

Prospects and epistemic challenges for using Chat Generative Pre-trained Transformers in higher education evaluation

Lucas Pedro¹

Correspondence:
Lucas Pedro¹
Hospital das Clínicas da
Universidade de São Paulo, São
Paulo, Brazil
Lucas.Pedro2@outlook.com

1. Hospital das Clínicas da
Universidade de São Paulo, São
Paulo, Brazil

Volume number 2
Issue number 2
Pages 62-63

Abstract

Every academic institution is shaken by the recent development of Chat Generative Pre-trained Transformer, and although we still don't fully grasp all of its potential and hazards, it is worthwhile to offer some first analysis. Academic prospects for Chat Generative Pre-trained Transformer are unparalleled because of its remarkable human-like skills, which outperform the majority of recently released tools. Over the past few months, Chat Generative Pre-trained Transformer has received extraordinary interest from the news and academic community (as of 23/02/2023, there were 650,000,000 results in a Google search for the term). Since it is unlikely that the chatbot was designed with the intention of serving as a stand-in for academic writing, its use in academic writing is a byproduct of clever artificial intelligence. If given the chance, students everywhere would find a way around assessments, thus we are all worried that some students would take advantage of it despite its advantages. Although there isn't now a problem involving assessment integrity in academics, it is impossible to overlook the development of powerful artificial intelligence and tools that could facilitate cheating. Some of us think that the use of Chat Generative Pre-trained Transformer in assessments has some epistemic consequences; yet, these risks do not indicate that we will give up. Although we now know that certain university programs—like management studies and information technology—have a higher risk of academic dishonesty, educators are not new to the practice; rather, they are still learning about Chat Generative Pre-trained Transformer. I don't see any strong arguments in favor of allowing its usage in assessments, even though it is unavoidable in certain academic contexts. Instead than teaching students to "copy and paste," they teach them to "think and write critically." Therefore, the fact that Chat Generative Pre-trained Transformer passed the MBA and medical school exams should raise red flags.

Keywords: prospects; epistemic; Chat Generative Pre-trained Transformers; higher education evaluation

Why is there a limited epistemic threat posed by artificial intelligences such as Chat Generative Pre-trained Transformer?

Some may suggest going back to paper-based assessments in light of the current chaos, but wouldn't this be an overreaction and, to be honest, premature? ¹ As with anything in academia, there will always be opposing utilitarianist and consequentialist points of view in the discussion surrounding Chat Generative Pre-trained Transformer. However, at this point,² we don't seem to know enough to make a strong case, so we can only make educated guesses and modify our methods. Given that companies like Turnitin have already made artificial intelligence and Chat Generative Pre-trained Transformer detection technologies available to cope with any malpractices, the academic community's strength is a major source of comfort. Threats do happen, but institutions are able to counter them, if not instantly. Precisely 23 years ago, a study was undertaken to understand the impact of computer use on

teachers,³ as there were ergonomic concerns, yet, university professors have continued to use computers safely until now. Scholars have come to accept the usage of iPads in the classroom, albeit with some reservations, since other studies presented conflicting results.⁴ Although new tools will emerge, they cannot pose an insurmountable hazard to university assessments for three main reasons: (1) Universities are policy driven and will always set new policies to counter cheating; (2) students are reasonable and want to learn and (3) there are tools and processes available to deal with intentional academic dishonesty (IAD).⁵

Conclusion:

Consequences of artificial intelligence on the future of assessments Even if the revolution in artificial intelligence reduces the validity of assessments of higher education, utilitarian ethicists will not find any reason to reject it. Consequentialists, on the other hand, will contend that the proliferation of AI and ethical concerns about its application will shape future research in a variety of fields, including the long-term goals and usefulness of higher education.⁵ To suggest that artificial intelligence will have no impact on the evolution of higher education is not only denial but existentially dangerous. Despite all the challenges of artificial intelligence, we must acknowledge that higher education will thrive alongside any artificial intelligence evolution as long as we learn to adapt our pedagogy and assessment strategies.

References

1. Illingworth, S. (2023), "ChatGPT: students could use artificial intelligence to cheat, but it's a chance to rethink assessment altogether", *The Conversation*, available at: <https://theconversation.com/chatgptstudents-could-use-ai-to-cheat-but-its-a-chance-to-rethink-assessment-together-198019> (accessed 6 February 2023).
2. Purtill, J. (2023), "ChatGPT appears to pass medical school exams. Educators are now rethinking assessments' ABC Science", available at: <https://www.abc.net.au/news/science/2023-01-12/chatgpt-generative-ai-program-passes-us-medical-licensing-exams/101840938> (accessed 6 February 2023).
3. Lai, K.W. (2000), "Health risks with teachers' computer use: some New Zealand observations", *Journal of Information Technology for Teacher Education*, Vol. 9 No. 3, pp. 303-318.
4. Perry, D.R. and Steck, A.K. (2015), "Increasing student engagement, self-efficacy, and meta-cognitive self-regulation in the high school geometry classroom: do iPads help?", *Computers in the Schools*, Vol. 32 No. 2, pp. 122-143.
5. Benuyenah, V. and Boukareva, B. (2018), "Making HRM curriculum relevant – a hypothetical practitioners' guide", *Journal of Work-Applied Management*, Vol. 10 No. 1, pp. 93-100.