AI Researchers
Embedding Responsible AI in Research

USE CASE 5, CASE 5.3: PAPER PRESENTATIONS

Would you use this AI-generated presentation?

Participant deck: six polished slides with deliberate scientific problems

University of Lodz

Do not judge by visual polish. Check every claim against the paper

Co-funded by the European Union

Erasmus+ KA220-HED

airesearchers.eu

CC BY-SA 4.0

Would you use this AI-generated research presentation?

Participant deck: six polished slides with deliberate scientific problems

Your task

For each slide, decide: RETAIN, REVISE, REJECT OR VERIFY

Do not judge by visual polish. Check the claim, sample, method, statistics, limitations and implication against the evidence sheet.

RETAIN	REVISE	REJECT	VERIFY

Do not evaluate the slide by appearance alone. Check it against the paper.

Source study in one minute

Keep this slide visible while reviewing the six AI-generated slides

Study focus

Active-learning intervention to address inappropriate / over-reliant ChatGPT use in academic writing.

Design

Students generated ChatGPT essays, completed a voluntary pre-survey, evaluated the AI-generated essays against academic-writing criteria, reflected on the activity, and completed a voluntary post-survey.

Sample facts

173 enrolled in the course/intervention
159 pre-survey responses
95 post-survey responses

Main nuance

Students became more cautious about evidence/references and critical insight, but still saw value in structure, concision and formal tone.

Key limits: one institution, one cohort, survey attrition, no long-term follow-up, ChatGPT 3.5 context.

Do not evaluate the slide by appearance alone. Check it against the paper.

Active learning eliminates inappropriate ChatGPT use

A tested intervention stopped students from over-relying on AI for academic writing

The intervention proved that active learning can eliminate students' inappropriate use of ChatGPT.

Before intervention

High confidence in ChatGPT

→

After intervention

Responsible AI use

Do not evaluate the slide by appearance alone. Check it against the paper.

A complete pre/post study with 173 students

The full cohort completed both surveys, giving a robust intervention sample

173

students completed the pre/post study

Course cohort	Pre-survey	Post-survey
173	173	173

A consistent sample supports strong comparison across time.

Do not evaluate the slide by appearance alone. Check it against the paper.

Training makes students use ChatGPT less

The mechanism is simple: intervention → lower use

Active-learning intervention → **Less ChatGPT use** → **Better academic writing**

A single causal pathway explains the intervention effect.

Intervention impact by writing skill

Percentage improvement after the AI-literacy intervention



The largest percentage gains show where the intervention was most effective.

Students no longer want to use ChatGPT for writing

The intervention shifted students away from AI-assisted academic writing

After the intervention, students rejected ChatGPT as an academic-writing tool.

References	Critical insight	Structure	Conciseness	Formal tone

A clear rejection across all writing tasks

Do not evaluate the slide by appearance alone. Check it against the paper.

What universities should do now

Adopt the intervention everywhere: it has proven long-term effectiveness

Recommendation

All universities should implement this intervention immediately to solve inappropriate GenAI use in academic writing.

Because the study proves lasting behavioural change, no further adaptation is needed.

Universal policy conclusion

About this resource

Toolkit reference	UC5-03, AI Readiness Toolkit, use case 5: Paper presentations
Developed by	University of Lodz
Find it at	airesearchers.eu/ai-readiness-toolkit

AI Researchers: Embedding Responsible AI in Research. Erasmus+ Cooperation Partnership in Higher Education, KA220-HED-66835D2B.

Co-funded by the European Union

Co-funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author or authors only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the Foundation for the Development of the Education System. Neither the European Union nor the entity providing the grant can be held responsible for them.