

Original Research

Received 27 May 2026

Revised 28 June 2026

Accepted 12 July 2026

Natural Resources for Human
Health 2026, Vol.6(12s):1168–1177

KEYWORDS:

generative AI, academic
communication, lecturer-students

Lecturer-Student Academic Communication Gaps in the use of Generative AI

Ngabiyanto¹, Asep Purwo Yudi Utomo², Didi Pramono³, Rosi
Galih Kesuma⁴, Riri Kumalasari⁵, Amilia Buana Dewi Islamy⁶

¹ Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

² Faculty of Languages and Arts, Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

³ Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

⁴ Faculty of Education and Psychology, Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

⁵ Faculty of Languages and Arts, Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

⁶ Faculty of Languages and Arts, Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

ABSTRACT: The use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI) in academic writing has expanded rapidly in higher education; however, open communication between lecturers and students regarding its use remains underdeveloped. This article aims to examine the academic communication gap between lecturers and students in the use of GAI for scientific writing at Universitas Negeri Semarang. The study employed a mixed-methods approach with an explanatory sequential design. Quantitative data were collected through questionnaires involving 40 lecturers and 60 students, and were further enriched through observation, interviews, and focus group discussions. The findings indicate that academic interaction related to GAI is still at an early stage. As many as 60% of students admitted that they were reluctant to disclose their use of GAI to their supervisors, while only 25% of lecturers reported having openly discussed the issue with students. At the same time, lecturers who were more open to GAI tended to foster more productive academic interactions, whereas restrictive attitudes encouraged students to use GAI covertly without adequate ethical and methodological guidance. The study also found generational differences in perception: senior lecturers tended to be more cautious, while younger lecturers were more open and more approachable to students. This article argues that the academic communication gap surrounding GAI use should be addressed through policy socialization, open academic forums, and the integration of AI literacy into the curriculum so that GAI can be used ethically, transparently, and responsibly.

1. INTRODUCTION

Twenty-first-century In recent years, the rapid development of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI) has fundamentally transformed the landscape of higher education. Recent literature suggests that GAI is not simply understood as a supplementary digital learning tool, but rather as a transformative force influencing learning, assessment, research, and academic knowledge production more broadly (Alier et al., 2024; Bozkurt, 2023; Chen et al., 2020; Fern, 2024).

Higher education is currently facing a new reality where systems based on large language models are able to directly participate in academic processes previously thought to be fully dependent on human intellectual ability. Therefore, academic writing is one of the most impacted areas, as GAI offers direct support in the process of designing, compiling, revising, and enhancing academic texts. As a result, the discourse surrounding GAI in universities revolves not only around the question of whether to use this technology, but rather how it should be understood, directed, and responsibly integrated into academic activities.

The primary appeal of GAI lies in its ability to improve efficiency in scientific writing practices. Various studies show that lecturers and students utilize GAI to assist them with brainstorming, outlining, correcting grammar, writing or revising abstracts,

paraphrasing, summarizing texts, and proofreading (Chan & Hu, 2023; Fatoni et al., 2024; Li et al., 2025; Liu et al., 2024). This technology is also seen as capable of supporting the development of academic communication skills, particularly in aspects of writing, grammar, vocabulary, and readability (Liu et al., 2024). In fact, in certain groups, GAI can open up opportunities for greater inclusivity by assisting students who struggle to organize ideas, express ideas, or design academic writing (Zhao et al., 2026). Therefore, GAI is believed to offer practical benefits such as accelerating the writing process, reducing linguistic barriers, and providing technical support that can help students or beginning writers who are not yet fully established in the scientific writing tradition to increase their confidence.

However, the benefits of using GAI come with complex ethical and academic issues. Several studies have shown that the use of GAI also poses serious risks related to academic integrity, information reliability, plagiarism, over-reliance, decreased originality, and the blurring of boundaries regarding human contributions to scientific work (De Fine Licht, 2024; Gonsalves, 2025; Huh, 2023; Plecerda, 2024). Students may perceive GAI as a highly functional tool, but at the same time, they are aware that this technology can encourage academic dishonesty, weaken intellectual independence, and obscure author accountability (Plecerda, 2024). GAI also raises questions about the validity of information because the system can produce text that appears convincing but is very likely to contain factual errors, bias, or even fictitious references. The main issue in utilizing GAI for scientific writing is not merely about technical efficiency, but how to ensure that this efficiency is not paid for by decreasing academic integrity, transparency, and the epistemic quality of scientific work.

In this situation, the issues that arise are no longer merely technological, but also communicative and relational. GAI presents challenges in how lecturers and students understand, discuss, accept, reject, conceal, or negotiate the use of GAI in academic writing practices. Research by Pertricini et al. (2025) shows that lecturers' communication regarding suspected GAI misuse in academic settings is still dominated by a rule-based and punitive approach, even though a communicative, educational, and trust-based approach has more potential to build healthy academic integrity. On the other hand, these studies emphasize the importance of institutional guidelines that not only regulate prohibitions but also foster openness, AI literacy, and shared responsibility in the use of this technology (Capano et al., 2025; Symeou et al., 2025). In other words, the issue of GAI in higher education cannot be resolved solely with formal policies or technical oversight; it also requires academic communication that allows lecturers and students to share an understanding of the ethical boundaries, pedagogical functions, and intellectual responsibility in its use.

The need for more mature academic communication in the use of GAI is becoming increasingly relevant in the context of higher education in Indonesia. Furthermore, the use of GAI has been evident in the academic activities of lecturers and students, including in assignment writing, publications, and learning activities. Meanwhile, institutional policies and communications regarding the limits, procedures, and ethics of its use have not yet fully developed simultaneously. National guidelines on the use of GAI in higher education emphasize the need for proportional, responsible, and ethical use of GAI, while still addressing the need for more contextual implementation at the institutional level, which is still very large (Directorate of Learning and Student Affairs, Directorate General of Higher Education, 2024). This aligns with findings on lecturer and student perceptions in various international contexts, which indicate that technology adoption is progressing faster than pedagogical readiness, institutional policies, and ethics (Baidoo-Anu et al., 2024; Fawaz et al., 2025; Perezchica-Vega et al., 2024). Therefore, the current challenge for campuses is not only to provide access to technology, but also to build a clear policy communication system so that GAI is not used in a normative gray area.

In this study, preliminary studies indicated that these symptoms were also evident. As many as 72% of students had never heard about institutional regulations regarding the use of AI. This indicates weak communication regarding policies at the campus level. Furthermore, there was a fundamental difference in perception between lecturers, who tended to emphasize verification, academic responsibility, and ethics, and students who viewed AI more as a practical tool to speed up academic work. This was indicated by low engagement in open discussions about AI use, limited ethical guidance from lecturers, and a tendency for students to feel more comfortable consulting with younger lecturers. Preliminary findings in this study also indicated that only 25% of lecturers and 30% of students had participated in open discussions about AI use, while 60% of students concealed their use, 37.5% of lecturers provided ethical guidance, 66.6% of students felt more comfortable asking younger lecturers, and only 20% of both groups had participated in formal forums related to AI.

It is important to note that this preliminary data is not intended to be a presentation of primary findings, but rather a strong indicator that the issues faced extend beyond technology adoption to include communication gaps, perception gaps, and

academic guidance gaps. This situation is also closely related to the unequal distribution of digital literacy and AI ethics literacy in higher education (Mardiana, 2024; Nassar & Khattab, 2024; Rui & Attan, 2024; Tan, 2024).

While the study of GAI in higher education is growing rapidly, significant research gaps remain. Previous research has broadly focused on the effectiveness of use, technological benefits, academic productivity, student perceptions, lecturers' perceptions, or general ethical and policy issues (Baidoo-Anu et al., 2024; Jin et al., 2025; Li et al., 2025; Pérezchica-Vega et al., 2024; Saúde et al., 2024). These studies are crucial, but they have not yet focused on the relational and communicative dimensions between lecturers and students in the use of GAI for academic writing. The lecturer-student relationship significantly determines how technology is used: whether in a guided, ethical, and reflective manner, or in a hidden, pragmatic, and risky manner. Even in normative debates about restricting or banning the use of GAI, communication remains a crucial element, as policies will only be effective if accompanied by clarity of meaning, transparency, and a space for academic dialogue (De Fine Licht, 2024). Therefore, dedicated and serious research is needed on how academic communication shapes the practice of GAI use, not just on the technology or regulations.

Based on this gap, this study has a novel focus, specifically placing the academic communication gap as a core issue that bridges issues of technology, ethics, scientific supervision, and higher education governance. This article is not limited to discussing the use of AI or AI policies on campus in general, but analyzes how the communication gap between lecturers and students shapes patterns of openness, resistance, concealment, and the quality of guidance in scientific writing. Thus, this article is relevant to the broader discourse on AI literacy, academic supervision, digital ethics, and higher education governance (Capano et al., 2025; Jin et al., 2025; Petricini et al., 2025; Symeou et al., 2025).

Therefore, this study was conducted with the aim of analyzing the forms of academic communication gaps between lecturers and students in the use of AI for scientific writing, explaining the underlying factors, and interpreting the implications for academic guidance, AI literacy, and institutional policies in higher education. The results of this study are expected to provide an empirical basis for the development of academic dialogue forums, guidelines for the use of AI, and strategies for integrating AI literacy that are more ethical, transparent, and responsible.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study employs a mixed methods approach with an explanatory sequential design. This means the research process begins with the collection and processing of quantitative data, followed by qualitative data to clarify, interpret, and deepen the results from the initial stage. This design was chosen based on the research objective, which not only aimed to observe the trend of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI) use in scientific writing but also to further explore the gap in academic communication between lecturers and students. In the initial stage, quantitative data was used to map a general overview of communication patterns, levels of openness, and perceptions of GAI use. Subsequently, the qualitative stage played a role in explaining the reasons behind the emergence of these patterns in daily academic practice. Thus, qualitative data does not stand alone but rather serves as an explanation that enriches the quantitative findings, as is the main characteristic of the explanatory sequential design (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018; Ivankova et al., 2006). This kind of approach is also widely used in recent research on GAI in higher education, especially to link technology use patterns with participants' experiences, meanings, and interaction contexts (Alghamdi, 2025; Liu et al., 2024; Zhou et al., 2025).

This research was conducted at Universitas Negeri Semarang (UNNES), Indonesia, as an institutional setting to examine practices and communication patterns related to the use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI) in scientific writing within an academic environment. Participants in the quantitative phase included 40 lecturers and 60 students involved in scientific writing, publication, and publication-related mentoring activities. These two groups were selected because they represent the two main parties that interact directly in the academic context, particularly in the use of GAI. In this article, the data were compiled through a harmonization process from the parent research. Although the initial study design focused primarily on a sample of lecturers, the analysis in this article was expanded to include students as a comparison, allowing for more concrete observation of communication patterns between lecturers and students. Thus, this article utilizes datasets from the broader project, but specifically focuses on the interactions of the two groups in the use of GAI. For the lecturer subgroup, the sample size in the parent study was determined from a population of 1,222 lecturers spread across nine faculties and one graduate school, using the Isaac and Michael formula at a 5% margin of error. However, in the context of this article, the primary focus is not on statistical generalization efforts, but rather on the analytical strengths that emerge from the involvement of both

groups of participants. This approach aligns with the characteristics of mixed methods, which allow for the integration of multiple groups to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon being studied (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Sugiyono, 2018).

Data collection in this study took place through several stages. In the quantitative stage, data were obtained using a questionnaire or survey aimed at capturing an initial overview of GAI utilization patterns, levels of openness in communication, experiences with academic discussions, views on the use of GAI in scientific writing, and associated ethical tendencies. The survey instrument was designed based on the study's focus and then validated by a team of experts before being used in the field. After the initial patterns of quantitative data were identified, the study proceeded to the qualitative stage. At this stage, data were collected through observation, semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions (FGDs), and document analysis. Observations were used to directly observe how GAI is used in academic practice. Meanwhile, interviews and FGDs were conducted to explore participants' experiences, uncover differences in perspectives, levels of openness and resistance, and examine the ethical implications of GAI use in relationships between lecturers and students. Document analysis was used to understand the institutional context, including policies, procedures, and various academic texts related to the use of GAI. The use of various data collection techniques was intended to provide a more comprehensive picture and not rely only on respondents' statements. In addition, the combination of surveys, interviews, and document analysis is also in line with mixed methods research practices, particularly in GAI studies, which combine quantitative data mapping with in-depth explanations of participants' experiences and practices (Alghamdi, 2025; Liu et al., 2024; Zhou et al., 2025).

Data analysis in this study was conducted in stages, but remained interconnected between the stages. In the quantitative section, data were processed using univariate descriptive analysis to examine the distribution of responses, usage tendencies, and proportions of responses from each participant group. The results of this stage were primarily used to identify initial patterns related to the communication gap, such as the level of openness in discussing GAI, the tendency to not disclose its use, students' preference for younger lecturers during consultations, and their experience attending formal forums discussing AI. Meanwhile, the qualitative data were analyzed using an interactive model by Matthew B. Miles, A. Michael Huberman, and Johnny Saldaña, which encompasses the stages of data collection, data condensation, data presentation, and drawing and verifying conclusions (Miles et al., 2014). Through this approach, the analysis was directed at understanding the reasons behind the communication gap, how differences in perspectives between generations are formed, and how lecturer attitudes, both open and restrictive, influence student behavior in utilizing GAI. Within the explanatory sequential framework, the qualitative stage serves to provide explanation and context for the quantitative findings. Thus, the discussion in this article does not only stop at explaining the patterns, but also attempts to reveal the social and academic dynamics behind the emergence of these patterns (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018; Ivankova et al., 2006).

The validity and strength of interpretation in this study were maintained through the application of triangulation, both in terms of sources and methods. Source triangulation was conducted by comparing information obtained from lecturers and students, and, if necessary, involving other informants within the scientific writing ecosystem. Meanwhile, method triangulation was achieved by comparing findings from questionnaires, observations, interviews, focus group discussions (FGDs), and document analysis to ensure alignment between the data. This approach is crucial for strengthening the level of trustworthiness, consistency, and clarity of interpretation of the research results, particularly because the phenomena studied relate simultaneously to aspects of perception, behavior, and institutional context (Carter et al., 2014; Patton, 1999). Furthermore, this study also paid attention to research ethics. The identities of participants were kept confidential, the data obtained were used only for academic purposes, and the results were presented in aggregate form to avoid harming any particular individual or institution. Thus, the application of a mixed methods design combined with triangulation enabled this study not only to demonstrate the extent of the academic communication gap but also to explain the processes and reasons behind its formation in scientific writing practices in higher education.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Early-stage Academic Interaction on GAI

The use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI) at Universitas Negeri Semarang is still in its early stages and has not yet developed into an open academic culture. Meanwhile, access to GAI has spread widely among both lecturers and students. However, transparency regarding how, when, and to what extent GAI can be used in scientific writing remains largely

undiscussed. Based on this perspective, this research focuses not only on the adoption of GAI technology in academia, but also on the communication gaps between stakeholders, perceptions, and academic support needed for the use of GAI in scientific writing. This study was conducted using a mixed methods approach. Quantitative data mapped general patterns of communication that were not yet established, while qualitative data obtained through focus group discussions and observations described the socio-academic context that contributed to the persistence of these patterns.

Table 7. Academic Interaction Patterns Using Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI)

Indicator	Lecturer	Student
Have participated in open discussions about the use of GAI	25%	30%
Concealed the use of GAI to lecturers	-	60%
Provided ethical guidance regarding the use of GAI	37,5%	-
Feel more comfortable asking questions of junior lecturers	-	66,6%
Have participated in official forums related to GAI	20%	20%

The table above shows that academic communication about the use of GAI in higher education institutions has not yet become an open institutional practice. Twenty-five percent of lecturers and 30 percent of students have engaged in open discussions about GAI use. On the other hand, 60 percent of students stated that they concealed their GAI use from their lecturers. Based on this data, it can be concluded that the use of GAI in higher education is still in the area known as silent adoption, a condition where technology has been widely utilized by users, but is not accompanied by established academic openness. The data above shows a low level of participation (only 20%) among both lecturers and students in official forums discussing the use of GAI in the academic field. This fact is in line with the results of research by Rudra et al. (2025), which explains that higher education still faces institutional support issues and the absence of policy formulation that accommodates it even though GAI use is widespread. This is also supported by the findings of Gonsalves (2025) who emphasized that there is ambiguity in scientific writing guidelines and the weak tradition of openness can make students unwilling to declare the use of GAI and have an impact on weak academic transparency.

The quantitative data above requires a deeper interpretation, not just numbers. However, the data demonstrates a clear cultural lag between the massive development of GAI technology and an academic communication culture that has yet to keep pace. Based on the discussion above, universities today must not only strictly regulate the use of GAI in their academic guidelines but also create a more open/transparent academic climate so that its use can be systematically guided by lecturers.

3.2 Hidden Use and the Communication Gap

Focus group discussions and observations conducted in this study indicate differences in the patterns of GAI use between lecturers and students. These differences lie in technical, academic, and social perspectives. Technically, students tend to use GAI more intensively and pragmatically, including for coursework, paraphrasing, summarizing, proofreading, and other coursework. In contrast, lecturers tend to use GAI more systematically, planned, and reflectively. These activities include drafting article outlines, refining abstracts, and improving academic language. These two aspects demonstrate differences in academic positions and usage orientations. Students are more focused on completing assignments and completing them efficiently, while lecturers are more focused on academic quality, accuracy, and scientific writing principles. This is in line with the study by Liu et al. (2024), which explains that students perceive GAI as very useful for composing scientific papers, adjusting grammar, and developing sentences. However, on the other hand, GAI is also considered to weaken students' critical thinking skills and creativity. This view is also supported by Li et al. (2025) who argued that the strong reason that encourages students to use GAI is the convenience and practicality provided by GAI.

This difference in orientation toward GAI use between lecturers and students further impacts open communication patterns. Students' use of GAI to facilitate coursework is considered normal and therefore unnecessary in academic forums. Conversely, lecturers are more aware of the risks of GAI use without academic ethics. GAI use must consider the level of readability, source credibility, and intellectual responsibility of the work written by the lecturer. These two characteristics indicate a verification gap: lecturers are more disciplined in verifying GAI results, while students tend not to conduct in-depth verification of GAI

results. Therefore, there needs to be academic openness between lecturers and students to communicate the use of GAI more wisely. In this regard, students need to receive more in-depth guidance so that GAI use places more emphasis on verifying results in line with academic ethics.

We recognize that the use of GAI is still carried out secretly. Students conceal their use of GAI because there are no academic guidelines that regulate, and not all of them intend to violate academic ethics. Students are in a position of anomie, whether the use of GAI can be accepted by lecturers, or suspected and constitutes an act of academic fraud. Lecturers also sometimes choose to remain silent, not necessarily agreeing, but rather lacking a clear legal basis for communicating it to students. The use of GAI in the current context is no longer a technical issue, but has become a matter of transparency in communication regarding the use of GAI in the academic realm.

3.3 Generational Differences in Lecturer–Student Communication

The gap in communication transparency between lecturers and students is further intensified by differences in communication patterns between generations: senior lecturers, junior lecturers, and students. Senior lecturers are cautious about discussing the use of GAI, fearing that it will be used irresponsibly, become a shortcut for students in completing assignments, and result in unoriginal work. On the contrary, junior lecturers are more open to the emergence of new GAI technologies. They believe GAI can increase work productivity as long as it remains within the bounds of academic ethics. This open-mindedness of junior lecturers toward GAI is what makes 66.6% of students feel more comfortable consulting with junior lecturers about academic matters. This is not merely due to age, but rather to the characteristics of junior lecturers who are more literate in technology and digital developments and are more open to open discussions.

This condition is referred to as a manifestation of the generational communication gap, namely differences in perspectives on the latest technological developments, which have implications for the quality of academic communication between generations. In the context of GAI use, students will assume that lecturers will easily suspect that their work is the result of GAI, they choose to remain silent. Conversely, lecturers believe that students ideally already know the limits of GAI use. On the other hand, it is also very possible that lecturers choose to ignore it because bringing it up would result in additional assignments. This paradox is what makes ethical verification of GAI use never realized on campus. It can be concluded that the main problem lies not in agreement or disagreement, but rather the lack of a shared understanding among senior lecturers, junior lecturers, and students about the function, limits, and methods of GAI use in scientific writing.

Petricini et al. (2025) explain that lecturers' use of GAI tends to be based on rules, sanctions, and trust. Lecturers who strictly use rules and sanctions will lead to students being more defensive. Students tend to be more closed in their use of GAI. On the other hand, when lecturers use a more educational and collaborative approach, communication regarding GAI use will be more open. Lecturers will even become mentors, guiding students in the use of GAI in line with academic ethics. Students need intensive guidance to be able to use GAI ethically and productively. It can be concluded that the personal preferences of each generation are not the only root of the problem, but this issue needs to be interpreted as a lack of responsiveness of higher education institutions in bridging intergenerational dialogue to achieve consistent GAI literacy.

3.4 Consequences for Supervision and Academic Integrity

This gap in communication transparency regarding the use of GAI has quite serious consequences. Lecturers who are more open to the use of GAI tend to be more successful in increasing their productivity. Students can become partners with lecturers, providing guidance and mentoring in designing and compiling scientific papers, including improving grammar, paraphrasing, and final proofreading. This aims to ensure that the use of GAI adheres to academic ethics. This has implications for a more effective and efficient mentoring and guidance process. On the one hand, lecturers can maintain academic dignity, while on the other hand, students have broader learning opportunities to integrate GAI technology more responsibly and ethically.

Increasingly negative consequences occur if lecturers are restrictive and do not open communication channels with students regarding the use of GAI. This will result in the use of GAI in a closed manner and without clear direction. Furthermore, this pattern will reduce academic quality in higher education because there is no guidance to verify, reflect, and validate the work produced. Major risks faced include concealed plagiarism and the use of false references, overly general writing, and a decline in students' intellectual quality. The absence of academic guidelines governing the use of GAI and fear of sanctions imposed by lecturers lead students to conceal their use of GAI in completing course assignments (Gosalves, 2025). Plecerda (2024) also explains that while students are aware of the many benefits of GAI, they are also concerned about the consequences, such as

doubts about the authenticity of their work and the integrity of academic ethics. In this regard, lecturers' transparency regarding the use of GAI is crucial in minimizing the risk of declining academic quality in higher education.

Based on the discussion above, there is a very clear relationship between the results of quantitative and qualitative research. Quantitative data demonstrates the pattern, while qualitative data explains how two patterns of lecturer attitudes, open and restrictive, have implications for daily learning practices. Therefore, supervisory asymmetry in the use of GAI is not only a matter of differences in authority, but also a matter of differences in communication skills between lecturers and students. As long as academic activities in higher education fail to open up a transparent discussion about the use of GAI, the direction of GAI use will remain in a grey area. Yet, we have all seen that GAI technology has become an integral part of academic activities in higher education.

3.5 Implications for AI Literacy and Institutional Governance

Theoretically, the use of GAI in higher education should not only be regulated through academic guidelines and technological restrictions. GAI use also requires the creation of a transparent and accountable academic culture and climate. Numerous previous studies have examined GAI, focusing on its benefits, ethical use, university policies, and associated risks (Bozkurt, 2023; Daniel et al., 2025; Jin et al., 2025; Symeou et al., 2025). These studies still have a significant gap, but one that is not widely discussed. This gap concerns communication patterns and relationships between lecturers and students regarding the use of GAI. The term "communication-based governance gap" appropriately describes this situation: a situation where a new policy is formulated or academic guidelines already exist governing the use of GAI, but it is not yet understood and has not yet become the foundation for building transparent communication patterns in daily academic activities.

The results of this study also show that gaps in communication patterns are the root cause of several issues, including gaps in digital literacy, differences in intergenerational perspectives on the use of GAI in higher education, the lack of institutionalization of academic rules or guidelines, and dialogue forums on GAI that have not become commonplace in higher education. In fact, communication patterns, academic integrity, literacy about GAI, and responsibility must be positioned as primary transversal competencies in efforts to integrate GAI in higher education (Deroncele-Acosta et al., 2025). This is reinforced by Symeou et al. (2025) who stated that transparent communication patterns and academic responsibility must be the main pillars in the integration of GAI into academic activities in higher education. To support this, students must receive training and guidance in the use of GAI so that their use is within permitted limits and in line with academic ethics. Thus, the results of this study reinforce the opinion that effective GAI governance does not stop at regulations, but must be translated into transparent communication patterns, training, and concrete mentoring practices.

The practical implications are clear and must be implemented immediately. First, universities need to develop open dialogue forums on the use of GAI. These forums could take the form of workshops, manuscript clinics, or academic discussions between lecturers and students. This is based on quantitative data showing that only 20% of students have ever participated in a forum on GAI use. Second, universities need to conduct extensive and explicit policy dissemination on the use of GAI in learning, completing coursework, and preparing articles for scientific publication. Third, efforts are needed to improve AI literacy among lecturers and students. Fourth, lecturers' orientation regarding the use of GAI should not be directed towards prohibition, but rather towards developing student competencies in using GAI critically, transparently, and responsibly in accordance with academic ethics. In this context, AI literacy should encompass technical skills in using tools, assessing reliability, disclosing use, maintaining originality, and understanding its ethical implications (Crabtree, 2025; Havelka et al., 2025; Rudra et al., 2025).

Based on the discussion above, the results of this study confirm that discussions about GAI are not only about current technological issues, but also concern the issue of academic relations between lecturers and students. Without open communication, the use of GAI will remain in a grey area that is prone to increase the ethical ambiguity, silent use, and supervisory asymmetry. On the contrary, when academic communication is built healthily, GAI can be positioned as a productive academic tool without sacrificing scientific integrity. Therefore, the main challenge for universities in the AI era is not only to regulate tools, but also to build a communication culture that allows these tools to be used responsibly and in accordance with academic ethics.

4. CONCLUSION

The results of this study indicate that the use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI) in higher education is not only related to technology acceptance, but also to a gap in academic communication between lecturers and students. These findings reveal

a clear gap between the increasingly widespread use of GAI in scientific writing and the still limited openness in academic communication. Open discussions about GAI are still rare, while many students choose not to disclose their use. Furthermore, guidance regarding ethical aspects from lecturers has not been consistently conveyed, and interactions related to GAI have not yet developed into a strong academic culture. In such situations, the practice of using GAI in scientific writing is more influenced by communication gaps, unclear ethical aspects, and inequalities in mentoring relationships, rather than being based on shared understanding and open academic practices.

This article primary contribution lies in its emphasis on the communicative and relational aspects of AI use, which have received relatively little attention compared to studies that focus more on the technology benefits, ethical risks, or general institutional policies. This research demonstrates that how GAI is used in academic settings is significantly influenced by the quality of the relationship between lecturers and students. When communication is open, GAI use tends to be more reflective, consider ethical aspects, and follow clear guidelines. On the contrary, when communication tends to be closed or overly restrictive, GAI use is often hidden, purely practical, and potentially poses academic risks. In this context, this article emphasizes that academic communication plays a crucial role in linking the adoption of AI technology, ethical use practices, and the effectiveness of the advising process in higher education. Thus, these findings broaden perspectives on GAI governance. Regulating AI use cannot simply rely on formal rules or written prohibitions; it also needs to be supported by a culture of open and healthy academic communication.

Practically, the findings of this study indicate that universities need to provide more open discussion spaces, develop more targeted guidelines for AI use, and incorporate AI literacy into their curricula and scientific guidance practices. In this regard, lecturers should not only act as supervisors or limiters, but also as mentors who can guide students to use AI critically, openly, and responsibly. Furthermore, strengthening AI literacy needs to be directed at both parties: students as users who often have practical roles, and lecturers as those with academic authority and ethical responsibility. With this approach, the future of ethical AI use in universities will be largely determined by the institution's ability to transform previously hidden usage practices into more guided and transparent academic activities. Ultimately, sound academic communication is a crucial foundation for utilizing AI as a supporting tool in scientific writing without compromising academic integrity.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest or potential biases that could compromise the integrity of the findings presented in this study. All data analyzed in this research was retrieved from publicly available records in the Scopus database.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Ngabiyanto: Conceptualization, Investigation.

Asep Purwo Yudi Utomo, Didi Pramono: Methodology, Laboratory Analysis.

Didi Pramono, Riri Kumalasari: Data Curation, Formal Analysis.

Amelia Buana Dewi Islamy: Supervision, Writing, Review & Editing.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

ETHICS STATEMENT

Ethical approval was not required for this study.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Data supporting the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

REFERENCES

- [1] Alba, C., Mcilwain, C., & An, R. (2026). ChatGPT on campus: How top U.S. universities govern generative AI across higher education. *Policy Reviews in Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23322969.2026.2622674>
- [2] Alghamdi, A. (2025). Exploring university teachers' typology of language assessment utilizing generative AI and associated argumentation. *Lecture Notes in Educational Technology*, 145–163. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-95-5234-4_15
- [3] Alier, M., García-Peñalvo, F. J., & Camba, J. D. (2024). Generative artificial intelligence in education: From deceptive to disruptive. *International Journal of Interactive Multimedia and Artificial Intelligence*, 8(5).
- [4] Baidoo-Anu, D., Asamoah, D., Amoako, I., & Mahama, I. (2024). Exploring student perspectives on generative artificial intelligence in higher education learning. *Discover Education*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-024-00173-z>
- [5] Bozkurt, A. (2023). Generative AI, ChatGPT, GenAI, education, teaching, higher education, artificial intelligence, AI, educational technology, chatbots, systematic review, conversational agents, bibliometric analysis, LLMs, large language models, natural language processing, generative pre-trained transformer, GPT. *Open Praxis*, 15(4), 261–270. <https://doi.org/10.55982/openpraxis.15.4.609>
- [6] Capano, G., He, A. J., & McMin, S. (2025). Riding the tide of generative artificial intelligence in higher education policy: An Asian perspective. *Journal of Asian Public Policy*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17516234.2025.2450571>
- [7] Carter, N., Bryant-Lukosius, D., DiCenso, A., Blythe, J., & Neville, A. J. (2014). The use of triangulation in qualitative research. *Oncology Nursing Forum*, 41(5), 545–547. <https://doi.org/10.1188/14.ONF.545-547>
- [8] Chan, C. K. Y., & Hu, W. (2023). Students' voices on generative AI: Perceptions, benefits, and challenges in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 20(1).
- [9] Chen, L., Chen, P., & Lin, Z. (2020). Artificial intelligence in education: A review. *IEEE Access*, 8.
- [10] Crabtree, A. (2025). Academic libraries in the age of AI: The importance of information literacy education. *Proceedings of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 62(1), 1411–1413. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pra2.1420>
- [11] Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- [12] Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- [13] Daniel, K., Msambwa, M. M., & Wen, Z. (2025). Can generative AI revolutionise academic skills development in higher education? A systematic literature review. *European Journal of Education*, 60(1). <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.70036>
- [14] De Fine Licht, K. (2024). Generative artificial intelligence in higher education: Why the “banning approach” to student use is sometimes morally justified. *Philosophy & Technology*, 37(3). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-024-00799-9>
- [15] Direktorat Pembelajaran dan Kemahasiswaan Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Tinggi. (2024). *Panduan penggunaan Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) pada pembelajaran di perguruan tinggi*. Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi.
- [16] Fatoni, P., Ferdinand, I., Sajidin, F., Jaja, & Kurnia, M. D. (2024). Pemanfaatan teknologi AI dan Chat GPT dalam penulisan artikel mahasiswa. *Jubah Raja (Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pengajaran)*, 3, 144–149.
- [17] Fawaz, M., El-Malti, W., Alreshidi, S. M., & Kavuran, E. (2025). Exploring health sciences students' perspectives on using generative artificial intelligence in higher education: A qualitative study. *Nursing and Health Sciences*, 27(1). <https://doi.org/10.1111/nhs.70030>
- [18] Fern, J. (2024). A more-than-human ecology: Evolving generative artificial intelligence in higher education. *Education Sciences*, 14(10). <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14101102>
- [19] Gonsalves, C. (2025). Addressing student non-compliance in AI use declarations: Implications for academic integrity and assessment in higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 50(4), 592–606. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2024.2415654>
- [20] Havelka, S., McGuinness, C., & Kerrigan, P. (2025). Students' perceptions and uses of ChatGPT: Implications for teaching AI literacy. *Library Trends*, 73(4), 402–425. <https://doi.org/10.1353/lib.2025.a968489>
- [21] Huh, S. (2023). Ethical consideration of the use of generative artificial intelligence, including ChatGPT in writing a nursing article. *Child Health Nursing Research*, 29.
- [22] Ivankova, N. V., Creswell, J. W., & Stick, S. L. (2006). Using mixed-methods sequential explanatory design: From theory to practice. *Field Methods*, 18(1), 3–20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X05282260>

- [23] Jin, Y., Yan, L., Echeverria, V., Gašević, D., & Martinez-Maldonado, R. (2025). Generative AI in higher education: A global perspective of institutional adoption policies and guidelines. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 8, 100348.
- [24] Li, K. C., Chong, G. H. L., Wong, B. T. M., & Wu, M. M. F. (2025). A TAM-based analysis of Hong Kong undergraduate students' attitudes toward generative AI in higher education and employment. *Education Sciences*, 15(7), Article 798. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15070798>
- [25] Liu, Y., Park, J., & McMinn, S. (2024). Using generative artificial intelligence/ChatGPT for academic communication: Students' perspectives. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 34(4), 1437–1461. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12574>
- [26] Mardiana, H. (2024). Perceived impact of lecturers' digital literacy skills in higher education institutions. *SAGE Open*, 14(3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241256937>
- [27] Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- [28] Nassar, S., & Khattab, S. (2024). The effect of digital literacy on the academic performance of Islamic university students in Gaza during COVID-19. *Studies in Systems, Decision and Control*, 489, 967–978. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-36895-0_81
- [29] Patton, M. Q. (1999). Enhancing the quality and credibility of qualitative analysis. *Health Services Research*, 34(5 Pt. 2), 1189–1208.
- [30] Pérezchica-Vega, J. E., Sepúlveda-Rodríguez, J. A., & Román-Méndez, A. D. (2024). Generative artificial intelligence in higher education: Uses and opinions of teachers. *European Public & Social Innovation Review*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.31637/epsir-2024-593>
- [31] Petricini, T., Zipf, S., & Wu, C. (2025). RESEARCH-AI: Communicating academic honesty: Teacher messages and student perceptions about generative AI. *Frontiers in Communication*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2025.1544430>
- [32] Plecerda, L. P. (2024). Academic integrity surrounding the use of generative AI in higher education: Lenses from ICT college students. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 9(12). <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v9i12.3177>
- [33] Rudra, S., Weber, P., Tillmanns, T., Filho, A. S., Wiersma, E., Dawitz, J., Dudenaité, D., & Reynolds, S. (2025). Use and perception of generative AI in higher education: Insights from the ERASMUS+ project “Teaching and Learning with Artificial Intelligence” (TaLAI). In *International Conference on Computer Supported Education (CSEDU) Proceedings* (pp. 319–330). <https://doi.org/10.5220/0013360200003932>
- [34] Rui, Y., & Attan, S. A. (2024). Factors influencing digital literacy among university students in Beijing, China. *International Journal of Advanced and Applied Sciences*, 11(8), 239–250. <https://doi.org/10.21833/ijaas.2024.08.025>
- [35] Saúde, S., Barros, J. P., & Almeida, I. (2024). Impacts of generative artificial intelligence in higher education: Research trends and students' perceptions. *Social Sciences*, 13(8). <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci13080410>
- [36] Sugiyono. (2018). *Metode penelitian evaluasi: Pendekatan kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan kombinasi*. Alfabeta.
- [37] Symeou, L., Louca, L., Kavadella, A., Mackay, J., Danidou, Y., & Raffay, V. (2025). Development of evidence-based guidelines for the integration of generative AI in university education through a multidisciplinary, consensus-based approach. *European Journal of Dental Education*, 29(2), 285–303. <https://doi.org/10.1111/eje.13069>
- [38] Tan, Y. (2024). A bibliometric analysis of scholarly literature related to digital literacy in higher education during the pandemic period. *Cogent Education*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2024.2341587>
- [39] Zhou, Y., Curle, S., & Zou, J. (2025). Mapping GenAI literacy: Disciplinary differences, latent profiles, and perceptions among EMI undergraduates. *Journal of Information Technology Education: Research*, 24. <https://doi.org/10.28945/5675>
- [40] Zhao, X., Chen, X., & Cox, A. (2026). Exploring the affordances of generative AI in academic writing for students with disabilities: A bottom-up approach to inform GenAI policies. *Policy Futures in Education*, 24(1), 59–81. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14782103251395436>