UDC 17:37+004.8
DOI https://doi.org/10.32782/ped-uzhnu/2025-10-18

Mudryk Daryna Pavlivna,
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-4962-1620
Doctor of Philosophy,
Senior Lecturer, Department of Foreign Languages
National University of Water Management and Nature Resources Use

PEDAGOGICAL ETHICS IN THE AGE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE: CAN A LECTURER REMAIN AN AUTHOR?

ПЕДАГОГІЧНА ЕТИКА У СВІТІ ШТУЧНОГО ІНТЕЛЕКТУ: ЧИ МОЖЕ ВИКЛАДАЧ ЗАЛИШАТИСЯ АВТОРОМ?

The article examines the phenomenon of pedagogical ethics in the context of the rapid integration of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) into higher education. The changes brought by tools such as ChatGPT, Grammarly, and Copilot transcend technical modernization: they affect the nature of authorship, the structure of academic integrity, assessment systems, and the professional identity of the lecturer. The author raises a key question: Can a lecturer remain an author in a world where part of the text, decisions, and instructional scenarios are produced by a machine? The study substantiates the thesis that a lecturer's ethical standing in the digital age is not merely defined by the degree of technological proficiency, but by the unique capacity to preserve human subjectivity, accountability, and transparency, making the lecturer's role more crucial than ever.

The paper argues that the key threat to contemporary academic integrity is not the use of AI per se but the loss of a human sense of authorship, when knowledge ceases to be associated with personal contribution and moral responsibility. To address this challenge, a new integrative E³-Author model (Ethical – Empathic – Evidence-based Authoring Model) is proposed for university lecturers. The model establishes a multi-level system of actions that ensures the ethical sustainability of pedagogical authorship under conditions of digital co-creation.

The ethical level of the model sets the norms of human–technology interaction: a deliberate decision to employ AI, transparent documentation of the process, final human oversight, and readiness to explain the provenance of each fragment. The empathic level emphasizes humanity and the moral connection between the lecturer and the produced material. The evidence-based level entails accountability: the lecturer retains versions, drafts, prompts, conducts fact-checking, and is ready to demonstrate the creation process. Within the model, practical implementation mechanisms are proposed:

– Ethical audit of instructional materials as a form of collective reflection without a punitive thrust;
– Ethical disclosure–a brief description of how AI was used at the end of a course or article;
– Reflective assessment–stage-by-stage recording of the contributions of students and lecturers;
– Community of practice–departmental and inter-university platforms for discussing new standards of academic ethics.

As a result, the university receives not a set of prohibitions but a support system for professional autonomy in which ethics rests on trust and transparency.

The proposed model aligns with a humanistic paradigm: education must remain human-centered, and technologies should serve as instruments for empowerment rather than control. The E³-Author approach does not deny AI's role but places it within a framework of accountability and co-creation, where the lecturer retains the status of the chief moral agent of the educational process. Practically, the model enables universities to integrate GenAI without jeopardizing integrity while laying the groundwork for new assessment formats–oral, process-based, and multimodal–that improve learning quality and simultaneously curb misuse, providing a practical and effective solution for the challenges of the digital age.

The E³-Author model offers a universal scaffold for rethinking the lecturer's role as a moral leader, facilitator of integrity, and guarantor of educational quality. Prospects for further research include validating the model across academic disciplines, developing indicators of the "sense of authorship," and analyzing relationships among empathy, process transparency, and academic trust. Globally, the approach can serve as a conceptual basis for a new pedagogy of AI-era ethics–one that fuses innovation with humanity, inspiring hope for a future where technology and ethics coexist harmoniously.

Key words: pedagogical ethics; artificial intelligence; academic integrity; lecturer authorship; ethical responsibility; Generative AI; transparency; human-centered education; evidence-based education; digital age.

У статті розглянуто феномен педагогічної етики в контексті швидкого впровадження генеративного штучного інтелекту (GenAI) у систему вищої освіти. Зміни, зумовлені появою таких інструментів, як ChatGPT, Grammarly, Copilot, виходять за межі технічної модернізації: вони впливають на природу авторства, структуру академічної

доброчесності, систему оцінювання та професійну ідентичність викладача. Авторка порушує ключове питання: чи може викладач залишатися автором у світі, де частину текстів, рішень і навчальних сценаріїв генерує машина. Дослідження обґрунтовує тезу, що етичний статус викладача у цифрову добу визначається не ступенем технологічного володіння, а здатністю зберігати людську суб'єктність, відповідальність і прозорість.

У роботі визначено, що ключовою загрозою сучасної академічної доброчесності є не саме використання ШІ, а втрата людського відчуття авторства, коли знання перестає асоціюватися з особистісним внеском і моральною відповідальністю. Для подолання цього виклику пропонується нова інтегративна модель E³-Author (Ethical – Empathic – Evidence-based Authoring Model), орієнтована на викладачів університетів. Модель формує багаторівневу систему дій, що забезпечує етичну сталість педагогічного авторства в умовах цифрової ко-творчості.

Етичний рівень моделі визначає норму взаємодії людини з технологією: усвідомлене рішення про використання ШІ, прозоре документування процесу, фінальний людський контроль і готовність пояснити джерело кожного фрагмента. Емпатійний рівень акцентує на людяності й моральному зв'язку між викладачем і створеним матеріалом. Доказовий рівень моделі пов'язаний із підзвітністю: викладач зберігає версії, чернетки, промпти, здійснює факт-чекінг і готовий демонструвати процес створення матеріалу. У межах моделі пропонуються практичні механізми впровадження:

– етичний аудит навчальних матеріалів як форма колективної рефлексії без карального змісту;

– етичне декларування – короткий опис способу використання ШІ у кінці курсу або статті;

– рефлексивне оцінювання – поетапна фіксація власного внеску студентів і викладачів;

– спільнота практики – створення кафедральних і міжуніверситетських платформ для обговорення нових стандартів академічної етики.

У результаті університет отримує не набір заборон, а систему підтримки професійної автономії, у якій етика ґрунтується на довірі та прозорості.

Розроблена модель узгоджується з гуманістичною парадигмою: освіта має залишатися людиноцентричною, а технології – слугувати засобом розширення можливостей, а не контролю. Підхід E³-Author не заперечує роль ШІ, але вводить його у рамку підзвітності й співтворчості, де викладач зберігає статус головного морального агента освітнього процесу. З практичного погляду модель дозволяє університетам інтегрувати GenAI без загрози для доброчесності, а також створює підґрунтя для нових форматів оцінювання – усних, процесних і мультимодальних – які підвищують якість навчання й одночасно запобігають зловживанням.

Модель E³-Author пропонує універсальний каркас для переосмислення ролі викладача як морального лідера, фасилітатора доброчесності та гаранта якості освіти. Перспективи подальших досліджень полягають у валідації моделі в різних академічних дисциплінах, розробленні індикаторів «відчуття авторства» та аналізі взаємозв'язку між рівнем емпатії, прозорістю процесу й рівнем академічної довіри. У глобальному вимірі запропонований підхід може слугувати концептуальною основою для формування нової педагогічної етики доби штучного інтелекту – етики, що поєднує інновацію з людяністю.

Ключові слова: педагогічна етика; штучний інтелект; академічна доброчесність; авторство викладача; етична відповідальність; Generative AI; прозорість; людиноцентрична освіта; evidence-based education; цифрова доба.

Problem Statement. Generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) is rapidly reshaping the educational landscape, offering new possibilities for university lecturers. It affects the ways knowledge is produced, verified, and disseminated, and while it sharpens ethical dilemmas, it also presents opportunities for innovation. If part of the creative and cognitive operations–from structuring texts to stylistic editing–is performed by algorithms, it's not just a challenge but a chance to enhance the educational process. This is not merely a technical or pedagogical question but primarily a moral-philosophical one, as it touches the fundamental value of education-trust in the human as the source of meaning.

In what follows, ethical authorship is understood as the set of lecturer decisions and actions (conception, content selection, interpretation, final approval) for which the lecturer bears moral responsibility. This includes the responsibility to disclose AI's role, which is construed as a brief public account of where and how AI was used. Process tracing, which denotes a minimal bundle of artifacts–from plan to final version–that reflects the trajectory of the work's production (drafts, change logs, comments, prompts without sensitive data), is also part of this responsibility. Human agency, a key component of ethical authorship, refers to the author's right and duty to make final decisions and to bear responsibility for the content.

The problem of authorship in the AI context is intertwined with the broader issues of academic integrity, lecturer professional identity, and the quality of the educational process. Universities worldwide face a challenge: how to reconcile innovation and technological efficiency with humanity, transparency, and responsibility? Simultaneously, traditional assumptions about assessment, creativity, and instructional roles are being reassessed. The lecturer is no longer merely a source of knowledge, but a curator of human–technology interaction, mediating

between ethical norms and digital practices. It's crucial to maintain the lecturer's role in decision-making to ensure the preservation of their professional identity.

Analysis of Recent Studies and Publications (Literature Review). Recent research highlights the urgent need to reconsider authorship, academic integrity, and responsibility in the age of generative AI. COPE's (2023) position statement explicitly outlines that AI tools cannot be credited as authors and stresses the importance of transparent disclosure of their use, reaffirming the central role of human agency in scholarly work (Committee on Publication Ethics, 2023). Similar principles are reflected in the guidelines of the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (2023), which emphasize that authorship requires intellectual contribution, accountability, and the ability to take responsibility for the published content. Empirical studies also shed light on psychological and ethical challenges: Draxler et al. (2024) describe the "AI ghostwriter effect", demonstrating that users often do not perceive generated text as their own, which undermines ownership and moral accountability. Within the educational sphere, Kofinas, Tsay, and Pike (2025) show that AI threatens traditional forms of authentic assessment, prompting higher education to move beyond control-based approaches toward assessment designs that cultivate responsibility and critical thinking. Complementing this, UNESCO's guidance (Miao & Holmes, 2023) underscores the necessity of human-centred approaches, advocating for transparency, ethical use, and protection of human dignity in AI-supported learning environments. Quality assurance bodies also warn of systemic risks: TEQSA's 2024 report identifies generative AI as an evolving threat to academic integrity and proposes immediate actions aimed at rethinking institutional policies. Additionally, technical evaluations by Weber-Wulff et al. (2023) reveal that AI-detection tools remain unreliable and prone to false positives, positioning them as supplementary but not definitive mechanisms for integrity enforcement. Together, these sources suggest a clear trend: sustainable academic integrity in the AI era cannot rely solely on prohibition or detection technologies; instead, it requires holistic frameworks that combine ethical reflection, process transparency, and accountability. International documents emphasize that AI should support, not replace, human agency. In practice, however, the so-called ghostwriter effect is increasingly observed, whereby GenAI users do not experience a sense of ownership over AI-generated texts. This leads to moral disorientation: on the one hand, the lecturer loses a feeling of control over outcomes; on the other, they do not deem it necessary to disclose AI's role. This situation undermines the foundations of academic integrity and calls for a renewed pedagogy of ethics based not on prohibition but on awareness, emphasizing the urgency of the situation [2].

Aim of the Article. The aim of the article is to conceptualize and substantiate the E^3-Author model as a framework for preserving ethical lecturer authorship in the era of generative AI, ensuring transparency, human agency, and responsible pedagogical practice.

The task, then, is to balance ethical norms and practical expediency, control and trust, technological assistance and human authorship. Hence, exploring the ethical dimensions of pedagogical authorship in the AI era is not only timely but conceptually necessary for understanding the future of education. The problem of authorship in the age of GenAI becomes central to pedagogical ethics because AI increasingly intervenes in producing instructional materials, editing texts, and even evaluating student work. To preserve the intellectual autonomy of the lecturer, it is crucial to clarify what "lecturer authorship" means when a powerful generative instrument operates alongside. In this context, operationalizing authorship presupposes distinguishing between elements of pedagogical creativity that may be automated and those constitutive of human professional action–conception, meaning-making, responsibility, and public accountability.

Presentation of the Main Material. Traditionally, lecturer authorship encompasses several interrelated dimensions: forming the idea and aim of instructional material, selecting and structuring content, linguistic-stylistic design, editing, and moral-professional responsibility for the final product. Together, these aspects construct the image of the lecturer as thinker, creator, and mediator between knowledge and student. With the advent of ChatGPT, Grammarly, Copilot, and other LLM systems, certain operations–drafting, stylistic polishing, or translation–are performed faster and more accurately, which raises the question of whether the lecturer remains an author if part of the work is done by a machine.

In real educational practice, AI's role is increasingly reduced to generating initial text or providing stylistic assistance. A lecturer may use AI to design a course structure, select topics, prepare a draft

lecture introduction, or translate terms, and then independently edit the output to align it with learning goals. In this model, the educator is no longer an "isolated author" in the classical sense but rather a curator or facilitator who interprets and verifies AI results, integrating them into an overarching concept. Yet precisely this curatorial role preserves the essentials–human control over idea, content, and responsibility.

According to updated ethical standards and recommendations, AI cannot be considered a co-author of academic or instructional materials, even when its contribution is substantial. The lecturer must clearly describe how AI was used and assume full responsibility for the accuracy and reliability of results. This means that while AI can assist in content creation, it cannot be given the same legal and ethical status as a human co-author. Such an approach transforms authorship from a formal signature under a text into a moral-professional stance requiring transparency and self-reflection. Accountability to audiences, colleagues, and students becomes no less important than the fact of creative participation itself [1; 3].

Users' subjective sense of authorship decreases when interacting with AI: people often do not perceive the generated text as "theirs," even when they actively engage with the system. This creates a cognitive and ethical gap between the machine's de facto involvement and the official attribution of authorship. In pedagogical practice, this gap can have serious consequences: if a lecturer ceases to feel like the author of instructional materials, engagement, motivation, and responsibility for content gradually diminish. Hence, one condition for preserving pedagogical ethics is sustaining the author's emotional connection to the text through active editing, interpretation, and personal involvement at every stage of material creation [2].

Another crucial issue is the boundary of delegation. Generative systems may help formulate phrases, explain rules, and select examples but must not independently determine learning objectives or course content. Responsibility for the conception, logic, selection of facts, and adherence to academic standards rests with the lecturer. Preserving lecturer autonomy entails that the human makes final decisions and bears ethical responsibility for consequences [5]. Practically, this implies transparent documentation: the lecturer can retain drafts, versions, and change logs indicating which elements were generated or edited by AI. Such practice not only supports academic integrity but also enables auditors or peers to trace text evolution. The shift should be from punitive methods, where mistakes are penalized, to preventive and educational strategies grounded in trust, transparency, and co-responsibility. This means creating an environment where mistakes are seen as opportunities for learning and improvement, and where all stakeholders are involved in the decision-making process [7].

Thus, preserving the lecturer's authorial role entails not merely formal control but conscious adherence to principles of transparency, agency, responsibility, and accountability. The lecturer may use generative AI as a partner tool yet must remain the initiator of meanings and bearer of pedagogical responsibility. The key ethical boundary is the moment at which the human makes the final decisions regarding content and publication. If that control is forfeited, authorship dissolves, and pedagogical activity degenerates into the technical administration of another's text.

The path to preserving ethical authorship lies not through prohibitions but through redesigning educational practice: creating conditions under which lecturers and students become co-creators of knowledge rather than consumers of ready-made products. Awareness of one's role, critical reflection on AI's contribution, process documentation, and open disclosure of tools used shape a new pedagogical culture–a culture of responsible authorship [4; 6].

Lecturer authorship in the AI age does not disappear–it transforms. It relinquishes traits of absolute individualism while acquiring new ethical content–honesty, transparency, and co-authorship – without losing human agency. The human must remain the chief value of contemporary education, and technology–merely a means of development. Accordingly, a lecturer who understands and controls AI's role not only remains an author but affirms a new form of ethical authorship in which creativity and responsibility are mutually reinforcing.

One of the most challenging moral-psychological issues of the digital age is the ghostwriter effect, in which users of generative AI do not feel like the authors of the texts they produce, even though they initiated the process, set instructions, revised, and approved the result. This paradox exposes a deep rift between a person's actual participation in content creation and their subjective sense of authorship. Under conditions of active interaction with a generative system, most users do not identify themselves as authors and perceive the material as "alien." This psychological shift triggers a range of ethical problems in education: Who is the author of

an instructional text–the lecturer who initiated and revised it, or the algorithm that technically realized the material? Is disclosure necessary if the user does not feel like an author and does not recognize the program as a co-author [2]?

When human participation is reduced to a minimum–for instance, to a brief prompt or to accepting the text without changes–authorial self-identification disappears. In pedagogical practice, this means that a lecturer who does not undertake critical verification or creative adaptation gradually loses not only the sense of authorship but also responsibility for content. The educational process then becomes outsourced intellectual labour, with technology acting as a "phantom author" in place of the human.

The ethical danger lies not only in losing a sense of authorship but also in the reluctance to disclose AI use openly. The vast majority of participants do not disclose the involvement of generative systems, even when they objectively acknowledge their contribution. This indicates a deficit of transparency norms that transfers to academia. When a lecturer or student conceals AI use, a double ethical dilemma arises: first, the perception of one's intellectual contribution is distorted; second, verification of factual accuracy and sources becomes impossible because the algorithm may produce "hallucinations"–fabricated citations and references.

International standards of academic integrity clearly state that AI cannot be a co-author of scholarly or educational texts. At the same time, they oblige the person using such tools to disclose the nature of their use in "Methods" or "Acknowledgements" sections. This transparency balances ethical duty and respect for human labour: the author retains authorship while acknowledging the technology's auxiliary role. Pedagogically, this means that a lecturer may use AI to optimize routine tasks but should inform students and colleagues about the extent of such use to avoid doubts about integrity [3].

In practice, such a declaration may be brief, laconic, and non-punitive, e.g.: "Some language edits and structural suggestions in this instructional material were generated with the aid of a generative AI system; all final revisions and factual verification are the author's". This format ensures openness without diminishing the human role. Human agency and responsibility are foundational principles of ethical AI use: "technologies should augment rather than replace human judgment". Through open disclosure, the lecturer turns AI use from a hidden risk into a learning resource, modelling honest human–machine collaboration for students [5].

However, the ethics of disclosure is not limited to formal statements. It rests on internal awareness of the boundary between assistance and substitution. If AI were used only for grammar editing or translation, a brief mention would suffice; if the generative system developed concepts, arguments, or conclusions, the lecturer must indicate this more explicitly–thereby preserving transparency to the community. This approach supports a pedagogical rather than punitive logic of integrity, where acknowledging technology use becomes a norm of professional culture.

An additional dimension of the ghostwriter effect is the psychological fear of "losing face" in front of colleagues. Many lecturers avoid disclosure, fearing it will be seen as incompetence or laziness. This fear breeds a new form of digital stigma–practices in which openness about innovation may entail reputational risk. Consequently, the ghostwriter effect is reinforced by a dual shadow: first, a person feels alienated from the text; then, they feel unable to speak openly about it. Overcoming this fear is possible only through institutional support for transparency–university policies should articulate clear, non-discriminatory rules on AI disclosure, backed by pedagogical rather than punitive motives.

Emphasis should shift from detection to design of learning: conditions must be created in which openness is not punished but encouraged. Acknowledging one's AI use becomes part of professional reflection rather than a threat to integrity. Research supports this pivot, showing that even authentic assessment forms cannot deter misconduct if there is no dialogue about values and responsibility. In this sense, the ethics of disclosure is not a bureaucratic requirement but an instrument for cultivating trust between lecturer and student, engaging the audience in a participative and meaningful dialogue.

The ghostwriter effect, coupled with the deficit of disclosure practices, forms a new ethical crisis in higher education: people lose the sense of authorship while fearing to acknowledge AI's involvement. This crisis can be overcome only by moving from a policy of prohibitions to a policy of partnership, in which disclosure becomes a norm of mutual trust. The lecturer remains an author not by entirely rejecting AI but by competently managing co-creation, thereby empowering educators to navigate the AI landscape with confidence.

One of the most acute issues in contemporary education concerns controlling AI use and

morally acceptable responses to possible misuse. An academic-integrity system built on a punitive logic increasingly conflicts with new technological realities. Since tools can produce credible text in seconds, educational communities gravitate to another technology–AI detectors designed to expose automatically generated text. Such an approach, however, merely creates an illusion of control and produces a new ethical crisis centered on the risk of false accusations, violations of human dignity, and erosion of trust between lecturers and students.

Instead of an "ethics of suspicion", which breeds mistrust and undermines the learning environment, a shift is needed toward learning design and process-based assessment (drafts, versioning, oral defenses, peer assessment) in which human agency and responsibility are central [6]. The chief safeguard is transparent disclosure of AI's role: concise, non-punitive statements about what was automated and what remained an authorial decision, combined with process tracing (plans, non-sensitive prompts, change logs) [3; 5]. This combination preserves the sense of authorship, renders contributions verifiable, and reduces incentives to misuse by moving AI from the realm of hidden risk to that of a learning resource [2].

The essence of this ethical transformation lies in recognizing that automatic punishment is incompatible with pedagogical responsibility. Punishment unaccompanied by learning has no formative effect. Replacing punitive approaches with practices of discussion and joint analysis dispels AI-related fears. Institutional procedures must be rethought to support this model. At the policy level, this may entail establishing ethical codes for AI use that guarantee the right to explanation and appeal, a principle of evidentiality, and obligations to document the creation process (drafts, versions, logs). Such measures restore trust and minimize the risk of false accusations.

All this calls for a new pedagogical lexicon in which "honesty" and "responsibility" cease to function as instruments of punishment and become modes of self-expression. A lecturer who refuses blind faith in detectors reclaims the role of moral mediator. The task is not to expose but to guide; not to judge but to teach. The sense of authorship is strengthened where people actively engage with content. Likewise, the sense of integrity grows when students are involved in the process rather than suspected in every line, fostering a sense of inclusivity and collaboration in the learning process.

In sum, the ethics of punishment are a relic of the industrial era, which sought to standardize behaviour. In the age of AI, such a strategy not only fails but contradicts the essence of education as a space of freedom and responsibility. Genuine pedagogical ethics lies not in identifying violators but in cultivating reflective and honest people capable of using technologies ethically. Education must foster critical consciousness rather than blind obedience. This is the best protection against misuse: a person who recognizes their responsibility need not fear remaining honest.

With the rise of generative systems, academic assessment has entered a crisis of trust. For decades, "authentic" forms–essays, reports, analytical memos–were considered reliable but are now vulnerable to automatic text generation. This raises questions not only about technical controls but also about the nature of pedagogical evaluation itself: What exactly do we assess–knowledge or ethical responsibility? Moreover, can a university preserve humanity in its assessment system while relying on algorithms?

Research shows that even the most carefully designed "authentic" assessments–tasks ostensibly testing real professional competencies–do not guarantee integrity. Generative systems can complete such tasks faster, more precisely, and often with greater structure than students. However, the mere fact of AI use is not evidence of cheating: the key problem is the absence of pedagogical dialogue about acceptable and ethical ways to integrate such tools into learning [4].

The main risk to academic integrity is not AI use but outdated assessment methods that incentivize students to take shortcuts. When evaluation is reduced to a one-off written product created apart from the process, it tacitly encourages using generative systems as a shortcut to the result. Under such conditions, technology becomes not a partner in learning but a temptation to substitute [6].

Therefore, the question is not how to ban AI but how to change the logic of assessment. We must transition from a control model to a developmental one, where evaluation records not only results but also the processes of thinking, inquiry, and self-correction. One of the key principles of digital education is the development of metacognitive self-awareness and ethical responsibility. These, rather than technical prowess, should be central in assessment.

Empirical observations indicate that the highest levels of academic honesty are demonstrated by students embedded in continuous process-based

assessment, where ideas, drafts, versions, and reflections are evaluated in stages. Process tracing (versioning, change logs, drafts) is the most effective evidence of human participation. In such a system, AI can remain a tool of assistance rather than substitution.

A practical solution is a gradual shift to multimodal assessment–combining written, oral, project-based, and reflective tasks. When students must present their product in diverse formats–oral presentations, videos, discussions, peer reviews–AI's role diminishes because it cannot fully replicate individual experience and an authentic communicative style. These formats foster trust between student and lecturer by showcasing not an "ideal text" but a process of growth.

A vital component of ethical assessment is the transparent disclosure of AI use. Openly noting the role of algorithmic tools removes suspicion and redirects attention to content rather than text provenance. The lecturer can introduce a mandatory element in assignments: a brief author's comment on whether and how AI was used. Such reflective statements enhance ethical awareness and make disclosure part of evaluation. When a student candidly describes their use of AI, they demonstrate the capacity to think critically about their activity–an authentic criterion of mature thinking [3].

The theoretical basis for the new assessment model is ethical authorship, developed at the intersection of pedagogical ethics and digital studies. It rests on four principles: transparency, agency, responsibility, and co-creation. The student must not only produce an output but also understand how it was produced; the lecturer must not only grade a text but also direct attention to the thinking process. Thus, assessment becomes a shared reflection on the ethical use of knowledge and technology.

The ghostwriter effect illustrates that loss of authorship occurs when people are detached from the process. Assessment should therefore be designed so that students cannot fully delegate content creation to a machine while simultaneously recognising the value of their own participation. This can be achieved through staged work: plan, draft, feedback, public defence, and reflection. Each stage captures human contribution and reinforces a sense of authorship [2].

It is crucial that the new assessment system rewards responsible AI use rather than punishes AI use per se. If a student uses a generative tool for ideation, data analysis, or language editing and discloses it clearly, this should be regarded as ethical practice, not a violation. The university's task is to teach people to use tools judiciously, consciously, and with respect for authorship and truth. Pedagogically, this fosters new motivation for learning. The student begins to see assessment not as a threat but as an opportunity for self-knowledge. The lecturer, in this context, plays a pivotal role as a mentor, helping to reframe the role of technology in knowledge creation. In this way, a pedagogical ecosystem emerges where trust and honesty are habits rather than mere regulations.

Reorienting assessment also entails introducing peer assessment. When students evaluate each other's work, they notice nuances of style and thought that are hard for a machine to imitate. This amplifies shared responsibility and mutual accountability, fostering a sense of connection among students. Peer assessment positively affects intrinsic motivation and reduces the risk of dishonest behaviour because the social context functions as a moral filter.

Accordingly, an assessment that reduces misuse is not a technological but an ethical category. Its effectiveness is measured not by detector accuracy but by the level of trust among participants in the educational process. If students know that the lecturer treats them as partners and is ready to discuss AI openly, they are less inclined to deceive. This once again affirms the human-centred principle: education must be grounded in mutual respect and co-creation, fostering a sense of security and confidence among the participants.

Ultimately, the new assessment model must restore the ethical meaning of pedagogical work. It shifts emphasis from suspicion to trust, from punishment to support, from automated control to conscious responsibility. As with authorship, the key is not to reject technology but to interpret its ethical role. AI can become a mirror of human honesty: the higher the levels of openness and reflection, the less room for misuse. Assessment should be an instrument of such openness. This pedagogical mechanism does not punish but helps one become a responsible author in a world where anyone can generate text, yet only a human can answer for it.

The ethical compass of educational activity has always formed at the intersection of law, morality, and professional culture. In the context of GenAI, these orientations require rethinking: technologies have transformed not only how knowledge is created but also how responsibility is understood. Hence, there is a need for a renewed normative-axiological

framework that connects legal standards of academic integrity, international ethical documents, and humanistic principles of education. This framework not only delineates boundaries of the permissible but also defines the moral horizon of university culture, within which AI use becomes part of a broader conversation about human dignity, trust, and autonomy.

Pedagogically, the lecturer becomes not only an author but also a model of ethical behaviour for students. By openly disclosing AI use while remaining responsible for content, the lecturer demonstrates a new type of professional honesty–honesty grounded in transparency rather than prohibition. This approach aligns with the university's humanistic tradition as a community where knowledge is a collective achievement and the ethics of cooperation outweigh those of competition.

The ethics of assessment should be based not on detection but on task design that cultivates critical thinking and ethical self-awareness. Moral responsibility for outcomes lies with humans, not algorithms. When a university embraces this model, detectors and bans recede from the centre, giving way to a culture of partnership.

The problems of punishment and false accusations show why fairness requires a normative framework. No algorithm can be the sole arbiter of honesty–this is a professional and ethical human function. Normative ethics, therefore, demands procedures for appeal, rights to explanation, and an obligation to provide evidence. A university grounded in these principles protects not only the student but also the very idea of just education.

At the same time, the new framework has a value dimension affirming three leading values: transparency, respect, and responsibility. Transparency means openness in knowledge-creation processes and disclosure of tools used. Respect means recognizing the human dignity of each participant and preventing discrimination based on language, origin, or access to technology. Responsibility means awareness that every piece of knowledge and every technology entails moral consequences, with the lecturer mediating between fact and value. Authorship and assessment require not only individual but also collective ethical agreements. Students and lecturers become co-authors of norms of trust, and the university becomes a platform for their realization. This implies creating ethics forums, open AI integrity courses, and mechanisms for feedback and reflection.

Thus, in the AI era, the normative-axiological framework transcends routine regulation and becomes a mechanism for preserving humanity in education. The role of the lecturer is not merely to control behaviour but to cultivate a conscious attitude toward knowledge and the tools that create it, making them integral to the process.

The authorship problem in the world of GenAI has moved far beyond technical debates. The issue is not limited to citation or disclosure rules but extends to preserving pedagogical subjectivity–the lecturer's ability to remain a moral author when text production can be fully automated. Meeting this challenge requires a shift from reactive ethics of prohibition to a professional model of ethical authorship that provides clear action guides without diminishing creative freedom, empowering the audience to embrace a forward-thinking approach.

Drawing on international normative documents and recent research on academic integrity, this article proposes the E³-Author model–Ethical, Empathic, and Evidence-based Authoring Model. It is designed for university lecturers and aims to shape a new type of professional conduct in which authorship combines moral reflection, care for the human, and evidential responsibility.

The E³-Author model rests on the idea that authorship under AI conditions has not only intellectual but also moral, social, and empathic dimensions. The lecturer is not merely a producer of texts or courses but a facilitator of an ethical space where knowledge emerges through human–technology interaction. This approach aligns with the human-in-the-loop principle, reassuring the audience that the human remains central to any educational ecosystem, and their role is as important as ever.

Pedagogically, authorship appears as a process of interaction: lecturer → AI → students → society. Each link requires its own ethical control yet is unified by a shared value–trust. Trust determines the quality, viability, and legitimacy of university knowledge in the scholarly domain.

Structure of the E³-Author Model

The model comprises three interrelated levels–Ethical, Empathic, and Evidence-based–each with specific principles, procedures, and expected outcomes.

1. Ethical level. This level defines the core norms of human–technology interaction. An author has made a creative contribution and assumes responsibility for textual accuracy and integrity. AI can be an instrument but not a subject of authorship. At this level, the lecturer formulates a

personal "ethical contract"–an internal set of rules adhered to when creating instructional materials. This contract includes honest AI disclosure, fact-checking, refusal of manipulation, and adherence to academic integrity.

In practice, the ethical level is realized through four actions:

– deliberate decision to use AI;

– transparent documentation of the process;

– editorial control of all outputs;

– readiness to explain the provenance of each text fragment.

2. Empathic level. This level pertains to the value-laden aspect of pedagogical interaction. Digital education should cultivate not only competence but also humanity–the ability to understand others. For the lecturer, this entails empathy toward students, colleagues, and oneself as an author. Empathic authorship involves transparently explaining AI's role without moralising, creating a safe space for open discussion of technologies and mistakes. Empathy functions as a pedagogical instrument: it significantly reduces the fear of error and strengthens motivation toward honesty. The ghostwriter effect shows that people lose authorship when they lose emotional connection to outcomes. Empathy restores this connection by foregrounding one's presence in the text. When the lecturer sees not merely an informational product but a self-reflection in the work, moral authenticity is preserved even in AI-rich environments.

3. Evidence-based level. This level concerns accountability and verification and draws on evidence-based education, according to which data, sources, and an action log should support any claim. Here, the lecturer not only verifies information but also ensures traceability of the work process: versions, prompts, comments, and interim results are retained. This supports evidence of human participation in material production. Evidence also implies pedagogical openness to review: the lecturer is ready to explain to students or colleagues how AI was used, what corrections were made, and which decisions were adopted. This principle fosters a culture of academic transparency–an environment in which knowledge can be traced, checked, and refined without fear of sanctions.

The E³-Author model proposes not a declaration but a set of implementable mechanisms in the university setting, promoting a culture of academic transparency and involvement. First, an ethical audit of instructional materials–regular self- and peer-review of AI use. The audit is non-punitive and aims at reflection. Lecturers share experiences, discuss complex cases, and analyse which practices to scale or limit. Second, ethical disclosure–short declarations appended to each course or set of teaching materials. A simple formulation might be: "During preparation of this course, some structural suggestions and stylistic edits were obtained using generative AI; the author performed all decisions and fact-checking". Such declarations normalise transparency as a habit rather than a compulsion. Third, reflective assessment–transferring principles of ethical authorship to the student realm. Students submit a brief process account: how sources were used, which stages were completed, and what was done independently. This cultivates critical thinking and responsibility while reducing the need for detection. Fourth, a pedagogical community of practice–departmental or faculty groups discussing new standards for ethical AI use. Such communities develop local codes that adapt international norms to specific contexts.

Compared to prohibition-oriented ethics, the E³-Author model has several advantages. First, it does not rely on technological control but stimulates internal responsibility. Second, it is psychologically supportive: it overcomes the ghostwriter effect by restoring authorship through active engagement and reflection–only through conscious human–AI interaction does a sense of ownership arise. Third, it reduces conflicts between lecturers and administrators by shifting ethics from "behaviour control" to professional development support. Ethical audits and disclosures allow universities to collect real data on AI use without infringing on lecturer autonomy. Fourth, it enhances instructional quality: documenting one's steps elevates awareness of decisions, positively affecting course content. Reflective assessment and process documentation are key drivers of academic integrity. Fifth, the model is adaptive, suitable for implementation in any educational environment, from traditional universities to online platforms.

To evaluate effectiveness, a multi-level monitoring system is proposed. At the individual level: an annual ethical portfolio including disclosure examples, sample materials, and a brief reflection on AI's role in one's activity. At the departmental level: case discussions and jointly developed integrity criteria. At the university level: an analytical report on AI-use trends submitted to quality-assurance bodies. This system cultivates an ethical culture of sustainability, where norms are built bottom-up through shared practices rather than imposed top-down.

Ukrainian universities that integrate this model can align with international standards without losing their national identity. The E³-Author model not only describes lecturer behaviour but also represents a new understanding of the nature of authorship. In the traditional system, the author creates the text. In the new post-digital paradigm, the author ensures the ethical integrity of creation. Authorship ceases to be private property and becomes a domain of shared responsibility–aligned with the humanistic orientation that "knowledge is a collective good to be created ethically and fairly".

Thus, the ethical author does not vanish in the AI age–they evolve. Tools change, but the mission remains: to create content that conveys information and affirms values. In this sense, the E³-Author model is not merely a recommendation but a project of a new pedagogical identity in which ethics, empathy, and evidence form an indivisible whole.

Conclusions. In conclusion, the E³-Author model attempts to transform the integrity debate into a positive program of action, inspiring and motivating all involved. Its central aim is to preserve humanity as AI becomes a co-participant in education. Ethical authorship is not only the defence of past standards but also a pathway to a new culture of responsibility in which the lecturer's word remains not the loudest but the most authentic voice in the digital chorus of modernity.

The development of generative AI has radically altered the educational sphere, posing questions not only about technological adaptation but also about moral self-determination for the university community. The research shows that the central problem of contemporary pedagogical ethics lies not in AI use itself but in preserving human subjectivity under automated creation. The lecturer remains central to education, yet the character of authorship undergoes a profound shift: from individual knowledge production to ethical curatorship of a shared learning space in which technologies are co-participants but not subjects.

In this context, the proposed E³-Author model provides a systemic response to current challenges by uniting three dimensions:

– Ethical, ensuring deliberate and transparent technology use;

– Empathic, restoring the human sense of authorship through personal reflection and moral involvement;

– Evidence-based, creating conditions for verification and accountability without repressive mechanisms.

The model is operational rather than declarative: it can be integrated into university policies and practices–through ethical audits, standard disclosures, process-based assessment, local codes, and communities of practice. This makes ethics part of everyday pedagogical culture rather than merely a matter of regulation.

The approach reframes the philosophy of academic integrity. Formerly grounded in behavioural control, it now shifts toward the development of professional consciousness. Ethical integrity emerges not as an external obligation but as internal honesty–the capacity to assume responsibility for one's word even when technology can automatically reproduce it. Thus, human uniqueness is preserved within a digital ecosystem that increasingly claims the role of co-author.

The findings also bear practical value for policy design on GenAI use, for courses on digital ethics and integrity, and for preparing lecturers for pedagogical interaction in a post-text culture. Universities that embrace E³-Author principles gain not only mechanisms for safeguarding integrity but also tools to enhance educational quality by fostering critical thinking, reflection, and openness.

In sum, a lecturer in the AI world remains an author insofar as they retain the capacity to be a moral subject–to think, evaluate, decide, and answer for consequences. Technologies may support, accelerate, and expand capacities, but they cannot replace conscience. Pedagogical ethics of the future must therefore rest not on a binary "human vs. machine" but on a synthesis: responsible lecturer – ethical user – builder of a culture of trust.

Prospects for Further Research. Further research should proceed along three lines:

1. Empirical testing of the E³-Author model's effectiveness across disciplines and learning contexts.

2. Development of indicators for the "sense of authorship" as an ethical and psychological criterion of pedagogical quality.

3. Comparative analysis of international and national practices in implementing GenAI policies in higher education.

The future of pedagogical ethics lies not in defending the past but in shaping a new culture of responsibility in which technologies become a realm of human self-knowledge and the lecturer retains the highest status–to be an author in a world learning to write on its own.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

1. Committee on Publication Ethics. Authorship and AI tools (COPE position statement) 2023, February 13. URL: https://publicationethics.org/guidance/cope-position/authorship-and-ai-tools

2. Draxler F., Starke A., Diefenbach S. The AI ghostwriter effect: When users do not perceive ownership of AI-generated text. In: Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, 2024. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1145/3637875

3. International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. Defining the role of authors and contributors [Електронний ресурс]. 2023, December. URL: https://www.icmje.org/recommendations/browse/roles-and-responsibilities/defining-the-role-of-authors-and-contributors.html

4. Kofinas A. K., Tsak C. H., Pike D. The impact of generative AI on academic integrity of authentic assessments within a higher education context. British Journal of Educational Technology, 2025, 56(2). DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13585

5. Miao F., Holmes W. Guidance for generative AI in education and research. Paris: UNESCO, 2023. URL: https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000386694

6. Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA). The evolving risk to academic integrity posed by generative artificial intelligence: Options for immediate action [Електронний ресурс]. 2024. URL: https://www.teqsa.gov.au/sites/default/files/2024-08/evolving-risk-to-academic-integrity-posed-by-generative-artificial-intelligence.pdf

7. Weber-Wulff D., Tschuggnall M., Breslin S., Bialke M., Gipp B., Stein B. Testing of detection tools for AI-generated text. International Journal for Educational Integrity, 2023, 19(26). DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-023-00146-z

Стаття надійшла до редакції 10.10.2025
Стаття прийнята 01.11.2025
Стаття опублікована 01.12.2025