



Motivations for AI Use in Assignments among University Students

Soma Hassan¹ , Aivar Surji¹ , Hannah Surji² , and Aziza Kavlu¹ 

¹English Language Teaching Department, Faculty of Education, Tishk International University, Erbil, Iraq

²Department of Nursing, College of Nursing, Catholic University in Erbil, Erbil, Iraq

Correspondence: Soma Hassan, English Language Teaching Department, Faculty of Education, Tishk International University, Erbil, Iraq

Email: soma.hassan@tiu.edu.iq

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.23918/ijsses.v13i1p5>

Abstract: The development of artificial intelligence has changed the manner that people work, gain information, and develop understanding. Artificial Intelligence has become a prominent part of various fields including education. Students use these programs and tools as a source of support to make finishing assignments and accessing content easier. The aim of this research was to find the reasons students' use AI to complete their assignments. A quantitative survey of 57 students across three Kurdistan universities was conducted to explore motivations for AI use. Data was analyzed using the IBM SPSS Program and descriptive statistics tests. The quantitative method showed that most of the participants completed their assignments by using AI, which was largely due to the overall workload and difficulty of the tasks. Moreover, the students' age, gender, university, or grade did not affect the students' motivation for using AI. These results reveal that students' motivation to use AI is the same across various demographic variables, indicating the prevalent application in education and highlighting the significance of educational endeavours to guarantee its ethical use. The findings contribute to ongoing debates on academic integrity and the ethical integration of AI in higher education. Hence, students' usage of AI should be acknowledged due to the evolving nature of AI within education and steps need to be taken to properly address such occurrences in modern education. Limitations related to sample size and generalizability are acknowledged.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Students, Motivation, Honesty, Academics, Education

1. Introduction

Artificial intelligence has become a significant part of the world. The number of pupils accessing AI has grown over time (DuBose & Marshall, 2023). Its incorporation into education has changed the manner that students learn, finish assignments, and are educated. AI has made accessing resources, information, personalizing learning, providing analysis, and constructing feedback easier for students of all learning backgrounds (Harry, 2023; Vieriu & Petrea, 2025). Hence, students may be motivated to use these programs and tools because of the ease they bring to the learning and assignment process. It gives them an abundant amount of information and responses that prompts quicker work or a deepening of understanding (Kasneci et al., 2023). However, frequent AI usage can have adverse influence on learners' independent thinking, completion of tasks, and motivation to explore knowledge, so guidance in appropriate usage for schooling is vital.

Received: 17.09.2025

Accepted: 12.04.2026

Published: 13.04.2026

Hassan, S., Surji, A., Surji, H., & Kavlu, A. (2026). Motivations for AI Use in Assignments among University Students. *International Journal of Social Sciences & Educational Studies*, 13(1), 85-105.

After all, the problem arises when AI generates assignments for students, especially university students. The rage started with Chat GPT, but now there are numerous AIs for each task whether it is generating a simple paragraph about a topic or humanizing an AI-generated written project (Krause et al., 2025). It is not a secret that students are using technologies to ease and quicken the completion of their assignments. The appeal of saving time or quickly understanding academic topics are possible motivations for AI usage. Recently with the rise of AI, there is an emerging phenomenon of utilizing various AI tools among students for tasks like information collection, paraphrasing, analysis, citations, sources, and much more. This raises the question of its impact on academic ability and honesty regarding the work produced by learners (Qadir, 2023).

The usage of AI is an emerging trend nowadays, and part of the population that uses AI on a daily basis are students. This study's purpose centers on the exploration of students' motives for using AI in their assignments and their choice of possible academic dishonesty. Moreover, AI usage discrepancies due to age, grades, institution, and gender were explored to comprehend these factors influence on students motives. Identification of these motives through this study can aid teachers and academic facilities to guide learners in attaining independent, honest, and efficient learning practices. Additionally, students can become aware of the appropriate manner to use AI in their education to acquire sufficient support while having a proper learning experience. While global studies have examined student reliance on AI, little is known about motivations in Middle Eastern contexts such as Kurdistan. This study addresses that gap.

Research Questions:

1. What motivates students to use AI tools in their assignments?
2. Are there any differences in students' motivation for using AI between age, grade, university and gender?

Hypothesis: Students view the usage of artificial intelligence during the learning process as a supportive and honest tool that assists them in their academic development.

2. Literature Review

2.1 What is Artificial Intelligence?

According to the Merriam-Webster (n.d.), artificial is something humans made, created, or formed especially to appear natural. Intelligence is the capacity to learn or manage new circumstances or use knowledge to influence surroundings. Artificial intelligence (AI) has multiple possible definitions and is complex to define but each approximately relate to the notion of forming programs or devices that display behavior that would be viewed as intelligent if shown in humans (Kaplan, 2016). Moreover, artificial intelligence is explained as simulation of human skills that involves knowledge growth, reasoning, and self-improvement (Bindayel et al., 2025). It is the capacity of computers to conduct actions often connected to intelligent beings. This is observed in systems being developed to include intellectual characteristics displayed by people like learning, generalization, reasoning, and understanding meaning. The constant development over the years has enabled computers and programs to proficiently complete complex actions or reach performance capabilities of human experts. Although AI is used in various applications, it does not have a program that can completely mimic human adaptability regarding activities that require daily

knowledge or broader scope (Jin et al., 2025). The AI community has attempted to develop technological programs that emulate intelligent performance. This is a challenge for developers due to a program having to successfully do various things to be labelled as intelligent.

Artificial intelligence systems enable individuals to learn using helpers such as bots and applications. It functions through a combination of information, intelligent processes, and iterative operations, which authorizes the software to recognize and learn from data patterns. AI is regarded as helpful for better learning experiences and efficiently reaching educational objectives (Fitria, 2021). Moreover, artificial intelligence has been divided into two categories, which are narrow AI and general AI. Narrow AI is built for certain tasks such as recognizing speech and translating text. However, general AI is constructed for human-like intelligence. Such AI systems that are able to generate text, photos, etc., have a great impact on students' learning. Certain AI tools have been developed to interact through dialogue, provide explanations, and help students with their assignments (Black & Tomlinson, 2025). According to Wang and Fan (2025), the AI tools can improve the students' higher-order thinking and performance if used appropriately, but it also raises a concern regarding educational ethics and excessive dependence (Balalle & Pannilage, 2025).

2.2 Students AI Usage

Students have become accustomed to using artificial intelligence to enhance their learning experience and understanding. According to Chen et al. (2020), artificial intelligence has made learning better through the possibility of personalizing or tailoring materials and resources to each learner's abilities and needs. Research indicates that students utilize AI tools in many different ways. Specifically, AI and language learning has had a beneficial connection due to its conversational ability to provide learners with individualized assessment and greater chances to practice (Chan & Tsi, 2023). Moreover, AI helps students brainstorm, structure their essays, simplify complex tasks, etc. It can be used as a tool to edit, paraphrase, and check grammar (Black & Tomlinson, 2025). Cotton et al. (2024) stated that learners usually use AI tools to save time. Woo et al. (2025) conducted research on EFL students and found that students usually alter the work produced by AI instead of directly submitting, which they suggested that AI is used as a foundation. However, the level of editing differs greatly as some learners make significant modifications whereas others do little to no edits at all. AI in education has many types and tools each for different tasks. One of the emerging and most used types of AI in education by students are the Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI) such as ChatGPT, Scite, Litmaps and Gemini. This type of AI as its name suggests generates information according to the prompts they are given (Juárez & Baumgartner, 2024).

Crcek and Patekar (2023) observed students' usage of the AI tool ChatGPT. They learned that students use ChatGPT for idea generation, summarization, paraphrasing, reviewing, and writing some content for writing tasks. Chen (2025) examined students' AI usage and found that a majority did use the tools to produce ideas to help with tasks and paper. Regardless of this, the students shared critical opinions towards AI output, which were presented through their experience using ChatGPT. Additionally, in STEM fields, AI is used for analyzing complicated formulas, problem-solving, and programming (Wang et al. 2025). Although several students use AI as a learning tool to manage their work, a significant number of learners depend on it to get tasks done directly (Wang et al. 2025). This type of usage could be an issue in causing

a possible decrease in thinking critically if such dependence becomes a routine. It was further emphasized by Zhai et al. (2024) that the role of AI as a learning tool and possible shortcut could improve student productivity and self-esteem; however, excessive reliance might weaken engagement with schoolwork.

2.3 AI Effect on Cognitive and Learning Process

In education, artificial intelligence has become a central tool used to aid cognitive and learning processes. Students use AI tools in a multitude of ways to support their learning and complete academic tasks. Playfoot et al. (2024) found that 32% of undergraduate students are willing to use AI tools in their assignments and 15% have already used them. Bai et al. (2023) stated that the inclusion of artificial intelligence has several possible positive and negative influences on learning processes. The positive aspects of using AI like ChatGPT in learning consist of constant support availability, personalized learning, repeated content access, less human communicative pressure, and interactive education. However, the negative possible features consist of inaccurate data, hindered critical thinking, less human connection, impedes motivation, and weakens in-depth comprehension of subjects. Students' lack of interest and low levels of punishment for being caught using AI tools is one of the main reasons for its usage among students. Teachers need to address the issue of students' interests and work on connecting their assignments to students' interests to reduce the likelihood of learners using AI tools (Playfoot et al., 2024). Additionally, Abdelmagid et al. (2025) stated that notable developments were seen in students' memory, contemplation, and reasoning due to using AI tools to learn.

Research by Lademann et al. (2024) reported that both extrinsic and intrinsic intellectual effort was decreased with the use of clarifications produced by AI. However, students' confidence and participation level were increased; therefore, showing that AI could essentially support student understanding (Lademann et al., 2024; Vieriu & Petrea, 2025). Furthermore, another finding by Bai and Wang (2025) showed that the quality of AI use and results positively affected the learners' creativity and motivation. Despite this, Gerlich (2025) suggested that depending on AI could decrease the ability to think critically as it was found that regular use of AI and analytical reasoning was negatively associated. Similarly, Kosmyna et al. (2025) revealed that students who relied on AI to write their essays showed a decline in neural activity, cognitive control, and individuality. Such outcomes emphasize the risks of reduced cognitive engagement when learners depend exclusively on AI.

2.4 Ethical Considerations in AI Use

Artificial intelligence incorporation in education has become prominent and requires ethical considerations to be factored for successful implementation (Röhl et al., 2025). It provides an enriched academic journey using virtual reality to construct a captivating learning atmosphere. Regardless of the advantages, its inclusion within academics has brought forth the need to be mindful of the ethical challenges. These challenges involve protecting and managing data pertaining to learners, possible biases or unfairness by the algorithms, accessibility obstacles, and digital gap (Eden et al., 2024). Li et al. (2024) shared that these tools provide various perks like personalization, access, and better pupil engagement. Yet, AI drawbacks are present in education concerning response reliability, information confidentiality, technology overdependence, and comprehensive learning. Another issue is plagiarism as AI tools can produce high-quality text ready to be submitted as an assignment, which makes it hard to verify the level of student

contribution (Baker, 2025). Data privacy is also an ethical issue in regard to AI use. Holmes et al. (2022) reported that AI systems usually depend on the data collected from the user for improving its performance, which raises concerns about how a student's data is saved, managed, and secured. AI algorithms must be fairly programmed and assessed to make certain that diversity is present in the data and biases are eliminated to maintain ethical outcomes (Naseeb & Bhatti, 2024).

Furthermore, AI systems learn from several datasets that could possibly contain societal biases, which may lead to outputs that inadvertently reinforce offensive language or stereotypes (Kasneci et al., 2023). In education, this can affect the quality of the content produced, possibly restricting specific student groups. Hence, proactive plans need to be executed to support responsible inclusion of AI. This would focus on policy development to guarantee learner privacy, handling probable biases in artificial intelligence, and transparency in its deliberation and response process. Reiss (2021) explained that artificial intelligence is capable of aiding and personalizing academics for learners especially those with particular academic requirements and needs. However, AI does influence learners' development which involves ethical issues like decrease in social skills and human involvement due to reliance on these programs.

3. Methodology

This study employs a Quantitative approach, which gives a generalized result for a larger sample size (Haradhan, 2020). Hence, the decision was made to choose this type of data collection. Initially, this study was designed to collect data qualitatively because qualitative data analysis will allow the participants to share their ideas and motives for using AI more in detail, rather than one-word answers. The students from the education faculty at Tishk International University were invited to do the interview. Still, they did not reply to the invitation. The students thought it was a way to identify who uses AI to do their assignments and inform their departments. From there, the researcher turned the data collection tool into a quantitative data collection and expanded the context of the study to include Salahaddin University and Garmian University students, too.

A cross-sectional survey design was employed, and data was collect via Google Forms from 57 students at three universities in Kurdistan. The survey items were designed through reading literature and seeing how other researchers collected data, then the researchers piloted the survey with 10 university lecturers and received the feedback to refine the instrument. After the first pilot the researchers shared the survey with the participants. The participants for this study were selected in a mixture of convenience and snowball sampling. The TIU students were selected by convenience sampling, and the other two universities were chosen by snowball sampling, where the researcher asked the students to share it with their classmates. After obtaining the data, the IBM SPSS program was used to analyze the data. Moreover, some descriptive statistics tests were chosen to achieve the objective of this paper, such as the Frequency tests, the Mann-Whitney test, and the Kruskal-Wallis test.

The sample size of this paper was 57 undergraduate students from three universities in Kurdistan-Iraq. Table 3.1 (see appendix) shows the percentages of each university's students who participated in this paper. The number of students in the study was due to availability and access issues with respect to the student population studied. As a result, this sample size will likely limit the generalizability of result from this

study. Frequencies and percent were used to analyze multiple response items to determine whether patterns exist among the respondents. Because the data violated all three assumptions of normality nonparametric analyses were conducted. The Mann-Whitney U test was used to examine whether there was a significant difference between two independent samples. The Kruskal-Wallis H-test was utilized when comparing greater than two independent samples. Both tests can be used for ordinal data, which is the type of data collected, as well as when normality cannot be assumed because of either a large number of tied ranks or an extremely small sample size.

The highest percentage of participants was from Salahaddin University with 46% (N= 26), TIU students were 40% (N= 23), and the lowest percentage of participants was from Garmian University with only 14% (N= 8). These percentages mean that the majority of the participants for this study were from public universities (Salahaddin and Garmian). In the same table, it can be noticed that the majority of the participants are from the English Language Department at 46% (N= 26), and the other participants are from the Faculty of Education, mostly from the Biology Education Department at 30% (N= 17). The grade of the participants is indicated in the table, which shows that almost half of the participants 49% (N= 28) were from first grade in all the departments. Moreover, the table shows the participants of this study were mostly female (68% N= 39) aged between 20-23 years old (58% N= 33). Ethical clearance was granted before collecting the data and all the participants provided a form of Informed Consent. The decision to participate in this project was that of each student's choice and they were told they could leave at anytime if they chose. All participants responses were anonymous and confidential at all times during this study.

4. Results

This research aimed to identify the motives behind students' usage of AI for the completion of their assignments. To accomplish this aim, the researcher initially asked the participants a few questions. First of all, it should be identified how many students use AI to do their assignments. Table 4.1 (see appendix) shows the data analysis for this question; almost all participants use AI in one way or another (91% N= 52). To see how often AI is used by the students, they were asked to rank their frequency of usage from 1-5 (see Appendix Table 4.2). The data analysis shows that the students reported their usage as mostly from a 2-3 scale, which means less usage. This means that they think they are not using it that much. The next step is to ask what kind of AI they use for their assignments.

The participants answered this question by choosing multiple choices of what they have used AI tools for till now. Then, for data analysis, the researcher used multiple response data analysis to measure how many times each choice has been chosen. The analysis shows that the most used type of AI by students is the Paraphrasing tool 23% (N=34), and the least used tool is the Humanization tool 4% (N=6). Table 4.3 (see appendix) shows the full analysis of all the tools with their percentages and the number of participants choosing each choice. The next logical question for gathering data would be asking the participants about what made them use those kinds of AI for their assignments.

The same kind of multiple-choice response analysis was used to analyse the data from this question. The students responded that the reason they use AI is mostly for understanding complex topics 19% (N=37), and the lowest reason for using AI is both because of curiosity and peer influence, 4% (N=7) (see appendix table 4.4). This data shows that the students might choose to get help from AI because they do not

understand the topic of the assignment or parts of it. Then the researcher asked the participants *how much of an assignment they tend to use AI for?* The data will be shown in Table 4.5 in the appendix.

Multiple response analysis shows that the participants tend to use AI for getting ideas to structure their assignment by 38% (N=40). This means that the students mostly use AI to get outlines or that the AI will structure their assignments for them, so that they might find it easier to complete. The least frequent choice to be chosen by the participants was to check for grammar mistakes and plagiarism, by only 10% (N=10). The participants' answers to this question was a little surprising for the researcher, students least usage of AI as a grammar or plagiarism checker. These tools are the most helpful for students to ensure that they submit assignments with the least amount of language problems. Using AI for generating the whole assignment was reported by 20% (N= 21) of the participants, which is a high rate if compared to the other options' rates (see Appendix Table 4.5).

Three Questions (*In your opinion, how widespread is the use of AI tools among students in your classes? Did the AI tool meet your expectations for the assignment? Would you recommend the use of AI tools to your peers for academic assignments?*) were asked, and the participants answered the following way. The participants were asked about the spread of using AI by students in their classes by selecting the spread on a 1-5 Likert scale. The participants reported that they think AI is somewhat level spread among their classmates by 37% (N=27). Then, they were asked if using an AI tool met their expectation or not. They reported that it managed somehow to meet their expectation but not entirely. Finally, they were asked if they would recommend using AI to their peers in the class, 71% (N=41) of the participants said that they would (see Appendix Table 4.6). The participants reported that they would recommend using AI, with the exception that was noticed from another question, where they said that the AI tools did not meet their expectations that much.

Table 4.7 (see appendix) combines the answers of the participants for three questions that were related to each other (*Do you believe using AI tools for assignments is a form of cheating? How comfortable are you with the use of AI tools for assignments?, Do you assess the credibility of the information generated by the AI tool?*). When asked if they find using AI as cheating, most of them responded that they do not think it is cheating to use AI for getting help in completing academic assignments by 84% (N= 48). If they did not find using AI as cheating, the question that follows is how comfortable they are with using AI. The participants were asked to determine their comfort level with using AI on a scale of 1-5. The analysis shows the participants are neutrally comfortable with using AI by almost half of the participants 45% (N=25). If the participants do not think it is cheating to use AI, logically, they must feel very comfortable using it, but they feel neutrally comfortable with it. The findings of these two questions somehow contradict each other. The participants were also asked if they check the credibility of the information they get from AI, and they reported that they sometimes check it by more than half of the participants 56% (N=32). This finding is promising for encouraging students to verify information before using it.

After collecting all the data from participants' answers and analyzing it to understand their perception, the researchers conducted additional tests to investigate the differences in participants' perceptions based on their age, gender, grade, and university. The normality test is a step to be taken before deciding which test should be carried out in the SPSS program. The normality test shows the data is not normally distributed;

therefore, the alternative tests to the T-test and ANOVA test should be carried out. The chosen tests for a non-normally distributed population are the Kruskal-Wallis and the Mann-Whitney tests.

The analysis of the questions regarding the variables (age, gender, grade, and university) is shown in tables (4.8,9,10, and 11) in the appendix. The test analysis shows that there are no significant differences among the variables gender, grade, and university for all the questions. All the P values were more than .05 mean score. One variable that showed significant results was the age variable. Only two questions showed a significant rate (*Have you ever used an AI tool to complete any University assignment? Would you recommend the use of AI tools to your peers for academic assignments?*). The P values were less than .05. The first question had a P value of .001, and the second question is .048. The post hoc test shows mean ranks for each category of age. For the first question, the highest mean rank is 40.75 for the 26 or more category. This means that the participants who are 26 and older are more likely to use AI to do their assignments. The finding for this question is not expected due to the fact that it is diverting from reality. This generation of students who are between 20-23 years old use AI extensively, and more than the students who are aged 26 and older. The post hoc test for the second question again shows that participants aged 26 and older are more likely to suggest AI for their peers, with a mean score of 35.25.

5. Discussion

This study examined why university students in Kurdistan, Iraq, turn to artificial intelligence (AI) for assignment work and whether these motivations vary by background factors. Three patterns stood out. First, AI use is widespread; 91% of students have used AI at least once. Second, students use AI for supportive purposes, especially to “get ideas for structuring” (38%) and paraphrasing, rather than relying solely on AI for full-assignment generation. 20% of respondents reported using AI to create an entire assignment. These findings imply that for some students, AI functions not only as a support tool but also as a substitute for independent work. This outcome could be explained by a sense of pressure to achieve results quickly, limited confidence in writing, or a lack of clarity regarding ethical guidelines (Cotton et al., 2024). Third, the majority of students (84 %) do not think that AI assistance is cheating and stated they “sometimes” verify AI outputs (56%). Except for two categories, related to age, motivations and attitudes did not differ by gender, grade, or university. An unexpected result was that the age differences appeared significant. Older students, 26 plus, were more likely to use and recommend AI tools. However, this subgroup was relatively small and should be interpreted with caution. One possible explanation is that older students may rely more heavily on AI due to increased external responsibilities, such as balancing academic work with employment or family commitments. These additional pressures may lead students to prioritize efficiency and time management, making AI tools particularly appealing for reducing cognitive workload. This interpretation is supported by recent large-scale survey data. According to an Inside Higher Ed student survey, older learners are significantly more likely than younger students to report time pressure related to work, family obligations, and lack of confidence, all of which contribute to increased reliance on AI tools for academic tasks. The same study found that pressure to achieve good grades and lack of time are among the primary reasons students engaged with AI, including in ways that may challenge academic integrity (“Survey: College students’ views,” 2025). This evidence strengthens the interpretation of the present study and suggests that age-related differences in AI use are not isolated, but rather reflect broader structural pressures experienced by non-traditional or older students. Similar

files have been reported in recent research, indicating that students adopt AI tools primarily for efficiency of workload reduction and productivity enhancement, rather than solely for academic dishonesty (Higher Education Policy Institute [HEPI], 2025).

From theoretical perspectives, these findings are consistent with the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), which suggests that students adopt AI tools based on perceived usefulness and ease of use (Marikyan & Papagiannidis, 2024; Schorr, 2023). In this study, the top reasons for using AI are to understand complex topics (19% of reasons) and manage workload/time (workload 14.5, time efficiency 10%), directly reflect these constructs. This study reveals that AI is now indispensable and an essential element for students in completing assignments.

These findings are expected, as AI tools are widely promoted for supporting information access, simplifying tasks, and increasing time efficiency (Kasneci et al., 2023). Students facing heavy academic demands often seek external aids that reduce stress and cognitive load, making AI an attractive option. The widespread adaptation observed in this study is consistent with recent research findings that AI tools have quickly become integrated into higher education (Chen et al., 2020; Playfoot et al., 2024). Widespread adoption also matches with recent multi-country surveys that demonstrate a sharp rise in students' use of genAI for explaining, writing, and summarizing (Črček & Patekar, 2023; Chen et al., 2025; Freeman, 2025). A growing body of quantitative research suggests that when carefully integrated, generative tools can enhance academic performance and higher-order thinking, while reducing mental effort (Deng et al., 2025; Salido et al., 2025; Vieriu & Petrea, 2025; Wang & Fan, 2025). This is in line with the findings of this study that students prefer scaffolding tasks (paraphrasing, outlining) to outright replacement. However, the 20% “whole-assignment” utilization differs from reports by Bai and Wang (2025), who found that most students still engaged in significant editing of AI-produced work. This may reflect contextual factors in Kurdistan, such as variations in institutional implementation of academic honesty policies or differing access to AI literacy training. This study's results support the view that norms and policies play a crucial role in students' attitudes toward AI (Playfoot et al., 2024).

At the same time, two outcomes complicate practical explanation. First, 71% of students would recommend AI to peers, and most do not label its use as “cheating,” and students' comfort levels remained moderate overall. Similar uncertainty has been reported in other studies, while students appreciate the ease of access, individualized support, and low social pressure of AI, yet remain cautious about inaccuracies, over-reliance, and ethical ambiguities (Bai et al., 2023; Smit et al., 2025; Stone, 2025). Since most students did not consider AI use as cheating, but still felt uncertain about its legitimacy, universities should provide transparent policies that define acceptable AI use, expectations for acknowledgment, and promote ethical practices. As suggested by Wiese et al. (2025), embedding ethics-focused workshops within the curriculum helps students balance the benefits of AI with academic honesty. The tension between productivity gain and academic integrity concerns has been a central theme in recent reviews (Bin-Nashwan et al., 2023; Cotton et al., 2024; McIntire et al., 2024). Second, only 10% reported regularly using grammar or plagiarism checkers, and more than half verify credibility “sometimes”, which shows a gap in critical evaluation skills. This is a noteworthy finding given the documented danger of bias in educational applications of AI. The implications are not to reject AI but to design task structures that require human judgment. Because detectors are unreliable, institutions increasingly recommend

assessment redesign, such as oral defences, process portfolios, in-class applications, and authentic data tasks (Khlaif et al., 2025; Lyanda et al., 2024; Nadeem et al., 2024). Educators could address this by integrating verification exercises into assignments, requiring students to cross-check AI-generated information with scholarly sources.

6. Limitations

Although this research offers a fresh insight into the perspectives of the students, like any research, this research is also prone to having limitations. The generalizability issues were affected by two points: the number of participants and the ethnicity of the participants. The number of participants was limited due to not being able to get to all the participants in the area, which causes problems for generalizability. On the other hand, the participants are from one ethnic group in the Middle East, and this might affect their beliefs about the topic of this research. A mixture of different ethnicities would make the generalizability of the findings better. The paper points out that the integration of Ethics in Artificial Intelligence education into Academic Curricula can foster Responsible AI Education. Although the current study has used a Quantitative Research Design as opposed to an in-depth qualitative method that would have allowed the researchers to delve further into the Students Attitudes towards using AI tools, it has been possible to mitigate some of this potential loss by including Structured Multiple Response Items within the Questionnaire. Therefore, future studies may wish to take a mixed method approach for a more comprehensive analysis. Despite the limitations of this study, it does offer a perspective of students on how and why they are using AI for their assignments, which can help many stakeholders in decision-making and raise awareness of their situation.

7. Conclusion

Artificial Intelligence is a powerful assistive source that can help increase knowledge and skill. In education, it has the capability to support learners' academic experiences if used appropriately. The inclusion of AI in academics increases the modernness of learning, but it does require management and policies. Hence, gaining insight into learners' uses, motivations, and perspectives of AI is vital in taking the necessary precautions to lessen the risk of academic dishonesty and increase scholarly effectiveness. This study provides context-specific insights from Kurdistan and underscores the need for clearer institutional policies on AI use. Further, this exploration examined the possible effect of background on students' motivations for AI usage. University students from both public and private sectors were considered for this paper. It provides context-specific insights from Kurdistan and underscores the need for clearer institutional policies on AI use. The quantitative method of data collection showed that almost all participants use AI for their assignments. Primarily caused by the workload and the complexity of the assignments. The data analysis presented that the students' motivation for using AI does not differ across age, gender, university, or grade. No matter which university, grade, or age you belong to, there is no significant difference between the motives behind your usage of AI for assignments. However, this finding might be influenced by one of the limitations of this paper, namely, the lack of diverse ethnicities of the participants. To sum up, students' motivation for using AI for the benefits it offers should not be dismissed as a simple issue that comes and goes. Rather, it should be considered and recognized as a signal of the challenges both students and teachers face in this fast-evolving era. Thus, the importance of academic

honesty among students and preparation to manage these types of AI includes challenges are a modern focus within education that needs to be monitored.

Recommendations:

- Additional exploration should be conducted based on students of other backgrounds and ethnicities to extend the range of data.
- Interviews could be implemented to collect great details from the students regarding AI.
- Workshops or training should be organised by educational facilities to increase awareness among students regarding the proper usage of AI for academic purposes.
- AI ethics training should be added to the curricula to ensure appropriate usage.

References

- Abdelmagid, A. S., Al-Mohaya, A. Y., Ibrahim, A. M., Teleb, A. A., & Jabli, N. M. (2025). The Impact of Artificial Intelligence Applications on Developing Levels of Cognitive Depth of Information among Postgraduate Students. *IJLTER. ORG*, 24(4), 316-333. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.24.4.15>
- Bai, L., Liu, X., & Su, J. (2023). ChatGPT: The cognitive effects on learning and memory. *Brain-X*, 1(3), e30. <https://doi.org/10.1002/brx2.30>
- Bai, Y., & Wang, S. (2025). Impact of generative AI interaction and output quality on university students' learning outcomes: a technology-mediated and motivation-driven approach. *Scientific Reports*, 15(1), 24054. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-025-08697-6>
- Baker, N. (2025). Generative Artificial Intelligence: Implications and Considerations for Higher Education Practice. *Education Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13111109>
- Balalle, H., & Pannilage, S. (2025). Reassessing academic integrity in the age of AI: A systematic literature review on AI and academic integrity. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 11, 101299. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2025.101299>
- Bindayel, A., Elsayed, H., & Khan, M. U. (2025, May). AI and self reflection. In *International Conference on Human-Computer Interaction* (pp. 289-302). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.
- Bin-Nashwan, S. A., Sadallah, M., & Bouteraa, M. (2023). Use of ChatGPT in academia: Academic integrity hangs in the balance. *Technology in Society*, 75, 102370. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2023.102370>
- Black, R. W., & Tomlinson, B. (2025). University students describe how they adopt AI for writing and research in a general education course. *Scientific reports*, 15(1), 8799. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-025-92937-2>
- Chan, C. K. Y., & Tsi, L. H. (2023). The AI revolution in education: will AI replace or assist teachers in higher education?. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.01185*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2305.01185>
- Chen, K., Tallant, A. C., & Selig, I. (2025). Exploring generative AI literacy in higher education: Student adoption, interaction, evaluation and ethical perceptions. *Information and Learning Sciences*, 126(1-2), 132-148. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ILS-10-2023-0160>

- Chen, L., Chen, P., & Lin, Z. (2020). Artificial intelligence in education: A review. *IEEE access*, 8, 75264-75278. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2020.2988510>
- Cotton, D. R., Cotton, P. A., & Shipway, J. R. (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>
- Črček, N., & Patekar, J. (2023). Writing with AI: University students' use of ChatGPT. *Journal of Language and Education*, 9(4 (36)), 128-138. <https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2023.17379>
- Črček, N., & Patekar, J. (2023). Writing with AI: University students' use of ChatGPT. *Journal of Language and Education*, 9(4 (36)), 128-138.
- Deng, R., Jiang, M., Yu, X., Lu, Y., & Liu, S. (2025). Does ChatGPT enhance student learning? A systematic review and meta-analysis of experimental studies. *Computers & Education*, 227, 105224. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2024.105224>
- DuBose, J., & Marshall, D. (2023). AI in academic writing: Tool or invader. *Public Services Quarterly*, 19(2), 125-130. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15228959.2023.2185338>
- Eden, C. A., Chisom, O. N., & Adeniyi, I. S. (2024). Integrating AI in education: Opportunities, challenges, and ethical considerations. *Magna Scientia Advanced Research and Reviews*, 10(2), 006-013. <https://doi.org/10.30574/msarr.2024.10.2.0039>
- Fitria, T. N. (2021, December). Artificial intelligence (AI) in education: Using AI tools for teaching and learning process. In *Prosiding seminar nasional & call for paper STIE AAS* (pp. 134-147). <https://doi.org/10.4236/jcc.2024.128002>
- Freeman, J. (2025). Student generative AI survey 2025. *Higher Education Policy Institute: London, UK*.
- Gerlich, M. (2025). AI tools in society: Impacts on cognitive offloading and the future of critical thinking. *Societies*, 15(1), 6. <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc15010006>
- Haradhan, M. (2020). Quantitative Research: A Successful Investigation in Natural and Social Sciences. *Journal of Economic Development, Environment and People*, <https://doi.org/10.26458/JEDEP.V9I4.679>
- Harry, A. (2023). Role of AI in education. *Interdisciplinary Journal & Humanity (INJURITY)*, 2(3). <https://doi.org/10.58631/injury.v2i3.52>
- Higher Education Policy Institute. (2025). Student generative AI survey 2025. Oxford, UK: Author. Retrieved from <https://www.hepi.ac.uk>
- Holmes, W., Porayska-Pomsta, K., Holstein, K., Sutherland, E., Baker, T., Shum, S. B., ... & Koedinger, K. R. (2022). Ethics of AI in education: Towards a community-wide framework. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, 32(3), 504-526. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-021-00239-1>
- Jin, H., & Wang, S. (2025). Why not replace people with machines? Exploring Artificial Intelligence's (in) capacity for education as subjectification. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, qhaf087.
- Juárez, J. S., & Baumgartner, R. (2024). The Use of Artificial Intelligence Applications For Education And Scientific Research. *Hatun Yachay Wasi*, 3(1), 98-111. <https://doi.org/10.57107/hyw.v3i1.61>
- Kaplan, J. (2016). *Artificial intelligence: What everyone needs to know*. Oxford University Press.
- Kasneji, E., Seßler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., ... & Kasneji, 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>
- Khlaif, Z. N., Alkouk, W. A., Salama, N., & Abu Eideh, B. (2025). Redesigning assessments for AI-enhanced learning: A framework for educators in the generative AI era. *Education Sciences*, 15(2), 174. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15020174>
- Kosmyna, N., Hauptmann, E., Yuan, Y. T., Situ, J., Liao, X. H., Beresnitzky, A. V., ... & Maes, P. (2025). Your brain on chatgpt: Accumulation of cognitive debt when using an ai assistant for essay writing task. arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.08872.
<https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2506.08872>
- Krause, S., Panchal, B. H., & Ubhe, N. (2025). Evolution of learning: Assessing the transformative impact of generative AI on higher education. *Frontiers of Digital Education*, 2(2), 21.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s44366-025-0058-7>
- Lademann, J., Henze, J., & Becker-Genschow, S. (2024). Building Bridges: AI Custom Chatbots as Mediators between Mathematics and Physics. arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.15747.
<https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2412.15747>
- Li, Z., Dhruv, A., & Jain, V. (2024, February). Ethical considerations in the use of AI for higher education: A comprehensive guide. In *2024 IEEE 18th International Conference on Semantic Computing (ICSC)* (pp. 218-223). IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSC59802.2024.00041>
- Lyanda, J. N., Owidi, S. O., & Simiyu, A. M. (2024). Rethinking higher education teaching and assessment in-line with AI innovations: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *African Journal of Empirical Research*, 5(3), 325–335-325–335.
<https://doi.org/10.51867/ajernet.5.3.30>
- Marikyan, D., & Papagiannidis, S. (2024). Technology acceptance model: A review. In *TheoryHub book*.
- McIntire, A., Calvert, I., & Ashcraft, J. (2024). Pressure to plagiarize and the choice to cheat: Toward a pragmatic reframing of the ethics of academic integrity. *Education Sciences*, 14(3), 244.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14030244>
- Nadeem, M., Farag, W. A., & Helal, M. (2024). *Rethinking Assessment Methodologies in the Era of Artificial Intelligence: Expanding Beyond ChatGPT's Scope*. Paper presented at the 2024 Mediterranean Smart Cities Conference (MSCC).
<https://doi.org/10.1109/MSCC62288.2024.10697084>
- Naseeb, J., & Bhatti, N. (2024). Ethical Considerations of AI in Educational Curriculum. *Multidisciplinary Journal of Emerging Needs of Curriculum*, 1(1), 30-38. (the page does not work)
- Playfoot, D., Quigley, M., & Thomas, A. G. (2024). Hey ChatGPT, give me a title for a paper about degree apathy and student use of AI for assignment writing. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 62, 100950. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2024.100950>
- Qadir, J. (2023, May). Engineering education in the era of ChatGPT: Promise and pitfalls of generative AI for education. In *2023 IEEE global engineering education conference (EDUCON)* (pp. 1-9). IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/EDUCON54358.2023.10125121>
- Reiss, M. J. (2021). The Use of AI in Education: Practicalities and Ethical Considerations. *London Review of Education*, 19(1), n1. <https://doi.org/10.14324/LRE.19.1.05>

- Röhrl, S., Staufer, S., Bugert, F., Nadimpalli, V. K., Hauser, F., Grabinger, L., ... & Mottok, J. (2025). Ethical Considerations of AI in Education: A Case Study based on Pythia Learning Enhancement System. *IEEE Access*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2025.3583975>
- Salido, A., Syarif, I., Sitepu, M. S., Wana, P. R., Taufika, R., & Melisa, R. (2025). Integrating critical thinking and artificial intelligence in higher education: A bibliometric and systematic review of skills and strategies. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 12, 101924. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2025.101924>
- Schorr, A. (2023, February). The technology acceptance model (TAM) and its importance for digitalization research: A review. In *International Symposium on Teknikpsychologie (TecPsy)* (pp. 55-65)
- Smit, M., Wagner, R. F., & Bond-Barnard, T. J. (2025). Ambiguous regulations for dealing with AI in higher education can lead to moral hazards among students. *Project Leadership and Society*, 100187. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.plas.2025.100187>
- Stone, B. W. (2025). Generative AI in higher education: Uncertain students, ambiguous use cases, and mercenary perspectives. *Teaching of Psychology*, 52(3), 347-356. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00986283241305398>
- Survey: College students' views on AI. (2025, August 29). Inside Higher Ed. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/students/academics/2025/08/29/survey-college-students-views-ai>
- Vieriu, A. M., & Petrea, G. (2025). The impact of artificial intelligence (AI) on students' academic development. *Education Sciences*, 15(3), 343. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15030343>
- Wang, J., & Fan, W. (2025). The effect of ChatGPT on students' learning performance, learning perception, and higher-order thinking: insights from a meta-analysis. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 12(1), 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-025-04787-y>
- Wang, K. D., Wu, Z., Tufts, L. N., Wieman, C., Salehi, S., & Haber, N. (2025, April). Scaffold or Crutch? Examining College Students' Use and Views of Generative AI Tools for STEM Education. In *2025 IEEE Global Engineering Education Conference (EDUCON)* (pp. 1-10). IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2412.02653>
- Wiese, L. J., Patil, I., Schiff, D. S., & Magana, A. J. (2025). AI ethics education: A systematic literature review. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 100405. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2025.100405>
- Woo, D. J., Yu, Y., & Guo, K. (2025). Exploring EFL Secondary Students' AI-generated Text Editing While Composition Writing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.17041*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2505.17041>
- Zhai, C., Wibowo, S., & Li, L. D. (2024). The effects of over-reliance on AI dialogue systems on students' cognitive abilities: a systematic review. *Smart Learning Environments*, 11(1), 28. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-024-00316-7>

Appendix:

Table 3.1 Background Knowledge of the participants

			<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Valid Percent</i>	<i>Cumulative Percent</i>
Val id	<i>University</i>	TIU	23	40.4	40.4	40.4
		Salahaddin	26	45.6	45.6	86.0
		Garmian	8	14.0	14.0	100.0
		Total	57	100.0	100.0	
	<i>Field of study</i>	English Language	26	45.6	45.6	45.6
		ELT	9	15.8	15.8	61.4
		Computer Education	3	5.3	5.3	66.7
		Mathematic Education	1	1.8	1.8	68.4
		Physics Education	1	1.8	1.8	70.2
		Biology Education	17	29.8	29.8	100.0
		Total	57	100.0	100.0	
		<i>Grade</i>	1	28	49.1	49.1
	2		2	3.5	3.5	52.6
	3		17	29.8	29.8	82.5
	4		10	17.5	17.5	100.0
	Total		57	100.0	100.0	
	<i>Gender</i>	Male	18	31.6	31.6	31.6
		Female	39	68.4	68.4	100.0
		Total	57	100.0	100.0	
	<i>Age</i>	17-19	21	36.8	36.8	36.8
		20-23	33	57.9	57.9	94.7
		24-26	1	1.8	1.8	96.5
		26 and more	2	3.5	3.5	100.0
		Total	57	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.1 Usage of AI

Have you ever used an AI tool to complete any University assignment?					
		<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Valid Percent</i>	<i>Cumulative Percent</i>
Valid	yes	52	91.2	91.2	91.2
	no	5	8.8	8.8	100.0
	Total	57	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.2 How often do you use Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools to assist you with your assignments?

		<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Valid Percent</i>	<i>Cumulative Percent</i>
Valid	1	7	12.3	12.3	12.3
	2	14	24.6	24.6	36.8
	3	18	31.6	31.6	68.4
	4	9	15.8	15.8	84.2
	5	9	15.8	15.8	100.0
	Total	57	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.3 What type of AI tool did you use?

Q2 Frequencies				
		<i>Responses</i>		<i>Percent of Cases</i>
		<i>N</i>	<i>Percent</i>	
What type of AI tool did you use? ^a	Q2. Paraphrasing. Tool	34	23.4%	65.4%
	Q2. Writing. Tool	23	15.9%	44.2%
	Q2. Humanizing. Tool	6	4.1%	11.5%
	Q2. Writing. feedback. tool	10	6.9%	19.2%
	Q2. Grammarcheckers	30	20.7%	57.7%
	Q2. Plagiarism. Detectors	11	7.6%	21.2%
	Q2. Text. summarization. tools	23	15.9%	44.2%
	Q2. Citation. Generators	8	5.5%	15.4%
Total		145	100.0%	278.8%
a. Dichotomy group tabulated at value 1.				

Table 4.4 Why did you consider using an AI tool for doing assignments?

Q4 Frequencies				
		Responses		Percent of Cases
		N	Percent	
Why did you consider using an AI tool for doing assignments? ^a	Q4. Workload	29	14.5%	50.9%
	Q4. Understanding. complex. topic	37	18.5%	64.9%
	Q4. Improving. writing. style	23	11.5%	40.4%
	Q4. Time. efficiency	20	10.0%	35.1%
	Q4.Curiosity.AI.tools	7	3.5%	12.3%
	Q4. Accuracy. completing. tasks	18	9.0%	31.6%
	Q4. Improving. quality. of. work	24	12.0%	42.1%
	Q4.Learning.from. suggestions	22	11.0%	38.6%
	Q4. Pressure. meet. deadlines	13	6.5%	22.8%
	Q4. Peer. influence	7	3.5%	12.3%
Total		200	100.0%	350.9%

a. Dichotomy group tabulated at value 1.

Table 4.5 How did you use the AI tool?

Q5 Frequencies				
		Responses		Percent of Cases
		N	Percent	
How did you use the AI tool? ^a	Q5.whole.assignment	21	20.0%	36.8%
	Q5.complete.sections	17	16.2%	29.8%
	Q5.paraphrase.existing.content	17	16.2%	29.8%
	Q5.get.ideas.for.structuring	40	38.1%	70.2%
	Q5.check.for.grammar.and.plagiarism	10	9.5%	17.5%
Total		105	100.0%	184.2%

a. Dichotomy group tabulated at value 1.

Table 4.6 Widespread of AI, AI meeting expectations, Recommending AI to peers.

			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	In your opinion, how widespread is the use of AI tools among students in your classes?	1	1	1.8	1.8	1.8
		2	4	7.0	7.0	8.8
		3	21	36.8	36.8	45.6
		4	13	22.8	22.8	68.4
		5	18	31.6	31.6	100.0
		Total	57	100.0	100.0	
			1	1	1.8	1.8
		2	12	21.1	21.1	22.8

	Did the AI tool meet your expectations for the assignment?	3	17	29.8	29.8	52.6
		4	12	21.1	21.1	73.7
		5	15	26.3	26.3	100.0
		Total	57	100.0	100.0	
	Would you recommend the use of AI tools to your peers for academic assignments?	yes	41	71.9	71.9	71.9
		no	16	28.1	28.1	100.0
		Total	57	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.7 Cheating, Comfort, and Credibility of Information Frequencies

			<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Valid Percent</i>	<i>Cumulative Percent</i>
Valid	Do you believe using AI tools for assignments is a form of cheating?	yes	9	15.8	15.8	15.8
		no	48	84.2	84.2	100.0
		Total	57	100.0	100.0	
	How comfortable are you with the use of AI tools for assignments?	1	4	7.0	7.0	7.0
		2	2	3.5	3.5	10.5
		3	25	43.9	43.9	54.4
		4	15	26.3	26.3	80.7
		5	11	19.3	19.3	100.0
		Total	57	100.0	100.0	
	Do you assess the credibility of the information generated by the AI tool?	yes	20	35.1	35.1	35.1
		no	5	8.8	8.8	43.9
		sometimes	32	56.1	56.1	100.0
		Total	57	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.8 Kruskal-Wallis H test for Age

Test Statistics ^{a,b}								
	Have you ever used an AI tool to complete any University assignment?	How often do you use Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools to assist you with your assignments?	In your opinion, how widespread is the use of AI tools among students in your classes?	Did the AI tool meet your expectations for the assignment?	do you assess the credibility of the information generated by the AI tool?	Do you believe using AI tools for assignments is a form of cheating?	Would you recommend the use of AI tools to your peers for academic assignments?	How comfortable are you with the use of AI tools for assignments?
Kruskal-Wallis H	15.741	4.548	2.870	1.972	1.021	6.357	7.900	3.226
df	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Asymp. Sig.	.001	.208	.412	.578	.796	.095	.048	.358
a. Kruskal Wallis Test								
b. Grouping Variable: Age								

Post Hock Test

Ranks			
	Age	N	Mean Rank
Have you ever used an AI tool to complete any University assignment?	17-19	21	29.21
	20-23	33	27.36
	26 and more	3	40.75
	Total	57	
Would you recommend the use of AI tools to your peers for academic assignments?	17-19	21	33.21
	20-23	33	25.32
	26 and more	3	35.25
	Total	57	

Table 4.9 Kruskal-Wallis H test for grade

Test Statistics ^{a,b}								
	Have you ever used an AI tool to complete any University assignment?	How often do you use Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools to assist you with your assignments?	In your opinion, how widespread is the use of AI tools among students in your classes?	Did the AI tool meet your expectations for the assignment?	do you assess the credibility of the information generated by the AI tool?	Do you believe using AI tools for assignments is a form of cheating?	Would you recommend the use of AI tools to your peers for academic assignments?	How comfortable are you with the use of AI tools for assignments?
Kruskal-Wallis H	7.692	2.954	5.515	2.171	7.301	2.437	2.480	1.500
df	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Asymp. Sig.	.053	.399	.138	.538	.063	.487	.479	.682
a. Kruskal Wallis Test								
b. Grouping Variable: Grade								

Table 4.10 Kruskal-Wallis H test for university

Test Statistics ^{a,b}								
	Have you ever used an AI tool to complete any University assignment?	How often do you use Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools to assist you with your assignments?	In your opinion, how widespread is the use of AI tools among students in your classes?	Did the AI tool meet your expectations for the assignment?	do you assess the credibility of the information generated by the AI tool?	Do you believe using AI tools for assignments is a form of cheating?	Would you recommend the use of AI tools to your peers for academic assignments?	How comfortable are you with the use of AI tools for assignments?
Kruskal-Wallis H	5.558	.357	.819	.170	.715	.633	1.530	.833
df	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Asymp. Sig.	.062	.836	.664	.919	.700	.729	.465	.659
a. Kruskal Wallis Test								
b. Grouping Variable: University								

Table 4.11 Mann-Whitney test for Gender

Test Statistics ^a								
	Have you ever used an AI tool to complete any University assignment?	How often do you use Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools to assist you with your assignments?	In your opinion, how widespread is the use of AI tools among students in your classes?	Did the AI tool meet your expectations for the assignment?	do you assess the credibility of the information generated by the AI tool?	Do you believe using AI tools for assignments is a form of cheating?	Would you recommend the use of AI tools to your peers for academic assignments?	How comfortable are you with the use of AI tools for assignments?
Mann-Whitney U	334.500	346.000	300.500	338.000	336.500	327.000	321.000	349.500
Wilcoxon W	505.500	517.000	1080.500	1118.000	1116.500	1107.000	492.000	520.500
Z	-.578	-.088	-.911	-.231	-.282	-.652	-.662	-.027
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.563	.930	.363	.818	.778	.514	.508	.978
a. Grouping Variable: Gender								