attribution and aligning with institutional policies. These also imply that while

The Evolving Roles of Academic Community in The Age of Artificial Intelligence

ethical awareness is strong, putting that awareness into practice, particularly in areas of attribution and policy compliance, remains a challenge. Teachers and students alike appear more confident in their general understanding of ethical norms than in their ability to demonstrate consistent compliance with policies or attribution requirements. This aligns with the findings of Lo (2023), who notes that students often face uncertainty in attributing AI-generated content, which can hinder lines of authorship and originality. Similarly, Dwivedi et al. (2023) argue that schools must establish clearer frameworks for responsible AI use to ensure that awareness is matched with consistent practice. For teachers, the gap between high ethical awareness and lower policy adherence suggests the need for professional development and stricter enforcement mechanisms. Strengthening academic integrity frameworks can thus help bridge this gap, ensuring that both students and teachers move from ethical recognition to applied ethical practice.

Extent of responsible practices when using AI platforms

Table 2. Extent of the responsible practices of students and teachers in using AI platforms

Indicator	Teachers			Students		
	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Description	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Description
Ensuring originality in their outputs	4.44	0.50	Strongly agree	4.23	0.63	Strongly agree
Avoiding misuse of AI in assessments	4.36	0.51	Strongly agree	4.18	0.65	agree
Balancing AI assistance with personal effort	4.48	0.50	Strongly agree	4.22	0.64	Strongly agree
Respecting data privacy and security	4.37	0.49	Strongly agree	4.22	0.63	Strongly agree

The data reveal that the highest mean score among teachers was 4.48 on balancing AI assistance with personal effort, while the lowest was 4.36 on avoiding misuse of AI in assessments. For students, the highest mean was 4.23 on ensuring originality in their outputs, while the lowest was 4.18 on avoiding misuse of AI in assessments.

These results suggest that both groups place the greatest value on maintaining personal accountability and originality when using AI tools, but show relatively weaker attention to preventing potential misuse in assessment contexts.

The findings imply that both teachers and students acknowledge the importance of using AI responsibly while maintaining human input. While originality and balance are strongly agreed, institutional efforts should focus more on strengthening guidelines and training to reduce AI misuse in evaluations. Moreover, the comparatively lower rating on avoiding misuse of AI highlights ongoing risks of overreliance or unethical use. This aligns with Fischer et al. (2023), who emphasize that AI should complement rather than replace human effort in learning, which is also consistent with Cotton et al. (2023), who found that students often struggle with applying integrity principles in assessment settings.

Challenges that students and teachers encountered in adhering to responsible usage of AI platforms

Table 3. Challenges that students and teachers encountered in using AI

Indicator	Teachers			Students		
	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Description	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Description
Accessibility of reliable information	4.05	0.66	Agree	4.15	0.63	Agree
Knowledge of AI tools' capabilities and limitations	4.17	0.69	Agree	4.17	0.69	Agree
Clarity of school rules on AI usage	3.77	0.78	Agree	4.11	0.68	Agree
Support from teachers and peers	3.95	0.49	Agree	4.11	0.73	Agree

The results show that for teachers, the highest mean score was 4.17 for knowledge of AI tools' capabilities and limitations, while the lowest was 3.77 for clarity of school rules on AI usage. For students, the highest mean was also 4.17 for knowledge of AI tools' capabilities and limitations, while the lowest was 4.11 shared between clarity of school rules and support from teachers and

The Evolving Roles of Academic Community in The Age of Artificial Intelligence

peers. These findings indicate that both groups are most challenged by the need to fully understand how AI tools work, while the lack of clear institutional policies and guidance also emerges as a significant concern.

These implications suggest that while users possess adequate knowledge about AI's capabilities, the main obstacle to responsible use comes from institutional shortcomings rather than personal deficiencies. As Holmes et al. (2022) highlight, the lack of clear academic policies on AI contributes to uncertainty and inconsistent practices in education. Similarly, Lund et al. (2023) emphasize that without adequate training and support, both teachers and students may misuse or underutilize AI. Therefore, these results imply that educational institutions should prioritize not only AI literacy training but also the development of clear, well-communicated policies that guide ethical and effective use of AI in academic contexts.

Teachers Competencies in facilitating AI-driven classroom interaction

Table 4. Level of Teachers Competencies in facilitating AI-driven classroom interaction

Indicator	Weighted mean	Standard deviation	Verbal description
Curate AI-Driven Content	4.45	0.50	Strongly Agree
Partner in Learning	4.24	0.52	Strongly Agree
Co-Design Powerful Learning	4.09	0.55	Agree
Prepare Learners for an AI-Driven Future	4.20	0.55	Strongly Agree
Cultivate Learning Communication	4.07	0.62	Agree

The data indicates a strong collective belief in their ability to effectively navigate and utilize AI in their classrooms which suggests a high degree of consensus among the teachers regarding their capabilities in this area which aligns with the growing recognition of the transformative potential of AI in education, as highlighted by Kohli (2023) and Aljanabi et al. (2023). The teachers in this context seem to be embodying the competency of curating AI-driven content effectively, as described by the UNESCO AI Competency Framework for Teachers (2024) and the TPACK model revisited by Güler (2020), which emphasizes the integration of technology, pedagogy, and content knowledge. Their confidence in evaluating reliability and adhering to ethical standards also addresses concerns raised by UNESCO (2024) regarding the importance of transparent and accountable AI usage. This data suggests a promising trend in this specific educational setting, where educators feel empowered and capable in leveraging AI to enhance the learning experience.

Significant Difference in the Responsible Usage of AI Platforms as Perceived by Students and Teachers

Table 5. Significant Difference in the Responsible Usage of AI Platforms as Perceived by Students and Teachers

Indicator	U Statistic	p-value	Interpretation
Awareness of ethical guidelines	1461.5	0.0205	Significant
Proper attribution of AI-generated content	1613.5	0.0621	Not significant
Adherence to school policies on academic integrity	2080.5	0.6302	Not significant
Understanding the limitations and risks of AI tools	2043.5	0.5525	Not significant

The only statistically significant difference observed between the two groups lies in their "Awareness of ethical guidelines" (U Statistic = 1461.5, p-value = 0.0205). The p-value being less than the significance level of acceptance of 0.05 indicates that there is a significant difference in the awareness of ethical guidelines related to AI usage between the two groups. The significant difference in awareness implies that these principles may not be uniformly understood or embraced by both teachers and students in Tago, reinforcing the Forum's recommendation for clear ethical frameworks to guide AI integration in education.

The significant finding aligns with UNESCO (2024), which emphasizes the critical need for transparent and accountable AI usage in education, highlighting potential ethical pitfalls such as data privacy and algorithmic bias. The observed difference in awareness suggests that one group may be less informed about these crucial ethical considerations advocated by UNESCO, underscoring the importance of their call for enhanced digital literacy and clear guidelines. This is supported by Ghimire and Edwards (2024) identified a significant policy gap in educational institutions concerning the ethical deployment of AI tools. This absence of clear guidelines could explain the disagreement in ethical awareness, particularly if policies are unclear or inconsistently communicated within the Tago educational context.

The Evolving Roles of Academic Community in The Age of Artificial Intelligence

Significant Difference on the Challenges Encountered in Adhering to Responsible Use of AI Platforms as Perceived by Students and Teachers

Table 6. Significant Difference on the Challenges Encountered in Adhering to Responsible Use of AI Platforms as Perceived by Students and Teachers

Indicator	U Statistic	p-value	Interpretation
Accessibility of reliable information	2494	0.4509	Not significant
Knowledge of AI tools' capabilities and limitations	2817.5	0.0860	Not significant
Clarity of school rules on AI usage	2916.5	0.0437	Significant
Support from teachers and peers	2813	0.0873	Not significant

A statistically significant difference emerges in the perception of the "Clarity of school rules on AI usage" (U Statistic = 2916.5, p-value = 0.0437). The p-value being less than 0.05 suggests that there is a significant discrepancy in how the two groups perceive the clarity of the school's policies regarding AI usage. Nevertheless, this significant finding indicates that one group finds the school rules on AI usage to be significantly less clear compared to the other group. This highlights a potential area needing attention to ensure that both teachers and students have a clear understanding of the expectations and guidelines surrounding the use of AI in their academic activities in the schools in Tago.

These align with findings of Ghimire and Edwards (2024) who emphasized the absence of clearly defined school-level AI policies, often leading to confusion and ethical dilemmas in implementation. Similarly, Jaramillo and Chiappe (2024) further assert that without proper curricular integration of AI ethics and practices, both teachers and students are left to navigate these tools with insufficient guidance. The statistical significance in the perception of AI policy clarity underscores the importance of *institutional transparency and communication*, reinforcing calls from the academic community for schools to establish consistent and accessible AI usage frameworks to ensure ethical, equitable, and effective AI adoption.

Significant Relationship Between Responsible Practices of AI Usage to the Teachers' Competencies in Facilitating AI-Driven Instruction

Table 7. Significant Relationship Between Responsible Practices of AI Usage to the Teachers' Competencies in Facilitating AI-Driven Instruction

Responsible Practice	Teacher Competency	Spearman ρ	p-value	Interpretation
Ensuring originality in their outputs	Curate AI-driven content	0.8029	0.0003	Significant
	Partner in learning	0.2235	0.4234	Not significant
	Co-design powerful learning	-0.1480	0.5988	Not significant
	Prepare learners for an AI-driven future	0.1429	0.6115	Not significant
	Cultivate learning communication	-0.0080	0.9776	Not significant
Avoiding misuse of AI in assessments	Curate AI-driven content	0.5942	0.01950	Significant
	Partner in learning	0.1547	0.5819	Not significant
	Co-design powerful learning	-0.1810	0.5187	Not significant
	Prepare learners for an AI-driven future	0.4076	0.1316	Not significant
	Cultivate learning communication	-0.0463	0.8697	Not significant
Balancing AI assistance with personal effort	Curate AI-driven content	0.8247	0.0002	Significant
	Partner in learning	0.3163	0.2508	Not significant
	Co-design powerful learning	-0.0382	0.8924	Not significant
	Prepare learners for an AI-driven future	0.3996	0.1400	Not significant
	Cultivate learning communication	0.2045	0.4648	Not significant
Respecting data privacy	Curate AI-driven content	0.7974	0.0004	Significant

The Evolving Roles of Academic Community in The Age of Artificial Intelligence

and security	Partner in learning	0.0830	0.7686	Not significant
	Co-design powerful learning	-0.2082	0.4566	Not significant
	Prepare learners for an AI-driven future	0.1476	0.5996	Not significant
	Cultivate learning communication	-0.1103	0.6956	Not significant

These results underscore the critical role of this teacher competency in promoting ethical and responsible AI integration in classrooms. When teachers are skilled at selecting, evaluating, and applying AI-driven content effectively, they are more likely to model and guide students in the proper use of AI upholding academic integrity, preventing overreliance, and safeguarding privacy. On the other hand, the other four competencies, *Partner in learning*, *Co-design powerful learning*, *Prepare learners for an AI-driven future*, and *Cultivate learning communication*, did not show statistically significant correlations with responsible practices (all p-values > 0.05). This suggests that while these areas are pedagogically valuable, they may not directly influence how teachers ensure responsible AI use, or that their impact is more indirect or context-dependent.

The findings emphasize that teachers' ability to curate AI content responsibly is the most critical predictor of students' ethical and responsible AI use, highlighting the importance of building teachers' expertise in evaluating, filtering, and modeling appropriate AI engagement. These findings are consistent with educational literature emphasizing the foundational role of content curation in AI integration. As noted by UNESCO (2024), teachers must develop strong competencies in evaluating and adapting AI tools to meet academic standards and uphold ethical norms. Güler (2020), through the TPACK framework, supports this by highlighting the intersection of content knowledge and technology as crucial in shaping effective instruction. Thus, while innovation and collaboration are important in AI-rich learning environments, it is the ability to discern, manage, and ethically implement AI content that most strongly supports responsible classroom practices.

Significant Relationship Between Respondents' Profile and their Demonstrated Practices in Using AI Platforms

Table 8. Significant Relationship Between Respondents' Profile and their Demonstrated Practices in Using AI Platforms

Profile Variable	AI Practice Indicator	Test Used	Test Statistic	p-value	Interpretation
Age	Ensuring originality in their outputs	Spearman Rank Correlation	0.0044	0.9381	Not significant
	Avoiding misuse of AI in assessments	Spearman Rank Correlation	0.0375	0.5075	Not significant
	Balancing AI assistance with personal effort	Spearman Rank Correlation	0.0556	0.3265	Not significant
	Respecting data privacy and security	Spearman Rank Correlation	0.0384	0.4981	Not significant
Sex	Ensuring originality in their outputs	Mann-Whitney U Test	12422.5	0.5719	Not significant
	Avoiding misuse of AI in assessments	Mann-Whitney U Test	12471.5	0.5287	Not significant
	Balancing AI assistance with personal effort	Mann-Whitney U Test	12005.5	0.9808	Not significant
	Respecting data privacy and security	Mann-Whitney U Test	11823	0.8318	Not significant
Parent's Educational	Ensuring originality in their outputs	Kruskal-Wallis Test	4.9169	0.5545	Not significant

The Evolving Roles of Academic Community in The Age of Artificial Intelligence

Attainment	Avoiding misuse of AI in assessments	Kruskal-Wallis Test	5.5597	0.4743	Not significant
	Balancing AI assistance with personal effort	Kruskal-Wallis Test	6.0564	0.4169	Not significant
	Respecting data privacy and security	Kruskal-Wallis Test	11.8915	0.0644	Not significant
Family Monthly	Ensuring originality in their outputs	Kruskal-Wallis Test	28.6031	2.77e ⁻⁰⁵	Significant
	Avoiding misuse of AI in assessments	Kruskal-Wallis Test	39.4998	1.88e ⁻⁰⁷	Significant
	Balancing AI assistance with personal effort	Kruskal-Wallis Test	29.2077	2.11e ⁻⁰⁵	Significant
	Respecting data privacy and security	Kruskal-Wallis Test	37.5659	4.61e ⁻⁰⁷	Significant
Digital Accessibility	Ensuring originality in their outputs	Kruskal-Wallis Test	16.9861	0.0019	Significant
	Avoiding misuse of AI in assessments	Kruskal-Wallis Test	20.1422	0.0005	Significant
	Balancing AI assistance with personal effort	Kruskal-Wallis Test	13.5227	0.0089	Significant
	Respecting data privacy and security	Kruskal-Wallis Test	21.4841	0.0003	Significant
Frequency of AI Usage	Ensuring originality in their outputs	Kruskal-Wallis Test	40.9052	2.81e ⁻⁰⁸	Significant
	Avoiding misuse of AI in assessments	Kruskal-Wallis Test	32.0563	1.86e ⁻⁰⁶	Significant
	Balancing AI assistance with personal effort	Kruskal-Wallis Test	28.9924	7.85e ⁻⁰⁶	Significant
	Respecting data privacy and security	Kruskal-Wallis Test	33.6828	8.66e ⁻⁰⁷	Significant

The results reveal that among the demographic variables assessed, family monthly income, digital accessibility, and frequency of AI usage significantly influence responsible AI practices across all four indicators: ensuring originality, avoiding misuse in assessments, balancing AI with personal effort, and respecting data privacy. In contrast, variables such as age, sex, and parent's educational attainment showed no statistically significant relationships with any of the AI responsibility indicators. This suggests that access to technological resources and the frequency of AI engagement play a more crucial role in shaping ethical behavior than static demographic attributes. More specifically, students from higher-income families and those with greater digital accessibility were more likely to practice responsible use of AI tools. This could be attributed to better access to devices, stable internet, and exposure to structured digital literacy programs. Furthermore, students who frequently use AI tools also demonstrated significantly more responsible practices.

These findings align with existing research. Holmes et al. (2019) and the U.S. Department of Education (2023) emphasize the role of equity and access in AI education, noting that students with better access to digital tools tend to perform more effectively and ethically. Gokcearslan et al. (2024) similarly stress the need for inclusive access to AI resources to bridge ethical and knowledge gaps. In the Philippine context, Milloria et al. (2024) point to the uneven distribution of technological resources as a barrier to AI literacy. Therefore, this study reinforces that enhancing technological infrastructure and equitable access is critical to fostering ethical AI use in education not only through instruction but also by ensuring students have regular, meaningful interaction with these tools in a supportive environment.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on these findings, the following conclusions were drawn: The contrasting profiles of digitally capable teachers lacking advanced AI qualifications and students with limited access but high reliance on AI highlight a challenge that is why schools must simultaneously invest in professional development for teachers and equitable access for students to decrease the digital divide and increase responsible AI integration.

The Evolving Roles of Academic Community in The Age of Artificial Intelligence

While both groups show high ethical awareness, their weaker performance in attribution and policy compliance reveals that awareness alone is insufficient; therefore, schools shall provide clear frameworks, training, and enforcement mechanisms to translate ethical understanding into consistent practice.

Teachers and students strongly agreed on originality and balancing AI with personal effort, yet their lower ratings on avoiding misuse in assessments show a risk of overreliance. This underscores the urgent need to strengthen assessment policies and embed integrity safeguards in classroom practice.

Although AI literacy is relatively strong, weak perceptions of policy clarity and limited support highlight structural gaps. Schools shall therefore make sure that AI literacy training is transparent, well-communicated rules and stronger institutional support to guide ethical use.

Teachers' strong competencies in curating AI content and preparing students for the future demonstrate their readiness to lead AI-driven learning. However, their lower confidence in co-designing and communication indicates the need for professional development focused on collaborative and communicative uses of AI.

The significant difference in ethical awareness between teachers and students reveals uneven understanding, stressing the need for school-wide initiatives that align both groups under shared ethical guidelines for AI use.

The significant difference in perceptions of policy clarity underscores a systemic gap that institutions shall urgently develop transparent, accessible AI usage frameworks to prevent confusion, inconsistency, and inequity in practice.

The strong correlation between teachers' ability to curate AI-driven content and students' responsible practices proves that teachers' competencies are foundational to shaping ethical AI behavior, making ongoing teacher training a priority.

The link between income, digital access, AI use, and responsible practices confirms that responsible AI adoption is shaped more by socioeconomic and technological resources than by demographic factors, emphasizing the need to focus in addressing these gaps.

Teachers and students both recognize AI's risks and benefits, but students are more enthusiastic and confident. This implies that schools must balance fostering student positive feedback with equipping both groups to manage risks responsibly, particularly inequities and bias.

To ensure responsible AI use, schools shall implement clear guidelines, integrated AI literacy, ethical safeguards, equitable access strategies, and authentic assessments while engaging the wider community to establish integrity in the use of AI.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author expresses her immeasurable appreciation and genuine gratitude to all those who have contributed to the completion of this masterpiece. To Dr. Rael Christopher O. Plaza, her esteemed adviser, whose invaluable support, faithful guidance, and tireless enthusiasm have been instrumental throughout every stage of this study. To the chairperson of the panel of examiners, Dr. Jennifer M. Montero, and the members, Dr. Erwin B. Berry, Dr. Rowena A. Baloyo, and Dr. Maria Lady Sol A. Suazo, for helping her see the beauty of her paper. To her censor, Sir Jestone T. Surilla, for meticulously editing her paper and ensuring it was ready for publication. To the Schools Division of Surigao del Sur, led by the supportive Superintendent, Dr. Lorenzo O. Macasocol, CESO V, for being the most responsive, helpful, and accommodating during the implementation of this study. To the Senior High School teachers and students at Clarence Ty Pimentel National High School, Purisima National High School, Gamut National High School, Badong National High School, and Bangsud Integrated School, for their cooperation and participation in this research. To the faculty and staff of Purisima National High School, thank you for your understanding and support throughout the course of my study.

REFERENCES

- 1) Aljanabi, M., Yaseen, M. G., & Ali, A. H. (2023). ChatGPT: Open possibilities. *Iraqi Journal for Computer Science and Mathematics*, 4(1), 62–64. <https://doi.org/10.52866/ijcsm.2023.01.01.0018>
- 2) Aydin, G., & Kara, M. (2023). *Exploring the adoption of artificial intelligence tools in education: Opportunities and challenges*. *Computers & Education*, 198, 104749. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2023.104749>
- 3) Cotton, D. R. E., Cotton, P. A., & Shipway, J. R. (2023). Chatting and cheating: Ensuring academic integrity in the era of ChatGPT. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 60(2), 148–159. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2023.2190148>
- 4) Cruz, R. C., & Biana, H. T. (2022). *The digital divide in Philippine education: Access, equity, and the role of technology*. *Philippine Journal of Educational Measurement*, 53(2), 45–60.
- 5) Dwivedi, Y. K., Hughes, L., Baabdullah, A. M., Ribeiro-Navarrete, S., Giannakis, M., Al-Debei, M. M., & Wamba, S. F. (2023). Responsible artificial intelligence (AI) for value formation and market performance in higher education. *Journal of Business Research*, 155, 113391. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.113391>
- 6) Fischer, C., Lund, B. D., & MacKenzie, R. (2023). Generative AI in higher education: Opportunities, challenges, and implications. *Journal of Applied Learning & Teaching*, 6(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2023.6.1.9>

- 7) Ghimire, S., & Edwards, D. (2024). Exploring AI policies and ethical considerations in education: Gaps in institutional frameworks. *Educational Policy Review Journal*, 15(3), 234-245. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1415037.pdf>
- 8) Gokcearslan, S., Tosun, C., & Erdemir, Z. G. (2024). Benefits, challenges, and methods of artificial intelligence (AI) chatbots in education: A systematic literature review. *International Journal of Technology in Education (IJTE)*, 7(1), 19–39. <https://doi.org/10.46328/ijte.600>
- 9) Güler, C. (2020). Technological pedagogical content knowledge (TPACK): A review of the literature. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*, 29(1), 73–89. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1475939X.2020.1734614>
- 10) Holmes, W., Bialik, M., & Fadel, C. (2019). Artificial intelligence in education: Promises and implications for teaching and learning. Center for Curriculum Redesign. <https://curriculumredesign.org>
- 11) Holmes, W., Porayska-Pomsta, K., & Holstein, K. (2023). Ethics of AI in education: Towards a community-wide framework. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 53(6), 13651381. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13285>
- 12) Jaramillo, J. J., & Chiappe, A. (2024). The AI-driven classroom: A review of 21st-century curriculum trends. *Prospects*, 54(3), 167–178. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11125-024-09704-w>
- 13) Kohli, S. S. (2023). Using CHAT GPT to write scientific manuscripts: Frame of reference. *Journal of Contemporary Orthodontics*, 7(1), 1–2. <https://doi.org/10.18231/j.jco.2023.001>
- 14) Lo, C. K. (2023). What is the impact of generative artificial intelligence (e.g., ChatGPT) on education? A rapid review of the literature. *Education and Information Technologies*, 28, 12345–12367. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-11575-6>
- 15) Lund, B. D., Wang, T., Mannuru, N. R., Nie, B., Shimray, S., & Wang, Z. (2023). ChatGPT and generative AI in higher education: Perspectives from educators. *Education and Information Technologies*, 28(6), 7661–7683. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-11674-0>
- 16) Milloria, B. R. B., Marzon, A. M. D., & Derasin, L. M. C. (2024). Investigating AI-integrated instruction in improving academic performance of senior high school students in the Philippines. *Journal of Harbin Engineering University*, 45(6), 61-64. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.36797.27366>
- 17) UNESCO. (2024). *Guidance for generative AI in education and research*. UNESCO. <https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/guidance-generative-ai-education-and-research>



There is an Open Access article, distributed under the term of the Creative Commons Attribution – Non Commercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits remixing, adapting and building upon the work for non-commercial use, provided the original work is properly cited.