

# Teachers' Acceptance and Tolerance of AI-Generated/Assisted Student Work

Gen Infinity E. Indac<sup>1\*</sup>, James L. Paglinawan<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Graduate Student, Central Mindanao University, Musuan Bukidnon, Philippines

<sup>2</sup>Associate Professor IV, Central Mindanao University, Musuan Bukidnon, Philippines

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100500101>

Received: 26 April 2026; Accepted: 01 May 2026; Published: 23 May 2026

## ABSTRACT

The rapid integration of generative artificial intelligence (AI) tools in education has transformed how students produce academic outputs and how teachers evaluate them. This study examines teachers' perceptions, acceptance, tolerance, challenges, and countermeasures regarding AI-assisted student work in Philippine secondary schools. Using a qualitative descriptive design, data were collected from 20 public secondary school teachers across various subject areas through semi-structured interviews administered via Google Forms. Thematic analysis was applied to identify recurring patterns and sentiments, providing insights into how educators balance innovation with academic integrity. Findings show that teachers detect AI use through stylistic discrepancies and cognitive mismatches, such as sudden improvements in grammar, vocabulary, and coherence that do not align with a student's typical performance. Acceptance of AI is conditional, with teachers allowing its use as a scaffold for learning—particularly for grammar checking, idea organization, and brainstorming—provided students demonstrate transparency and accountability. Tolerance is framed by clear pedagogical rules, with educators permitting AI use in low-stakes tasks under disclosure requirements and process-based evidence. However, challenges persist, particularly a crisis of authenticity and cognitive ownership, as polished AI outputs often mask diminished creativity and critical thinking. To address these issues, teachers employ countermeasures such as requiring multiple drafts, oral defenses, contextualized tasks, and process-based assessments, thereby restoring the human element in learning.

This study emphasizes that teachers' responses to AI are shaped by conditional frameworks that balance innovation with integrity. It recommends institutional policies and training programs that support ethical AI use, strengthen teacher competence, and embed accountability measures to ensure AI remains a supplementary aid rather than a replacement for authentic student effort.

**Keywords:** Artificial Intelligence, Teacher Perceptions, Acceptance, Tolerance, Countermeasure

## INTRODUCTION

The rapid rise of generative AI chatbots has significantly impacted the education sector, reshaping how both teachers and students approach academic tasks. With their powerful capacity to assist in writing, organizing ideas, and enhancing productivity, these tools are increasingly integrated into classrooms, often without clear institutional policies to guide their use. This growing reliance on AI highlights the need to examine how teachers perceive, accept, and tolerate its use in student outputs, as well as the challenges and countermeasures they employ to safeguard academic integrity.

Existing literature shows that teachers recognize AI as a helpful aid but remain cautious in its integration due to concerns about plagiarism, originality, and the erosion of critical thinking skills. Lin (2026) noted that educators exhibit limited integration of generative AI tools, relying heavily on their observations and familiarity with students to detect potential misuse. Gruenhagen et al. (2024) similarly found that students perceive AI chatbots as useful for grammar checking, idea generation, and organizing assessments, but their reliance raises concerns about diminished ownership of learning and academic integrity. Teachers, therefore, often depend on observable

“red flags,” such as sudden improvements in grammar, vocabulary, or coherence, to identify AI use (Lucero, 2025). Feldman-Maggor et al. (2025) emphasize that acceptance is conditional, focusing on process over product and requiring evidence of student understanding. Research also highlights moderate tolerance levels, particularly when AI use is paired with oral explanations or process evidence (Crompton, 2023), while Chan (2023) underscores the emergence of “tolerance frameworks” that balance cautious acceptance with integrity-preserving strategies.

Despite these insights, a critical gap remains in understanding the nuanced tolerance frameworks employed by teachers in localized contexts. Reports such as the Center for Democracy and Technology (2025/2026) reveal widespread concerns that AI weakens critical thinking and raises issues of data privacy and digital injustice. Langreo (2026) further warns that the rising use of AI in schools comes with significant downsides for students, including over-reliance on automated tools and reduced opportunities for developing independent problem-solving skills. Yet, limited qualitative evidence exists on how public secondary school teachers navigate these risks while acknowledging the practical benefits of AI in classrooms. This study seeks to address this gap by investigating teachers’ perceptions, acceptance, tolerance, challenges, and countermeasures in relation to AI-assisted student work. Specifically, it aims to identify the criteria educators use to detect AI, the conditions under which they accept or tolerate its use, and the strategies they employ to maintain authenticity in learning.

Furthermore, this research contributes to the broader discourse on academic integrity by situating teachers’ lived experiences within the global debate on AI in education. While international studies highlight systemic concerns about fairness, privacy, and the erosion of higher-order thinking, this study emphasizes the practical realities faced by educators in Philippine secondary schools. By focusing on teacher-driven strategies and classroom-level innovations, the study underscores the importance of policy frameworks that not only regulate AI use but also empower teachers to design authentic, process-based assessments. In doing so, it aims to provide actionable insights for both local and international contexts, ensuring that AI serves as a supplementary aid rather than a replacement for genuine student effort.

This study is limited by its reliance on self-reported data, its focus on a single national context (Philippine secondary schools), and a relatively small sample size of twenty participants. These restrictions caution against broad generalization but provide valuable localized insights.

## METHODOLOGY

### Research Design

This study utilized a qualitative descriptive design to explore the authentic experiences and “tolerance frameworks” developed by educators in response to AI-generated or assisted student outputs. This approach allowed for a detailed exploration of teacher sentiments within their specific educational contexts, providing a comprehensive summary of how they perceive and manage the integration of generative AI. By focusing on qualitative descriptions, the research aimed to identify the nuanced strategies teachers use to balance technological innovation with the necessity of upholding academic integrity.

### Participants and Sampling

The participants consisted of 20 public secondary school teachers from various subject areas, ensuring a multidisciplinary perspective on AI integration. The study employed purposive sampling to target educators with direct exposure to AI in student work, ensuring the data remained strictly aligned with the research focus on professional acceptance and identification methods.

### Data collection and Ethical Consideration

Data collection was conducted using a digital adaptation of a semi-structured interview guide, which was administered through Google Forms to facilitate efficient and detailed qualitative responses. The instrument focused on three core areas: the specific methods teachers use to identify AI-generated content, the reasons influencing their levels of acceptance or tolerance, and the challenges they encounter alongside their proposed

countermeasures. To maintain high ethical standards, participation was entirely voluntary and conducted anonymously. Participants were informed that all gathered data would be used exclusively for the conduct of this research, and ethical protocols were strictly followed to ensure confidentiality and adhere to standards for qualitative educational research.

### **Data Analysis**

The qualitative data gathered from the electronic forms were analyzed using thematic analysis. This process involved a systematic review of the written responses to identify recurring patterns, sentiments, and "red flags" described by the educators, such as rapid progression in grammar or coherence that does not align with a student's typical work.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS**

This section presents the analysis and interpretation of the data obtained from the participants of the study.

### **On Teacher's Perception and Identification on the use of AI in students' output**

Theme: Discrepancy in Stylistic and Cognitive Performance

The theme emerges from the responses that highlight how teachers perceive discrepancies between students' stylistic outputs and their actual cognitive performance when using Artificial Intelligence (AI). Participants rely on identifying "telltale" markers that reveal incongruities between a student's expected ability and the quality of the submitted work. These indicators include texts that appear "too perfect," overly polished, or formal in ways that lack the student's personal voice, insights, or class-specific context. Teachers also emphasize the importance of process-based verification, such as follow-up oral explanations or classroom questioning, to confirm suspicions when written submissions fail to reflect genuine understanding.

This theme is supported/generated by the following responses:

"I usually observe AI use... when there is big changes in their writing style or the quality of their output" (Participant 3).

"I identify AI... by looking for a combination of... a sudden, unexplained jump in quality or vocabulary" (Participant 4).

"I notice it when the writing suddenly becomes too formal or different from the student's usual style" (Participant 11).

"A student who struggles in class but submits highly advanced work" (Participant 9).

"I identify it through unnatural writing flow, I also cross-check with previous submissions and ask students to explain their work" (Participant 12).

Teachers in this study consistently reported that they identify AI-generated student work by observing discrepancies between stylistic quality and cognitive performance. The obvious jump in terms of vocabulary, formal tone and polished coherence that do not align with a students' writing style. These observations resonate with broader scholarship emphasizing that educators rely on stylistic incongruities and contextual mismatches to detect AI integration (Co, 2025). This challenge is evident in the Philippine context, where research on Senior High School students shows that the absence of institutional policies forces teachers to rely on observational strategies, such as comparing writing patterns, to monitor AI use. Such reliance underscores the vulnerability of educators who must balance innovation with integrity in environments lacking formal guidelines.

The reliance on stylistic detection reflects both the strengths and limitations of current teacher practices. While such markers provide immediate cues, research cautions that human judgment alone is often insufficient. Copyleaks (2026) highlights that educator are shifting away from traditional detection software toward

monitoring real-time workflows and requiring students to provide evidence of their writing process. This aligns with participant strategies such as oral questioning and cross-checking with past submissions, which serve as process-based verification methods. However, Stanford University studies have shown that even experienced teachers frequently overestimate their ability to detect AI-generated text by eye, particularly when evaluating work from non-native English speakers (Stanford University, 2025). This underscores the vulnerability of detection practices that rely solely on stylistic observation.

The Philippine context further complicates detection, as the absence of institutional policies forces teachers to depend on ad hoc strategies. Research on Senior High School students demonstrates that educators often compare writing patterns across assignments to infer AI use, highlighting the lack of systemic support for authentic assessment. This reliance on observational methods reflects a broader tension between innovation and integrity in environments where policy frameworks are underdeveloped. The literature consistently emphasizes the need for policy development and pedagogical innovation to ensure that AI use enhances rather than undermines student learning (Co, 2025; Copyleaks, 2026; Stanford University, 2025).

### **On reasons influencing Teachers to accept AI assisted/generated Students' output**

Theme: AI as a Scaffold for Learning and Productivity

The theme emerges from the participants' responses highlighting that their acceptance of AI-generated or AI-assisted student work is conditional, grounded in the belief that AI should function as a scaffold rather than a substitute for student thinking. Participants emphasized that AI is acceptable when it supports learning processes such as grammar checking, idea organization, and brainstorming, provided that students remain the "human in the loop" who contextualize and explain the output.

This theme is supported/generated by the following responses:

"I would accept AI-generated or AI-assisted outputs when the technology is used as a support tool for learning rather than a replacement for the student's own thinking" (Participant 2).

"I usually accept AI-generated outputs... if they use AI as a support tool to check their grammar, get initial information and to organize their ideas" (Participant 3).

"I accept AI use when it is honest, purposeful, and still reflects the student's own thinking, not when it replaces their effort entirely" (Participant 9).

"I accept it when it is used as a learning tool... provided the student adds their own analysis, examples and original input, and properly declares its use" (Participant 12).

Philippine-based research corroborates this perspective. Teacher's view AI positively so long as it helps in students' learning. Silagan (2025) found that teachers' positive attitudes toward AI, coupled with technological competence and training, are strong predictors of acceptance, particularly when AI is framed as a tool for personalized learning and instructional support. These findings suggest that Filipino educators view AI as a supplementary aid that can enhance productivity and clarity, but only when integrated ethically and transparently.

International scholarship reinforces these insights. Ali et al. (2024) argue that AI applications in education can significantly boost student engagement and productivity when used as scaffolds for tasks such as brainstorming and idea generation, but stress the importance of institutional policies to safeguard academic integrity. Likewise, the U.S. Department of Education (2023) underscores AI's potential to tailor instruction to diverse learners, noting that acceptance is strongest when AI supports unfinished learning and strengthens adaptive teaching strategies. Together, these studies highlight a convergence between local and global perspectives: teachers accept AI-assisted work when it demonstrably enhances learning outcomes without eroding student accountability.

Overall, acceptance of AI in classrooms is not unconditional. It is framed by pedagogical value, ethical safeguards, and the requirement that students demonstrate genuine understanding. This conditional acceptance

reflects a constructive stance toward AI integration, positioning it as a supportive educational tool rather than a replacement for authentic student effort.

### **On Teachers' tolerance on the use of AI assisted/generated students' output**

Theme: Guided Integration through Pedagogy-Centric Policy

The theme emerges highlighting the extent to how much teachers tolerate AI with guided integration through Pedagogy-Centric Policy. The findings reveal that teachers adopt a nuanced approach to AI integration, shifting from outright prohibition to guided tolerance framed by clear pedagogical rules. Participants emphasized that they allow AI use "selectively and with clear rules," particularly in low-stakes or formative tasks, provided students disclose their use and demonstrate genuine understanding.

This theme is supported/generated by the following responses:

"I allow AI use in assignments or projects to a limited extent, mainly as a support tool for learning... The main content, analysis, and conclusions of the work should still come from the student's own understanding" (Participant 2).

"I allow AI use selectively and with clear rules: students may use AI for low-stakes or formative work... provided they disclose what they used and submit process artifacts" (Participant 4).

"I allow limited use of AI as a support tool... but not for generating complete answers or final outputs" (Participant 14).

"I'd allow AI use to a guided and limited extent—enough to support learning, but not so much that it replaces the student's own thinking" (Participant 20).

"Tolerance is lower for younger students still building foundational skills, and higher for senior students learning professional application" (Participant 12).

Philippine-based studies support this cautious stance. Lucero (2025) highlighted that secondary school teachers tolerate AI use when students can defend their process through oral explanations or contextualized applications, noting that tolerance is higher in senior levels where professional application is emphasized. Similarly, Silagan (2025) found that tolerance is strongly linked to teacher training and technological competence, with educators more willing to permit AI use when they feel confident in guiding its ethical integration. These findings underscore that tolerance in the Philippine context is conditional, shaped by both student maturity and teacher preparedness.

International research echoes these patterns. Crompton (2023) demonstrated that teachers in science education contexts show moderate tolerance levels (60–75%) when AI use is paired with process evidence such as oral defense or iterative drafts. Chan (2023) further argued that tolerance frameworks are emerging globally as educators balance cautious acceptance with countermeasures to uphold academic integrity. Feldman-Maggor et al. (2025) add that explainable AI tools can strengthen teacher trust, suggesting that tolerance increases when educators understand how AI outputs are generated and can contextualize them within student learning processes.

Taken together, these insights suggest that tolerance is not passive acceptance but an active pedagogical strategy. Teachers tolerate AI use when it is framed as a support tool, embedded within transparent processes, and accompanied by student accountability. This guided integration reflects a broader shift toward "AI-ready" assessments, where tolerance is conditional on the demonstration of authentic learning and cognitive ownership.

### **On challenges dealing with AI assisted/generated students' output**

Theme: Crisis of Authenticity and Cognitive Ownership

The theme emerges as the common challenge by teachers when dealing with AI generated/assisted students output as being crisis of authenticity and cognitive ownership. The findings reveal that teachers face a profound crisis of authenticity when evaluating AI-assisted student outputs. Participants consistently noted a mismatch between the polished quality of written work and the students' ability to verbally defend or explain their reasoning. This discrepancy creates professional uncertainty, as educators struggle to determine whether the work represents genuine intellectual effort or a sophisticated machine-generated product

This theme is supported/generated by the following responses:

Participant 1: "Learner understanding drops... their over-reliance and overconfidence in the 'correctness' of the prompt results is a problem... AI, used in this manner, is counterproductive to that goal."

Participant 2: "The main difficulties... include identifying whether the work is truly AI-generated because AI text can be well written and similar to human writing."

Participant 7: "The output is very polished and well-organized, which makes it hard to tell if the ideas are truly theirs or mostly from AI."

Participant 10: "The answers are good and most perfect. You are doubtful if you take a record of 10/10. Uncertainty in your mind remains."

Participant 13: "Loss of creativity and accountability to their own learnings."

Participant 15: "They are good on papers but not orally or on oral recitations."

Participant 20: "It's too perfect and it does not reflect their own voice, especially in writing."

Philippine-based studies highlight similar challenges. Co (2025) emphasized that the absence of institutional policies forces teachers to rely on ad hoc detection strategies, such as stylistic comparisons and oral questioning, which are often inconsistent and unreliable. Duhaylungsod and Chavez (2025) further reported that teachers perceive generative AI as a threat to academic integrity, noting that over-reliance on AI diminishes student accountability and ownership of learning. These findings underscore the vulnerability of educators in local contexts where policy frameworks remain underdeveloped.

International research reinforces these concerns. Filgueiras (2023) argued that without governance structures, AI integration risks undermining equity and reliability in assessment, as practices vary widely across teachers and institutions. Han, Yang, and Liu (2025) similarly cautioned that educators often struggle to distinguish between human and AI-generated text, highlighting the limitations of detection-centric approaches. Gamage et al. (2023) advocate for policy reforms that emphasize deeper learning outcomes and authentic assessment designs to counteract AI-enabled shortcutting. Collectively, these studies suggest that the challenges posed by AI are not merely technical but fundamentally pedagogical, requiring systemic responses to safeguard cognitive ownership.

In sum, the challenges encountered by teachers reflect a dual tension: the difficulty of verifying authenticity in student work and the broader risk of eroding creativity and accountability. These findings highlight the urgent need for institutional policies and innovative assessment strategies that protect academic integrity while acknowledging the growing presence of AI in education.

### **On countermeasures to deal with AI assisted/generated students' output**

Theme: Authentic Learning through Process-Based Assessment

The theme emerges as the common countermeasure of participant as authentic learning through project-based Assessment. The findings indicate that teachers are responding to the challenges of AI integration by shifting their focus from evaluating static products to monitoring the process of learning. Participants described

strategies such as requiring multiple drafts, oral defenses, and reflection questions to ensure that students demonstrate genuine understanding

This theme is supported/generated by the following responses:

Participant 14: "I use strategies such as requiring drafts, asking students to explain their work orally, designing more application-based questions, and setting clear guidelines on acceptable AI use."

Participant 16: "I manage AI use by requiring students to explain their work orally, submit drafts or process outputs, and using varied assessments that focus on understanding rather than just final answers."

Participant 18: "I clarify guidelines on acceptable AI use, require process-based outputs, use oral validation or reflection questions, and design tasks that emphasize critical thinking and personal application."

Participant 19: "I manage AI use by setting clear guidelines on when it's acceptable... I also compare student work with their past performance [and] discuss expectations openly."

Participant 20: "Question and Answer portion about the content of the output they have submitted."

Philippine-based research supports this process-centered approach. Santos et al. (2025) emphasized that local schools are increasingly adopting proctored and authentic assessments that emphasize performance-based tasks and cultural relevance, ensuring that AI functions as a supportive tool rather than a proxy for student effort. Similarly, Duhaylungsod and Chavez (2025) reported that teachers actively design countermeasures such as oral validations and contextualized assignments to safeguard academic integrity in environments where institutional policies remain limited. These findings underscore that Filipino educators are innovating at the classroom level to restore the "human element" in learning.

International frameworks mirror these strategies. UNESCO (2023) guidelines advocate for process-based grading, encouraging educators to assign value to brainstorming, revisions, and iterative drafts to neutralize the shortcut appeal of generative AI. Dawson et al., (2025) argued that secure assessment must be relational, tied to real-time classroom dialogues that fall outside the reach of static AI models. Collectively, these studies highlight that the most effective countermeasure is not technological prohibition but a deeply human, process-focused pedagogy. In sum, teachers' countermeasures reflect a deliberate shift toward authentic learning frameworks. By embedding process-based assessments, oral defenses, and contextualized tasks, educators are building intellectual safeguards that ensure AI remains a supplementary aid rather than a replacement for student effort. This reorientation positions countermeasures as proactive strategies to uphold academic integrity while embracing the realities of AI in education.

These findings suggest the need for a tiered policy framework on AI use in education, where low-stakes tasks may allow guided AI integration under disclosure rules, while high-stakes assessments remain strictly regulated. Such tiered laws would align classroom practice with institutional accountability, ensuring AI functions as a scaffold rather than a substitute for authentic learning.

## CONCLUSION

This study highlights that teachers' responses to AI-assisted student work are shaped by conditional frameworks that balance innovation with academic integrity. Educators perceive AI use through stylistic discrepancies and cognitive mismatches, accept it when it functions as a scaffold for learning, and tolerate it only under clear rules and disclosure requirements. At the same time, they face challenges of authenticity, creativity, and accountability, which underscore the risks of over-reliance on generative tools.

Overall, the study emphasizes that teachers are not rejecting AI outright but are cautiously integrating it through process-based assessments, oral defenses, and contextualized tasks. These countermeasures reflect a pedagogical reorientation toward authentic learning. Based on the results, the study recommends the development of institutional policies and training programs that support ethical AI use, strengthen teachers' competence, and

embed accountability measures. Such frameworks will ensure that AI remains a supplementary aid that enhances student learning without undermining originality and cognitive ownership.

## REFERENCES

1. Chan, C. K. Y. (2023). Is AI changing the rules of academic misconduct? An in-depth look at students' perceptions of "AI-giarism." *arXiv (Cornell University)*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2306.03358>
2. Co, S. J. (2025). Artificial intelligence in Philippine education: A narrative review of applications, perceptions, and challenges. *Zenodo (CERN European Organization for Nuclear Research)*. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15902949>
3. Co, S. J. (2025). *Artificial intelligence in Philippine education: A narrative review of applications, perceptions, and challenges*. Zenodo (CERN European Organization for Nuclear Research). <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15902949>
4. Copyleaks. (2026, March 18). *What educators should know about AI detection in 2026*. <https://copyleaks.com/blog/what-educators-should-know-about-ai-detection-in-2026>
5. Corbin, T., Dawson, P., & Liu, D. (n.d.). Talk is Cheap: Why structural assessment changes are needed for a time of GENAI. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 50(7), 1087–1097. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2025.2503964>
6. Crompton, H., & Burke, D. (2023). Artificial intelligence in higher education: the state of the field. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 20(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00392-8>
7. Duhaylungsod, A. V., & Chavez, J. V. (2023). ChatGPT and other AI Users: Innovative and Creative Utilitarian Value and Mindset Shift. *Journal of Namibian Studies History Politics Culture*, 33. <https://doi.org/10.59670/jns.v33i.2791>
8. Duhaylungsod, F. J., & Chavez, R. (2025). Academic integrity in peril: Teachers' experiences towards generative artificial intelligence. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 12(7). <https://oapub.org/edu/index.php/ejes/article/view/616>
9. *Ethics of artificial intelligence*. (2026, March 12). AI | UNESCO. <https://www.unesco.org/en/artificial-intelligence/recommendation-ethics>
10. Fabito, B. S., et al. (2025). *Artificial intelligence in Philippine education: A narrative review of applications, perceptions, and challenges*. Zenodo. <https://zenodo.org/records/15902950>
11. Feldman-Maggor, Y., Cukurova, M., Kent, C. et al. The Impact of Explainable AI on Teachers' Trust and Acceptance of AI EdTech Recommendations: The Power of Domain-specific Explanations. *Int J Artif Intell Educ* 35, 2889–2922 (2025). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-025-00486-6a>
12. Filgueiras, F. (2023). Artificial intelligence and education governance. *Education Citizenship and Social Justice*, 19(3), 349–361. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17461979231160674>
13. Gamage, K. A., Dehideniya, S. C. P., Xu, Z., & Tang, X. (n.d.). ChatGPT and higher education assessments: More opportunities than concerns? *Journal of Applied Learning & Teaching*, 6(2). <https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2023.6.2.32>
14. Gruenhagen, J. H., Sinclair, P. M., Carroll, J., Baker, P. R., Wilson, A., & Demant, D. (2024). The rapid rise of generative AI and its implications for academic integrity: Students' perceptions and use of chatbots for assistance with assessments. *Computers and Education Artificial Intelligence*, 7, 100273. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100273>
15. Han, J., Yang, Y., & Liu, G. (2025). Are teachers assessing work written by students or by AI? A rapid literature review of research on detecting content generated by generative AI. *European Journal of Education*, 60(4). <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.70240>
16. Henry, J.V., Oliver, M. Who Will Watch the Watchmen? The Ethico-political Arrangements of Algorithmic Proctoring for Academic Integrity. *Postdigit Sci Educ* 4, 330–353 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-021-00273-1>
17. Langreo, J. V. (2026b, February 3). Rising use of AI in schools comes with big downsides for students. *Education Week*. <https://www.edweek.org/technology/rising-use-of-ai-in-schools-comes-with-big-downsides-for-students/2025/10#:~:text=Other%20big%20concerns%20also%20showed,conducted%20between%20June%20and%20August>

18. Lin, X. (2026, December 24). *Technology-Enhanced Writing Pedagogy for EFL Learners: A Multi-Study Dissertation on Practice, Effectiveness, and Teacher Perceptions*. <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1bf8j2r7>
19. Lin, X. (2026b, December 24). *Technology-Enhanced Writing Pedagogy for EFL Learners: A Multi-Study Dissertation on Practice, Effectiveness, and Teacher Perceptions*. <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1bf8j2r7>
20. Lucero, D. B. (2025). The lived experiences of teachers in detecting AI generated content in students' written outputs in private schools of Bislig City. *Journal of Information Systems Engineering & Management*, 10(47s), 288–298. <https://doi.org/10.52783/jisem.v10i47s.9259>
21. Manalang, A. (2026). More and more teachers and students are using AI, even though it can be problematic. *Phys.org*. <https://phys.org/news/2026-03-teachers-students-ai-good.html>
22. Omar Ali, Peter A. Murray, Mujtaba Momin, Yogesh K. Dwivedi, Tegwen Malik, *The effects of artificial intelligence applications in educational settings: Challenges and strategies*, *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, Volume 199, 2024, 123076, ISSN 0040-1625, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2023.123076>.
23. Tumapon, T. T., & Silagan, B. L. (2025). *Technological Competence, Training and Support, Attitude Towards AI, and Teachers' Acceptance*. <https://ejournals.ph/article.php?id=32547>
24. U.S. Department of Education. (2023). *Artificial intelligence and the future of teaching and learning: Insights and recommendations*. <https://www.ed.gov/sites/ed/files/documents/ai-report/ai-report.pdf>
25. *Utilization of Artificial Intelligence (AI) Tools among Senior High School Students: Inputs for Policy Recommendations – International Journal of Research and Scientific Innovation (IJRSI)*. (n.d.). <https://rsisinternational.org/journals/ijrsi/articles/utilization-of-artificial-intelligence-ai-tools-among-senior-high-school-students-inputs-for-policy-recommendations/>
26. Viberg, O., Cukurova, M., Feldman-Maggor, Y., Alexandron, G., Shirai, S., Kanemune, S., Wasson, B., Tømte, C., Spikol, D., Milrad, M., Coelho, R., & Kizilcec, R. F. (2023). What Explains Teachers' Trust of AI in Education across Six Countries? *arXiv (Cornell University)*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2312.01627>