



Vol. 3 No. 10 (October) (2025)

ChatGPT in Higher Education in Trinidad and Tobago: Perceptions, Practices and Policy Recommendations

Muhammad Abid Malik*

Academic Research Advisor, Shandong Vocational University of Foreign Affairs,
Weihai, People's Republic of China Email: m_abidmalik7@yahoo.com

ORCID: 0000-0002-7676-3034

Steve Carlise Warner

Senior Lecturer, UWI Roytec, Trinidad and Tobago

Email: steve.warner@roytec.edu

ORCID: 0000-0002-2591-0540

ABSTRACT

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) in education is transforming teaching and learning processes across the globe. While global interest in tools like ChatGPT has surged, research in the Caribbean, particularly in Trinidad and Tobago, remains scarce. This study explores the perceptions, usage patterns, and policy awareness surrounding ChatGPT among university educators in Trinidad and Tobago. Using semi-structured interviews with eight university teachers, the findings reveal that ChatGPT has become deeply embedded in academic life, with some participants even referring to it as a "department member." Educators primarily used the tool for research, writing tasks, and professional development. Most expressed positive views and permitted student use, albeit under specific guidelines such as proper attribution and limited reliance. Despite the absence of standardized national or institutional policies, participants adopted individual ethical practices to guide usage. The study concludes with a strong call for a uniform, national-level policy to ensure the ethical and equitable use of AI tools in higher education, warning that policy gaps may widen existing educational disparities and create an AI divide.

Keywords: Artificial intelligence, ChatGPT, higher education, education policy, Trinidad and Tobago,

Introduction

Artificial intelligence (AI)-based chatbots are not a recent invention, as chatbots like Eliza existed decades ago; however, the performance and output of those earlier chatbots were limited by their rule-based systems and narrow domains (Malik & Shah, 2025; Weizenbaum, 1966). The advancements in AI in the last decade, especially the developments of transformer architectures, have brought a paradigm shift in natural language processing (NLP) and AI (Vaswani et al., 2017). Combined with the large amount of data they have been trained on, recent AI-based chatbots like Chat Generative Pre-Trained Transformer (ChatGPT) can perform multiple tasks with unprecedented accuracy and versatility (Malik et al., 2024; Zaremba & Demir, 2023).

ChatGPT, the first widely used AI-based chatbot, was developed and trained by OpenAI with the help of 570 gigabytes of data (Tan et al., 2023). Its abilities to recognize prompts or cues from users and provide immediate, contextually relevant responses have



Vol. 3 No. 10 (October) (2025)

made it a valuable tool in various fields and disciplines, including education (Giray, 2023).

Use of ChatGPT in Education

Although ChatGPT has been used extensively by both teachers and students for various activities and tasks, Malik (2024) said that “it was more commonly used by the students than the teachers” (p. 319).

In education, ChatGPT can be used for various purposes. It can be an effective tool for self-learning and personal development (Abas et al., 2023). Its ability to gather relevant data, manage and arrange it, simplify and summarize difficult concepts, provide contextual responses to different problems and issues, and give real-time feedback makes it an invaluable tool for personal, academic, and professional development (Holmes et al., 2022; Malik et al., 2024).

Teachers use it for lesson planning, creating course outlines, developing different assessment and evaluation activities, finding answers to the questions, and marking and grading different assessment activities; while students employ it for finding answers to the questions and quizzes, identifying key points, summarization, getting feedback for their work, and write ups (Gupta et al., 2023; Lo, 2023; Selwyn, 2021; Sok & Heng, 2023). Furthermore, it can also be employed for language learning (Shaikh et al., 2023), developing critical and creative skills (Shanto et al., 2024), problem-solving, and research purposes (Malik, 2024). Due to its ability to generate human-like text, it is most commonly employed for generating writings for various purposes (Tseng et al., 2023). Both students and teachers utilize it for preparing initial drafts, creating outlines, or even generating partial or entire writing tasks (Malik et al., 2024).

Students and Teachers' Perceptions, Views, and Experiences of ChatGPT

The introduction of ChatGPT in education has elicited mixed reactions from students and teachers. Although many have viewed it positively, there have also been some apprehensions and concerns (Zeb et al., 2024).

Studies have shown that students generally view ChatGPT as a valuable tool that facilitates their academic learning and work (Ngo, 2023). It is also appreciated for its ability to provide instant feedback, clarify doubts, and offer personalized assistance (Abas et al., 2023; Sok & Heng, 2023). However, some expressed concerns about its reliability, accuracy, and over-reliance on it (Malik et al., 2024; Malik & Amjad, 2025; Shidiq, 2023).

Teachers also view it positively as it reduces their workload, improves the quality of work, and assists them in various tasks (Kanwal et al., 2023; Malik, 2024). Their concerns mainly pertain to ethical issues and the degradation of students' cognitive skills due to overreliance on AI-based chatbots (Malik et al., 2024; Shidiq, 2023). Some teachers were concerned that they were not provided with adequate training to use it effectively (Holmes et al., 2021).

Policies and Practices about ChatGPT in Education

Although it has been over three years since ChatGPT was first launched, there is still uncertainty and confusion about policies pertaining to it (Ghimire & Edwards, 2024). Not only are the existing policies quite diverse, but at times even contradictory (Shardlow & Latham, 2023). The irony is that not only do those differences and contradictions exist from country to country, but also for different universities within the same country (Malik et al., 2024). Caulfield (2023) pointed out how different universities



Vol. 3 No. 10 (October) (2025)

in the United Kingdom had different protocols, guidelines, and policies about ChatGPT. Many studies have called for a uniform and standardized policy about ChatGPT and other AI tools, and also given policy recommendations for it (Ghimire & Edwards, 2024; Malik et al., 2024; Raza, 2023; Zeb et al., 2024). However, unlike plagiarism, where most of the universities follow standardized protocols laid down either by standardized conventions (e.g., APA) or national regulatory bodies for higher education, the situation about the use of ChatGPT (and other AI tools) in higher education has remained quite diverse, ambiguous, and confusing (Caulfield, 2023). Even the guidelines within the same country or even the same university vary a great deal (especially for the students)-from a blanket ban to open and unconditional permission; from allowing it to be used in certain parts to empowering the faculty members to decide about it; from turning a blind eye to asking for its proper acknowledgment (Malik et al., 2024). The level of awareness, use, experiences, and observance of publication and research ethics about the use of ChatGPT varies from country to country; it demands baseline studies in every country so that a suitable and pragmatic universal policy may be formulated based on them.

Research Gap and Significance of the Study

The growing influence and impact of ChatGPT in education have attracted studies about it across the world (Abas et al., 2023; Malik, 2024; Ngo, 2023; Sok & Heng, 2023; Zeb et al., 2024). However, ChatGPT in Caribbean countries in general, and Trinidad and Tobago in particular, has largely remained unexplored. It is surprising because the Ministry of Education (MOE) in Trinidad and Tobago has been making constant efforts to incorporate modern technologies into the teaching-learning process (MOE, 2020; Warner et al., 2021). This gap has stimulated us to carry out this study, which not only explores the perceptions and use of ChatGPT among university teachers in Trinidad and Tobago but also investigates the national and institutional policies and the participants' practices and approaches towards students' use of ChatGPT. In this way, this study not only uncovers the situation of ChatGPT in Trinidad and Tobago universities but also gives pragmatic and relevant policy recommendations for its effective and ethical use in the twin island state.

Research Objectives

Based on the broader aims of the study, the following research objectives were developed for university teachers in Trinidad and Tobago.

To explore their perceptions about ChatGPT

To explore the utilization pattern of ChatGPT in universities

To identify the national and institutional policies about ChatGPT

To understand their approaches and practices towards university students' use of ChatGPT

To give policy recommendations for the ethical and responsible use of ChatGPT

Research Methodology

Research Method and Approach

This study employs a qualitative research method, which is more suitable for investigating perceptions and experiences within a specific context (Patton, 2002). Moreover, it is better suited for gathering in-depth and rich data, and when the issue is relatively less explored (Patton, 2002). As ChatGPT in the higher education sector in Trinidad and Tobago is relatively less explored, and we wanted to gather in-depth and rich contextual data, the qualitative research method was employed for this study. Within the qualitative research method, we selected a basic interpretive study approach.



Vol. 3 No. 10 (October) (2025)

Participants of the Study

As the study was about the higher education sector in Trinidad and Tobago, data were collected from university teachers in the country. Participants were selected using purposive sampling. The inclusion criteria consisted of three conditions: must be a university teacher in Trinidad and Tobago, have been working at the university level for at least three years, and have been engaged in research (as a supervisor and/or a researcher). To have a more comprehensive sample, we decided to include both males and females, and have participants from different universities, faculties, and designations to make it more inclusive and representative.

Sample size in qualitative studies is determined by data saturation (Patton, 2002). Data saturation was achieved after the eighth interview; thus, the sample was capped there. Table 1 shows further details about the participants.

Table 1 Participants' Details

#	Pseudonym	Gender	Age	Position	Faculty	University	Have you used ChatGPT?
1	Jada	Female	50-60	Lecturer	Business Studies	1	No
2	Justin	Male	50-60	Lecturer	Computer/IT	1	Yes
3	Ted	Male	40-50	Instructor	Computer/IT	2	Yes
4	Kevin	Male	30-40	Lecturer	Computer/IT	2	Yes
5	Sarah	Female	40-50	Assistant Professor	Education	3	Yes
6	Britney	Female	40-50	Lecturer	Social Sciences	3	Yes
7	Amy	Female	40-50	Senior Instructor	Education	3	No
8	Anna	Female	40-50	Associate Professor	Business Education	1	Yes

Data Collection Tool and Technique

For data collection, we opted for semi-structured interviews as they provide room for further probing, which helps in rich and in-depth data collection (Patton, 2002). For this purpose, an interview guide was developed with six main interview questions. Supplementary questions were asked for further probing. We employed three probing methods: a detail-oriented probe, an elaboration probe, and a clarification probe (Stewart & Shamdasani, 1990).

Content validity was carried out through experts' opinion (Sánchez-Guardiola Paredes et al., 2021). Tentative research topic, research objectives, and the interview guide were sent to three experts in the field of qualitative research. Based on their feedback, minor changes were made in the interview guide.

The second author collected data through one-to-one interviews. As the participants were spread across the country, telephonic and online interviews were preferred. First, text messages were sent to the participants to obtain their consent for interviews and their preferred date and time. Interviews were conducted only after their written consent. The duration of the interviews varied greatly. The shortest one lasted for six minutes, while the longest lasted for twenty-two. Interviews were audio-recorded with the participants'



permission.

Data Analysis Techniques

First of all, audio recordings were transcribed using TurboScribe (an online transcription tool); however, as online transcription tools are not 100% accurate (Hendrick, 2023), we checked every transcription individually to ensure accuracy.

For the qualitative data analysis, various strategies have been proposed by different experts. In this study, we used the model developed by Marshall and Rossman (2006). We went through all the transcriptions to familiarize ourselves with them. Later, the transcriptions were coded, and themes were generated. The final draft contained keywords, themes, and verbatim quotations.

As there were only eight interviews, we did not use any qualitative data analysis software. Instead, it was done manually through MS Word using cut, copy, paste, and highlight functions as suggested by Malik et al. (2020).

Ethical Considerations

All four principles of research ethics (anonymity, confidentiality, voluntary participation, and no harm to the participants) were observed in this study. The participants' involvement was voluntary, and the interviews were conducted only after obtaining informed consent. Instead of using their real names, pseudonyms were used to ensure anonymity. They were told about their right to decline to answer any question. Audio recording and raw data were not shared with anyone to ensure confidentiality. Long verbatim quotations were shown to the participants and included after their permission. As the study was not medical, psychological, or even experimental, no harm was caused to them.

Data Findings and Discussion

Four main themes were generated during the data analysis process. Those themes and subthemes are given in Table 2.

Table 2 Themes and subthemes generated from the data

Main Themes	Subthemes
1. Perceptions of the participants about ChatGPT in higher education	
2. Utilization patterns of ChatGPT	2.i. Utilization by the teachers 2.ii. Utilization by the students
3. National and institutional policies on ChatGPT	3.i. National policies on ChatGPT 3.ii. Institutional policies on ChatGPT
4. Teachers' approaches and practices towards students' use of ChatGPT	4.i. Encouraged to used it without any condition/ regulation 4.ii. Did not allow the students to use it 4.iii. Regulated use
5. Teachers' recommendations for the ethical and responsible use of ChatGPT in Trinidad and Tobago	5.i. Standardized and uniform policy 5.ii. Regulated use 5.iii. Training for the teachers



Vol. 3 No. 10 (October) (2025)

Perceptions of the Participants about ChatGPT in Higher Education

With an increasing use with every passing day, it is clear that ChatGPT and other AI tools are “here to stay” (Malik et al., 2024, p. 10). Realizing that the future belongs to them, the participants said that universities and education systems cannot turn a blind eye. Jada said that universities “cannot prevent students from using ChatGPT,” so they must acknowledge and take steps regarding it.

Teachers generally perceive ChatGPT as a valuable asset that streamlines teaching processes and fosters innovative pedagogical approaches (Kanwal et al., 2023). The same pattern was observed in this study, with all the participants viewing it positively. They acknowledged the growing presence and positive impact of ChatGPT in higher education. Jada believed that ChatGPT had “a place in higher education in Trinidad and Tobago and could benefit both students and faculty”. Many participants called it a “useful tool” (Justin) and even “extremely useful” (Kevin). Anna did “not see hindrances but opportunities with ChatGPT”.

Despite their positivity and optimism, they also expressed some concerns and caution about it. Realizing that the students were not technically or ethically prepared to use ChatGPT properly and effectively, all of them suggested guiding/educating students about it. Ted argued that ChatGPT can be “an asset if students are guided to use it appropriately”. Anna highlighted how ChatGPT should become a tool for facilitating learning, rather than being outsourced to it, saying, “We do not want students to lose the process of learning to ChatGPT but find a way to let ChatGPT enhance the learning process.” Amy also expressed similar opinion, “Experimentation is good but allowing a resource to think, plan, analyze and do much more when learning things for the first time is dangerous”.

These concerns are not new, as studies in different parts of the world have expressed their concerns about ChatGPT and other AI tools. Those concerns were mostly about improper and unethical use of ChatGPT (Malik & Amjad, 2025; Malik et al., 2024; Shardlow & Latham, 2023; Zeb et al., 2024), degradation of students’ cognitive and writing skills due to overreliance on it (Hutson, 2022; Malik et al., 2024; Shidiq, 2023), and hallucination and unauthentic information generated by it (Emsley, 2023); consequently, proper training, education and specific regulation and policies have been recommended by numerous studies (AlZaabi et al., 2023). The same has been expressed by the participants in this study. They highlighted the need for awareness, training, and education about ChatGPT. Some said that such training should also include teachers. Jada advised “educating everyone about the good and bad, the benefits and the risks, and the impact of learning”.

Utilization Patterns of ChatGPT

Due to its versatility and adaptability, ChatGPT can be used in many fields and disciplines for various tasks and purposes (Malik et al., 2024; Zaremba & Demir, 2023). Similar varied responses were obtained when the participants were asked about the use of ChatGPT in the higher education sector in Trinidad and Tobago. Those responses were divided into two different groups: personal use (by the teachers) and students’ use.

Other than Jada and Amy, all the participants had used ChatGPT for different purposes. Anna reported using ChatGPT “extensively” for various academic and professional activities, including research assistance, seeking information on new tech tools, drafting rubrics, creating course outlines, and generating sample student work. She called it “the additional member of the department,” whereas some of her other colleagues called it by



Vol. 3 No. 10 (October) (2025)

a human name. The participants used it to develop course outlines and research activities, such as citations and literature review. Sarah pointed out an interesting and novel way in which she used ChatGPT in her classroom. She reported that she had employed it to facilitate and enrich the classroom discussion, saying, "I used ChatGPT in my classroom. I have asked students to check and see what ChatGPT said on certain points, and then we have discussions." She said that it greatly helped the students think out of the box and conceive new ideas.

While talking about the use of ChatGPT by students, all the participants said that it was more extensively used by students than by teachers. Many researchers have observed this pattern. Malik (2024) reported that ChatGPT was "more commonly used by the students than the teachers" (p. 319). Some participants said that as many as 70% of the students were using ChatGPT or other AI tools in Trinidad and Tobago. They said that students mostly used it for different writing assignments, especially "when doing assignments to be submitted and done out of class" (Jada).

These findings are in-line with the literature which also reports that ChatGPT is primarily used for research purposes (Haman & Školník, 2024; Malik, 2024; Tilwani et al., 2024), developing and refining course outlines (Davis & Lee, 2023; Gupta et al., 2023), and personal and professional development (Abas et al., 2023); however, using it for facilitating classroom discussions seems to be a novel utilization of the AI tool. Another interesting and unique point that emerged from the data was humanizing ChatGPT (by calling it "an additional member of the department" or by a human name), highlighting how rapidly and seamlessly ChatGPT and other AI tools are becoming an integral part of our classrooms and society at large.

ChatGPT's ability to produce human-like writing is one of its most salient features and biggest selling points (Hutson, 2022; Malik et al., 2024; Shidiq, 2023; Tseng et al., 2023). While talking about the use of ChatGPT by students, the participants also reported the same, saying that it was mostly used for written assignments and tasks, especially for out-of-class ones

National and Institutional Policies on ChatGPT

Out of the eight participants, four (Jada, Kevin, Sarah, and Britney) said categorically that there was no national policy about the use of ChatGPT or other AI tools in higher education in Trinidad and Tobago, while the others said that they were not aware of any such policy. Many studies have pointed out a lack of uniform and standardized national policies about the use of ChatGPT or other AI tools in higher education (Caulfield, 2023; Malik, 2024; Shardlow & Latham, 2023). MOE and the government in Trinidad and Tobago are quite keen to incorporate technologies into their education system and have implemented many policies about it (MOE, 2020; Warner et al., 2021); however, when it came to ChatGPT and AI in education, it seems that they are not as proactive.

Table 3 National and University Policies about ChatGPT in Trinidad and Tobago

#	Pseudonym	University	National Policies about ChatGPT	Institutional Policies about ChatGPT
1	Jada	1	No policy	No policy
2	Justin	1	Not sure about it	No policy
3	Ted	2	Not sure about it	Interim guidelines for use of artificial intelligence



Vol. 3 No. 10 (October) (2025)

4	Kevin	2	No policy	Interim guidelines for use of artificial intelligence
5	Sarah	3	No policy	No policy
6	Britney	3	No policy	No policy
7	Amy	3	Not sure about it	Not sure about it
8	Anna	1	Not sure about it	No policy

Even when there is no national policy, some universities have developed their own policies (or at least guidelines) about the use of ChatGPT and other AI tools. When asked about it, the participants gave different responses; however, a certain pattern could still be observed. All three participants from university 1 (Jada, Justin, and Anna), and two out of three from university 3 (Sarah and Britney) reported an absence of any institutional policy about ChatGPT. Amy from University 3 was not sure about it, saying that there could be a policy. Participants from university 2 (Ted and Kevin), on the other hand, said that there was an institutional-level policy/guidelines (titled “Interim Guidelines for use of Artificial Intelligence”). Kevin shared it through an email.

Those guidelines supported the “ethical use of Generative AI tools in all of its activities provided that such use is appropriate for its context, and aligned with The University’s Core Values”. Although it stated that every “course must have a clear statement defining acceptable use of AI for their students”, it also gave freedom to course instructors to decide for their courses. The guidelines provided three different options about ChatGPT and other AI tools: prohibiting the use of AI in coursework/assignments, fully permitting the use of AI in coursework/assignments, and partially/conditionally permitting the use of AI in coursework/assignments.

Although such differences and disparities about policies and practices about ChatGPT and other AI tools within a country are not new, and have been reported by many studies (Caulfield, 2023; Ghimire & Edwards, 2024; Malik et al., 2024), they raise serious concerns about the uniformity and standardization of educational policies and practices in a country. They can also lead to higher levels of inequalities and disparities as students from certain departments/universities are allowed to use a tool that provides them with an added advantage, while others are prohibited from using it (Malik et al., 2024). The participants highlighted the acute need for a uniform and standardized policy about the use of ChatGPT and AI in education (especially higher education) in Trinidad and Tobago in order to ensure its ethical, responsible, and effective use, and urged the governments and the MOE to take immediate steps in this regard.

Teachers’ Approaches and Practices towards Students’ Use of ChatGPT

Many university teachers are quite proactive and, even in the absence of policies, have their own approaches and practices towards something as widespread and impactful as ChatGPT. Keeping this in mind, the participants were then asked about their practices and approaches towards the use of ChatGPT by their students. They shared three main approaches: unrestricted permission, complete prohibition, and regulated/conditional permission.

Table 4 Teachers’ Approaches and Practices towards Students’ Use of ChatGPT

Teachers’ Approaches and Practices towards Students’ Use of ChatGPT	Frequency
---	-----------



Vol. 3 No. 10 (October) (2025)

Allow to use it without any limitation/ regulation	1
Students do not use / Prohibited to use	2
Allow regulated/ conditional use	5

Out of the eight participants, one (Sarah) said that she would “encourage the students to use it” without mentioning any conditions or regulations, while two said that either their students did not use it due to the nature of their course (Britney) or they did not allow them to use it (Amy).

However, the majority of the participants (Jada, Justin, Ted, Kevin, and Anna) followed the path of conditional/regulated use of ChatGPT. Justin said that he told his students that ChatGPT can be the “starting point”; however, it should not be employed for the entire task. Ted said that at the start of a semester, he told students “not [to] discredit it but warn of its advantages and disadvantages”, especially “not to be plagiarized”. Kevin repeatedly reminded students that ChatGPT “must be declared”. Jada spoke at length about the ethical and responsible use of ChatGPT and what she advised her students.

"I tell students of the good and the bad of ChatGPT as a tool and a resource to their learning as humans. I spend time showing them how it can be used in programming and how it should not be used. If used the wrong way, then their brain will become artificial, and the AI will become a human brain. In other words, I use an approach of letting my students see the need to learn as humans ought to learn and understand the benefits that ChatGPT can bring to them."

Literature highlights the importance of a comprehensive approach to ensure fair, just, ethical and responsible use of ChatGPT. Previous studies have recommended similar steps for its ethical and fair use such as developing and implementing a comprehensive policy, creating awareness about its fair, just and ethical use, prohibiting to use it to generate the entire assignments or tasks, discouraging overreliance on it, and properly acknowledging its use (Ghimire & Edwards, 2024; Malik, 2024; Malik et al., 2024; Raza, 2023; Zeb et al., 2024).

Conclusion

While the adoption of ChatGPT is growing rapidly in Trinidad and Tobago, it remains relatively underexplored compared to other parts of the world. It is even more astounding because MOE in Trinidad and Tobago is generally quite active in incorporating modern technologies into its education system through policies, practices, and training. This study was carried out to fill this gap, and also to draw the attention of the MOE to it.

The study believes that the integration of ChatGPT in education offers transformative potential for enhancing teaching and learning experiences in Trinidad and Tobago. ChatGPT is already utilized widely by both teachers and students for various activities; however, students appear to use it more than teachers. University teachers in the country utilize it for a wide variety of activities such as research work, developing course outlines, self-development, enriching classroom discussions, and various writing tasks. It is generally viewed positively and considered an important tool. So much so that some participants considered it “the additional member of the department” and called it by a human name.

However, the worrisome thing is that despite its widespread use and impact, no policy about its proper and ethical use has been reported. Not only was there an absence of a policy at the national level, but even universities lack proper policies about it. Out of the three universities, only one reported an interim guideline for it. Such policy gaps and differences may lead to an AI divide where some students have an added advantage by having permission to use AI tools, while others are deprived of it.



Vol. 3 No. 10 (October) (2025)

The teachers, however, employed various approaches, strategies, and practices regarding students' use of ChatGPT. Whereas some either turned a blind eye or prohibited it altogether, many opted for various practices for its ethical use. They included creating awareness about its proper use, prohibiting its use for generating the entire assignments, discouraging overreliance on it, and ensuring proper acknowledgement. They believed that human intelligence should be at the forefront and ChatGPT and other AI tools should be taken as helping tools only.

All the participants urged for a uniform and standardized policy for the higher education sector in Trinidad and Tobago to ensure that all students have equal opportunities and treatment regarding it. Otherwise, it would create an AI divide as some students would be allowed to use that extremely powerful and beneficial tool while others may be deprived of it.

Due to the scope and nature of the study, it comes with some limitations. Being a qualitative study, and due to the small sample size, the findings cannot be generalized. Furthermore, this study focuses on the teachers only. It is important to explore students' perspectives to formulate a more comprehensive and balanced policy for the use of ChatGPT and other AI tools.

However, despite the aforementioned limitations, this study is significant as it is one of the first of its kind about the Caribbean countries in general, and Trinidad and Tobago in particular. As a result, it can serve as a significant and powerful foundation for a comprehensive national policy about ChatGPT and other AI tools.

Policy Recommendations for ChatGPT

Based on the literature review and findings, the study presents the following recommendations for just, fair, and ethical use of ChatGPT in Trinidad and Tobago.

Being a relatively small country, Trinidad and Tobago must have a uniform and standardized national policy about ChatGPT in higher education to ensure its just, fair, and ethical use. It will also simplify and streamline the awareness and training process.

There should also be a uniform national policy about the use of ChatGPT at the school level (especially secondary and higher school levels). It would ensure that even at the school level, students are aware of the dos and don'ts of using ChatGPT. It is essential to ensure that they do not pick up bad habits and practices at the school level.

ChatGPT is here to stay, and banning it altogether would only deprive the students of a very useful learning tool. Similarly, turning a blind eye to it will encourage students to use it unethically. The best way is to regulate it to ensure that this highly beneficial tool is utilized in a just, fair, and ethical way.

Students should not be allowed to use ChatGPT to generate the entire assignment, task, or text.

If ChatGPT is used for any assignments, tasks, or research work, it must be acknowledged properly. Full disclosure about it must be made either in the methodology section or at the end of the work.

Course papers, final term assignments, thesis, and research papers should be checked through AI-detection tools.

Regular training sessions and workshops must be conducted to educate and train about the fair, just, ethical, and effective use of ChatGPT. Those training sessions and workshops should not only be conducted at the national level but also at the university and faculty/department level to ensure proper dissemination of the message and training. They should be for both teachers and students.

Teachers should also be asked to keep educating students from time to time during their lectures about the potential, challenges, and protocols of ChatGPT.

Although this study and recommendations are for ChatGPT, they are also applicable to other LLMs and AI tools used for similar purposes.



References

- Abas, M. A., Arumugam, S. E., Yunus, M. M., & Rafiq, K. R. M. (2023). ChatGPT and personalized learning: Opportunities and challenges in higher education. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 13(12), 3536-3545.
- AlZaabi, A., ALamri, A., Albalushi, H., Aljabri, R., and AalAbdulsallam, A. (2023). ChatGPT applications in academic research: a review of benefits, concerns, and recommendations. *Biorxiv* 2023, 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.17.553688>
- Caulfield, J. (2023). University Policies on AI Writing Tools | Overview & List. Amsterdam: Scribbr. <https://www.scribbr.co.uk/using-ai-tools/chatgpt-university-policies-uk/>
- Davis, R. O. & Lee, Y. J. (2023). Prompt: ChatGPT, create my course, please!. *Education Sciences*, 14(1), 24. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14010024>
- Emsley, R. (2023). ChatGPT: These are not hallucinations—they're fabrications and falsifications. *Schizophrenia*, 9(1), 1-2. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41537-023-00379-4>
- Ghimire, A., & Edwards, J. (2024, July). From guidelines to governance: A study of AI policies in education. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence in Education* (pp. 299-307). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.
- Giray, L. (2023). Prompt engineering with ChatGPT: A guide for academic writers. *Annals of Biomedical Engineering*, 51, 2629-2633. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10439-023-03272-4>
- Gupta, P., Raturi, S., & Venkateswarlu, P. (2023). ChatGPT for designing course outlines: A boon or bane to modern technology. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4386113>
- Haman, M., & Školník, M. (2024). Using ChatGPT to conduct a literature review. *Accountability in research*, 31(8), 1244-1246.
- Hendrick, A. (2023). Biases in a digital era: Examining the accuracy of transcription tools (Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas). <https://doi.org/10.26153/tsw/55561>
- Holmes, W., Bialik, M., & Fadel, C. (2021). *Artificial intelligence in education*. Center for Curriculum Redesign.
- Holmes, W., Persson, J., Chounta, I. A., Wasson, B., & Dimitrova, V. (2022). Artificial intelligence and education: A critical view through the lens of human rights, democracy, and the rule of law. Council of Europe.
- Hutson, M. (2022). Could AI help you to write your next paper? *Nature* 611, 192-193. <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-022-03479-w>
- Kanwal, A., Hassan, S. K., & Iqbal, I. (2023). An investigation into how university-level teachers perceive ChatGPT impact upon student learning. *Gomal University Journal of Research*, 39(3), 250-265.
- Lo, C. K. (2023). What is the impact of ChatGPT on education? A rapid review of the literature. *Education Sciences*, 13(4), 410. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13040410>
- Malik, M. A. & Amjad, A. I. (2025). AI vs AI: How effective are Turnitin, ZeroGPT, GPTZero, and Writer AI in detecting text generated by ChatGPT, Perplexity, and Gemini? *Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching*, 8(1), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2025.8.1.9>



Vol. 3 No. 10 (October) (2025)

- Malik, M. A. & Shah, R. (2025). AI teachers (AI-based robots as teachers): History, potential, concerns and recommendations. *Frontiers in Education*, 10, 1-5. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2025.1541543>
- Malik, M. A. (2024). Challenges and Opportunities about ChatGPT in Higher Education: A Qualitative Study about University Teachers in Pakistan. *Voyage Journal of Educational Studies*, 4(2), 315-324. <https://doi.org/10.58622/vjes.v4i2.166>
- Malik, M. A., Amjad, A. I., Aslam, S., & Fakhrou, A. (2024). Global insights: ChatGPT's influence on academic and research writing, creativity, and plagiarism policies. *Frontiers in Research Metrics and Analytics*, 9, 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/frma.2024.1486832>
- Malik, M. A., Azmat, S., & Bashir, S. (2020). Influence of Social Interaction on Workplace Motivation and Efficiency of Instructors: An Exploratory Case Study about an Online University in Pakistan. *International Journal of Distance Education and E Learning*, 5(2), 1-19.
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2006). *Designing Qualitative Research*. (4th ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- MOE. (2020). National ICT in Education Policy. Ministry of Education, Trinidad and Tobago. <https://www.moe.gov.tt>
- Ngo, T. T. A. (2023). The perception by university students of the use of ChatGPT in education. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning*, 18(17), 4-19. <https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v18i17.39019>
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods*. Sage Publications.
- Raza, M. (2023). Implications of ChatGPT: Insights from the Higher Education of Pakistan. *Journal of Education And Humanities Research*, 16(2), 38-46.
- Sánchez-Guardiola Paredes, C., Aguaded Ramírez, E. M., & Rodríguez-Sabiote, C. (2021). Content validation of a semi-structured interview to analyze the management of suffering. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(21), 11393. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph182111393>
- Selwyn, N. (2021). *Education and technology: Key issues and debates*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Shaikh, S., Yayilgan, S. Y., Klimova, B., & Pikhart, M. (2023). Assessing the usability of ChatGPT for formal English language learning. *European Journal of Investigation in Health, Psychology and Education*, 13(9), 1937-1960.
- Shanto, S. S., Ahmed, Z., & Jony, A. I. (2024). Enriching Learning Process with Generative AI: A Proposed Framework to Cultivate Critical Thinking in Higher Education using Chat GPT. *Tuijin Jishu/Journal of Propulsion Technology*, 45(1), 3019-3029.
- Shardlow, M., & Latham, A. (2023). ChatGPT in computing education: a policy whitepaper, In Discussion Paper. Council of Professors and Heads of Computing, UK. <https://e-space.mmu.ac.uk/633469/>
- Shidiq, M. (2023). The use of artificial intelligence-based Chat-GPT and its challenges for the world of education; from the viewpoint of the development of creative writing skills. In *Proceeding of International Conference on Education, Society, and Humanity 1*, 360-364.
- Sok, S., & Heng, K. (2023). ChatGPT for education and research: A review of benefits and risks. *Cambodian Journal of Educational Research*, 3(1), 110-121.
- Stewart, D. W. & P. N. Shamdasani. 1990. *Focus Groups: Theory and Practice*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Tan, Y., Min, D., Li, Y., Li, W., Hu, N., Chen, Y., & Qi, G. (2023). Evaluation of



Vol. 3 No. 10 (October) (2025)

- ChatGPT as a question answering system for answering complex questions. arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.07992.
- Tilwani, D., Saxena, Y., Mohammadi, A., Raff, E., Sheth, A., Parthasarathy, S., & Gaur, M. (2024). REASONS: A benchmark for Retrieval and Automated citations of scientific Sentences using Public and Proprietary LLMs. arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.02228.
- Tseng, R., Verberne, S., & van der Putten, P. (2023, November). ChatGPT as a commenter to the news: Can LLMs generate human-like opinions? In *Multidisciplinary International Symposium on Disinformation in Open Online Media* (pp. 160-174). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.
- Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A. N., ... & Polosukhin, I. (2017). Attention is all you need. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 30, 5998-6008.
- Warner, S. C., Malik, M. A., & Mohammed, J. H. (2021). ICT Professional Development Workshops and Classroom Implementation Challenges: Perceptions of Secondary School Teachers in Trinidad and Tobago. *International Journal of Innovation in Teaching and Learning*, 7(1), 1-19.
- Weizenbaum, J. (1966). ELIZA- A computer program for the study of natural language communication between man and machine. *Communications of the ACM*, 9(1), 36-45.
- Zaremba, A., & Demir, E. (2023). ChatGPT: Unlocking the Future of NLP in Finance. 93-98. <https://doi.org/10.61351/mf.v1i1.43>
- Zeb, A., Ullah, R., & Karim, R. (2024). Exploring the role of ChatGPT in higher education: opportunities, challenges and ethical considerations. *The International Journal of Information and Learning Technology*, 41(1), 99-111.