ISCTE IUL
REPOSITÓRIO
INSTITUTO UNIVERSITÁRIO DE LISBOA

Repositório ISCTE-IUL

Deposited in *Repositório ISCTE-IUL*:
2026-10-14

Deposited version:
Accepted Version

Peer-review status of attached file:
Peer-reviewed

Citation for published item:
Louçã, J. (2025). The AI-pocalypse in academia: Challenges and opportunities in the age of generative AI. In Jorge Louça, Manuel João Ramos (Ed.), Proceedings of the International Meeting AI-Pocalypse: How AI is turning academia upside down. Zenodo.
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15780186

Further information on publisher's website:
10.5281/zenodo.15780186

Publisher's copyright statement:
This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Louçã, J. (2025). The AI-pocalypse in academia: Challenges and opportunities in the age of generative AI. In Jorge Louça, Manuel João Ramos (Ed.), Proceedings of the International Meeting AI-Pocalypse: How AI is turning academia upside down. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15780186, which has been published in final form at https://dx.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15780186. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with the Publisher's Terms and Conditions for self-archiving.

Use policy

Creative Commons CC BY 4.0
The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a link is made to the metadata record in the Repository
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Serviços de Informação e Documentação, Instituto Universitário de Lisboa (ISCTE-IUL)
Av. das Forças Armadas, Edifício II, 1649-026 Lisboa Portugal
Phone: +(351) 217 903 024 | e-mail: administrador.repositorio@iscte-iul.pt
https://repositorio.iscte-iul.pt



In: J. Louçã e M. J. Ramos, *Proceedings of the International Meeting AI-Pocalypse: How AI is turning academia upside down – May 28th, 2025*. Available at https://zenodo.org/communities/ai-pocalypse-1

The AI-Pocalypse in Academia:
Challenges and Opportunities in the Age of Generative AI

Jorge Louçã
ISTA-Iscte, Lisbon, Portugal

Correspondence: Jorge.L@iscte-iul.pt

Keywords: AI, LLM, generative AI, AI in academia

Version: 2025-06-29

Abstract

The rapid integration of generative AI (GenAI) into academia has sparked both excitement and concern. Large Language Models (LLMs) now assist in grading essays, drafting research papers, and even applying for grants, raising critical questions about the future of education. This paper examines the dual-edged impact of AI on academia, addressing ethical dilemmas, pedagogical challenges, and the potential erosion of critical thinking skills. It explores whether AI will usher in a golden age of innovation or degrade academic integrity through over-reliance on automated systems. Finally, the paper proposes strategies for universities to adapt responsibly to this technological shift.

1. Introduction

The academic world is undergoing a seismic shift as artificial intelligence (AI) transitions from a speculative future technology to an entrenched reality in classrooms, research labs, and

administrative offices. No longer confined to science fiction, AI systems now grade essays (1), draft research papers (2), summarize complex readings (3), assist in grant applications (4), and even recruit students (5), raising profound questions about the future of education. While some herald this as the dawn of a new intellectual renaissance, others warn of an impending erosion of critical thinking, academic integrity, and the very essence of human learning.

The infiltration of AI into academia is not merely a matter of efficiency; it challenges foundational pedagogical principles. Students increasingly rely on AI to bypass traditional learning processes, questioning whether deep engagement with material is necessary when algorithms can instantly generate summaries, essays, and even exam answers. Meanwhile, educators grapple with ethical dilemmas: should AI draft recommendation letters? Can automated grading systems truly assess nuanced student work? And as universities adopt AI-driven tools, a deeper concern emerges: are we outsourcing intellectual labor to systems that, despite their sophistication, lack true understanding?

At the heart of this transformation are Large Language Models (LLMs), algorithmic systems trained on vast datasets to predict and generate text. Though they mimic human writing with startling accuracy, their knowledge is constrained by the biases, gaps, and limitations of their training data (10). More troublingly, the development of these tools is dominated by corporate interests, raising questions about whether education is being reshaped to serve market demands rather than intellectual growth.

This paper examines the dual-edged impact of AI on academia, exploring both its transformative potential and its risks. It interrogates whether AI will elevate scholarship by automating routine tasks, freeing humans for creative and critical work; or whether it will degrade learning into a passive, transactional process. By analyzing student and faculty reliance on AI, the limitations of LLMs, and the corporate influence behind educational technology, this text argues that the future of academia hinges not on resisting AI, but on integrating it thoughtfully, preserving the irreplaceable value of human curiosity, struggle, and intellectual rigor.

2. The Rise of AI in Academia: Transformation and Tension in the Digital Classroom

The infiltration of artificial intelligence into academic institutions has unfolded with remarkable speed, reshaping pedagogical practices, and redefining the relationship between learners, educators, and knowledge itself. While researchers, such as Vicari (7), have reported on the evolving use of AI in teaching, recent transformation in academia differ fundamentally from past developments. This transformation manifests most visibly in two interconnected spheres: the

evolving behaviors of students and the changing professional landscape for educators. What began as experimental applications in isolated contexts has rapidly evolved into widespread institutional adoption, creating both unprecedented opportunities and profound challenges for higher education.

2.1 The Changing Landscape of Student Learning

The modern student faces a paradoxical relationship with AI tools—simultaneously empowered by their capabilities and constrained by their limitations. A growing number of learners now approach their education with what might be termed "algorithmic pragmatism," questioning the necessity of traditional study methods when sophisticated language models can instantly produce coherent summaries, analytical responses, and even complete research papers. This shift represents more than mere convenience; it reflects a fundamental renegotiation of the educational contract. Where traditional pedagogy emphasized the developmental value of intellectual struggle, many students now perceive AI as a legitimate means to bypass the cognitive effort historically required for academic achievement.

The implications for academic integrity have become particularly acute in this new landscape. Contemporary AI systems have effectively democratized sophisticated plagiarism, enabling students to generate superficially credible work with minimal original input. The boundary between legitimate assistance and academic dishonesty grows increasingly nebulous as these tools become more advanced and accessible (6). More troubling still is the potential erosion of essential cognitive skills, such as the capacity for critical analysis, original synthesis, and independent problem-solving that have long formed the foundation of higher learning. When students routinely rely on AI to summarize complex texts or formulate arguments, they risk developing what cognitive scientists call "outsourced cognition," where crucial intellectual muscles atrophy from disuse.

Perhaps most insidiously, this reliance on AI may fundamentally alter students' relationship with knowledge itself. The traditional learning process, marked by active engagement with primary sources, iterative refinement of understanding, and the gradual development of one's own voice, risks being replaced by a transactional model where knowledge becomes something to be retrieved rather than constructed. This shift carries implications that extend far beyond academic performance, potentially shaping how future generations approach complex problems and value intellectual labor.

2.2 The Educator's Dilemma: Efficiency Versus Authenticity

Faculty members face their own complex set of challenges as they navigate this new technological landscape. The promise of AI-assisted teaching tools is undeniably compelling—automated grading systems that provide instant feedback, algorithms that can generate customized learning materials, and language models capable of drafting administrative documents in seconds. Yet each of these applications raises profound questions about the nature and purpose of education.

The adoption of AI for student assessment presents perhaps the most immediate ethical quandary. While automated grading systems offer obvious efficiencies, particularly in large lecture courses, their ability to evaluate nuanced arguments, creative expression, or disciplinary-specific modes of thinking remains fundamentally limited. The risk emerges of a pedagogical "flattening," where assignments are increasingly designed to accommodate algorithmic evaluation rather than foster deep learning. Similarly, the use of AI for drafting recommendation letters, traditionally deeply personal documents that speak to a student's unique qualities, threatens to reduce these important professional artifacts to generic templates, potentially disadvantaging students in competitive application processes.

Even in course preparation, where AI tools can rapidly assemble lecture notes and reading lists, concerns persist about the gradual erosion of pedagogical expertise. The convenience of algorithmically generated content may come at the cost of the careful curation and contextualization that expert instructors provide, the very qualities that often distinguish transformative educational experiences from mere information delivery. As faculty members increasingly incorporate these tools into their professional practice, they must navigate difficult questions about where to draw the line between helpful assistance and the surrender of core academic responsibilities.

This dual transformation, affecting both how students learn and how educators teach, represents not merely a technological shift but a philosophical challenge to traditional educational values. The academy now faces critical questions about what aspects of the learning process should be preserved in their human-centered form, and where AI integration might genuinely enhance educational outcomes. The answers to these questions will likely determine whether the rise of AI in academia ultimately serves to elevate or diminish the transformative power of higher education.

3. Understanding Large Language Models (LLMs): The Engines and Architects of AI's Educational Revolution

The transformative impact of artificial intelligence on academia cannot be fully grasped without examining the technological bedrock upon which it stands: Large Language Models. These sophisticated Natural Language Processing systems represent more than just advanced pattern recognition systems, they embody a fundamental reimagining of how machines process, generate, and interact with human knowledge. Their rapid adoption across educational institutions worldwide belies a complex reality that educators, students, and policymakers must confront.

3.1 The Nature and Limitations of LLMs

At their core, Large Language Models operate on a deceptively simple premise: predicting the most likely next word in a sequence based on statistical patterns observed in their training data. The procedure, even if it seems simple, is constrained due to the heavy use of computational resources. The key change maker of LLMs was the application of the sophisticated Transformer Architecture (11), relying mostly on feedforward layers without recurrent connections as in Recurrent Neural Networks. This process, repeated across billions of parameters, enables the generation of remarkably coherent text that mimics human writing. However, this apparent fluency masks profound limitations that become particularly consequential in academic contexts.

The knowledge boundaries of these systems reveal significant gaps shaped by their training datasets. While encompassing vast quantities of digital text, from scholarly articles to internet forums, these collections inevitably exclude entire categories of knowledge. Corporate intranets, paywalled research, and most non-digitized materials remain beyond their reach, creating an inherent bias toward publicly available, predominantly Western, English-language sources. This results in what might be termed "epistemic inequality", or more particularly "hermeneutical injustice", where certain types of knowledge become amplified while others remain marginalized or entirely absent from the AI's worldview (12).

More fundamentally, these systems lack any genuine understanding of the content they process. When a LLM generates an essay on Shakespeare or solves a mathematics problem, it operates without comprehension, manipulating symbols based on statistical correlations rather than conceptual reasoning. This distinction becomes crucial when such tools are employed for educational purposes, as they cannot evaluate truth claims, assess logical coherence, or engage in the critical thinking that higher education seeks to cultivate. Their outputs, while often plausible, emerge from mathematical operations rather than intellectual engagement with ideas.

3.2 The Corporate Architecture of Educational AI

The development and deployment of these powerful tools remains concentrated within a small group of technology corporations, raising critical questions about control and influence over educational systems. This concentration of power creates a paradox: while universities have traditionally been centers of knowledge production and dissemination, they find themselves increasingly dependent on proprietary systems whose inner workings remain opaque and whose priorities may not align with pedagogical values.

The commercial imperatives driving AI development introduce subtle but significant distortions into educational applications. Algorithms optimized for user engagement and retention may prioritize features that maximize usage metrics rather than learning outcomes. The black-box nature of these systems compounds the problem, as educators and students alike must trust outputs they cannot verify or fully understand. This dynamic risks creating what some scholars term "pedagogical lock-in", where educational practices gradually adapt to the capabilities and limitations of corporate AI tools rather than vice versa.

Perhaps most concerning is how this corporate mediation affects the transmission of knowledge itself. When commercial entities become the gatekeepers of educational technology, the values embedded in their systems, whether consciously or unconsciously, begin to shape what counts as valid knowledge, appropriate expression, and even legitimate inquiry. The potential for subtle homogenization of thought and method looms large, particularly as these tools become more deeply integrated into assessment systems and curriculum development.

This corporate dominance also raises practical concerns about sustainability and access. As universities build infrastructure around proprietary AI systems, they risk creating dependencies that may prove costly to maintain or difficult to replace. The concentration of this power in private hands challenges traditional academic values of transparency, reproducibility, and collective stewardship of knowledge — values that have underpinned higher education for centuries.

The challenge facing academia is not simply about adopting or resisting these technologies, but about developing frameworks for their use that preserve institutional autonomy, pedagogical integrity, and the diversity of knowledge systems. As LLMs become increasingly embedded in educational practice, understanding their nature and governance becomes not just a technical matter, but an essential component of defending the core mission of higher education in the digital age.

4. The Crisis of Learning in the AI Era

The rapid integration of artificial intelligence into educational spaces has precipitated a silent crisis that threatens to undermine the very foundations of meaningful learning. What initially appeared as a technological boon, offering unprecedented access to information and analytical tools, has revealed itself to be a double-edged sword, cutting at the core of how knowledge is acquired, processed, and internalized. This crisis manifests across multiple dimensions, each compounding the others to create a perfect storm that challenges academia to reconsider its fundamental values and methods.

4.1 The Disappearance of Struggle

At the heart of this crisis lies the gradual erosion of intellectual struggle from the learning process. Cognitive science has long established that genuine understanding emerges not from passive absorption, but from the active engagement with challenging material. This kind of engagement that demands time, effort, and occasional frustration. The metacognitive processes triggered by such struggle, weighing different approaches, learning from mistakes, and eventually achieving hard-won insights, are precisely what build durable problem-solving skills and intellectual resilience. Yet AI tools, by offering instant solutions to complex problems, threaten to render this crucial developmental process obsolete.

The consequences extend far beyond academic performance. When students routinely bypass the struggle inherent to learning, they miss out on cultivating the very cognitive muscles needed to navigate an increasingly complex world. The classroom has traditionally served as a training ground for life's challenges, where the ability to persevere through difficulty translates directly to professional and personal adaptability. In its place, we risk creating a generation of learners accustomed to immediate answers but unequipped to handle situations where no algorithm can provide them, where problems are messy, solutions unclear, and the path forward demands sustained intellectual effort.

4.2 Overreliance on Generative AI

Compounding this issue is the problematic nature of AI-generated content itself. Large language models, while capable of producing impressively fluent text, operate without any genuine understanding of the material they process. Their responses represent statistically probable arrangements of words rather than verified knowledge, creating what might be termed "the plausibility trap", where students mistake well-articulated text for accurate information. This

phenomenon proves particularly dangerous in academic contexts, where AI-generated content may contain subtle errors that escape detection by those still developing expertise in a field.

The risks multiply when considering how these systems handle bias and critical thinking. Trained on vast datasets that reflect all the prejudices and imbalances of their sources, AI tools tend to amplify existing biases while presenting them with an air of algorithmic objectivity. Perhaps more insidiously, their design encourages intellectual complacency, since most models default to affirming user prompts rather than challenging assumptions, effectively rewarding superficial engagement over deep critical analysis. The result is an educational environment where confirmation bias thrives, complex issues become oversimplified, and the very skill of rigorous debate risks atrophy.

4.3 Corporate Influence on Education

Underlying these challenges is the growing corporate capture of educational technology. As AI systems become increasingly central to learning processes, their development remains concentrated in the hands of a few technology companies whose priorities inevitably reflect commercial rather than pedagogical values. This shift carries profound implications for what counts as knowledge and how it is accessed.

The standardization inherent in mass-market AI tools threatens to homogenize educational content, privileging certain forms of knowledge while marginalizing others. Non-Western epistemologies, minority perspectives, and non-digital sources risk being pushed to the periphery as algorithms optimize for the most common denominators in their training data. Similarly, the very definition of "good" writing or "correct" answers begins to reflect the limitations and biases baked into corporate AI systems, potentially stifling intellectual diversity, and creativity.

Perhaps most concerning is how this corporate mediation changes the relationship between learners and knowledge. Traditional education fostered what might be called an "ownership" of learning, i.e. the personal construction of understanding through direct engagement with sources and ideas. The AI-augmented alternative promotes a "rental" model, providing temporary access to prefabricated knowledge, convenient but never truly internalized or made one's own. This shift carries implications that extend far beyond academic performance, touching on the development of critical autonomy and the very formation of intellectual identity.

Together, these challenges represent not just technological disruptions to be managed, but fundamental questions about the purpose and practice of education in an age of artificial intelligence. The path forward will require more than policy adjustments, it demands a

philosophical reckoning with what we value in learning and why those values matter for individuals and society alike.

5. The Future of Academia: Adaptation or Decline?

The rapid ascent of artificial intelligence in higher education presents institutions with a stark ultimatum: evolve or risk obsolescence. As AI systems demonstrate increasing proficiency in tasks traditionally reserved for human intellect, from composing research papers to evaluating student work, universities stand at a crossroads. The path forward demands more than superficial adjustments to syllabi or honor codes; it requires a fundamental reimagining of academia's purpose in an age where artificial and human intelligence increasingly intersect. This transformation must address both the philosophical foundations of education and the practical realities of technological integration.

5.1 Re-evaluating the Purpose of Education in the AI Era

The metrics that have long defined academic success (standardized test scores, GPAs, and publication counts) now appear increasingly anachronistic in an environment where algorithms can optimize for these benchmarks without genuine understanding. This revelation compels a profound reconsideration of what education should prioritize when machines can replicate many of its traditional outputs. The future of academia may depend on its ability to cultivate distinctly human forms of intelligence that resist algorithmic replication.

Critical thinking must become more than a buzzword in course catalogs; it should form the cornerstone of a revised educational paradigm. This means shifting focus from the retention and regurgitation of information to the development of discernment—the ability to interrogate sources, identify logical inconsistencies, and construct nuanced arguments even when faced with convincingly articulated AI-generated content. Similarly, creativity must be redefined not as novel production (a domain where AI excels) but as the capacity for original synthesis—connecting disparate ideas in ways that reflect deep, personal understanding rather than statistical probability.

Equally important are the human-centric skills that AI cannot authentically replicate, such as empathy that informs ethical reasoning, emotional intelligence that enables meaningful collaboration, and the moral imagination to consider the societal implications of technological progress. These capacities, long treated as secondary to cognitive performance, may emerge as the defining features of human education in an AI-augmented world. The challenge lies in

developing pedagogical approaches that cultivate these skills with the same rigor traditionally applied to quantitative disciplines.

The integration of AI into this revised educational framework must be neither uncritical nor reactionary. Tools that automate administrative tasks or surface relevant research can free educators and students to focus on higher-order thinking. However, this integration requires careful boundaries: recognizing that some intellectual struggles, though inefficient, are essential to cognitive development. The goal should be a symbiotic relationship where AI handles what it does best (information retrieval and pattern recognition) while humans focus on what they do best (contextual understanding and value judgment).

5.2 Constructing a Framework for Responsible Innovation

Translating these philosophical principles into practice demands concrete institutional reforms. Foremost among these is the development of comprehensive AI literacy curricula that equip both students and faculty to engage with these tools as critical users rather than passive consumers. Such programs should extend beyond technical proficiency to examine the epistemological foundations of AI, its training data limitations, inherent biases, and commercial influences. Students might analyze cases where AI systems failed spectacularly, not to dismiss the technology but to understand its failure modes. Faculty development programs could incorporate workshops on detecting AI-generated work while also exploring pedagogically sound applications.

Assessment methodologies require particularly urgent reinvention. The traditional term paper, vulnerable to AI substitution, might be supplemented or replaced by iterative portfolio assessments that document a student's intellectual journey. Oral examinations, where learners must defend and expand upon their ideas in real-time, offer another AI-resistant alternative that additionally cultivates valuable communication skills. Some disciplines might adopt "adversarial learning" exercises where students critique and improve AI-generated content, turning the technology into a foil for developing analytical abilities rather than a shortcut.

At the institutional level, universities must negotiate their relationship with AI developers from a position of strength rather than dependence, aligning with the concept of *Critical AI Literacy* discussed by Baldi (8). This could involve forming consortia to commission custom educational AI tools designed with pedagogical rather than commercial priorities. Open-source alternatives developed specifically for academic needs might provide transparency currently lacking in proprietary systems. Accreditation bodies could establish standards for "education-safe" AI that prioritizes factual accuracy over engagement metrics.

Ultimately, the future of academia in the AI age hinges on its ability to articulate and defend the unique value of human education. This will require moving beyond defensive postures about cheating prevention to proactive visions of what human minds can achieve when augmented—but not replaced—by artificial intelligence. The institutions that thrive will be those that harness AI's capabilities while deepening their commitment to fostering the intellectual independence, ethical reasoning, and creative problem-solving that remain humanity's exclusive domain. In this sense, the AI revolution could ultimately reinforce, rather than erode, the highest ideals of higher education, provided academia has the courage to reimagine itself for a new era.

6. Conclusion: Preserving the Human Essence of Learning in the AI Age

The integration of artificial intelligence into academia represents not merely a technological shift, but a profound test of higher education's values and vision. As universities navigate this transformation, they confront a fundamental question: will they allow AI to redefine the very nature of learning, or will they harness these tools to enhance and amplify the distinctly human dimensions of intellectual growth? The answer will determine whether the future of academia becomes one of enriched possibility or diminished purpose.

AI's presence in education is inevitable. Its capacity to process information, generate content, and identify patterns ensures its continued adoption across campuses worldwide. Yet this inevitability does not dictate uniformity of impact. The consequences of AI integration will vary dramatically depending on the choices made by educators, administrators, and policymakers. One path leads toward the automation of intellectual labor, where efficiency gains come at the expense of cognitive depth. Another promises a renaissance of human potential, where machines handle routine tasks while humans focus on higher-order thinking, creativity, and ethical discernment.

At stake is the preservation of what might be called the "pedagogy of struggle", the recognition that true learning emerges not from the effortless acquisition of information, but from the intellectually demanding process of questioning, analyzing, and constructing understanding. This struggle, often messy and frustrating, represents not an obstacle to be circumvented through AI shortcuts, but the essential crucible in which critical thinking and original insight are forged. The danger lies not in students using AI, but in allowing these tools to insulate them from the productive discomfort that drives intellectual maturation.

The way forward requires reasserting the irreplaceable value of human oversight in education. AI systems, for all their sophistication, lack the capacity for contextual judgment, ethical reflection, or genuine creativity that defines the highest forms of intellectual endeavor. The

classroom of the future must become a space where human and artificial intelligence collaborate, but not compete, with each playing to their distinctive strengths. This means designing assessments that value process over product, cultivating AI literacy alongside traditional scholarly skills, and creating institutional policies that encourage thoughtful rather than reflexive use of emerging technologies.

Ultimately, the challenge posed by AI may prove salutary for academia. By forcing a reckoning with what truly matters in education, these technologies provide an opportunity to reaffirm first principles. The universities that thrive will be those that articulate a compelling vision of human learning that no algorithm can replicate: one centered on curiosity, wisdom, and the lifelong cultivation of judgment. In this future, AI becomes not a threat to genuine education, but the mirror that reflects and reminds us of its enduring human essence. The choice between adaptation and decline comes down to whether we have the wisdom to use these powerful tools without becoming tools ourselves.

Author contributions

Ideas, concepts, arguments, bibliography, and original draft provided by the author. DeepSeek R1 nicely re-ordered the words composing the text.

References

1. Kelly, S.M.; Teachers are using AI to grade essays. But some experts are raising ethical concerns. *CNN Business.* 2024.04.06. Available online (access 2025-06-29): https://edition.cnn.com/2024/04/06/tech/teachers-grading-ai
2. Kwon, D.; Is it OK for AI to write science papers? Nature survey shows researchers are split. *Nature – News Feature.* 2025.05.14. Available online (access 2025-06-29): https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-025-01463-8
3. Hammond, K.; The AI Summarization Dilemma: When Good Enough Isn't Enough. *Center for Advancing Safety of Machine Intelligence.* 2024.08.27. Available online (access 2025-06-29): https://casmi.northwestern.edu/news/articles/2024/the-ai-summarization-dilemma-when-good-enough-isnt-enough.html
4. Singer, N.; Welcome to Campus. Here's Your ChatGPT. OpenAI, the firm that helped spark chatbot cheating, wants to embed A.I. in every facet of college. *The New York Times.* 2025.06.07. Available online (access 2025-06-29): https://www.nytimes.com/2025/06/07/technology/chatgpt-openai-colleges.html
5. Donadel, A.; These schools are pioneering AI in student recruitment. *University Business.* 2025.03.12. Available online (access 2025-06-29): https://universitybusiness.com/these-schools-are-pioneering-ai-in-student-recruitment/

6. Goodier, M.; Revealed: Thousands of UK university students caught cheating using AI. *The Guardian.* 2025.06.15. Available online (access 2025-06-29): https://www.theguardian.com/education/2025/jun/15/thousands-of-uk-university-students-caught-cheating-using-ai-artificial-intelligence-survey
7. Vicari, R.M.; Influências das Tecnologias da Inteligência Artificial no ensino. *Estudos Avançados.* 35 (101). 2021. Available online (access 2025-06-29): https://revistas.usp.br/eav/article/view/185034/171215
8. Baldi, V.; Inteligência aumentada, a nossa. *Observador.* 2025-06-05. Available online (access 2025-06-29): https://observador.pt/opiniao/inteligencia-aumentada-a-nossa/
9. Dignum, V.; Responsible Artificial Intelligence: How to Develop and Use AI in a Responsible Way (Artificial Intelligence: Foundations, Theory, and Algorithms). *Springer.* 2019.
10. Johnson, S.; Hyland-Wood, D.; A Primer on Large Language Models and their Limitations. *Qeios.* 2025-01-09. Available online (access 2025-06-29): https://www.researchgate.net/publication/387888205_A_Primer_on_Large_Language_Models_and_their_Limitations
11. Vaswani, A.; Shazeer, N.; Parmar, N.; Uszkoreit, J.; Jones, L.; Gomez, A.N.; Kaiser, L.; Polosukhin, I.; Attention Is All You Need. 31st Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems. 2017. Available online (access 2025-06-29): http://arxiv.org/abs/170 6.03762
12. McInerney, T.; The Algorithmic Construction of Epistemic Injustice. Socio-Legal Studies of Epistemic Injustice and Spaces and Places. 2024-10-14. Available online (access 2025-06-29): https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=5172655