UTILIZATION OF GENERATIVE AI TOOLS IN ASSIGNMENT COMPLETION AMONG DCS AND DCV STUDENTS

Nor Radhiah Borhan[1], Halizayanie Kimlin[2], Rasma Suzieyantee Ismail[3]

[1,2] Department of Design and Visual Communication, Politeknik Tuanku Syed Sirajuddin, Perlis, Malaysia
[3] Department of Design and Visual Communication, Politeknik METrO Tasek Gelugor, Pulau Pinang, Malaysia

*Corresponding E-mail: radhiah@ptss.edu.my

ABSTRACT
Objective: This study explores the types, frequency of use, purpose and perception of GenAI tools used in academic tasks and assessments among students from Diploma in Digital Creative Technology Arts (DCS) and Diploma in Digital Creative Technology Video Production (DCV) programmes.
Research Method: The study used a quantitative research design by adapting a structured online questionnaire. The questionnaire was distributed to students, and the collected data was analysed using SPSS. Reliability testing and descriptive statistics were conducted to examine the frequency of GenAI tools usage and the mean scores for purpose and perception items. Additionally, thematic review was applied to analyse the open-ended responses.
Findings: Results indicate frequent use of text-based GenAI tools, design platforms, and proofreading applications. Students mainly utilize GenAI tools for idea generation, saving time, improving content quality, and enhancing learning support. The perception towards GenAI is positive, with high agreement on ethical use and interest in attending AI-related training. These findings are also aligned with the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), where students' adoption of GenAI tools is influenced by its usability and user friendliness.
Originality: Focusing on Malaysian polytechnic students, this study contributes to the growing body of literature concerning the usage of Generative AI (GenAI) in creative-based higher education programs. The findings provide practical insights for integrating AI literacy, ethical guidelines, and skill-based training digital creative and media-related curricula.
Keywords: Generative AI; Student Perception; Creative Technology Education; Assignment Completion; Polytechnic Students

1. INTRODUCTION

In current years, artificial intelligence (AI) has become increasingly embedded in educational settings, with generative AI (GenAI) representing one of the most influential innovations shaping modern academic practices (Dwivedi et al., 2023; Kasneci et al., 2023). Platforms such as ChatGPT, Gemini, DALL·E, and Copilot allow learners to efficiently generate ideas, compose written materials, and support creative processes. Despite these advantages, the widespread adoption of GenAI tools has sparked debates concerning excessive reliance on technology and the preservation of academic honesty (Zou & Lee, 2023).

In the Malaysian polytechnic context, particularly among students enrolled in the Diploma in Digital Creative Technology Arts (DCS) and Diploma in Digital Creative Technology Video Production (DCV) programmes, the use of GenAI applications—most notably ChatGPT—has grown considerably. Students frequently rely on these technologies to summarize academic materials, generate design concepts, and create scripts or visual elements for coursework (Lim et al., 2023). Nevertheless, there

remains a lack of empirical data on which specific GenAI tools are most commonly adopted and to what extent they are utilized by creative technology students (Heigl, 2025). Gaining such insights is crucial for educators seeking to adapt and integrate AI responsibly in teaching and learning.

Accordingly, this study aims to: (1) identify the types of GenAI tools most frequently utilized by DCS and DCV students in completing their coursework; (2) determine the overall extent of GenAI tool utilization; and (3) examine students' underlying purposes and perceptions regarding the use of such technologies in academic work.

This research was primarily conducted within the Department of Design and Visual Communication (JRKV) at Politeknik Tuanku Syed Sirajuddin (PTSS) and Politeknik METrO Tasek Gelugor (PMTG). The inclusion of PMTG was essential as it also offers the DCV programme, thereby ensuring that the sample reflects a more comprehensive student population across two institutions. Such inclusion enhances the validity and generalizability of the findings. Ultimately, the results presented in Chapter 4 are expected to offer meaningful insights into how students engage with AI technologies, reveal trends in GenAI usage for creative academic work, and inform institutional policies promoting ethical and effective integration of AI tools in higher education (Cotton et al., 2024; Susnjak, 2023).

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 GENERATIVE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) has become an evolutionary innovation in contemporary education, offering new opportunities for enhancing creativity, critical thinking, and personalized learning. Dwivedi et al. (2023) highlight that GenAI technologies such as ChatGPT and DALL·E have redefined how students generate knowledge, explore ideas, and personalize their learning experiences. These tools are especially relevant to creative and digital disciplines, where both conceptual exploration and technical production are integral to learning outcomes. By producing text, images, or even code, GenAI applications expand students' creative capacity while improving efficiency in academic and artistic processes.

In higher education, the adoption of GenAI has been shown to encourage students to engage in reflective and analytical thinking through AI-assisted content creation (Kasneci et al., 2023). However, the benefits of such tools are contingent upon students' understanding of their scope and limitations. Examining how learners use these technologies therefore offers valuable insight into their adaptability, learning preferences, and digital competency.

According to Lee et al. (2023), generative AI supports the process of knowledge construction by helping students synthesize information and generate ideas more efficiently than traditional methods. Similarly, Liu and Chew (2024) argue that in art and design education, GenAI allows learners to shift their focus from repetitive manual skills to higher-order creative expression. The ERASMUS+ TaLAI Project (2025) reported that over 70% of European university students use GenAI for academic activities at least once a week, illustrating its growing integration into the learning environment.

Despite its numerous advantages, the introduction of GenAI also presents challenges. Qiao et al. (2024) observed that issues such as authenticity, ethical responsibility, and excessive dependence on AI systems remain major concerns. This observation aligns with Malaysian educators' apprehension that students might rely too heavily on GenAI, potentially limiting the development of independent critical thinking skills.

2.2 CATEGORIES OF GENAI TOOLS USED BY STUDENTS

The use of AI-powered applications among students has increased significantly since the emergence of accessible platforms like ChatGPT, Gemini, and Copilot. These tools are frequently employed to generate ideas, summarize academic content, refine writing, and support creative design tasks (Susnjak, 2023). For students in creative technology fields, AI also serves as a powerful source of inspiration for visual design, multimedia production, and digital storytelling.

Cotton et al. (2024) found that most tertiary students regard AI tools as complementary aids that enhance learning rather than as replacements for original thought. Nonetheless, the extent of dependence on these technologies varies by discipline. Creative and technical students are typically more inclined to use AI for practical applications such as layout design, image editing, or video production. Recognizing these disciplinary differences is crucial for evaluating how GenAI is utilized across diverse student populations such as those in DCS and DCV programmes.

Students today have access to a wide variety of AI-based tools across text, image, video, audio, and productivity domains. Understanding each category helps identify which tools are most popular and the specific purposes they serve.

Text-Based GenAI Tools (e.g., ChatGPT, Gemini, Copilot)

Among the various categories of GenAI, text-based tools are still the ones students use the most frequently. These platforms assist with generating essays, outlines, summaries, and even computer code. Lee et al. (2023) reported that ChatGPT enhances students' brainstorming and organizational abilities in academic writing. The TaLAI Project (2025) similarly revealed that such tools are predominantly used for idea generation and paraphrasing. However, Qiao et al. (2024) warned that overdependence on text-based AI may undermine originality, underscoring the need for educators to position AI as a helping partner rather than a substitute for critical thought.

2.3 IMAGE AND ILLUSTRATION GENERATOR TOOLS (E.G., LEONARDO AI, MIDJOURNEY, DALL·E)

In visual arts and creative disciplines, image-generation tools have become integral to the ideation process. Liu and Chew (2024) found that GenAI-based image tools enable art students to experiment with form, colour, and composition at an accelerated pace. Applications such as Midjourney and DALL·E allows text prompts to be converted into complex visuals, encouraging experimentation before manual refinement. This supports the development of conceptual design skills and nurtures artistic exploration aligned with current industry practices.

2.4 DESIGN AND LAYOUT TOOLS (E.G., CANVA AI, ADOBE FIREFLY)

Design-oriented AI applications are highly valued in creative education. According to Bryanhouse Journal (2024), tools such as Canva AI simplify visual layout processes, while Adobe Firefly integrates generative features directly into professional design suites. These technologies enable students to produce visually appealing materials and professional-grade outputs with minimal technical expertise.

2.5 VIDEO GENERATION AND EDITING TOOLS (E.G., RUNWAY ML, PIKA LABS, CAPCUT AI)

Video-based GenAI tools automate complex production tasks, enhancing both efficiency and creativity. Lee et al. (2023) noted that such applications streamline video editing, motion graphics, and special effects in academic projects. However, they also caution against misuse, such as creating deepfakes or manipulating content unethically.

2.6 AUDIO AND MUSIC CREATION TOOLS (E.G., SOUNDRAW, MUBERT, AIVA, ELEVENLABS)

AI-generated audio tools are increasingly utilized for sound design and music composition in multimedia projects. The *Journal of Creative Arts Studies* (2024) emphasized that tools like Soundraw and AIVA empower users to craft custom soundtracks and effects without advanced technical training. This broadens creative autonomy while supporting artistic expression through accessible digital means.

2.7 PROOFREADING AND PARAPHRASING TOOLS (E.G., GRAMMARLY, QUILLBOT)

Proofreading applications help enhance linguistic quality and coherence in students' written work. The TaLAI Project (2025) found Grammarly and QuillBot to be among the most frequently used GenAI tools among non-native English speakers, significantly improving writing accuracy and fluency. Nevertheless, Liu and Chew (2024) advise that such tools should complement, not replace, students' language learning and editing skills.

2.8 PRODUCTIVITY AND PRESENTATION TOOLS (E.G., NOTION AI, COPILOT, SLIDESAI)

AI-enhanced productivity software supports task organization and presentation preparation. The TaLAI Project (2025) observed that students often use Notion AI to summarize notes, Copilot for document assistance, and SlidesAI for generating presentations efficiently. These applications streamline workflow and communication in academic and collaborative environments.

2.9 CHALLENGES AND ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS IN AI TOOL USAGE

While GenAI tools contribute substantially to learning efficiency and creative productivity, their application also introduces significant ethical and academic challenges. Issues such as plagiarism, authenticity, and overreliance have been widely discussed in educational research (Zou & Lee, 2023). Students may unintentionally commit academic misconduct by submitting AI-generated work without proper acknowledgment. Moreover, overreliance on AI may hinder the development of critical thinking and originality—skills essential to higher education.

Educators, therefore, bear the responsibility of promoting digital ethics and ensuring that students understand how to use AI responsibly. Lim et al. (2023) emphasized the importance of fostering awareness and establishing transparent policies to guide the ethical use of AI tools in academic settings. By cultivating a balanced approach, institutions can integrate technological innovation without compromising academic integrity or independent learning.

3. METHODOLOGY

This research employed a survey-based quantitative approach, selected for its ability to capture numerical patterns related to GenAI usage among students enrolled in the Diploma in Digital Creative Technology Arts (DCS) and Diploma in Digital Creative Technology Video Production (DCV) programmes. According to Pentang (2023), the quantitative approach allowed the data to be systematically collected and analysed. This includes the numerical data, which later allows for the identification of the usage of trends, patterns, and relationships.

3.1 PARTICIPANTS AND SAMPLING

The study involved students from two Malaysian polytechnics—Politeknik Tuanku Syed Sirajuddin (PTSS) and Politeknik METrO Tasek Gelugor (PMTG). These institutions were chosen as both offer creative technology programmes under the Department of Design and Visual Communication. A number of 200 students submitted the responses. This diverse sample included students from both DCS and

DCV programmes, providing a balanced representation of learners engaged in different areas of digital creative technology.

3.2 RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

Data was gathered using a structured online questionnaire developed via Google Forms due to its accessibility, user-friendly interface, and cost-free availability. The instrument was designed based on previous research and accustomed to fit the context of GenAI tool usage in creative education. A meta-analysis by Manggaberani and Darlis (2024) supported the reliability of Google Forms as an efficient and effective data collection platform, noting that approximately 90% of reviewed studies reported positive outcomes when using it for surveys and assessments. The questionnaire used for this study is provided in Appendix 1. The questionnaire was classified to the five main sections:

Section A: Demographic information (e.g., gender, institution, programme, and semester).
Section B: Types of GenAI tools used.
Section C: Frequency of GenAI tool usage.
Section D: Students' purposes and perceptions of GenAI tools.
Section E: Open-ended suggestions for improving AI use in education.

Sections C and D utilized a five-point Likert scale. The response options ranged from 1 (Never/Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Very Often/Strongly Agree). Items in Section D were adjusted from several validated instruments addressing students' attitudes and perceptions of AI usage in education (Khairuddin et al., 2024; Cvetković et al., 2024; Okonkwo & Adeniran, 2024; Al-Hamad et al., 2025). Meanwhile, items in Section C were developed by the researchers, grounded in relevant literature to ensure alignment with the study's objectives. Although a formal expert review was not conducted, the items were refined through self-assessment to maintain internal coherence with the study constructs.

The reliability of the questionnaire was evaluated using Cronbach's Alpha, which indicated a strong internal consistency across items, confirming the suitability of the instrument for data collection.

3.3 DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURE

The survey link was disseminated through academic advisors to DCS and DCV students across semesters one to five. The data collection process took place over a four-day period and concluded once the desired number of responses (n=200) was achieved. Responses were automatically compiled through Google Forms and subsequently exported to SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) for analysis.

3.4 DATA ANALYSIS

Descriptive statistics and reliability testing were utilized for the analysis of the collected data. Specifically, frequency counts and mean scores were computed to determine the most frequently used AI tools, the extent of their usage, and students' purposes and perceptions. To establish the internal consistency of the instrument, reliability was assessed using Cronbach's Alpha.

3.5 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Ethical procedures were strictly followed throughout the research process. All participants were informed of the study's purpose before participating. The survey required approximately 4–5 minutes to complete, and participation was entirely voluntary. Students were not offered any compensation or incentives. To maintain anonymity, the questionnaire did not collect names or registration numbers. Only the

main and co-investigators had access to the dataset, which was securely stored and anonymized prior to analysis.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

A total of 200 students participated in this study. However, 9% (n = 18) indicated that they did not use any Generative AI (GenAI) tools for academic purposes; thus, their responses were excluded from further analysis. Consequently, only 182 valid responses were used in Sections B to E, which examine the usage frequency, purpose, and perception of GenAI tools among students.

4.1 Section A: Demographic Profile of Respondents

The demographic distribution of the respondents demonstrates balanced participation across gender, institution, and programme. As shown in Table 1, female students comprised 52.5% of the sample, while male students represented 47.5%. In terms of institutional representation, the majority were from PTSS (65.5%), with the remainder from PMTG (34.5%).

Programme-wise, 57% of respondents were enrolled in the Diploma in Digital Creative Technology Video Production (DCV), while 43% were from the Diploma in Digital Creative Technology Arts (DCS). Regarding semester distribution, Semester 1 students accounted for the largest proportion (40%), followed by Semester 3 (22.5%), Semester 2 (19%), and Semesters 4 and 5 (WBL) (18.5%). This demographic composition reflects a diverse sample across multiple academic levels and institutions, thereby enhancing the representativeness of the findings.

Table 1: Respondents' Demographic Profile

Variable	Category	Frequency (n=182)	Percentage
Gender	Male	95	47.5%
	Female	105	52.5%
Institute	PTSS	131	65.5%
	PMTG	69	34.5%
Programme	DCS	86	43%
	DCV	114	57%
Semester of Study	Semester 1	80	40%
	Semester 2	38	19%
	Semester 3	45	22.5%
	Semester 4 and 5 (WBL)	37	18.5%

4.2 Section B: Types of Generative AI Tools Used

The results indicate that students use a wide variety of GenAI tools, often selecting more than one option due to the multi-response format of the survey. As shown in Table 2, the most frequently used category was Conversational AI/Chatbots, with 99.5% of respondents reporting usage of tools such as ChatGPT, Gemini, or Copilot. This demonstrates the dominant role of text-based AI platforms in academic work.

The second most common category comprised AI design tools such as Canva AI and Adobe Firefly (58.8%), primarily among DCV students who engage in visual and layout design tasks. AI writing assistants such as Grammarly and QuillBot were used by 25.3% of students, suggesting reliance on AI for language refinement and grammar checking.

Moderate levels of usage were recorded for AI video and animation tools (19.2%) and AI audio/voice tools (14.3%). Meanwhile, AI image generation platforms like Midjourney and DALL·E were the least utilized (4.9%), indicating limited adoption in creative coursework. These results suggest that while conversational AI dominates student engagement, more advanced creative AI applications remain underexplored.

Table 2: Percentage of GenAI Tools Used by Respondents

GenAI Tool Category	Examples	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Conversational AI / Chatbot	ChatGPT / Gemini / Copilot	181	99.5%
AI Design Tools	Canva AI / Adobe Firefly	107	58.8%
AI Writing Assistants	Grammarly / QuillBot	46	25.3%
AI Video & Animation Tools	Runway ML / Pika Labs / CapCut AI	35	19.2%
AI Audio & Voice Tools	ElevenLabs / Suno / Soundraw	26	14.3%
AI Image Generation	Mid Journey / DALL-E / Leonardo	9	4.9%
Others	e.g., Claude, Perplexity, Nova AI, DeepSeek, Notion AI	<2 each	<1%

4.3 Section C: Usage Frequency of GenAI Tools

The analysis of usage frequency employed a five-point Likert scale (1 = Never to 5 = Very Often). Cronbach's Alpha for this section was α = 0.844, confirming high reliability.

The overall results reveal moderate usage of GenAI tools, with notable variation across categories. Text-based GenAI applications recorded the highest mean score (M = 3.76), reflecting frequent use for tasks such as brainstorming, outlining, and generating written content.

Conversely, audio-based GenAI tools showed the lowest mean (M = 2.13), followed by presentation tools (M = 2.41) and video generation tools (M = 2.43) (see Table 3). These lower scores may stem from limited awareness, higher technical requirements, or less relevance to students' academic assignments.

The data indicates primary student reliance on Generative AI (GenAI) for tasks related to text and design, with less utilization observed for multimedia or audio production.

Table 3: Usage Frequency for Various Types of GenAI Tool

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Text	182	3.76	.938
Image	182	2.47	1.286
Layout	182	2.85	1.504
Video	182	2.43	1.335
Audio	182	2.13	1.228
Paraphrase	182	2.55	1.368
Presentation	182	2.41	1.292
Merge AI Tool	182	2.73	1.278

4.4 Section D: Purpose and Perception

This section investigates the purpose and perception of students regarding Generative AI (GenAI) by using a five-point Likert scale. The scale ia ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). A reliability test confirmed the good internal consistency of the measurement, yielding a Cronbach's Alpha of α = 0.810.

The mean scores (Table 4) ranged from 3.53 to 4.19, indicating generally positive perceptions. The highest-rated item was ethical awareness (M = 4.19), followed closely by saving time (M = 4.13) and improving content quality (M = 3.92). These findings imply that students not only value GenAI for its efficiency and productivity but also demonstrate awareness of the importance of responsible use.

The lowest mean score was observed for willingness to attend AI courses (M = 3.53), suggesting a gap between students' practical use of GenAI and their motivation to pursue structured AI-related training. Nevertheless, the overall results highlight a constructive and ethical attitude toward AI integration in academic work.

Table 4: Purpose and Perception of GenAI Tools Usage

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Improve Quality	182	3.92	.889
Save Time	182	4.13	.828
Idea Generation	182	3.89	1.019
Ethic	182	4.19	.778
Willing to Attend AI Course	182	3.53	1.215

4.5 Section E: Open Suggestions

A thematic analysis following the approach of Braun and Clarke (2006) was conducted on the open-ended responses, and several key themes emerged from the data. Respondents emphasized that AI should function primarily as a learning support tool rather than a means for academic dishonesty. They also highlighted the importance of establishing clear ethical guidelines and responsible usage policies to ensure appropriate implementation. Many students expressed interest in additional AI-related workshops and training opportunities to enhance their digital competency. Another recurring point concerned the need for improved access to AI tools within educational institutions to ensure equitable learning experiences. Finally, respondents stressed the importance of maintaining critical thinking skills and adopting a balanced approach to avoid excessive reliance on AI technologies.

Collectively, these themes suggest that students are aware of both the advantages and potential risks associated with generative AI. Their suggestions reflect a desire for structured guidance that encourages creativity, promotes efficiency, and upholds ethical academic practices.

4.6 DISCUSSION

The findings clearly demonstrate that GenAI tools have become an integral component of students' academic routines, especially for text-based and idea-generation tasks. This aligns with broader global trends where higher education institutions increasingly adopt AI to enhance learning efficiency and engagement (Fošner, 2024).

The high mean scores for saving time and improving quality suggest that students perceive GenAI as a mechanism for increasing academic productivity. Importantly, their strong ethical awareness indicates responsible attitudes, challenging assumptions that AI usage automatically leads to academic dishonesty.

However, the relatively moderate willingness to engage in formal AI training reflects a need for more structured institutional initiatives. Many students appear to learn AI tools informally, which may limit their understanding of ethical implications

and advanced functionalities. Therefore, educators and institutions should design targeted AI literacy programmes to bridge this gap, ensuring that students use GenAI not only efficiently but also responsibly and critically.

Furthermore, the findings of this study align with the core principles of the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), which posits that individuals are more likely to adopt a technology when they perceive it as useful and easy to operate (Davis, 1989). This connection underscores the importance of designing learning environments that emphasise the accessibility and practical usability of Generative AI tools for students.

5. CONCLUSIONS

This study investigated how students in the Diploma in Digital Creative Technology Arts (DCS) and Diploma in Digital Creative Technology Video Production (DCV) programmes utilize GenAI tools. The results offer significant insights into the integration of these new technologies into academic assignments, as well as students' perceptions of their utility and ethical considerations.

The study's findings indicate a high frequency of GenAI tool use among students for assignment completion. Specifically, text-based platforms like ChatGPT, Gemini, and Copilot are commonly utilized for crucial academic tasks, including brainstorming ideas, structuring content, and drafting written assignments. Furthermore, students involved in creative work frequently employ design-focused GenAI tools, such as Canva AI and Adobe Firefly. Overall, students perceive these GenAI tools as beneficial for enhancing the quality and speed of their assignments, all while remaining conscious of the ethical considerations surrounding their use.

Moreover, students demonstrated a positive attitude toward responsible AI usage, emphasizing the importance of transparency, learning support, and creative exploration. However, their relatively low willingness to participate in formal AI training highlights the need for institutions to offer structured AI literacy programmes and ethical usage guidelines.

While this research contributes valuable insights into GenAI adoption within creative digital education, it is limited to two polytechnics under the Department of Design and Visual Communication (JRKV). Future studies could expand the scope by including more programmes across Malaysian polytechnics or comparing results with institutions offering other creative disciplines. Broader sampling would enable a better understanding of AI integration trends in higher education specifically in polytechnic.

Overall, the study underscores that responsible and informed use of GenAI can enhance students' learning experiences and productivity. The results further offer meaningful guidance for educators and policymakers, helping them develop approaches that promote technological advancement while safeguarding academic integrity within creative-focused educational settings.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to show their deepest gratitude to Allah SWT for the strength, patience, and determination granted throughout the completion of this research. Sincere appreciation is extended to colleagues and collaborators for their continuous encouragement, constructive feedback, and academic support during the study process.

Special thanks are also conveyed to the management, academic advisors, and students of PTSS and PMTG for their cooperation and willingness to participate in the data collection phase. Their contributions were essential in ensuring the success and validity of this research.

Finally, heartfelt appreciation goes to their families, whose love, understanding, and prayers served as a constant source of motivation. Their unwavering support made it possible to complete this work with perseverance and gratitude.

Alhamdulillah — may this research benefit educators, students, and future scholars in advancing responsible and creative use of AI in education.

May this research, by the grace of God (Alhamdulillah), serve to benefit educators, students, and future scholars as they seek to advance the responsible and creative application of AI in educational settings.

REFERENCES

Al-Hamad, A., et al. (2025). *Assessing Familiarity, Usage Patterns, and Attitudes of Medical Students Toward ChatGPT and Other Chat-Based AI Apps in Medical Education. JMIR Medical Education, 11*(1), e63065. https://mededu.jmir.org/2025/1/e63065/

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). *Using thematic analysis in psychology.* Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Bryanhouse Journal. (2024). Thoughts on the construction of art curriculum using generative AI. Journal of Education and Research Practice, 4(2), 54–61. Retrieved from https://bryanhousepub.com/index.php/jerp/article/view/754

Cotton, D. R. E., Cotton, P. A., & Shipway, J. R. (2024). *ChatGPT and the educational implications of generative artificial intelligence.* Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 5(1), 100158.

Cvetković, D., et al. (2024). *University Students' Attitudes and Perceptions towards AI Tools: Implications for Sustainable Educational Practices. Sustainability, 16*(19), 8668. https://doi.org/10.3390/su16198668

Davis, F. D. (1989). *Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology.* MIS Quarterly, 13(3), 319-340. https://doi.org/10.2307/249008

Dwivedi, Y. K., et al. (2023). *The rise of generative AI: Opportunities, challenges, and implications for education.* International Journal of Information Management, 71(2), 102642.

Fošner, A. (2024). *University students' attitudes and perceptions towards AI tools: Implications for sustainable educational practices*. Sustainability, 16(19), 8668. https://doi.org/10.3390/su16198668

Heigl, R. (2025). *Generative artificial intelligence in creative contexts: A systematic review and future research agenda. Management Review Quarterly.* Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11301-025-00494-9

Kasneci, E., et al. (2023). *ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education.* Learning and Individual Differences, 103(1), 102274.

Khairuddin, N., Rahim, N. A., & Omar, M. H. (2024). *Students' Perceptions on The Artificial Intelligence (AI) Tools as Academic Support. Malaysian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities, 9*(4), 1–15. https://msocialsciences.com/index.php/mjssh/article/view/3087

Lee, C. B., Tan, K. H., & Teo, T. (2023). Designs and practices using generative AI for sustainable student discourse and knowledge creation. Smart Learning Environments, 10(1), 1–14. https://slejournal.springeropen.com/articles/10.1186/s40561-023-00279-1

Lim, C., Chai, C. S., & Tay, L. Y. (2023). *Artificial intelligence literacy for teachers and students: Ethical use in education.* Educational Technology Research and Development, 71(4), 1865–1882.

Liu, M. H., & Chew, E. (2024). Generative AI and creative thinking in art education: A TPACK-based theoretical framework. Journal of Creative Arts Studies, 6(1), 22–34. https://so07.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/JCAS/article/view/7882

Okonkwo, C., & Adeniran, M. (2024). *Artificial Intelligence Tools Usage: A Structural Equation Modeling of Undergraduates' Technological Readiness, Self-Efficacy and Attitudes. Education and Information Technologies.* Springer. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s41979-024-00132-1

Pentang, J. T. (2023). *Quantitative research instrumentation for educators*. PhilArchive. https://philarchive.org/archive/PENQRI

Qiao, J., Zhao, L., & Han, Y. (2024). Integrating generative AI in creative arts curriculum: Opportunities and challenges for higher education. Journal of Education and Research Practice, 4(3), 80–95. https://bryanhousepub.com/index.php/jerp/article/view/754

Rudra, S., Weber, P., Tillmanns, T., Salomão Filho, A., Wiersma, E., Dawitz, J., Dudenaite, 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 Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Computer Supported Education – Volume 2: CSEDU (pp. 319–330). ISSN 2184-5026. https://doi.org/10.5220/0013360200003932

Susnjak, T. (2023). *ChatGPT and student engagement: Exploring generative AI in academic settings.* Journal of Applied Learning & Teaching, 6(1), 35–49.

Zou, D., & Lee, J. (2023). *Academic integrity and AI-generated content: Challenges for higher education.* Education and Information Technologies, 28(7), 9041–9058.

Appendix 1: Questionnaire on the Utilization of Generative AI Tools in Assignment Completion Among DCS and DCV Students

Section A: Demographic Profile

Question	Item
A1	Gender (Male / Female)
A2	Institute (PTSS / PMTG)
A3	Programme (DCS / DCV)
A4	Semester of Study (1 / 2 / 3 / 4 / 5)
A5	Have you ever used any Generative AI tools while completing an assignment? Yes / No *(If no, then Submit Form)*

Section B: Types of GenAI Tools Used

Instruction: Tick all that apply.

- ☐ ChatGPT / Gemini / Copilot
- ☐ Canva AI / Adobe Firefly
- ☐ Midjourney / DALL.E / Leonardo AI
- ☐ Runway ML / Pika Labs / CapCut AI Tools
- ☐ ElevenLabs / Suno / Soundraw.io
- ☐ Grammarly / Quillbot
- ☐ Other: _____

Section C: Frequency of Use of GenAI Tools

Instruction: 1 = Never, 2 = Rarely, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Often, 5 = Very Often

Item	Statement
C1	I use text-based GenAI tools (e.g., ChatGPT, Gemini, Copilot) to generate ideas, outlines, or written content.
C2	I use image or illustration generator tools (e.g., ImageFX, Leonardo AI, Midjourney, DALL·E) to create visual materials or concepts.
C3	I use design and layout tools (e.g., Canva AI, Adobe Firefly) for creating posters, infographics, or layouts.
C4	I use video generation or editing tools (e.g., Runway ML, Pika Labs, CapCut AI Tools) for video projects or motion content.
C5	I use audio and music creation tools (e.g., Suno, Soundraw, Mubert, ElevenLabs) to produce background music, sound effects, or narration.
C6	I use proofreading and paraphrasing tools (e.g., Grammarly, QuillBot) to check grammar or improve language quality.
C7	I use presentation or productivity AI tools (e.g., Notion AI, Copilot, SlidesAI) to organize or present ideas.
C8	I integrate multiple GenAI tools for completing assignments or creative tasks.

Section D: Purpose & Perception
Instruction: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree

Item	Statement
D1	GenAI tools help me improve the quality of my assignments.
D2	GenAI tools save my time in completing tasks.
D3	I use GenAI tools mainly for idea generation.
D4	I am aware of the ethical use of AI tools in education.
D5	I would like to attend workshops or training on GenAI.

Section E: Open-Ended Response

Instruction: Please provide suggestions regarding the use of GenAI tools for learning.

_____

_____