

Effects of AI on the Trust and Confidence of Faculty Members in Submitted Academic Works by Students

Wyeth A. Aguio¹, Harold R. Lucero², Nina R. Gerero³, Shena E. Gutierrez⁴, Ronah Pearl V. Kadusale⁵,
Robinne Louise Chretien M. Cuervo⁶

College of Computer Studies, Quezon City University

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51583/IJLTEMAS.2026.150500177>

Received: 14 May 2026; Accepted: 19 May 2026; Published: 11 June 2026

ABSTRACT

This study examined faculty trust, student confidence, and the perceived impact of artificial intelligence (AI) tools in academic assessment within higher education institutions. Specifically, it explored faculty perceptions regarding authenticity, authorial verifiability, and evaluative certainty; students' confidence in submitting academic work; and the influence of AI-related practices such as algorithmic surveillance and linguistic flattening. Using a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design, data were gathered from faculty members and students through survey questionnaires and analyzed using weighted mean, Pearson correlation, and ANOVA. Findings revealed that faculty members generally remained confident in evaluating student submissions, with a grand mean interpreted as "Confident/Agree," although concerns regarding authenticity and authorship verification persisted. Students likewise demonstrated confidence in submitting academic work, particularly in academic self-efficacy, but also reported anxiety regarding AI detection systems and moderate trust in institutional assessment practices. The study further found that AI tools significantly influenced student behavior, particularly through linguistic flattening, where students intentionally simplified writing styles to avoid detection. Correlation analysis showed no significant relationship between the frequency of AI detector use and faculty trust in student submissions, while ANOVA results revealed no significant differences in perceptions based on years of teaching experience. Overall, the study concluded that AI has substantially reshaped academic assessment practices, faculty perceptions, and student writing behavior, emphasizing the need for balanced institutional policies, ethical AI governance, improved AI literacy, and assessment frameworks that promote both academic integrity and responsible AI use in higher education.

Keywords: academic integrity, artificial intelligence, faculty trust, higher education, student submissions, quantitative research

INTRODUCTION

Artificial intelligence (AI) refers to computer systems designed to perform tasks that traditionally require human intelligence, including learning, reasoning, and decision-making. Copeland, (2026) and National Aeronautics and Space Administration, (2024) describe AI systems as capable of processing complex information, adapting to new data, and supporting decision-making across diverse domains. In higher education, AI has become a significant driver of digital transformation, where technological tools are integrated with pedagogical strategies and organizational support to enhance teaching and learning processes (Oliviera & Souza, 2022). Parra G. & Calero S. (2019) demonstrated that AI-assisted writing tools can improve students' writing performance when used alongside instructor feedback, a finding that underscores the growing functional role of AI in academic output. Vinay (2023) further highlights that AI applications in school and university settings are reshaping both instructional delivery and student engagement with learning materials. These developments reflect a broader transformation in higher education, where AI increasingly shapes how academic work is produced, submitted, and evaluated (Robert, 2026)

In the current educational landscape, AI plays an increasingly influential role in students' academic activities. Many students now rely on AI tools for writing assistance, research summarization, problem-solving, and organizing academic tasks, a trend that Vieriu & Petrea (2025) attribute to AI's capacity for personalized learning

support and improved academic outcomes. While these tools can enhance productivity and reduce workload-related stress, Elrefaei et al. (2025) note that the traditional processes of evaluating student outputs—previously based on the assumption of individual effort and originality—are becoming more complex. Faculty members face challenges in determining whether submitted files truly reflect students' understanding or are heavily assisted or generated by AI. This situation has raised concerns about academic integrity, authenticity, and fairness in assessment, as well as inefficiencies in existing evaluation methods that were not designed for an AI-assisted academic environment (Kasneci et al., 2023). Faculty members now face persistent challenges in determining whether submitted files authentically reflect students' understanding or are heavily assisted or generated by AI. Shrivastava & Shrivastava (2022) point out that the broader digitalization of higher education had already introduced structural readiness gaps in institutions, and the arrival of generative AI has intensified these pressures further. This situation has raised pressing concerns about academic integrity, authenticity, and fairness in assessment, as well as significant inefficiencies in existing evaluation methods that were not designed for an AI-assisted academic environment (Lee et al., 2024).

Although several studies have examined the use of AI in education, much of the existing literature focuses on student outcomes, learning effectiveness, and the ethical implications of AI adoption. Edmund (2025) observes that limited attention has been given to how AI specifically affects faculty trust and confidence in evaluating student-submitted work. Existing institutional systems and policies often emphasize text-matching plagiarism detection tools, which are effective for identifying direct plagiarism but insufficient for addressing AI-generated or AI-rephrased content that does not constitute technical plagiarism yet raises legitimate concerns about authenticity and originality (Ogwueleka, 2025). While some studies have begun examining faculty involvement in AI-driven assessment, previous research rarely explores how faculty perceptions of AI influence their decision-making, grading practices, and confidence in the academic credibility of student submissions (Choiriyah et al., 2025; Herath et al., 2025). Herath et al. (2025) further add that although AI tools demonstrate strong surface-level performance in educational tasks, they consistently fall short in the nuanced judgment that characterizes meaningful academic assessment—a distinction that current detection frameworks have yet to reliably capture. This gap highlights the need for focused investigation into the limitations of current evaluation practices and the absence of clear frameworks to support faculty in maintaining trust within an AI-integrated learning environment.

The increasing use of AI tools has also raised concerns about the reliability and consistency of academic evaluation. Nassar (2025) found that comparisons between AI-generated and instructor feedback reveal only moderate agreement between the two, underscoring the need for continued human oversight to ensure credible and fair grading practices. Building on this, Lee et al. (2024) document that faculty across higher education institutions report diminished confidence in the credibility of student submissions as AI use grows more prevalent, further eroding the assessment relationship between educators and students. The specific problem addressed by this study, therefore, is the lack of clear strategies and institutional support mechanisms that help faculty adapt their assessment practices and maintain trust and confidence in evaluating student-submitted files within an AI-integrated educational environment.

To address this problem, the study proposes practical strategies aimed at restoring trust and strengthening evaluation practices in AI-assisted academic settings. These include the development of clearer AI-use guidelines, the redesign of assessment methods to better account for AI involvement, the provision of faculty training on AI literacy, and the integration of transparent academic integrity policies. Diamante et al. (2025) support this direction, demonstrating that targeted professional development significantly enhances faculty trust and confidence in AI-oriented teaching and assessment strategies. Toquero (2026) further argues that the absence of coherent institutional AI policies has left faculty to manage these challenges individually, reinforcing the need for structured, institution-wide frameworks as proposed in this study.

This study is significant to multiple stakeholders within the academic community. Faculty members will benefit from a clearer understanding of how AI influences their trust in student work and from recommended strategies to strengthen evaluation practices, contributing to more consistent and credible academic assessment (Khlaif et al., 2024). Academic institutions may use the findings to develop updated policies, guidelines, and professional development programs that address AI-related challenges in assessment (Toquero, 2026). Students will benefit from clearer expectations regarding acceptable AI use, promoting both fairness and academic integrity (Borbon

et al., 2025). Lastly, future researchers may use this study as a foundation for further investigation into the intersections of AI, trust, and assessment practices, contributing to the growing body of knowledge on the responsible integration of AI in higher education.

A. Statement of the Problem

This study evaluates the effects of Artificial Intelligence (AI) on the trust and confidence of faculty members regarding academic work submitted by students at Quezon City University. It examines how student AI usage affects faculty evaluation and the academic relationship.

Specifically, this study seeks to answer the following questions:

- a. What is the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of:
 - i. Faculty:
 1. Academic department;
 2. Years of teaching experience; and
 3. Frequency of AI detection tool usage.
 - ii. Students:
 1. Frequency of AI tool usage for academic tasks; and
 2. Self-reported rating of AI utility (benefits vs. negative effects).
- b. What is the level of faculty members' confidence in student submissions in terms of:
 - i. Perceived Authenticity;
 - ii. Authorial Verifiability; and
 - iii. Evaluative Certainty.
- c. What is the level of students' confidence in submitting academic works in terms of:
 - i. Academic Self-Efficacy;
 - ii. Detection Anxiety; and
 - iii. Institutional Trust.
- d. How do students perceive the impact of AI on the academic environment in terms of:
 - i. Algorithmic Surveillance; and
 - ii. Linguistic Flattening.
- e. What is the overall level of trust of faculty members toward student-submitted academic works?
- f. Is there a significant relationship between the frequency of AI detection tool usage and the level of trust faculty members have in student submissions?
- g. Is there a significant difference in the perception of AI-mediated work when respondents are grouped according to their demographic profile?

Related Studies

The reviewed literature consistently highlights that the integration of artificial intelligence in higher education has significantly reshaped faculty perceptions of assessment, academic integrity, and student evaluation. Across multiple studies, educators reported declining confidence in their ability to verify the authenticity of student work, largely due to the increasing sophistication of AI-generated outputs and the limitations of current detection technologies. Khlaif et al. (2024), Lee et al. (2024), Abdelaal & Al Sawy (2024), and Opele et al. (2024) collectively emphasized that faculty concerns extend beyond technological unfamiliarity to deeper anxieties surrounding authorship verification, credibility of submissions, and the erosion of traditional assessment validity. These concerns are intensified by evidence showing that AI detection systems remain unreliable and inconsistent, often failing to distinguish between authentic human writing and advanced AI-assisted text (Kotmungkun et al., 2024; Plattner et al., 2024). Tang (2024) and Parker (2024) further argued that the issue is no longer limited to detection accuracy but instead challenges the very purpose and meaning of academic assessment in AI-mediated learning environments.

The literature also demonstrates that students engage with AI tools within a complex landscape shaped by institutional expectations, academic pressures, and technological accessibility. Studies by Borbon et al. (2025), Giray et al. (2025), and Désiron & Petko (2023) revealed that many students strategically conceal or modify their AI use to avoid detection, reflecting what this study conceptualizes as the “performance of compliance.” Research on AI-assisted writing further showed that these technologies reshape student voice, writing style, and linguistic structure, complicating originality assessments and making the distinction between human and AI contribution increasingly blurred (Marzuki et al., 2023; Delfin et al., 2025; Llausas et al., 2024; Clorion et al., 2024). Collectively, these studies suggest that faculty challenges are no longer centered solely on identifying AI-generated work but on interpreting student submissions in environments where AI and human authorship are deeply intertwined.

Beyond academic integrity concerns, the literature highlights the broader relational and pedagogical consequences of AI integration. Studies by Guan et al. (2021), Jinowat et al. (2026), Arshavskaya (2026), and Otermans et al. (2026) found that AI-mediated assessment and feedback practices alter teacher-student dynamics by increasing faculty vigilance, weakening trust, and complicating authentic feedback processes. These relational tensions directly influence grading and evaluation practices, with instructors revising assessment frameworks due to uncertainty regarding authorship and the role of AI in student outputs (Chavez et al., 2024; Espartinez, 2025). Herath et al. (2025) and Antonelli et al. (2025) additionally noted that although AI demonstrates strong surface-level capabilities, it lacks nuanced human judgment, reinforcing the need for careful faculty oversight and institutional guidance.

The reviewed studies further establish that faculty confidence in AI-related assessment is strongly influenced by psychological readiness, institutional support, and policy environments. Shahid et al. (2024), Sultan et al. (2025), and Wu et al. (2025) identified risk perception, self-efficacy, organizational culture, and institutional climate as major determinants of faculty acceptance and trust in AI systems. Within the Philippine context, researchers consistently found that while awareness of AI technologies is relatively high, institutional policies and structured guidance remain insufficient (Giray et al., 2024; Toquero, 2026; Jala et al., 2026). Nonetheless, professional development initiatives and increased AI literacy among faculty were shown to improve confidence and encourage more constructive AI integration (Diamante et al., 2025; Capinding, 2026; Capinding & Dumayas, 2024). Broader governance and ethical concerns were likewise emphasized by Arcilla et al. (2023), Chua et al. (2023), Mallillin et al. (2025), and Sy et al. (2024), who argued that transparent policies, accountability mechanisms, and institutional infrastructures are necessary to restore trust and support effective AI governance in education.

Finally, the literature underscores that students experience AI integration differently depending on their literacy, self-efficacy, and socio-demographic context. Studies focusing on ESL and under-resourced learners revealed that AI detection systems may disproportionately affect vulnerable students, contributing to anxiety, impostor syndrome, and fear of false accusations (Domingo, 2025; Asio, 2024; Albino et al., 2025). Additional research demonstrated that demographic variables, psychosocial influences, and perceived usefulness significantly shape how students adopt and interact with AI technologies (Hortelano & Salamia, 2025; Balasa et al., 2025; Acosta-

Enriquez et al., 2025; Chen, 2025; Cao et al., 2025). At the same time, some studies acknowledged the positive educational potential of AI, particularly in supporting self-directed learning and student engagement when used responsibly (Giray et al., 2025; Fošner, 2024; Luo & Tang, 2026). Overall, the literature suggests that effective responses to AI in higher education require balanced and context-sensitive approaches that consider not only academic integrity and detection reliability but also student vulnerability, literacy, motivation, and institutional readiness.

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

A. Research Design

This study employed a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design to examine the effects of Artificial Intelligence on faculty members' trust and confidence in student-submitted academic work at Quezon City University. The descriptive component allowed the researchers to measure and characterize the current levels of faculty confidence across dimensions such as Perceived Authenticity, Authorial Verifiability, and Evaluative Certainty, as well as students' confidence indicators, including Academic Self-Efficacy, Detection Anxiety, and Institutional Trust. This design was appropriate given the study's aim to quantify perceptions and attitudes rather than manipulate variables, making it well-suited for capturing the state of AI's influence on academic evaluation practices within a defined institutional context.

The correlational component was employed to determine whether a significant relationship exists between faculty members' frequency of AI detection tool use and their overall level of trust in student submissions, and to identify significant differences in perceptions when respondents were grouped by demographic profile. Data were gathered through a structured survey instrument using a four-point Likert scale, administered to both faculty and students across five colleges: the College of Computer Studies, College of Engineering, College of Education, College of Accountancy, and College of Business. The sample size of 386 respondents was determined using Slovin's Formula with a 5% margin of error, applied against Quezon City University's total population of 10,599. Statistical tools, including frequency and percentage, weighted mean, Pearson Correlation Coefficient, and One-Way ANOVA, were utilized to analyze the gathered data systematically and objectively.

B. Data Gathering

The study was conducted in May 2026, and the data collection procedure analyzed the following procedure:

The researchers first secured the validation of the research instrument with the Statement of the Problem as the basis and was validated by a degree holder of Bachelor of Science in Statistics graduated in University of the Philippines - Visayas. Following this expert consultation, the "Level of Faculty Trust" section was converted into a quantitative Likert scale. To mitigate pattern bias, reverse-coded statements were integrated throughout the questionnaire. Additionally, the variables of "Algorithmic Surveillance" and "Linguistic Flattening", previously combined, were separated into distinct independent sections.

Upon receiving certification, a reliability test was performed to ensure the instrument's internal consistency. Utilizing Slovin's Formula with a 5% margin of error ($e = 0.05$) to account for the 10,599 members of the Quezon City University population, the researchers determined a minimum requirement of 386 respondents.

The collection employed a dual-approach strategy: Digital Distribution: An online survey via Google Forms was utilized for streamlined data sorting and; Physical Distribution: Due to time constraints, traditional pen-and-paper methods were also implemented, requiring a more intensive manual tallying process. Prior to distribution, the researchers obtained formal Ethical Clearance from their research adviser. This permission authorized the collection of data from both faculty and students, strictly stipulating that the information be used for academic purposes only.

To maintain integrity, each participant was restricted to a single submission; once the target sample size was reached, the digital portal was closed. The study was localized within Quezon City University, spanning the

In strict adherence to the Data Privacy Act of 2012, respondent confidentiality was prioritized, with privacy notices explicitly included in both the physical and digital versions of the survey. Finally, the accumulated data was organized and calculated according to the designated Statistical Treatment.

C. Statistical Treatment of Data

As soon as the researchers gathered the data, they were compiled, sorted, organized, and tabulated. They were subject to statistical treatment in order to answer the questions proposed in the study. The following statistical tools were employed:

1. Frequency and Percentage.

Used to determine the proportion of each given data point in relation to the total population, specifically for the demographic profile of students and faculty members (SOP 1) . The formula used is:

$$\% = \frac{f}{N} \times 100$$

Where:

% = Percentage

F = Frequency

N = Total number of cases

2. Weighted Mean.

Used to measure the average response of students and faculty across various domains, including Academic Self-Efficacy, Detection Anxiety, Institutional Trust, and Perceived Authenticity (SOP 2, 3, 4, and 5) . Responses were based on a 4-point Likert scale. The formula used is:

$$WM = \frac{\sum(f \times w)}{N}$$

Where:

MW = Weighted Mean

$\sum$ = Summation

w = Weight of each response

f = Frequency of each response

N = Total number of respondents

3. Pearson Correlation Coefficient (r).

Used to determine if a significant relationship exists between the frequency of AI detection tool usage and the level of trust faculty members have in student submissions. The formula is:

$$r = \frac{\sum[(x - \bar{x})(y - \bar{y})]}{\sqrt{\sum(x - \bar{x})^2 \times \sum(y - \bar{y})^2}}$$

Where:

r = Pearson Correlation Coefficient

X = Frequency of AI detection tool usage

Y = Level of faculty trust

N = Total number of faculty respondents

4. One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

This was employed to determine if there are significant differences in the perception of AI-mediated work when respondents are grouped according to their demographic profile, such as years of teaching experience or academic department (SOP 7). The formula for the F-statistic is:

$$F = \frac{MS_d}{MS_E}$$

Where:

F = ANOVA Coefficient

MS_d = Mean square between groups (variance caused by the different categories)

MS_e = Mean square within groups (variance within each specific category)

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the results, analysis, and interpretation of the data gathered to evaluate the effects of Artificial Intelligence (AI) on the trust and confidence of faculty members and students at Quezon City University. The presentation follows the order of the objectives stated in the Statement of the Problem.

Profile of the Respondents

A total of 386 respondents were surveyed, consisting of 346 students and 40 faculty members.

Table 1. Distribution of Faculty by Academic Department

DEPARTMENT	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
CCS	9	22.5%
COA	6	15.0%
COB	7	17.5%
COED	14	35.0%
COE	4	10.0%

This presents the demographic profile of the faculty respondents according to their academic department. Data shows that the **College of Education (COEd)** had the highest number of participants with 14 (35%), while the **College of Engineering (COE)** had the lowest with 4 (10%).

Table 2. Years of Teaching Experience

EXPERIENCE	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
0–5 YEARS	10	25.0%
6–10 YEARS	10	25.0%
11–20 YEARS	10	25.0%
21+ YEARS	10	25.0%

Table 2 displays the years of teaching experience of the faculty. The respondents are equally distributed across all experience brackets, with each category containing exactly **10 respondents (25%)**. This ensures a balanced perspective between new and veteran educators.

Table 3 below, describes the frequency of AI detection tool usage among faculty. A total of **18 respondents (45%)** use these tools "Sometimes," while **7 (17.5%)** use them "Always." This indicates that a majority of faculty rely on algorithmic verification to some degree.

Table 3. Frequency of AI Detection Tool Usage

FREQUENCY	FREQUENCY COUNT	PERCENTAGE			
ALWAYS	7	17.5%			
SOMETIMES	18	45.0%			
RARELY	14	35.0%			
NEVER	1	2.5%			

Table 4. Student Frequency of AI Tool Usage

USAGE FREQUENCY	FREQUENCY COUNT	PERCENTAGE			
DAILY/ALWAYS	150	43.4%			
SOMETIMES	157	45.3%			
RARELY	37	10.7%			
NEVER	2	0.6%			

Table 4 summarizes the frequency of student AI usage. Out of 346 students, **157 (45.4%)** use AI tools "Sometimes," and **150 (43.4%)** use them "Daily." Only **2 (0.6%)** students reported "Never" using AI, showing that AI is deeply integrated into student academic habits.

Table 5. Student Self-Reported Rating of AI Utility

UTILITY RATING	FREQUENCY COUNT	PERCENTAGE
HIGHLY BENEFICIAL	180	52.0%
SOMEWHAT BENEFICIAL	148	42.8%
SOMEWHAT NEGATIVE	25	7.2%

Table 5 presents the students' perceived utility of AI. A majority of **180 students (52%)** find AI "Highly Beneficial," while only **25 (7.2%)** perceive it as "Somewhat Negative."

Level of Faculty Members' Confidence

Table 6. Level of Faculty Confidence in Student Submissions

INDICATOR	WEIGHTED MEAN	INTERPRETATION			
PERCEIVED AUTHENTICITY	2.70	Confident/Agree			
AUTHORIAL VERIFIABILITY	2.71	Confident/Agree			
EVALUATIVE CERTAINTY	3.01	Confident/Agree			
GRAND MEAN	2.81	Confident/Agree			

The table presents the respondents' level of confidence in evaluating student outputs within an AI-assisted academic environment. The grand mean of 2.81, interpreted as "Confident/Agree," indicates that faculty members generally remain confident in their ability to assess student work despite the growing use of AI tools. Among the indicators, Evaluative Certainty obtained the highest weighted mean of 3.01, suggesting that respondents still trust their professional judgment, grading practices, and ability to determine learning outcomes even when AI may have influenced student submissions. This finding supports Herath et al. (2025), who emphasized that human evaluators continue to possess stronger contextual and nuanced judgment compared to AI systems.

Meanwhile, Authorial Verifiability (2.71) and Perceived Authenticity (2.70) received comparatively lower weighted means, although both remained within the "Confident/Agree" interpretation. These findings suggest that while faculty members generally trust student submissions, they experience moderate uncertainty in verifying whether outputs genuinely reflect students' own work. The results align with Khlaif et al. (2024), Lee et al. (2024), and Opele et al. (2024), who found that educators increasingly struggle with confirming authorship and originality due to the sophistication of AI-generated writing. Overall, the findings indicate that faculty confidence in evaluation remains positive, but concerns regarding authenticity and authorship verification persist in AI-mediated learning environments.

Level of Students' Confidence

Table 7. Level of Students' Confidence in Submitting Works

INDICATOR	WEIGHTED MEAN	INTERPRETATION
ACADEMIC SELF-EFFICACY	3.10	Confident/Agree
DETECTION ANXIETY	3.01	Agree
INSTITUTIONAL TRUST	2.92	Agree
GRAND MEAN	3.01	Confident/Agree

Table 7 presents the level of students' confidence in submitting academic works in an AI-influenced learning environment. The grand mean of 3.01, interpreted as "Confident/Agree," indicates that students generally remain confident when submitting their outputs despite concerns associated with AI use and detection systems. Among the indicators, Academic Self-Efficacy obtained the highest weighted mean of 3.10, suggesting that students generally believe in their capability to complete academic tasks and produce acceptable outputs. This finding aligns with Chen (2025) and Giray et al. (2025), who emphasized that AI tools can enhance student engagement, confidence, and perceived competence when used to support learning and academic work.

Meanwhile, Detection Anxiety recorded a weighted mean of 3.01, interpreted as “Agree,” indicating that students still experience concern or apprehension regarding the possibility of their work being flagged as AI-generated. This result supports the findings of Domingo (2025) and Albino et al. (2025), who noted that AI-related scrutiny and fear of false accusations contribute to anxiety among students, particularly those who rely on AI-assisted tools for writing support. The finding suggests that even confident students remain cautious about how their submissions may be interpreted by faculty and detection systems.

Similarly, Institutional Trust obtained the lowest weighted mean of 2.92, though still interpreted as “Agree.” This indicates that students moderately trust institutional policies and faculty judgment regarding AI-related assessment practices, but some uncertainty remains. The result reflects the observations of Toquero (2026) and Jala et al. (2026), who found that limited institutional guidance and inconsistent AI policies in higher education contribute to uncertainty among students and educators alike. Overall, the findings suggest that while students maintain confidence in their academic abilities, concerns regarding AI detection and institutional fairness continue to shape their submission experiences.

This indicates that students consistently provided high ratings toward these indicators, evidenced by the grand mean of **3.01** interpreted as **"Agree/Confident."** **Academic Self-Efficacy** achieved the highest mean of **3.10**, showing students feel confident in their output quality when using AI tools.

Impact of AI on the Academic Environment

Table 8. Perceived Impact of AI Tools

INDICATOR	WEIGHTED MEAN	INTERPRETATION			
ALGORITHMIC SURVEILLANCE	2.84	Agree			
LINGUISTIC FLATTENING	2.97	Agree			

Table 8 presents the perceived impact of AI tools on the academic environment, particularly on student behavior and writing practices. The grand mean of 2.91, interpreted as “Agree,” indicates that respondents generally perceive AI technologies and detection systems as having a noticeable influence on how students prepare and submit academic work. This suggests that the presence of AI-related monitoring and detection mechanisms has begun shaping not only assessment practices but also students’ behavioral and linguistic choices in academic settings.

Among the indicators, Linguistic Flattening obtained the higher weighted mean of 2.97, indicating that students tend to simplify or alter their writing styles to avoid being flagged by AI detection software. This finding implies that students may intentionally reduce stylistic complexity, creativity, or advanced language use out of fear that sophisticated writing could be misidentified as AI-generated. The result supports the findings of Marzuki et al. (2023) and Llausas et al. (2024), who observed that AI-assisted writing technologies and detection systems influence students’ writing patterns and reshape their linguistic expression. The finding also reflects the concept of the “performance of compliance,” wherein students adapt their outputs not solely for learning purposes but to satisfy algorithmic expectations and avoid suspicion.

Meanwhile, Algorithmic Surveillance obtained a weighted mean of 2.84, also interpreted as “Agree,” suggesting that students are aware of and affected by the increasing use of AI monitoring and detection technologies in academic institutions. This indicates that students perceive AI detection systems as a form of surveillance that influences their academic behavior and submission practices. The result aligns with the observations of Guan et al. (2021) and Jinowat et al. (2026), who noted that AI-mediated educational environments can create heightened vigilance, anxiety, and behavioral adjustment among both teachers and students. Overall, the findings suggest that AI tools are reshaping the academic environment by influencing how students write, present, and regulate their academic outputs.

Overall Level of Faculty Trust

Table 9. Grand Weighted Mean of Faculty Trust

VARIABLE	WEIGHTED MEAN	INTERPRETATION			
OVERALL TRUST LEVEL	2.63	Agree / Trusting			

Table 9 presents the overall level of faculty trust in evaluating student outputs within an AI-assisted academic environment. The weighted mean of 2.63, interpreted as “Agree/Trusting,” indicates that faculty members generally maintain a positive level of trust despite the growing challenges associated with AI-generated content and detection systems. This suggests that educators still believe in their ability to exercise professional judgment and uphold academic standards even as AI tools increasingly influence teaching and assessment practices.

However, the moderate level of trust reflected in the result also implies that faculty confidence is not absolute and may still be affected by concerns regarding authenticity, authorship verification, and the reliability of AI detection technologies. The finding aligns with Khlaif et al. (2024), Lee et al. (2024), and Plattner et al. (2024), who reported that educators continue to experience uncertainty in confirming the originality of student work in AI-mediated learning environments. Overall, the result suggests that while faculty members remain generally trusting, the integration of AI in education continues to challenge traditional perceptions of academic integrity and evaluative certainty.

Significant Relationship Analysis

The Pearson correlation analysis revealed an $r=0.1448$, indicating a very weak positive relationship between the frequency of AI detector use and faculty trust in student submissions. However, the obtained p-value of 0.366 shows that the relationship is not statistically significant. This means that the frequency with which professors use AI detection tools does not significantly influence or predict their level of trust toward students. The result suggests that faculty trust remains relatively independent of reliance on AI detection technologies.

The scatterplot further supports this finding by showing no clear linear relationship between the two variables, which is consistent with the interpretation of “no correlation.” Although some faculty members may frequently use AI detectors, this does not necessarily correspond to lower or higher levels of trust in student work. The finding implies that faculty trust may instead be shaped by other factors such as professional experience, institutional policies, assessment practices, or personal perceptions of academic integrity rather than solely by the use of AI detection systems. This supports the literature of Shahid et al. (2024) and Sultan et al. (2025), which emphasized that faculty attitudes toward AI are influenced by broader psychological and institutional factors rather than technology use alone.

Significant Difference Analysis

Table 10. ANOVA Results for Differences in Perception

DEMOGRAPHIC GROUP	F-VALUE	P-VALUE	INTERPRETATION				
YEARS OF EXPERIENCE	0.81	0.492	Not Significant				

Table 10 presents the ANOVA results examining whether significant differences exist in faculty perceptions when grouped according to years of teaching experience. The computed F-value of 0.81 with a corresponding p-value of 0.492 indicates that the result is not statistically significant. Since the p-value is greater than the standard significance level of 0.05, the null hypothesis is accepted, suggesting that faculty perceptions do not significantly differ based on years of experience.

This finding implies that both less experienced and more experienced faculty members share relatively similar perceptions regarding AI-related assessment issues, trust, and academic integrity concerns. The result suggests that the challenges posed by AI technologies in education are experienced broadly across faculty groups regardless of professional tenure. This aligns with the findings of Lee et al. (2024) and Opele et al. (2024), which showed that concerns regarding AI-generated work and authenticity are common among educators across different academic backgrounds and levels of experience.

Furthermore, the result may indicate that exposure to AI technologies and the challenges associated with AI-assisted student outputs have become widespread enough that years of experience no longer create substantial differences in perception. Instead, faculty attitudes may be influenced more strongly by institutional context, AI literacy, and professional readiness rather than length of teaching service alone, as supported by Shahid et al. (2024) and Wu et al. (2025).

CONCLUSION

The study concluded that faculty members generally maintain confidence and trust in evaluating student submissions despite the increasing integration of artificial intelligence in academic environments. Respondents demonstrated positive perceptions in terms of perceived authenticity, authorial verifiability, and evaluative certainty, indicating that educators still rely on their professional judgment when assessing student work. However, concerns regarding the authenticity and originality of submissions remain evident, particularly due to the growing sophistication of AI-generated content and the limitations of AI detection technologies. Faculty trust was found to remain moderately positive, suggesting that while AI has introduced challenges to academic integrity and assessment practices, educators continue to uphold confidence in their evaluative capabilities.

The findings also revealed that students generally remain confident in submitting their academic work, particularly in terms of academic self-efficacy. Nevertheless, detection anxiety and moderate institutional trust indicate that students experience apprehension regarding AI detection systems and the fairness of institutional assessment practices. The study further established that AI tools significantly influence the academic environment, particularly through linguistic flattening and perceptions of algorithmic surveillance. These findings suggest that students may intentionally modify or simplify their writing styles to avoid being flagged by AI detectors, reflecting behavioral adjustments shaped by AI-mediated academic monitoring.

Furthermore, the correlation analysis showed no significant relationship between the frequency of AI detector use and faculty trust in student submissions, indicating that faculty trust is independent of reliance on AI detection tools. Similarly, the ANOVA results revealed no significant differences in perceptions when grouped according to years of teaching experience, suggesting that concerns and attitudes toward AI in education are shared across faculty members regardless of professional tenure. Overall, the study concludes that AI has substantially reshaped academic assessment, student behavior, and faculty perceptions, highlighting the need for balanced institutional policies, improved AI literacy, ethical assessment frameworks, and supportive educational practices that promote both academic integrity and responsible AI use.

REFERENCES

- 1 Abdelaal, N., & Al Sawy, I. (2024). Perceptions, challenges, and prospects: University professors' use of artificial intelligence in education. *Australian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7(1), 1309. <https://doi.org/10.29140/ajal.v7n1.1309>
- 2 Acosta-Enriquez, B. G., Guzmán Valle, M. de los Á., Arbulú Ballesteros, M., Arbulú Castillo, J. C., Arbulu Perez Vargas, C. G., Torres, I. S., Silva León, P. M., & Saavedra Tirado, K. (2025). What is the influence of psychosocial factors on artificial intelligence appropriation in college students? *BMC Psychology*, 13(1), 7. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-024-02328-x>
- 3 Albino, M. G., Albino, F. S., Asio, J. M. R., & Gadia, E. D. (2025). Influence of AI Anxiety on AI Self-Efficacy Among College Students. *International Journal of Technology in Education*, 8(2), 557–573. <https://doi.org/10.46328/ijte.1109>

- 4 Antonelli, M., Vaughan-McGovern, M., & Barrett, M. (2025). "Don't Force It": An Action Research Study on AI Integration in Undergraduate and Graduate Teacher Education Coursework. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education*, 25(4), 762–780.
- 5 Arcilla, A. O., Espallardo, A. K. V., Gomez, C. A. J., Viado, E. M. P., Ladion, V. J. T., Naanep, R. A. T., Pascual, A. R. L., Artificio, E. B., & Tubola, O. D. (2023). Ethics in AI Governance: Comparative Analysis, Implication, and Policy Recommendations for the Philippines. 2023 27th International Computer Science and Engineering Conference (ICSEC), 319–326. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSEC59635.2023.10329756>
- 6 Arshavskaya, E. (2026). Exploring the Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence as a Tool to Mediate the Emotional Nature of Feedback in Writing Instruction. *TESOL Journal*, 17(1). <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.70109>
- 7 Asio, J. M. R. (2024). AI LITERACY, SELF-EFFICACY, AND SELF-COMPETENCE AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS: VARIANCES AND INTERRELATIONSHIPS AMONG VARIABLES. *Malaysian Online Journal of Education Services*. <http://mojes.um.edu.my/EISSN:2289-3024>
- 8 Balasa, K. A., Hiedie Dumagay, A., Alieto, E. O., & González Vallejo, R. (2025). Gender and Age Dynamics in Future Educators' Attitudes toward AI Integration in Education: A Sample from State-managed Universities in Zamboanga Peninsula, Philippines. *Seminars in Medical Writing and Education*, 4, 668. <https://doi.org/10.56294/mw2025668>
- 9 Borbon, N. M. D., Hernandez, G. R. P., Villamayor, P. D., Silva, C. L., & Pastrana, J. Q. (2025). Academic Integrity in the Age of AI: Exploring on the Educational Experiences for Students and Teachers in a Private University in the Philippines. In *INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND MECHATRONICS ENGINEERING (ICITME) 2023*. www.istes.org <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4834-6313> <https://orcid.org/0009-0002-9776-0630> <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-6012-6990> <https://orcid.org/0009-0001-8496-4303> www.istes.org
- 10 Cao, X., Lin, Y.-J., Zhang, J.-H., Tang, Y.-P., Zhang, M.-P., & Gao, H.-Y. (2025). Students' perceptions about the opportunities and challenges of ChatGPT in higher education: a cross-sectional survey based in China. *Education and Information Technologies*, 30(9), 12345–12364. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-025-13339-5>
- 11 Capinding, A. T. (2026). Embracing AI in Academia: Faculty Researchers' Awareness, Acceptance, and Utilization for Scholarly Innovation. *International Journal of Information and Education Technology*, 16(4), 1020–1033. <https://doi.org/10.18178/ijiet.2026.16.4.2572>
- 12 Capinding, A. T., & Dumayas, F. T. (2024). TRANSFORMATIVE PEDAGOGY IN THE DIGITAL AGE: UNRAVELING THE IMPACT OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE ON HIGHER EDUCATION STUDENTS. *Problems of Education in 21st Century*, 82, 630–657.
- 13 Chavez, J. V., Cuilan, J. T., Mannan, S. S., Ibrahim, N. U., Carolino, A. A., Radjuni, A., Albani, S. E., & Garil, B. A. (2024). Discourse Analysis on the Ethical Dilemmas on the Use of AI in Academic Settings from ICT, Science, and Language Instructors. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 6(5), 349–363. <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v6i5.6765>
- 14 Chen, X. (2025). The Impact of Artificial Intelligence Tools on College Students' Academic Self-efficacy. *Transactions on Materials, Biotechnology and Life Sciences*, 8, 142–148. <https://doi.org/10.62051/4sgyh834>
- 15 Choiriyah, S., Nugroho, A., Ramadhan, S., Pembangunan, H. R. P., & Muharom, F. (2025). Artificial intelligence-driven learning assessment in faculties of education: An exploratory study. *Munaddhomah: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, 6(3), 482–495. <https://doi.org/10.31538/munaddhomah.v6i3.1937>
- 16 Chua, L., Aquino, F. I., Ligot, D. V., Santiago, S. A., Ato, N. B., Bawagan, P., & Cuevas, E. (2023). Public Call on Ethics, Safety, and Governance of AI in the Philippines. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4461284>
- 17 Clorion, F. D. D., Alieto, E. O., Fuentes, J. O., Suicano, D. J. B., Natividad, E.-R., Miñoza, M. V., Pil, A. O., Aidil-Karanain, F., & Vallejo, R. G. (2024). Artificial Intelligence in Academic Writing in Higher Education in a Country of Emerging Economy: An Analysis of Knowledge, Perceived Influence, Extent of Use and Perception. In *General Aspects of Applying Generative AI in Higher Education* (pp. 301–326). Springer Nature Switzerland. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-65691-0_16
- 18 Copeland, B. J. (2026). Artificial Intelligence. In B. J. Copeland (Ed.), *Encyclopedia Britannica*. <https://www.britannica.com/technology/artificial-intelligence>.

- 19 Delfin, J. O., Guerrero, R. M., Maghamil, M. C., & Toylo, M. D. (2025). ChatGPT and Writing Skills: The College of Education Experience. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 7(3), 129–142. <https://doi.org/10.32996/jeltal.2025.7.3.13>
- 20 Désiron, J. C., & Petko, D. (2023). Academic dishonesty when doing homework: How digital technologies are put to bad use in secondary schools. *Education and Information Technologies*, 28(2), 1251–1271. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-022-11225-y>
- 21 Diamante, R. E. J., Martin, A. B., Berry, E. B., Chavez, J. V., Dela Calzada, K. P., & Dimzon, S. D. (2025). Developing trust and confidence in the delivery of Ai-Oriented teaching strategies among Non-ICT expert teachers. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 10(8). <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v10i8.3851>
- 22 Domingo, M. A. (2025). Investigating the influence of AI-driven tools in ESL students' experience of AI-induced impostor syndrome and academic confidence. *Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, 13(1), 98–125. <https://doi.org/10.59960/13.1.a5>
- 23 Edmund, D. (2025). Faculty and Administrators' Perspectives of Generative Artificial Intelligence at an Online Higher Education Institution. In *Walden University ProQuest Dissertations & Theses*. <https://www.proquest.com/openview/f28aa3329d5f690f6dbec3431a7412ef/1>
- 24 Elrefaei, E., El-Deep, O. S., Abd El-Khalik, S. R., Eltokhy, A. K., Okasha, A. H., Elsheikh, M., Shamma, S., Ibrahim, R. R., & Aboraya, A. A. (2025). Exploring the Effect of Using Artificial Intelligence Tools on Preclinical Medical Students' Workload and Well-being: A Cross-Sectional Study. *Journal of Health Professions Education and Innovation*, 2(1), 11–21. <https://doi.org/10.21608/jhpei.2025.347543.1040>
- 25 Espartinez, A. S. (2025). Between Innovation and Tradition: A Narrative Inquiry of Students' and Teachers' Experiences with ChatGPT in Philippine Higher Education. *Social Sciences*, 14(6), 359. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci14060359>
- 26 Fošner, A. (2024). University Students' Attitudes and Perceptions towards AI Tools: Implications for Sustainable Educational Practices. *Sustainability*, 16(19), 8668. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16198668>
- 27 Giray, L., De Silos, P. Y., Adornado, A., Buelo, R. J. V., Galas, E., Reyes-Chua, E., Santiago, C., & Ulanday, Ma. L. (2024). Use and Impact of Artificial Intelligence in Philippine Higher Education: Reflections from Instructors and Administrators. *Internet Reference Services Quarterly*, 28(3), 315–338. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10875301.2024.2352746>
- 28 Giray, L., Jacob, J., Encanto, V., & Mansilungan, C. J. (2026). Cheating Writing with Generative AI: Exploring Student Motivations Using the Theory of Planned Behavior. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 24(1), 19. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-025-09695-z>
- 29 Giray, L., Nemeño, J., & Edem, J. (2025). Self-directed Learning Using ChatGPT Positively Affects Student Engagement. *International Journal of Technology in Education*, 8(3), 667–680. <https://doi.org/10.46328/ijte.1162>
- 30 Guan, H., Chen, Q., Han, S., & Zhang, B. (2021). The Influence of “Artificial Intelligence + Human–Computer Interaction” on Teachers' Psychological Changes in Academic Management in Colleges. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.730345>
- 31 Herath, D. B., Ode, E., & Herath, G. B. (2025a). Can AI replace humans? Comparing the capabilities of AI tools and human performance in a business management education scenario. *British Educational Research Journal*, 51(3), 1073–1096. <https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.4111>
- 32 Herath, D. B., Ode, E., & Herath, G. B. (2025b). Can AI replace humans? Comparing the capabilities of AI tools and human performance in a business management education scenario. *British Educational Research Journal*, 51(3), 1073–1096. <https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.4111>
- 33 Hortelano, J. C., & Salamia, S. (2025). Perceptions of Artificial Intelligence among Philippine Undergraduate Students: Examining Instrument Construct and Demographic Influences on Knowledge and Beliefs. *Journal of Teaching and Learning*, 19(4). <https://doi.org/10.22329/jtl.v19i4.9790>
- 34 Jala, J. V. M., Nacalaban, E. A., Sandinao, N. R. A., Origines, R. B. D., Ventayen, R. J. M., & Bation, N. D. (2026). The Influence of Artificial Intelligence on Higher Education in the Philippines. In *ICT Systems and Sustainability* (pp. 262–276). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-032-06671-8_27
- 35 Jinowat, N., Wiboolyasar, K., Chomchuen, F., & Wiboolyasar, W. (2026). Trust, resistance, and transformation: A Q-methodological study of teachers' perspectives on AI-generated feedback in second language writing. *Foreign Language Annals*, 59(1), 34–62. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.70042>
- 36 Kasneci, E., Sessler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., Gasser, U., Groh, G., Günnemann, S., Hüllermeier, E., Krusche, S., Kutyniok, G., Michaeli, T., Nerdell, C., Pfeiffer, J., Poquet,

- O., Sailer, M., Schmidt, A., Seidel, T., ... Kasneci, G. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 103, 102274. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274>
- 37 Khlaif, Z. N., Ayyoub, A., Hamamra, B., Bensalem, E., Mitwally, M. A. A., Ayyoub, A., Hattab, M. K., & Shadid, F. (2024). University Teachers' Views on the Adoption and Integration of Generative AI Tools for Student Assessment in Higher Education. *Education Sciences*, 14(10), 1090. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14101090>
- 38 Kotmungkun, S., Chompurach, W., & Thaksanan, P. (2024). OpenAI ChatGPT vs Google Gemini: A study of AI chatbots' writing quality evaluation and plagiarism checking. *English Language Teaching Educational Journal*, 7(2), 90–108. <https://doi.org/10.12928/eltej.v7i2.11572>
- 39 Lee, D., Arnold, M., Srivastava, A., Plastow, K., Strelan, P., Ploeckl, F., Lekkas, D., & Palmer, E. (2024). The impact of generative AI on higher education learning and teaching: A study of educators' perspectives. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 6, 100221. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100221>
- 40 Llausas, S. M., Ruiz, E., Ayucan, S. M., & Evardo Jr., O. J. (2024). A Systematic Literature Review on the Use of Grammarly in Improving the Writing Skills of ESL/EFL Students. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 5(9), 3507–3516. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.05.09.10>
- 41 Luo, W., & Tang, T. (2026). A Study on Chinese College Students' Intention to Use Toward AI Chatbots: Integrating Innovation Diffusion Theory and Technology Acceptance Model. *European Journal of Education*, 61(1). <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.70377>
- 42 Mallillin, L. L. D., Enriquez, B. B., & Yee, C. C. (2025). ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE (AI) IN THE HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS (HEIS) PRACTICES: A TRANSFORMATION TRENDS IN TEACHING AND LEARNING. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 12(2). <https://doi.org/10.46827/ejes.v12i2.5811>
- 43 Marzuki, Widiati, U., Rusdin, D., Darwin, & Indrawati, I. (2023). The impact of AI writing tools on the content and organization of students' writing: EFL teachers' perspective. *Cogent Education*, 10(2). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2023.2236469>
- 44 Nassar, H. M. (2025). Comparing the Quality of AI-generated and Instructor Feedback in a University Writing Program . AUC Knowledge Fountain.
- 45 National Aeronautics and Space Administration. (2024). What is Artificial Intelligence? National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
- 46 Ogwueleka, F. N. (2025). Plagiarism Detection in the Age of Artificial Intelligence: Current Technologies and Future Directions (Vol. 3). AI and ethics, academic integrity and the future of quality assurance in higher education. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Mamman-Muazu-2/publication/384969429_AI_and_EthicsAcademic_integrity_and_the_future_of_Quality_Assurance_in_Higher_Education_Hand_Book_on_AI_and_Quality_Higher_Education_in_Honour_of_Prof_Abubakar_Adamu_Rasheed_Volume_3/links/67655c89e74ca64e1f20daff/AI-and-Ethics-Academic-integrity-and-the-future-of-Quality-Assurance-in-Higher-Education-Hand-Book-on-AI-and-Quality-Higher-Education-in-Honour-of-Prof-Abubakar-Adamu-Rasheed-Volume-3.pdf#page=133
- 47 Oliviera, K. K. de S., & Souza, R. (2022). Digital Transformation towards Education 4.0. *Informatics in Education - An International Journal*, 21(2), 283–309. <https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=1045455>
- 48 Opele, J. K., Alade, T. T., & Ajifowoke, R. O. (2024). THE IMPACT OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE (AI) ON TEACHING AND RESEARCH EXPERIENCE OF UNIVERSITY LECTURERS: A REVIEW. *Journal of Educational Research and Policy Studies*, 17(1), 24–35.
- 49 Otermans, P. C. J., Baines, S., Livingstone, C., & Aditya, D. (2026). Talking Technology Tutors: The Perceptions of Conversational AI in Education through the Eyes of Parents and Teachers Worldwide International Journal of Technology in Education and Science, 10(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.46328/ijtes.5437>
- 50 Parker, L. (2024). AI in Academia: Assessing ChatGPT's Integration in College Classrooms. *Proceedings of the 2024 AERA Annual Meeting*. <https://doi.org/10.3102/2103302>
- 51 Parra G., L., & Calero S., X. (2019). Automated Writing Evaluation Tools in the Improvement of the Writing Skill. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(2), 209–226. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2019.12214a>

- 52 Plattner, M., Kosec, I., & Pejić Bach, M. (2024). The Impact of AI Tools on Education: Preliminary Research of HEIs' Teachers' Perspectives. *ENTRENOVA - ENTERPRISE RESEARCH INNOVATION*, 10(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.54820/entrenova-2024-0001>
- 53 Robert, J. (2026, January). The Impact of AI on Work in Higher Education. Research Report. Boulder, CO: EDUCAUSE.
- 54 Shahid, M. K., Zia, T., Bangfan, L., Iqbal, Z., & Ahmad, F. (2024). Exploring the relationship of psychological factors and adoption readiness in determining university teachers' attitude on AI-based assessment systems. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 22(2), 100967. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2024.100967>
- 55 Shrivastava, S. K., & Shrivastava, C. (2022). The Impact of Digitalization in Higher Educational Institutions. *International Journal of Soft Computing and Engineering*, 11(2), 7–11. <https://doi.org/10.35940/ijscce.B3536.0111222>
- 56 Sultan, Y., Hussain, S. A., Anwar, S., & Faiz, M. U. (2025). Psychological Factors Influencing the Acceptance of AI Tools among Teachers and Students in inclusive Classroom. *Review of Applied Management and Social Sciences*, 8(2), 897–913. <https://doi.org/10.47067/ramss.v8i2.524>
- 57 Sy, C. Y., Maceda, L. L., & Abisado, M. B. (2024). AI-Driven Analysis: Optimizing Tertiary Education Policy through Machine Learning Insights. *International Journal of Advances in Intelligent Informatics*, 10(2), 296. <https://doi.org/10.26555/ijain.v10i2.1525>
- 58 Tang, K. H. D. (2024). Implications of Artificial Intelligence for Teaching and Learning. *Acta Pedagogica Asiana*, 3(2), 65–79. <https://doi.org/10.53623/apga.v3i2.404>
- 59 Toquero, C. M. (2026). Trends, Trajectories and Tomorrows of AI Regulations in Philippine Higher Educational Institutions. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 80(1). <https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.70090>
- 60 Vieriu, A. M., & Petrea, G. (2025). The Impact of Artificial Intelligence (AI) on Students' Academic Development. *Education Sciences* 2025, Vol. 15, Page 343, 15(3), 343. <https://doi.org/10.3390/EDUCSCI15030343>
- 61 Vinay, S. B. (2023). APPLICATION OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE (AI) IN SCHOOL TEACHING AND LEARNING PROCESS- REVIEW AND ANALYSIS. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS (IJITMIS)*, 14(1), 1–5.