

## **Ethical Use of AI in ELT**

**Annisa Khairir Rizki**

*Universitas Islam Negeri Antasari Banjarmasin*

*annisarizki@uin-antasari.ac.id*

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

The advent of generative artificial intelligence (AI) chatbots such as ChatGPT, Google Gemini, Claude, Perplexity AI, DeepSeek, and many more have been postulated as causing shock to traditional higher education, one of them is in the field of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) education. Universities hurry to prohibit these tools, relying primarily on detection software to catch students in the act. However, we soon realized that this “ban” approach is ineffective. AI detection tools are often inaccurate and can produce false results, leading to unfair accusations. In addition, constantly trying to monitor this issue is exhausting for educators. More importantly, a complete ban harms students by leaving them unprepared for a modern professional world that requires digital skills.

On the other hand, students' perceptions of AI's educational influence indicate a complex variety of experiences and attitudes that are critical for understanding its role in language learning. EFL

students' positive attitudes with AI are multifaceted, with many stating major improvements in language learning and usage (Werdiningsih, Indrawati, Rusdin, Ivone, & Basthomi, 2024). Cotton et al., (2024) noted one of the primary benefits of artificial intelligence language models is that they enable asynchronous communication. This feature has been shown to improve student engagement and collaboration by allowing students to pose questions and discuss subjects without having to be present at the same time. AI can also be used to personalise the learning experience (Trinovita et al., 2025), such as by recommending resources such as books and websites based on the student's requirements and interests. In a survey, up to 89% of students acknowledged utilizing ChatGPT to help with their schoolwork (Cong-lem, Tran, & Nguyen, 2024). AI can help students collaborate more effectively. It can improve asynchronous communication, provide fast feedback, enable student groups, and promote remote learning, some tools such as GPT-3 can be used for language translation, summarization, question answering, text production, and personalized assessments, among other things.

However, these tools present a number of issues and concerns, particularly in terms of academic integrity and plagiarism. In response to this issue, several leading universities such as Oxford University, Carnegie Mellon University, and Cornell University have established clear policies (Giugliano, 2025). At the national level, UIN Antasari Banjarmasin has also set a maximum limit on the use of AI in completing thesis, allowing up to 25% (Keputusan Rektor UIN Antasari, 2024). Among these is a deterioration in writing integrity, which has led many students to rely on AI for practically everything (Werdiningsih et al., 2024). It can be difficult to distinguish between a student's own writing and the responses generated by a chatbot

application. Academic staff may find it difficult to adequately assess the student's understanding of the material when the student is using a chatbot application to provide answers to their queries. This is because the responses generated by the chatbot application may not accurately reflect the student's true level of understanding (Daud et al., 2025).

In their study Cong-lem, Tran, & Nguyen, (2024) identified at least six types of academic dishonesty in the misuse of AI: (1) copying and using exact texts without proper citations; (2) copying texts without paraphrasing; (3) plagiarising; (4) using whole essays generated by AI chatbots, (5) lacking original ideas or efforts from the learners; and (6) others. Therefore, in this new AI-driven educational context, EFL educators are tasked not only with effectively teaching the English language but also with addressing potential issues of academic integrity arising from students' use of ChatGPT. In response, in January 2023, ChatGPT was banned from all devices and networks in New York's public schools (Yang, 2023).

Instead of completely banning AI, many forward-thinking institutions are choosing to guide its use in a more balanced way. This chapter shows that setting clear and practical boundaries for AI doesn't reduce academic integrity, it actually helps reshape it for today's context (Hasbi et al., 2025). When we treat AI as a supportive thinking partner rather than a shortcut for cheating, we can still uphold important values like honesty, resilience, and personal responsibility, while also preparing students to face the ethical challenges of an increasingly digital world.

## **2. DISCUSSION**

Regulations pertaining to AI must be precise and clear in order to be effective. Uncertain guidelines can easily result in unintentional

errors, so students should know exactly what is and is not permitted. Many leading universities are addressing this by utilizing a straightforward and useful "Traffic Light" system to illustrate various permissible AI use levels:

## **2.1 Traffic Light Rules for AI Use**

Regulations pertaining to AI must be clear for students to understand where the boundaries are in order for them to be effective (Ka & Chan, 2025). Only unintentional error results from unspecific policies. Many leading colleges such as Oxford University, Carnegie Mellon University, and Cornell University are using a "Traffic Light" paradigm to categorize the various applications of AI in order to address this issue:

### *The Green Zone (Technical Assistance)*

This refers to using AI for basic, surface-level support, similar to an advanced spelling and grammar checker. For example, in an EFL class, students who are writing short essays or personal reflections can use AI to check their grammar, improve sentence structure, or find more appropriate everyday vocabulary. This helps them express their ideas more clearly without replacing their own thinking or writing process.

### *The Yellow Zone (Cognitive Partnership)*

In this stage, AI functions as a tool for thinking support. Students may use it to generate ideas, organize outlines, or explore different perspectives. Its use is more controlled and must be clearly acknowledged. While AI can help initiate ideas, the analysis, personal voice, and final work must remain the student's own.

### *The Red Zone (Total Substitution):*

This represents the strict boundary that should not be crossed. It refers to situations where students rely entirely on AI to produce

their work, handing over the whole writing process and avoiding the effort needed to think, analyze, and compose ideas on their own. This kind of use removes the learning process itself, as students no longer engage with the task intellectually. As a result, it is considered a serious violation of academic integrity, since the final output does not reflect the student's own understanding, skills, or development.

By clearly defining these zones, regulations shift our focus away from obsessively policing the final product and toward guiding the actual learning process.

## **2.2 Ensuring Integrity through AI Transparency and Assessment Design**

When students are allowed to use AI, then full transparency must be required. A key part of modern academic policy is teaching students that taking responsibility for their work also means being honest about how it was produced. In practice, many institutions now require students to include an “AI Declaration” or a short explanation at the end of their assignments. In this section, students clearly state which tools they used, what they used them for, and how they modified the results. Some educators also ask students to submit their prompt history as additional evidence. By requiring this kind of documentation, students become more aware of how they use AI, and the process becomes more responsible and intentional. This also helps build honesty as a core academic value and a professional standard.

At the same time, the use of AI brings an important consequence. When students are allowed to use AI to help writing, traditional take-home assignments are no longer fully reliable for assessment. This means that assessment methods need to change. Educators should focus more on evaluating the student's learning process over time. One effective approach is using digital portfolios, where students

regularly document their progress and stages of writing throughout the semester. This allows teachers to track their development more clearly. If a student suddenly submits work that is very different from their usual style, it becomes easier to notice. In addition, assessments should include tasks that cannot be easily completed by AI, such as in-class presentations, live problem-solving activities, or reflective tasks based on specific local contexts (Kiernon, 2025). In the end, it depends on the educator's ability to design assessments that highlight each student's own ideas, voice, and learning experience (Astawa et al., 2026).

### **3. FUTURE DIRECTION**

While these regulatory frameworks give us a solid place to start, integrating AI into higher education is an ongoing conversation. Moving forward, we have to seriously address the "digital divide." We cannot allow a situation where only students who can afford premium, high-tier AI subscriptions have an academic advantage.

Beyond the technology, we must remember that regulations alone cannot mandate morality. The ultimate goal of these policies is not just to make students comply with rules, but to help them internalize a sense of integrity (Cong-lem et al., 2024; Cotton et al., 2024). Our role as educators is changing from just delivering content and checking plagiarism to guiding students in ethical use. By keeping discussions open and talking about issues such as cultural bias in AI algorithms and the ethics of automated writing, we can help students graduate not only as skilled users of technology but also as professionals who use it responsibly (Hastomo et al., 2025).

With proper understanding of ethical AI use and motivation focused on authentic learning rather than just high scores, the promise of AI in education can be fulfilled while avoiding potential

downsides. The most commonly cited consequence was that over-reliance on AI tools fails to help students develop real, comprehensive knowledge and skills (Hasbi, 2025). There are several implications that the findings of this chapter have for language teaching and assessment practices. First, regulations need to be put in place concerning where, when, and how AI is or is not allowed to be used. For instance, relevant stakeholders, such as educators, need to collaborate and discuss which assessments and tasks students can use AI to assist them, and which they cannot. Second, it is also clear that educators and students alike need to be equipped with knowledge and skills regarding the merits and shortcomings of AI.

## Author



**Annisa Khairir Rizki M.Pd.** completed her bachelor in English Language Education Department at UIN Antasari Banjarmasin in 2020 and master's level of English Department Education at Yogyakarta State University (UNY) in 2023. Her experience in teaching English by becoming a lecturer at UIN Antasari Banjarmasin (2023-present). Her academic passion includes TEYL, CLIL, and TEFL. Apart from teaching, she also a part of Himpunan Penerjemah Indonesia as Translator. The author can be contacted via email: [annisarizki@uin-antasari.ac.id](mailto:annisarizki@uin-antasari.ac.id) and on Instagram: [@icakhairir](https://www.instagram.com/icakhairir).

## References

- Astawa, N. L. P. N. S. P., Hasbi, M., Islamiah, N., Hamid, S. F., Male, H., Kurniati, Khairatunnisa. (2026). *Teaching English for Specific Purposes*. Rizquna.
- Cong-lem, N., Tran, T. N., & Nguyen, T. T. (2024). ACADEMIC INTEGRITY in the AGE of GENERATIVE AI : PERCEPTIONS and RESPONSES of VIETNAMESE EFL TEACHERS. *Teaching English*

*with Technology*, 24, 28–47.

- Cotton, D. R. E., Cotton, P. A., Shipway, J. R., Cotton, D. R. E., Cotton, P. A., Chatting, J. R. S., & Cotton, D. R. E. (2024). Chatting and cheating: Ensuring academic integrity in the era of ChatGPT. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 61(2), 228–239. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2023.2190148>
- Daud, A., Aulia, A. F., Muryanti, Harfal, Z., Nabilla, O., & Ali, H. S. (2025). Integrating Artificial Intelligence Into English Language Teaching: A Systematic Review. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 14(2), 677–691.
- Giugliano, A. (2025). Generative AI Policies at the World’s Top Universities: October 2025 Update. Retrieved from Thesify website: <https://www.thesify.ai/blog/gen-ai-policies-update-2025>
- Hasbi, M., Islamiah, N., Sulisty, T., Marhaban, S., Sari, A. L., Nor, H. (2025). *Deep Learning: A Handbook for English Language Teachers*. Rizquna.
- Hasbi, M. (2025). The dual faces of deep learning in ELT: Meaningful and AI-driven approaches. In *Deep Learning: A Handbook for English Language Teachers* (pp. 1-11). Rizquna.
- Hastomo, T., Widiati, U., Ivone, F. M., Zen, E. L., Hasbi, M., & Khulel, B. (2025). AI-powered conversational agents and intercultural learning: Insights from Indonesian EFL students. *Intercultural Communication Education*, 8(1), 103217-103217. <https://doi.org/10.29140/ice.v8n1.103127>
- Ka, C., & Chan, Y. (2025). Students’ perceptions of ‘AI-giarism’: investigating changes in understandings of academic misconduct. *Education and Information Technologies*, (30), 8087–8108. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-13151-7>
- Keputusan Rektor UIN Antasari. (2024). *Keputusan Rektor UIN Antasari*. Retrieved from <https://www.uin-antasari.ac.id/keputusan-rektor-no-312-tahun-2024-tentang-perubahan-atas-keputusan-rektor-no-164-tahun-2024->

tentang-pedoman-akademik-uin-antasari-banjarmasin/

- Kiernon, D. (2025). Rethinking project-based assessment in the age of ai: the case of elt learners' projects authenticity. *Revue Des Sciences Humaines et Sociales, Letrres, Langues et Civilisations*, 3, 86–102. <https://doi.org/doi:https://dx.doi.org/10.4314/akiri.v3i4.7>
- Trinovita, D., Nurchurifiani, E., Hastomo, T., Andewi, W., & Hasbi, M. (2025). Exploring the Influence of Generative AI on Self-Regulated Learning: A Mixed-Methods Study in the EFL Context. *Jurnal Iqra': Kajian Ilmu Pendidikan*, 10(2), 301-316. <https://doi.org/10.25217/ji.v10i2.6389>
- Werdiningsih, I., Indrawati, I., Rusdin, D., Ivone, M., & Basthomi, Y. (2024). Revolutionizing EFL writing : unveiling the strategic use of ChatGPT by Indonesian master ' s students. *Cogent Education*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2024.2399431>
- Yang, M. (2023). New York City schools ban AI chatbot that writes essays and answers prompts. Retrieved April 4, 2026, from The Guardian website: <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2023/jan/06/new-york-city-schools-ban-ai-chatbot-chatgpt>