World Conference on Social Sciences, Law and Public Policy
Hosted Online from Toronto, Canada
Date: 26th February 2026
Website: https://econferencia.com

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN EDUCATION POLICY: OPPORTUNITIES AND RISKS

Shermatov Avazbek G‘ofur o‘g‘li
Independent Researcher at the Institute of Social and Spiritual Studies under the Republican Center for Spirituality and Enlightenment
Phone: +998 50 107 00 58
Email: avazbekshermatov8@gmail.com

Abstract
This article provides a scientific analysis of the key positive functions of artificial intelligence in education, while also examining risks such as the growing reliance on “quick results” in learning processes, declining reliability of assessment, and the potential weakening of critical thinking. In conclusion, it argues that the core issue is not whether to restrict or not AI use, but rather how to govern and manage its application.

Keywords: Generative artificial intelligence, education policy, academic integrity, assessment, AI literacy, digital inequality, cognitive decline.

In recent years, generative artificial intelligence (AI) tools have moved beyond being simple technical assistants and have deeply entered the educational process. How a student writes, how they conduct research, how their work is evaluated, and which profession they are directed toward in the future—all have become directly influenced by AI. This situation has, naturally, led to reconsidering education not only as a pedagogical institution but also as a socio-political institution. As a result, issues such as state human capital policy, equal

opportunities, the authenticity of diplomas, and the legitimacy of "rules" in education have come to the forefront.

The main purpose of this article is to identify how generative AI impacts the educational process, what its political consequences are, and what should and should not be done to address the situation.

The most frequently cited advantage of generative AI in education is the ability to personalize learning. AI can effectively assist in analyzing students' errors, providing individualized explanations, adapting examples, and acting as a live conversation partner for language learning. At the same time, it can partially automate routine tasks for teachers, such as preparing lesson plans and creating assessment questions.

According to the OECD's 2026 *Digital Education Outlook*, generative AI can be beneficial in education, but only if implemented according to specific pedagogical principles and with controlled supervision; solutions "specifically designed for education" tend to yield better results than general-purpose chatbots [3]. Thus, at the level of political decision-making, the issue is not "adding AI everywhere," but rather managing it: for which tasks, under what standards, and with what responsibilities.

In practice, generative AI is often used not to enhance learning processes but to obtain results more quickly. This raises significant concerns about fair assessment and academic integrity: the authorship of assignments, the originality of texts, and the independence of ideas become unclear. UNESCO also highlights these problems, emphasizing the lack of clear guidelines and recommendations in many places.

Another critical concept identified by OECD studies is that generative AI may reinforce a "false mastery" illusion for students—that is, answers may appear excellent, but in reality, they are not based on deep learning [3: 51]. This places

teachers in a difficult position: a text may be well-written, but it may not reflect the student's genuine knowledge. Consequently, assessment systems risk focusing on the aesthetic quality of work rather than the learning process itself.

Caution is also required regarding cognitive consequences. A 2025 Microsoft Research study indicates that the use of generative AI, in some conditions, may reduce cognitive effort (mental energy expended in thinking) and weaken critical evaluation—especially when students have low confidence in themselves but high reliance on AI [2]. Over the long term, this trend could impact "reading culture" and reduce the social value of independent research.

The use of generative AI in education is not merely a pedagogical matter—it directly affects state policy in several areas:

First, the issue of equal opportunities. The speed and quality of AI use depend on internet infrastructure, the availability of digital devices, the development of language corpora, and citizens' financial means. These factors vary widely among countries and within societies, potentially increasing the digital divide in education and raising social equity concerns. Worries about AI deepening disparities between wealthy and disadvantaged regions have been widely discussed, including in a UN Development Programme report [4].

Second, the legitimacy of diplomas and assessments. If society begins to value AI-assisted diplomas over actual student knowledge, the credibility of diplomas comes into question, raising concerns about educational institutions and affecting employers, civil services, and social mobility mechanisms. This undermines the idea of fair selection through education.

Third, regulatory and oversight limits. Countries are taking different approaches between "banning" and "integrating" generative AI. UNESCO notes this distinction [6]. While some countries restrict digital technology in classrooms, in high-income nations, up to two-thirds of secondary school students reportedly use

generative AI tools for homework [7]. AI use in exams, admissions, and career guidance can pose transparency and discrimination risks. Consequently, the European Union AI Act classifies some AI systems in education (e.g., for admissions, guidance, or detecting prohibited behavior in exams) as "high-risk" [5]. Therefore, using AI in education is not a simple technical matter but involves serious legal and political responsibility.

Addressing negative consequences of widespread AI use in education is a complex challenge. Effective interventions may require a combination of rules + assessment + literacy rather than relying on a single measure. Recommended measures include:

1. Clear guidelines for educational institutions regulating AI use. UNESCO has developed global guidelines for generative AI, regularly updated, which can serve as an initial reference for institutions [1]. Surveys conducted by UNESCO in 2025 indicate that most higher education institutions are developing their own AI usage policies; institutional rules are increasingly becoming a necessity rather than voluntary [7]. Schools also need to develop their own policies and ensure students are not completely excluded from AI.

2. Revising assessment mechanisms. Completely eliminating written assignments is not necessary, but mechanisms should be introduced to demonstrate effort in the learning process (plans, source maps, draft versions), such as short written or oral defenses in the classroom, and questions encouraging reasoning like "Why did you draw this conclusion?" This prioritizes natural learning over mere results. AI should act as a "learning partner," not a shortcut to quick answers.

3. AI literacy and academic ethics. Simply telling students "it is prohibited" is insufficient. Practical modules should be developed for checking AI outputs,

comparing sources, identifying errors, and teaching citation and authorship culture. This also supports the restoration of critical thinking.

4. Data protection and transparency. Policies must clarify where AI-generated data in education (especially assessments, guidance, and monitoring) goes, who can access it, and under what conditions.

5. Pilot implementation. Before deploying AI across the entire system, a phased pilot program is advisable to limit potential negative impacts.

Conclusion

Generative AI can both enhance and weaken education. From a political perspective, the key issues are: maintaining the legitimacy of educational institutions (societal trust in higher education and diplomas), ensuring equal opportunities, and using AI responsibly while preserving governance accountability. In an era where young people increasingly rely on generative AI for learning, educational institutions cannot adopt a "wait and see" approach. Clear rules for AI use, fair assessment mechanisms, and systematic measures to increase literacy are now essential.

References

1. Guidance for generative AI in education and research, URL: https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/guidance-generative-ai-education-and-research?utm_

2. Hao-Ping (Hank) Lee, Advait Sarkar, Lev Tankelevitch, Ian Drosos, Sean Rintel, Richard Banks, and Nicholas Wilson. 2025. The Impact of Generative AI on Critical Thinking: Self-Reported Reductions in Cognitive Effort and Confidence Effects From a Survey of Knowledge Workers. In Proceedings of the 2025 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '25).

Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 1121, 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1145/3706598.3713778

3. OECD (2026), OECD Digital Education Outlook 2026: Exploring Effective Uses of Generative AI in Education, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/062a7394-en.

4. THE NEXT GREAT DIVERGENCE. Why Al may widen inequality between countries. United Nations Development Programme. New York, USA, 2025. https://www.undp.org/asia-pacific/publications/next-great-divergence

5. REGULATION (EU) 2024/1689 OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL, https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1689/oj/eng?utm_

6. UNESCO dedicates the International Day of Education 2025 to Artificial Intelligence, URL: https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/unesco-dedicates-international-day-education-2025-artificial-intelligence

7. UNESCO survey: Two-thirds of higher education institutions have or are developing guidance on AI use, URL: https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/unesco-survey-two-thirds-higher-education-institutions-have-or-are-developing-guidance-ai-use?utm_