

Generative AI Usage and Academic Performance

Janik Ole Weeks^{a*}

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-4116-1888>

LinkedIn: <https://www.linkedin.com/in/janik-ole-wecks-960ba01b2/>

Johannes Voshaar^a

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0276-4509>

LinkedIn: <https://www.linkedin.com/in/johannes-voshaar-431aa6201>

Benedikt Jost Plate^a

LinkedIn: <https://www.linkedin.com/in/benedikt-j-plate-710a2b144/>

Jochen Zimmermann^a

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1189-7007>

^aFaculty of Business Studies and Economics, University of Bremen, Bremen, Germany

This version: May 2024

Abstract

This study evaluates the impact of students' usage of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) tools such as ChatGPT on their academic performance. We analyze student essays using GenAI detection systems to identify GenAI users among the cohort. Employing multivariate regression analysis, we find that students using GenAI tools score on average 6.71 (out of 100) points lower than non-users. While GenAI tools may offer benefits for learning and engagement, the way students actually use it correlates with diminished academic outcomes. Exploring the underlying mechanism, additional analyses show that the effect is particularly detrimental to students with high learning potential, suggesting an effect whereby GenAI tool usage hinders learning. Our findings provide important empirical evidence for the ongoing debate on the integration of GenAI in higher education and underscores the necessity for educators, institutions, and policymakers to carefully consider its implications for student performance.

Keywords: Generative AI, ChatGPT, Artificial Intelligence, Higher Education, Exam Performance.

*Corresponding author. Address: Faculty of Business Studies and Economics, University of Bremen, Max-von-Laue-Str. 1, 28213 Bremen, Germany; Tel.: +49 (421) 218 666 89; Email: wecks@uni-bremen.de.

1 Introduction

The launch of OpenAI's user-friendly and conversational ChatGPT in November 2022 made generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) models widely accessible to a broad audience, regardless of technical proficiency (Kishore et al. 2023). ChatGPT can process and generate natural language and performs exceptionally in solving real-world problems through back-and-forth conversations, question-answering, and machine translation (Lee 2023; Zhu et al. 2023). These novel characteristics led to a tremendous surge in public attention, with over 100 million monthly active users two months after its launch (Ahangama 2023; Gregor 2024). The launch spurred heated discussions on the implications of GenAI across various sectors of society. Researchers and media voiced concern about its potential for spreading misinformation, undermining trust (Hsu and Thompson 2023), and threatening democratic processes and social cohesion (Ferrara 2024).

The popularity of ChatGPT among students has led to extensive debate over what role GenAI applications should play in higher education (Abdaljaleel et al. 2024; Katavic et al. 2023; Ngo 2023; Strzelecki 2023; Tiwari et al. 2023). GenAI tools offer considerable benefits such as enabling personalized learning and adaptive instruction, enhancing learning efficiency and student engagement, as well as providing intelligent tutoring systems including real-time feedback, hints, and scaffolding (Chen et al. 2022; Kishore et al. 2023). Nevertheless, these tools may hinder students' ability to think independently and critically and to solve problems; they also harbor strong potential for perpetuating biases and misinformation (Kasneci et al. 2023; Kishore et al. 2023). Some educational institutions have thus prohibited the use of ChatGPT at school or blocked it on school devices and networks (Johnson 2023; Weber-Wulff et al. 2023).

This debate has been informed by recent research examining the implications of GenAI applications in higher education settings. Studies have found that GenAI enhances student

understanding, engagement, and academic writing by simplifying information (Engelmann et al. 2023; Pavlik 2023), providing grammatical feedback (Perkins 2023; Wu et al. 2023), and fostering creativity (Qadir 2023). Other research has also found detrimental effects, such as GenAI leading to decreased learning performance due to passive information consumption (Markauskaite et al. 2022), reduced social interaction (Eager and Brunton 2023), and superficial learning (Rasul et al. 2023). Studies across the board have identified various ways GenAI can support or hinder student learning. However, the overall effect on students' performance remains unclear. We seek to bridge this gap by addressing the research question: *How does students' GenAI usage affect their exam performance?*

To do so, we collect a sample of student data and empirically assess the effect of GenAI usage of students' academic performance. We employ a fixed effects regression model controlling for numerous factors affecting the exam score. Because students' use of GenAI for writing case study essays is not directly observable, we harness the capabilities of ZeroGPT, a renowned GenAI detection system. We conduct a set of robustness checks to ensure our findings hold under different approaches for identifying GenAI usage and we address potential endogeneity issues using entropy balancing. In additional analyses, we utilize an identification strategy with exam retakers to further examine the causal effect and disaggregate the effect by considering students' learning potential. Our results show that students who use GenAI score significantly lower on exams. This finding holds after including control variables, fixed effects, and several robustness checks. The negative effect is particularly large for students with high learning potential, indicating that GenAI use affects exam performance by impeding users' learning progress.

We contribute to the existing literature in several ways. First, we extend the information systems (IS) research on GenAI applications by examining its implications in higher education. A

number of IS studies emphasize the technical capabilities and power of GenAI tools and its disruptive potential (Ahangama 2023; Chen et al. 2020; Kasneci et al. 2023; Lee 2023; Mu et al. 2022; Radford et al. 2018). We shed light on how GenAI impacts critical areas of society by documenting empirical evidence on the effect of GenAI usage on exam scores. Second, we contribute to higher education literature by investigating the effect of GenAI on academic performance. Educational institutions and researchers have discussed the costs and benefits of GenAI extensively, ultimately asking whether tools such as ChatGPT should be banned in higher education (Chhina et al. 2023; Kishore et al. 2023; Van Slyke et al. 2023). We not only provide evidence on the implications of GenAI for academic performance, but are also able to address effects on different user groups. Third, by using detection systems to identify GenAI usage, we extend research on the functionalities of GenAI detectors, discuss various approaches to identify AI-generated content, and document empirical findings on which GenAI detectors provide trustworthy results.

The paper is structured as follows: Section 2 covers the conceptual basics of GenAI and large language models (LLMs) and summarizes the relevant literature. In Section 3, we describe our multivariate model, discuss AI detectors, and provide details on our sample and descriptive statistics. Section 4 presents the empirical results, robustness checks, and additional analyses, which are discussed in detail in Section 5. In Section 6, the paper concludes with a summary, an examination of the study’s limitations and an outlook for further research.

2 Conceptual Basics and Related Work

2.1 Generative AI and Large Language Models

GenAI refers to machine learning techniques (e.g., neural networks) to create seemingly novel and meaningful data instances or artifacts based on patterns and relationships in training data

(Feuerriegel et al. 2024; Tao et al. 2023). These artifacts appear in various forms such as text, images, sound, and video (Alavi et al. 2024). LLMs are a subset of GenAI models capable of processing and creating natural language by applying learning technologies to extensive datasets (Lee 2023). They can comprehend context and create textual data outputs similar to human language without requiring specific input formats (Brown et al. 2020; Teubner et al. 2023; von Brackel-Schmidt et al. 2023; Wilson et al. 2023).

GenAI constitutes the larger technological infrastructure required for the practical implementation of LLMs, including the actual model and user-facing components, their modality, and corresponding data processing (Feuerriegel et al. 2024). Such implementation enables users to enter input data and instructions conditioning the LLM, which is referred to as *prompting* (Feuerriegel et al. 2024; von Brackel-Schmidt et al. 2023). With the emergence of conversational LLMs (e.g., models with a chat-based interface), prompting shifted from one-off inputs toward multi-step interactions (von Brackel-Schmidt et al. 2023). Such GenAI models are capable of completing various tasks, such as developing creative ideas, software coding, or textual content creation with high accuracy in grammar and wording (Yuan and Chen 2023). These capabilities render GenAI applications particularly interesting for knowledge work as in academia and higher education (Benbya et al. 2024; Yuan and Chen 2023).

2.2 Literature Review and Research Question

A considerable body of literature has rapidly emerged discussing how GenAI influences learning behavior and success. GenAI seems to offer several benefits for learning, potentially supporting academic performance. For example, numerous studies discuss how GenAI chatbots can serve as virtual tutors. Fauzi et al. (2023) and Gilson et al. (2023) report that ChatGPT can help students by providing accurate answers to unclear questions, which can lead to better understanding and

knowledge retention. In this way, GenAI has the potential to replace search engines by responding directly to questions rather than providing information from which the answer must be pieced together (AlAfnan et al. 2023). Pavlik (2023) and Engelmann et al. (2023) highlight the ability of GenAI to summarize or simplify information into a shorter or less complex form. Students can use this to understand and process textual learning material better or faster (Calderon et al. 2023; Sallam et al. 2023). Qadir (2023) emphasizes the usefulness of ChatGPT in enhancing students' creativity by helping them brainstorm ideas and organize their thoughts. Students can also use GenAI as an academic writing assistant that helps with phrasing (Lund et al. 2023), correcting grammar (Wu et al. 2023), or providing feedback (Perkins 2023). Research has also shown more latent benefits. Cotton et al. (2023) document increased student engagement and collaboration, while other studies mention higher motivation when studying is supported by ChatGPT (Ali et al. 2023; Fauzi et al. 2023). By providing plain language explanations, giving feedback on grammar, and demystifying academic conventions, GenAI can be particularly helpful to disadvantaged or less privileged students, such as non-native speakers or those with communication disabilities (Sullivan et al. 2023).

Other studies report potential negative consequences of the use of GenAI on academic performance. Markauskaite et al. (2022) argue that AI-assisted learning may decrease learning performance by promoting passive consumption of information rather than active engagement. Excessive usage also reduces opportunities for interactions with teachers and peers, impacting social and emotional learning. Similarly, Eager and Brunton (2023) find that AI-enabled learning companions negatively affect social interaction between students, which is an important determinant of academic performance (Jain and Kapoor 2015). Research also argues that students' approaches to learning are affected by the use of GenAI. Easy access to answers without the need

for close and detailed engagement with materials may lead to superficial learning (Rasul et al. 2023), which could hinder students' ability to deeply understand learning materials (Crawford et al. 2023a). Sallam et al. (2023) discuss that the quick and easy answers from AI software impede students' development of independent problem-solving skills, which becomes a problem as there is no AI available in exams. Crawford et al. (2023b) mention that inaccuracies and lack of accountability in AI-generated content may lead to misinformation being incorporated into students' knowledge, ultimately reducing learning quality. Moreover, the extent to which GenAI facilitates writing scientific texts and essays for students can also have negative effects on learning (Lund et al. 2023). According to Milano et al. (2023) this diminishes the effort involved in crafting well-written and argued texts – effort that helps in understanding course materials and which has a positive influence on academic performance (Bangert-Drowns et al. 2004).

Research has thus identified various ways in which GenAI can support or hinder learning, presenting a mixed picture of its impact on students' performance. Ultimately, assessment in higher education rests on exam performance; hence, a comprehensive understanding of GenAI tools in higher education requires investigation of this tangible effect, which so far has not been thoroughly explored. While existing studies have documented several individual effects of GenAI usage on performance, our study seeks to examine its overall impact. To do so, we analyze how students' GenAI use influences their exam scores. Focusing on exam scores provides a measure that encapsulates the individual effects of GenAI on learning, offering a comprehensive view of its impact on student performance.

3 Data and Methodology

3.1 Multivariate Model and Approach

To answer the research question, we utilize the educational setting of our institution's first-year introductory accounting class. To detect GenAI users among the cohort, we rely on case study essays our students submitted during the semester. The case study concerns a knowledge transfer exercise for students to immerse themselves in the course material and enhance comprehension. We identify GenAI-written texts by harnessing the capabilities of ZeroGPT, a popular and frequently used online GenAI detector. This measure of GenAI usage allows us to empirically assess its impacts on exam performance using a fixed effects ordinary least square (OLS) regression. In line with related research (e.g., Chiu et al. 2023; Eskew and Faley 1988), we control for various factors that have been shown to affect exam performance. The full OLS model reads as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} Exam\ Score_i = & \beta_0 + \beta_1 GenAI\ User_i + \beta_2 A - Level\ Grade_i + \beta_3 Attempt_i \\ & + \beta_4 Attendance_i + \beta_5 Vocational\ Training_i + \beta_6 Voluntary\ Service_i \\ & + \beta_7 Female_i + \beta_8 LinkedIn\ User_i + Course\ of\ Study\ FE + \varepsilon_i \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Our dependent variable is *Exam Score*, which is a continuous measure indicating the percentage of points a student achieved in the final exam. While the minimum is zero, the actual (achievable) maximum is 96.67 (100). The variable of interest is *GenAI User*, an indicator variable taking the value one if a student uses GenAI for studying and for producing work that the instructor intended to be written without such assistance, and zero otherwise. Based on the indicated

probability of our GenAI detector, we classify students as *GenAI User* if the text is more likely to have been written by AI than not (percentage > 50%).¹

To eliminate potential confounding effects biasing our inference, we use established determinants of exam performance as control variables. First, we control for academic preparedness and achievements prior to higher education. We include *A-Level Grade* as a common predictor for academic performance (e.g., Lento 2018; Massoudi et al. 2017). We also include two dummy variables indicating completion of *Vocational Training* or *Voluntary Service* as indications of maturity and experience (e.g., Guney 2009; Hartnett et al. 2004; Voshaar et al. 2023b). Second, we control for academic behavior by including session *Attendance* and the number of *Attempts* at taking the final exam (e.g., Cheng and Ding 2021; Massoudi et al. 2017; Voshaar et al. 2023a). Third, previous studies have found correlations between exam performance and gender as well as course of study (e.g., Aldamen et al. 2015; Hu et al. 2023; Weeks et al. 2023). We include *Course of study*-fixed effects and a dummy variable indicating students' gender (*Female*). In addition, we introduce a novel control variable by adding a dummy indicating whether a student is a *LinkedIn User*.² LinkedIn usage has been found to be correlated with exam performance (Paul et al. 2012). Also, because GenAI acceptance among students is driven by personal innovativeness (Strzelecki 2023), which is also correlated with (new) social media usage (Aldahdoh et al. 2020; Wijesundara and Xixiang 2018), we adopt *LinkedIn User* as a potentially important control variable for our analysis.

¹ Alternatively, and to rule out potential biases, we use higher (0.6) and lower (0.4) thresholds in ZeroGPT as well as other GenAI detection tools to define our variable of interest (also see our robustness checks).

² We also show results without including the variable *LinkedIn User*.

3.2 Generative AI Detection Systems

Constructing our variable of interest requires us to differentiate between students who utilize GenAI to write their case study essays and those who do not. For this, we leverage the capabilities of a GenAI detection tool. As the availability of GenAI models has become more widespread, the development and dissemination of AI detection tools has also accelerated (e.g., Dalalah and Dalalah 2023). Many detection tools are now available online for a fee or free of charge. They process the inputted text by splitting it into individual tokens and predicting the probability that a specific token will be followed by the subsequent sequence (Crothers et al. 2023). The detector also analyzes a text's perplexity, which refers to the use of random elements and idiosyncrasies typical of human writing and speech (Walters 2023). If the detector identifies high predictability and low perplexity, it is probable that the text is AI-written and is recognized as such. In this instance, the GenAI text detector provides a qualitative (i.e., "Your file content is AI/GPT generated") or quantitative (i.e., "63%") evaluation of the probability that the text was generated by AI.

After assessing the capabilities of the most frequently used GenAI detectors and their suitability for German language texts, and upon reviewing the scientific literature, we opted to use ZeroGPT (<https://www.zerogpt.com/>) for multiple reasons.³ First, previous research has found ZeroGPT to be among the best detector tools, and has been consistently and accurately identifying AI-generated texts (Aremu 2023; Liang et al. 2023; Walters 2023; Weber-Wulff et al. 2023). Its capabilities in detecting human-generated texts have also been shown to be precise (Aremu 2023; Liang et al. 2023; Pegoraro et al. 2023; Weber-Wulff et al. 2023). Second, it is essential to select

³ For a comprehensive overview on the effectiveness and capabilities of 16 AI text detectors, we refer the reader to Walters (2023).

a detector that does not have high rates of false positives or negatives. While false negatives lead to GenAI use remaining undetected, false positives might lead to unwarranted accusations against students. ZeroGPT has been shown to perform well at avoiding both (Walters 2023). Third, ZeroGPT is specifically designed to identify content generated by the most popular GenAI models, such as ChatGPT 3.5 and 4, Gemini, and LLaMA. Finally, ZeroGPT claims to be multilingual, making it suitable for our German language setting (ZeroGPT 2024).

ZeroGPT uses machine learning algorithms and natural language processing techniques to analyze textual data and identify patterns common to GenAI-generated text (Alhijawi et al. 2024; ZeroGPT 2024). The tool offers a front-end for inputting texts, which it passes along to a pretrained model in the back-end. It outputs the proportion of the tokens estimated to be AI-generated, which is more detailed than the binary outputs of several other detectors (e.g., Copyleaks).

3.3 Sample Selection and Descriptive Statistics

Our study is based on a broad sample of business, economics, and management students taking an introductory financial accounting course at a German university in the winter term 2023/2024. To obtain the required data for our analysis, we have drawn on several data sources. First, using an online survey at the beginning of the semester, we collected data on student characteristics that might influence exam success. Second, we retained the students' case study essays throughout the semester, and processed and analyzed them in terms of the use of GenAI after the final exam. Third, we obtained the final exam scores from the central examination office to evaluate the impact on academic performance.

Starting with an initial sample of 572 students who participated in the survey, we first excluded students who did not hand in an essay ($N = 243$). Additionally, we excluded those students who did not take the final exam ($N = 127$). Finally, we dropped the observations with

missing data for the required variables ($N = 9$). This leaves us with a final sample of 193 students. Given the 502 students in the final exam, our sample accounts for about 38% of the underlying population and can thus be considered representative.

[Insert Table 1 about here]

Table 1 reports the descriptive statistics of the student characteristics for the full sample in Panel A.⁴ The mean exam score is 45.39, indicating that our sample students on average fall below the 50% threshold. This reflects the high failure rates commonly observed among higher-education introductory accounting courses (Prinsloo et al. 2010; Sanders and Willis 2009). The binary variable of interest *GenAI User* has a mean of 0.306, indicating that 30.6% of the students in our sample (i.e., 59 students) are identified as GenAI users by ZeroGPT. The mean value of *ZeroGPT* indicates that on average 35.4% of students' texts are flagged as AI-generated. The average student in our sample has taken the final exam for the first time (mean *Attempt* = 1.425) and has attended fewer than half of the offered tutorials (mean *Attendance* = 0.447). A rather small subset of 19.2% of the students has a LinkedIn profile.

Panel B of Table 1 presents descriptive statistics divided into GenAI users and non-users. The last column presents the results of a two-tailed *t*-test. The average GenAI user achieves 9.027 (p -value < 0.01) fewer exam points, has a lower A-level grade (0.152; p -value < 0.1), and a higher number of attempts compared to non-users. This gives an initial indication of poorer exam performance among GenAI users compared to non-users. However, because not only GenAI usage but also student characteristics may influence exam performance, the association of GenAI usage

⁴ Pearson correlations are reported in Online Appendix B (<https://tinyurl.com/zjehfa3n>) and do not show any indication of multicollinearity issues, as the highest absolute value is 0.331.

and exam performance calls for multivariate examination taking control variables into consideration.

4 Impact of Generative AI Usage on Exam Performance

4.1 Main Results

Table 2 shows the results of our multivariate regression. The *GenAI Usage* dummy variable, being the only independent variable in column (1), displays a significantly negative coefficient. In column (2), we add the control variables commonly found in literature explaining exam performance. The coefficient of the variable of interest remains significant and slightly lower. Finally, column (3) presents the results of our main model, (Equation 1).⁵ The control variables primarily show significance and signs in line with the literature. For the variable of interest (*GenAI User*), we continue to find a statistically significant and negative coefficient. According to the model, students using GenAI score 6.71 points lower in the final exam, which is substantial, as the mean student scores 45.39 points. Thus, on average, the scores of GenAI users are about 15% lower than that of the mean non-user. Given that the passing threshold is at 41 points, GenAI use can tip the scales toward failing the exam – at least statistically. The empirical evidence provides a clear picture of a negative influence of students’ GenAI usage on their exam scores.

[Insert Table 2 about here]

⁵ The *link* test (Pregibon 1980; Tukey 1949), a significant *F*-test, and the coefficient of determination (adjusted R^2) all indicate a well-fitted model. As the Breusch and Pagan (1979) and Cook and Weisberg (1983)-test detects no heteroscedasticity (p -value of 0.56), we refrain from using robust standard errors.

4.2 Robustness Checks

We conduct a set of robustness checks to ensure the reliability and validity of our results. Our initial step involves scrutinizing the robustness of the *GenAI User* variable. In our main analysis, we identify GenAI users based on a threshold of over 50% in the written case study essays, as determined by ZeroGPT. This approach yields 30.6% of our sample as GenAI users. To test whether this share is realistic, we conduct an anonymous survey among all students in our sample (see Appendix C: <https://tinyurl.com/zjehfa3n>). Among the 30 survey responses (15.5% of the sample), 30.0% state that they used GenAI tools for the written case study, aligning well with our measured value. Identifying about a third of our population as GenAI users is also consistent with findings reported elsewhere in the literature. von Garrel and Mayer (2023) conducted a representative survey among German university students and find that 34.8% of them report using AI-based tools for studying occasionally, frequently, or very often. Considering the variation in reported usage rates across different studies and online reports (Abdaljaleel et al. 2024), we proceed to test alternative thresholds for the detection tool. Adjusting the threshold to 0.6 reduces GenAI users to 20.2%, while a threshold of 0.4 increases them to 40.9%. The results in columns (1) and (2) of Table 3 with the adjusted thresholds remain robust and unchanged.

[Insert Table 3 about here]

Additionally, we ensure the robustness of our findings by using alternative detection tools. We utilize Originality.AI, given its prominence in the literature (Walters 2023) and its claims to be multi-language (Originality.AI 2024). The coefficient of *GenAI User*, although slightly confirming the observed effect, is not statistically significant. Looking at the detector score distributions in Online Appendix D (<https://tinyurl.com/zjehfa3n>) reveals that Originality.AI may indeed face difficulties with German language texts. Except for a few cases, all values are either

exactly 0%, 50%, or 100%, showing an apparent dysfunction. Despite the difficulties of Originality.AI for German texts, the *GenAI User* coefficient remains negative and shows a similar value, however is slightly insignificant (p -value of 0.17).

Given this potential for bias with German texts, we repeat the robustness check using an AI detector particularly designed for the German language, developed at the University of Applied Sciences Wedel (Tlok et al. 2023). According to the developer, this tool's outputs are probabilities and thus not directly comparable to other tools. As shown in Online Appendix D (<https://tinyurl.com/zjehfa3n>), this results in a distribution of outputs with many at 0% probability and a uniform distribution across the remaining value range. A *more likely than not* classification would be impractical. Instead, we run a pre-test with 12 student seminar papers written before GenAI was available and modify them using ChatGPT 4, creating a paired sample of known GenAI and non-GenAI texts on the same topics as our main study. The German detector consistently shows values below 10% for human-written and above 10% for AI-generated texts. Adopting this threshold for our robustness check, we identify 36.3% of our sample as GenAI users, which is similar to the main analysis, our survey, and the values reported in previous literature (von Garrel and Mayer 2023). Column (4) presents the results using the German detector. The *GenAI User* coefficient is now even more negative and significant, suggesting improved accuracy due to the detector's optimization for German texts.

To address potential concerns about the opacity of AI detectors, we conduct a further robustness check by manually computing the propensity of GenAI usage. A growing body of research analyzes AI-generated texts and how to distinguish them from human-written ones. The literature reports that AI-generated texts typically exhibit lower readability, higher lexical richness, and a greater number of adjectives than human-written texts (Martínez et al. 2024; Muñoz-Ortiz

et al. 2023; Shah et al. 2023). AI texts tend to have more words per sentence and sentences per paragraph, contributing to lower readability scores (Deveci et al. 2023; Pehlivanoğlu et al. 2023). We employ the Gunning-Fog Index as a well-regarded measure of readability (Gunning 1952). Lexical richness essentially refers to the ratio of unique words measurable by the metric Herdan's C (Herdan 1960). As another metric, we consider the proportion of adjectives used as another metric (Markowitz et al. 2023). We conduct a principal component analysis to consolidate these three variables into a single vector.⁶ This results in a factor variable ranging from 0 to 1 indicating AI markers. In column (5), we use this factor as variable of interest and find that the presence of lexical characteristics of AI-generated texts in a student's work correlates with lower exam scores, reinforcing the findings from previous analyses.

Beyond the robustness of our measure, we also account for potential endogeneity issues. The group-wise comparison between GenAI users and non-users in Panel B of Table 1 indicates that GenAI users have a lower A-level grade and a higher number of attempts. Academic preparedness or experience might affect both exam performance and GenAI usage. Our approach already addresses potential endogeneity to some extent, as our control variables can capture such characteristics (Hill et al. 2021). To provide additional robustness, we use entropy-balancing to balance the distributions of control variables between GenAI users and non-users and subsequently repeat the analysis (Hainmueller 2012). The results in column (6) underscore our main findings even when controlling for potential endogeneity.⁷

⁶ The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of 0.657 (Kaiser and Rice 1974) and a significant Bartlett (1937) test of sphericity (p -value < 0.01) indicate that the variables are highly correlated and collectively measure the construct of a text being written by GenAI.

⁷ This approach primarily addresses observable sample selection bias, while this issue might also arise from omitted correlated variables (unobserved). However, our course of study-fixed effects mitigate this to some extent (Wooldridge 1995) and the Ramsey (1969) RESET test indicates no omitted variables (p -value of 0.764). Additionally, potential instrumental variables related to technical affinity and engagement do not show any correlation with *GenAI User*, allowing us to discount endogeneity due to omitted correlated variables.

4.3 Additional Analyses

Our main results show a negative impact of students' GenAI usage on their exam performance. To further explore the effect and the mechanism at work, we complement our findings by conducting additional analyses. We explore the documented effect for different levels of student engagement and cognitive abilities and measure how GenAI use affects performance improvement when repeating the exam.

First, we apply an identification strategy to further analyze the causal effect. In our first additional analysis, we identify and match all repeating students who did not pass the exam in the year before our main analysis, when GenAI models were not yet available for student use (*Pre GenAI*).⁸ This leaves us with a sample of matched observations before and after broad GenAI availability containing (*Pre GenAI Users* ($N = 15$)) and (*Pre Non-Users* ($N = 12$)). Figure 1 shows the distribution of exam scores for each group and the differences in mean exam scores between the groups and time periods (within group) along with their statistical significance. Due to the small sample size, we bootstrap the distributions around the mean.

[Insert Figure 1 about here]

The *Pre GenAI* period solely consists of students who failed the exam. We observe a statistically significant improvement in exam score in the next attempt for both groups (*Post GenAI*).⁹ However, the *GenAI User* group shows a substantially lower increase. While both subsamples perform equally well in their second attempt, those in the *GenAI User* group reach far

⁸ The *Pre GenAI* semester ended in January 2023. The first publicly available GenAI model (ChatGPT 3) was launched only a few weeks before the exam but had very few users, difficult access, and extensive downtime at that early stage. Therefore, an effect on the exam performance can be ruled out, allowing us to consider this semester as a *Pre GenAI* period.

⁹ An increased performance among repeating students aligns with related research attributing the effect to increased commitment (e.g., Martínez and Martínez 1992; Voshaar et al. 2023a; Weeks et al. 2023).

more points than the *Non-User group* in the attempt before in the *Pre GenAI* period. In the attempt after GenAI was widely available, the *Non-User* group increases their exam scores to a greater extent than the *GenAI User* group. Consequently, we observe a learning-hindering for students using GenAI, as their improvement is far lower.

In our second additional analysis, we perform split sample analyses using two measures of student capabilities and engagement. If the documented effect in our main results is indeed attributable to hindering learning, the effect should be more pronounced for students where individual learning and comprehending the content would otherwise have fallen on fertile ground. To approximate this characteristic, we use students' A-level grades and attendance at tutorials. While the first addresses academic preparedness, pre-university achievements, and cognitive abilities, the latter measures engagement. We conduct a median split for both measures to create two samples with low and high A-level grades and attendance to gain additional insights into the mechanism behind the effect. Table 4 presents the results of the additional split sample analysis. Columns (1) and (2) include the two regressions for the split samples by A-level grade, while attendance is used to split the sample in columns (3) and (4).

[Insert Table 4 about here]

For the split sample of students with good A-level grades (and therefore strong cognitive abilities demonstrated through considerable pre-university performance), we find the coefficient of *GenAI User* to be highly significant and negative (column (1)). While this aligns with our main results, the coefficient's magnitude is almost doubled compared to the one in column (3) of Table 2. In contrast, the coefficient is positive but insignificant for students with A-level grades below the median (Column (2)). A similar picture emerges when utilizing students' tutorial attendance (and hence engagement) for median split. While the students with higher attendance

perform worse not only statistically significantly but to an educationally impactful extent when using GenAI, the effect is insignificant for low-attendance students (columns (3) and (4), respectively). This suggests that the documented negative effect of GenAI use in the main analysis is primarily due to the effect on students with good A-level grades and high attendance.

We can conclude that the impact of GenAI use on exam performance varies depending on students' prior academic achievements and/or cognitive abilities as well as engagement during the semester. We find using GenAI to be detrimental to the exam scores of higher achieving and more engaged students. This confirms the learning-hindering mechanism as those students who would have been well equipped to understand the learning materials suffer particularly from the forgone opportunity to engage with the course content. When compared intra-group with other students with good prerequisites and who prepare for and write the essays themselves, the disadvantage of (over-)reliance on GenAI is even more glaring.

5 Discussion and Implications

Our main results show that GenAI usage negatively affects students' exam scores. While the literature has found many aspects of GenAI that can have a positive or negative influence on academic performance, it is unclear whether the benefits or the downsides prevail. We observe clear evidence of a negative overall effect. Positive aspects such as summarizing information (Pavlik 2023), increasing study motivation (Ali et al. 2023; Fauzi et al. 2023), or providing plain-language explanations (Sullivan et al. 2023) may still occur. However, our results show that these are overshadowed by the negative effects that have been described in previous studies (Crawford et al. 2023a; Markauskaite et al. 2022; Rasul et al. 2023).

We explore this effect in greater depth, leveraging an identification strategy in a sample of repeating students and find that students opting for GenAI usage for learning and academic writing

purposes do not exhibit an increase in their exam scores similar to that of their peers not using GenAI. We ascribe this result primarily to a learning-hindering mechanism when using GenAI. For example, when students let GenAI write an essay on a complex and challenging topic, instead of exploring, grappling with, and mastering the content and then writing the essay themselves, students waste the opportunity to learn and to experience the inherent rewards of figuring things out. Research such as Milano et al. (2023) warn of this, stating that GenAI's role in facilitating academic writing is dependable to the point of negatively impacting students' learning. Similarly, the ready availability of quick answers may reduce the intensity of students' engagement with the subject matter and ultimately deter their learning, as argued by Cotton et al. (2023), Rudolph et al. (2023), and Sallam et al. (2023).

The results of our split sample regressions further support the learning-hindering mechanism, as students with high learning potential are especially impacted by GenAI usage. The significantly negative effect for the students in our sample with good A-level grades or high attendance – which can be reasonably equated to higher levels of skill or commitment – indicates that these students have more to lose when they do not immerse themselves in the subject matter. And indeed, we find no effect for the opposite group, who are less predisposed to assimilate knowledge due to lower attendance or cognitive ability. We can however document the impact of GenAI usage for these students when looking at the results of the identification strategy analysis. This subsample solely consists of repeating students with attendance and A-Level grades that are below average. While we document a significant performance increase in the next exam attempt, GenAI usage hampers this improvement. Thus, the negative GenAI influence becomes evident when there is considerable learning potential, providing further support for the learning-hindering mechanism.

These findings align with the constructivist theory of learning (cf. Bada and Olusegun 2015), which highlight the importance of being actively involved in the learning process to achieve deeper understanding and build knowledge. In this sense, writing a case study essay is valuable not merely as an end in itself but also as an instrument to assist students in developing skills in planning, completing, and editing their written work (Dweck 1986) as well as engaging with, exploring, and understanding subject-related content. When students immerse themselves in their subjects, they are more likely to experience an *eureka* moment that enhance comprehension. By using GenAI for essay writing, students may bypass this essential cognitive process of comprehension, analysis, and summarization. This might similarly occur when GenAI is used to study for exams.¹⁰ If for instance GenAI is used to simplify or explain complex topics, students might use it as a shortcut that makes learning seem easier, but which actually prevents them from going through the process of understanding and learning on a deeper level.

Our findings have important implications for students, educators, and educational institutions. For students, the results suggest a cautious approach to using GenAI for learning. While GenAI may appear to ease the learning process, it can adversely affect learning performance. Students should be mindful of the potential drawbacks and consider integrating GenAI as a supplementary tool rather than a primary resource for grappling with complex topics. Educators likewise need to take students' use of GenAI into account when designing curricula. It is essential to provide tasks and learning materials that promote deep learning and minimize the potential for GenAI to diminish engagement with the subject matter. Strategies could include incorporating in-class discussions, handwritten assignments, and other methods that encourage

¹⁰ Our detection solely identifies GenAI use in essay writing, yet it is likely that GenAI users apply this versatile technology for various academic tasks. This is supported by our survey, as 26.7% indicate using GenAI broadly for academic purposes, close to the 30.0% reporting that they use it for the essay.

active learning and critical thinking. Lastly, this study offers valuable insights for educational institutions regarding GenAI policies in higher education. Although our results point to negative implications of GenAI use on student performance, we do not advocate for outright bans. As with many revolutionary information systems, there are both positive and negative aspects of GenAI. The negative results of this study may rather show that higher education does not yet harness the full potential of GenAI. Educational institutions should guide educators on how to instruct students in the proper use of GenAI and develop policies that mitigate its negative effects while amplifying its benefits. Similar to the disruptions of higher education caused by calculators and the internet, banning is not a practical solution. Students will inevitably encounter GenAI outside the university setting and must learn to use it effectively rather than confining themselves to getting by without it.

6 Conclusion, Limitations, and Future Research

The present study contributes to the rich debate on how GenAI will affect learning in (higher) education by evaluating the tangible effects of GenAI usage on exam performance. We address an important research gap, as performance effects have not yet been examined but are nevertheless crucial when discussing how to adapt education to the age of GenAI. Our findings reveal that using GenAI tools for writing essays and likely for other learning purposes significantly decreases exam scores. The additional analysis offers nuanced insights by documenting a learning-hindering mechanism through which GenAI usage negatively affects exam scores. Our study thus has implications for students, educators, and institutions.

Some of the limitations of our study warrant further attention. First, using GenAI detector tools to identify GenAI users among our students comes with the risk of inaccurate detection results. Not identifying all GenAI users (or too many) in our sample would affect our findings.

Having said that, we improve the robustness of our results by using several different GenAI detector tools. These tools are particularly suited to German language applications or have distinct operating principles. We also find the share of detected GenAI users to align with the numbers found in related research (von Garrel and Mayer 2023) and through our own anonymous survey. Second, our results may lack generalizability as our study is limited to a financial accounting class at one German university. Finally, our study does not account for usage behavior and hence usage intensity. Different intensities of use might come with different impacts on exam performance.

In addressing these limitations, future research might explore students' GenAI usage behavior. This could help in understanding the implications more comprehensively. Future research might also evaluate the impact of GenAI tools from an educator's perspective. Our study takes a student-centric viewpoint, but GenAI also affects the daily work of educators. Exploring the threats and opportunities from this perspective would help institutions position themselves in discussing whether using GenAI tools should be banned, tolerated, or taught.

References

- Abdaljaleel, M., Barakat, M., Alsanafi, M., Salim, N. A., Abazid, H., Malaeb, D., Mohammed, A. H., Hassan, B. A. R., Wayyes, A. M., Farhan, S. S., Khatib, S. E., Rahal, M., Sahban, A., Abdelaziz, D. H., Mansour, N. O., AlZayer, R., Khalil, R., Fekih-Romdhane, F., Hallit, R., Hallit, S., and Sallam, M. 2024. "A Multinational Study on the Factors Influencing University Students' Attitudes and Usage of ChatGPT," *Scientific Reports* (14:1), pp. 1983-1997.
- Ahangama, S. 2023. "An Investigation of Domain-Based Social Influence on ChatGPT-Related Twitter Data," *ICIS 2023 Proceedings*.
- AlAfnan, M. A., Dishari, S., Jovic, M., and Lomidze, K. 2023. "ChatGPT as an Educational tool: Opportunities, Challenges, and Recommendations for Communication, Business Writing, and Composition Courses," *Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Technology* (3:2), pp. 60-68.
- Alavi, M., Leidner, D. E., and Mousavi, R. 2024. "Knowledge Management Perspective of Generative Artificial Intelligence," *Journal of the Association for Information Systems* (25:1), pp. 1-12.
- Aldahdouh, T. Z., Nokelainen, P., and Korhonen, V. 2020. "Technology and Social Media Usage in Higher Education: The Influence of Individual Innovativeness," *SAGE Open* (10:1).
- Aldamen, H., Al-Esmail, R., and Hollindale, J. 2015. "Does Lecture Capturing Impact Student Performance and Attendance in an Introductory Accounting Course?," *Accounting Education* (24:4), pp. 291-317.
- Alhijawi, B., Jarrar, R., AbuAlRub, A., and Bader, A. 2024. "Deep Learning Detection Method for Large Language Models-Generated Scientific Content," *available at arXiv: 2403.00828*.
- Ali, J. K. M., Shamsan, M. A. A., Hezam, T. A., and Mohammed, A. A. Q. 2023. "Impact of ChatGPT on Learning Motivation," *Journal of English Studies in Arabia Felix* (2:1).
- Aremu, T. 2023. "Unlocking Pandora's Box: Unveiling the Elusive Realm of AI Text Detection," *Available at SSRN: 4470719*.
- Bada, S. O., and Olusegun, S. 2015. "Constructivism Learning Theory: A Paradigm for Teaching and Learning," *Journal of Research & Method in Education* (5:6), pp. 66-70.
- Bangert-Drowns, R., Hurley, M. M., and Wilkinson, B. 2004. "The Effects of School-Based Writing-to-Learn Interventions on Academic Achievement: A Meta-Analysis," *Review of Educational Research* (74), pp. 29-58.
- Bartlett, M. S. 1937. "Properties of Sufficiency and Statistical Tests," *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Mathematical and Physical Sciences* (160:901), pp. 268-282.
- Benbya, H., Strich, F., and Tamm, T. 2024. "Navigating Generative Artificial Intelligence Promises and Perils for Knowledge and Creative Work," *Journal of the Association for Information Systems* (25:1), pp. 23-36.
- Breusch, T., and Pagan, A. 1979. "A Simple Test for Heteroscedasticity and Random Coefficient Variation," *Econometrica* (47:5), pp. 1287-1294.
- Brown, T., Mann, B., Ryder, N., Subbiah, M., Kaplan, J. D., Dhariwal, P., Neelakantan, A., Shyam, P., Sastry, G., and Askell, A. 2020. "Language Models are Few-Shot Learners," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* (33), pp. 1877-1901.
- Calderon, T. G., Gao, L., and Cardoso, R. L. 2023. "Generative Artificial Intelligence in the Classroom: A Financial Accounting Experience," in *Advances in Accounting Education: Teaching and Curriculum Innovations*, T.G. Calderon (ed.). Emerald Publishing Limited, pp. 125-144.
- Chen, M., Radford, A., Child, R., Wu, J., Jun, H., Luan, D., and Sutskever, I. 2020. "Generative Pretraining from Pixels," *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 1691-1703.
- Chen, X., Zou, D., Xie, H., Cheng, G., and Liu, C. 2022. "Two Decades of Artificial Intelligence in Education Contributors, Collaborations, Research Topics, Challenges, and Future Directions," *Educational Technology & Society* (25:1), pp. 28-47.
- Cheng, P., and Ding, R. 2021. "The Effect of Online Review Exercises on Student Course Engagement and Learning Performance: A Case Study of an Introductory Financial Accounting Course at an International Joint Venture University," *Journal of Accounting Education* (54:1), p. 100699.
- Chhina, S., Antony, B., and Firmin, S. 2023. "Navigating the Terrain of Large Language Models in Higher Education: A Systematic Literature Review," *ACIS 2023 Proceedings*.
- Chiu, C., King, R., and Crossin, C. 2023. "Using Colour-Coded Digital Annotation for Enhanced Case-Based Learning Outcomes," *Accounting Education* (32:2), pp. 201-221.
- Cook, R. D., and Weisberg, S. 1983. "Diagnostics for Heteroscedasticity in Regression," *Biometrika* (70:1).

- Cotton, D. R. E., Cotton, P. A., and Shipway, J. R. 2023. "Chatting and Cheating: Ensuring Academic Integrity in the Era of ChatGPT," *Innovations in Education and Teaching International* (61:2), pp. 228-239.
- Crawford, J., Cowling, M., and Allen, K.-A. 2023a. "Leadership is Needed for Ethical ChatGPT: Character, Assessment, and Learning Using Artificial Intelligence (AI)," *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice* (20:3).
- Crawford, J., Cowling, M., Ashton-Hay, S., Kelder, J.-A., Middleton, R., and Wilson, G. S. 2023b. "Artificial Intelligence and Authorship Editor Policy: ChatGPT, Bard, Bing AI, and Beyond," *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice* (20:5).
- Crothers, E. N., Japkowicz, N., and Viktor, H. L. 2023. "Machine-Generated Text: A Comprehensive Survey of Threat Models and Detection Methods," *IEEE Access* (11), pp. 70977-71002.
- Dalalah, D., and Dalalah, O. M. A. 2023. "The False Positives and False Negatives of Generative AI Detection Tools in Education and Academic Research: The Case of ChatGPT," *The International Journal of Management Education* (21:2), p. 100822.
- Deveci, C. D., Baker, J. J., Sikander, B., and Rosenberg, J. 2023. "A Comparison of Cover Letters Written by ChatGPT-4 or Humans," *Danish Medical Bulletin* (70:11).
- Dweck, C. S. 1986. "Motivational Processes Affecting Learning," *American Psychologist* (41:10), pp. 1040-1048.
- Eager, B., and Brunton, R. 2023. "Prompting Higher Education Towards AI-Augmented Teaching and Learning Practice," *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice* (20:5).
- Engelmann, B., Haak, F., Kreutz, C. K., Khasmakhi, N. N., and Schaer, P. 2023. "Text Simplification of Scientific Texts for Non-Expert Readers," *available at arXiv: 2307.03569*.
- Eskew, R. K., and Faley, R. H. 1988. "Some Determinants of Student Performance in the First College-Level Financial Accounting Course," *The Accounting Review* (63:1), pp. 137-147.
- Fauzi, F., Tuhuteru, L., Sampe, F., Ausat, A. M. A., and Hatta, H. R. 2023. "Analysing the Role of ChatGPT in Improving Student Productivity in Higher Education," *Journal on Education* (5:4), pp. 14886-14891.
- Ferrara, E. 2024. "GenAI Against Humanity: Nefarious Applications of Generative Artificial Intelligence and Large Language Models," *Journal of Computational Social Science* (Forthcoming).
- Feuerriegel, S., Hartmann, J., Janiesch, C., and Zschech, P. 2024. "Generative AI," *Business & Information Systems Engineering* (66:1), pp. 111-126.
- Gilson, A., Safranek, C. W., Huang, T., Socrates, V., Chi, L., Taylor, R. A., and Chartash, D. 2023. "How Does ChatGPT Perform on the United States Medical Licensing Examination (USMLE)? The Implications of Large Language Models for Medical Education and Knowledge Assessment," *JMIR Medical Education* (9:1).
- Gregor, S. 2024. "Responsible Artificial Intelligence and Journal Publishing," *Journal of the Association for Information Systems* (25:1), pp. 48-60.
- Guney, Y. 2009. "Exogenous and Endogenous Factors Influencing Students' Performance in Undergraduate Accounting Modules," *Accounting Education* (18:1), pp. 51-73.
- Gunning, R. 1952. *The Technique of Clear Writing*. McGraw-Hill.
- Hainmueller, J. 2012. "Entropy Balancing for Causal Effects: A Multivariate Reweighting Method to Produce Balanced Samples in Observational Studies," *Political Analysis* (20:1), pp. 25-46.
- Hartnett, N., Römcke, J., and Yap, C. 2004. "Student Performance in Tertiary-Level Accounting: An International Student Focus," *Accounting & Finance* (44:2), pp. 163-185.
- Herdan, G. 1960. *Type-Token Mathematics*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Hill, A. D., Johnson, S. G., Greco, L. M., O'Boyle, E. H., and Walter, S. L. 2021. "Endogeneity: A Review and Agenda for the Methodology-Practice Divide Affecting Micro and Macro Research," *Journal of Management* (47:1), pp. 105-143.
- Hsu, T., and Thompson, S. A. 2023. "Disinformation Researchers Raise Alarms About A.I. Chatbots." *The New York Times*, from <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/02/08/technology/ai-chatbots-disinformation.html>
- Hu, Y., Nath, N., Zhu, Y., and Laswad, F. 2023. "Accounting Students' Online Engagement, Choice of Course Delivery Format and Their Effects on Academic Performance," *Accounting Education* (32), pp. 1-36.
- Jain, T., and Kapoor, M. 2015. "The Impact of Study Groups and Roommates on Academic Performance," *Review of Economics and Statistics* (97:1), pp. 44-54.
- Johnson, A. 2023. "ChatGPT in Schools: Here's Where it's Banned - and How it Could Potentially Help Students." *Forbes*.

- Kaiser, H. F., and Rice, J. 1974. "Little Jiffy," *Educational and Psychological Measurement* (34:1), pp. 111-117.
- Kasneci, E., Sessler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., Gasser, U., Groh, G., Günemann, S., Hüllermeier, E., Krusche, S., Kutyniok, G., Michaeli, T., Nerdel, C., Pfeffer, J., Poquet, O., Sailer, M., Schmidt, A., Seidel, T., Stadler, M., Weller, J., Kuhn, J., and Kasneci, G. 2023. "ChatGPT for Good? On Opportunities and Challenges of Large Language Models for Education," *Learning and Individual Differences* (103).
- Katavic, R., Pahuja, A., and Syed, T. A. 2023. "Navigating the Use of ChatGPT in Classrooms: A Study of Student Experiences," *ICIS 2023 Proceedings*.
- Kishore, S., Hong, Y., Nguyen, A., and Qutab, S. 2023. "Should ChatGPT be Banned at Schools? Organizing Visions for Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Education," *ICIS 2023 Proceedings*.
- Lee, M. 2023. "A Mathematical Investigation of Hallucination and Creativity in GPT Models," *Mathematics* (11:10).
- Lento, C. 2018. "Student Usage of Assessment-Based and Self-Study Online Learning Resources in Introductory Accounting," *Issues in Accounting Education* (33:4), pp. 13-31.
- Liang, W., Yuksekgonul, M., Mao, Y., Wu, E., and Zou, J. 2023. "GPT Detectors are Biased Against Non-Native English Writers," *available at ArXiv: 2304.02819*.
- Lund, B. D., Wang, T., Mannuru, N. R., Nie, B., Shimray, S., and Wang, Z. 2023. "ChatGPT and a New Academic Reality: Artificial Intelligence-Written Research Papers and the Ethics of the Large Language Models in Scholarly Publishing," *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology* (74:5), pp. 570-581.
- Markauskaite, L., Marrone, R., Poquet, O., Knight, S., Martinez-Maldonado, R., Howard, S., Tondeur, J., De Laat, M., Buckingham Shum, S., Gašević, D., and Siemens, G. 2022. "Rethinking the Entwinement Between Artificial Intelligence and Human Learning: What Capabilities Do Learners Need for a World with AI?," *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence* (3), p. 100056.
- Markowitz, D. M., Hancock, J. T., and Bailenson, J. N. 2023. "Linguistic Markers of Inherently False AI Communication and Intentionally False Human Communication: Evidence From Hotel Reviews," *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* (43:1), pp. 63-82.
- Martínez, G., Hernández, J. A., Conde, J., Reviriego, P., and Merino, E. 2024. "Beware of Words: Evaluating the Lexical Richness of Conversational Large Language Models," *available at arXiv: 2402.15518*.
- Martínez, J. G., and Martínez, N. C. 1992. "Re-Examining Repeated Testing and Teacher Effects in a Remedial Mathematics Course," *The British Journal of Educational Psychology* (62:3), pp. 356-363.
- Massoudi, D., Koh, S., Hancock, P. J., and Fung, L. 2017. "The Effectiveness of Usage of Online Multiple Choice Questions on Student Performance in Introductory Accounting," *Issues in Accounting Education* (32:4), pp. 1-17.
- Milano, S., McGrane, J. A., and Leonelli, S. 2023. "Large Language Models Challenge the Future of Higher Education," *Nature Machine Intelligence* (5:4), pp. 333-334.
- Mu, N., Kirillov, A., Wagner, D., and Xie, S. 2022. "Slip: Self-Supervision Meets Language-Image Pre-training," *European Conference on Computer Vision*: Springer, pp. 529-544.
- Muñoz-Ortiz, A., Gómez-Rodríguez, C., and Vilares, D. 2023. "Contrasting Linguistic Patterns in Human and LLM-Generated Text," *available at ArXiv: 2308.09067*.
- 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).
- Originality.AI. 2024. "Originality AI Plagiarism and Fact Checker." from <https://originality.ai/>
- Paul, J. A., Baker, H. M., and Cochran, J. D. 2012. "Effect of Online Social Networking on Student Academic Performance," *Computers in Human Behavior* (28:6), pp. 2117-2127.
- Pavlik, J. V. 2023. "Collaborating With ChatGPT: Considering the Implications of Generative Artificial Intelligence for Journalism and Media Education," *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator* (78:1), pp. 84-93.
- Pegoraro, A., Kumari, K., Fereidooni, H., and Sadeghi, A.-R. 2023. "To ChatGPT, or Not To ChatGPT: That is the Question!," *available at arXiv: 2304.01487*.
- Pehlivanoglu, M. K., Syakura, M. A., and Duru, N. 2023. "Enhancing Paraphrasing in Chatbots Through Prompt Engineering: A Comparative Study on ChatGPT, Bing, and Bard," *8th International Conference on Computer Science and Engineering*: IEEE, pp. 432-437.
- Perkins, M. 2023. "Academic Integrity Considerations of AI Large Language Models in the Post-Pandemic Era: ChatGPT and Beyond," *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice* (20:2).

- Pregibon, D. 1980. "Goodness of Link Tests for Generalized Linear Models," *Applied Statistics* (29:1), pp. 15-14.
- Prinsloo, P., Müller, H., and Du Plessis, A. 2010. "Raising awareness of the risk of failure in first-year accounting students," *Accounting Education: an international journal* (19:1-2), pp. 203-218.
- Qadir, J. 2023. "Engineering Education in the Era of ChatGPT: Promise and Pitfalls of Generative AI for Education," *IEEE Global Engineering Education Conference IEEE*, pp. 1-9.
- Radford, A., Narasimhan, K., Salimans, T., and Sutskever, I. 2018. "Improving Language Understanding by Generative Pre-Training." *OpenAI*
- Ramsey, J. B. 1969. "Tests for Specification Errors in Classical Linear Least-Squares Regression Analysis," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology* (31:2), pp. 350-371.
- Rasul, T., Nair, S., Kalendra, D., Robin, M., de Oliveira Santini, F., Ladeira, W. J., Sun, M., Day, I., Rather, R. A., and Heathcote, L. 2023. "The Role of ChatGPT in Higher Education: Benefits, Challenges, and Future Research Directions," *Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching* (6:1).
- Rudolph, J., Tan, S., and Tan, S. 2023. "War of the Chatbots: Bard, Bing Chat, ChatGPT, Ernie and Beyond. The New AI Gold Rush and Its Impact on Higher Education," *Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching* (6:1).
- Sallam, M., Salim, N. A., Barakat, M., and Ala'a, B. 2023. "ChatGPT Applications in Medical, Dental, Pharmacy, and Public Health Education: A Descriptive Study Highlighting the Advantages and Limitations," *Narra J* (3:1).
- Sanders, D. E., and Willis, V. F. 2009. "Setting the PACE for Student Success in Intermediate Accounting," *Issues in Accounting Education* (24:3), pp. 319-337.
- Shah, A., Ranka, P., Dedhia, U., Prasad, S., Muni, S., and Bhowmick, K. 2023. "Detecting and Unmasking AI-Generated Texts Through Explainable Artificial Intelligence Using Stylistic Features," *International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications* (14:10).
- Strzelecki, A. 2023. "To Use or Not to Use ChatGPT in Higher Education? A Study of Students' Acceptance and Use of Technology," *Interactive Learning Environments* (31), pp. 1-14.
- Sullivan, M., Kelly, A., and McLaughlan, P. 2023. "ChatGPT in Higher Education: Considerations for Academic Integrity and Student Learning," *Journal of Applied Learning & Teaching* (6:1).
- Tao, Y., Yoo, C., and Animesh, A. 2023. "AI Plus Other Technologies? The Impact of ChatGPT and Creativity Support Systems on Individual Creativity," *ICIS 2023 Proceedings*.
- Teubner, T., Flath, C. M., Weinhardt, C., van der Aalst, W., and Hinz, O. 2023. "Welcome to the Era of ChatGPT et al," *Business & Information Systems Engineering* (65:2), pp. 95-101.
- Tiwari, C. K., Bhat, M. A., Khan, S. T., Subramaniam, R., and Khan, M. A. I. 2023. "What Drives Students Toward ChatGPT? An Investigation of the Factors Influencing Adoption and Usage of ChatGPT," *Interactive Technology and Smart Education* (2023).
- Tlok, T., Annuth, H., and Pawłowski, M. 2023. "Robuste Erkennung von KI-generierten Texten in deutscher Sprache," in: *Master Thesis at Department of Data Science & Artificial Intelligence – FH Wedel*.
- Tukey, J. W. 1949. "One Degree of Freedom for Non-additivity," *Biometrics* (5:3), pp. 232-242.
- Van Slyke, C., Johnson, R., and Sarabadani, J. 2023. "Generative Artificial Intelligence in Information Systems Education: Challenges, Consequences, and Responses," *Communications of the Association for Information Systems* (53:1), pp. 1-21.
- von Brackel-Schmidt, C., Kučević, E., Memmert, L., Tavanapour, N., Cvetkovic, I., Bittner, E. A., and Böhmann, T. 2023. "A User-Centric Taxonomy for Conversational Generative Language Models," *ICIS 2023 Proceedings*.
- von Garrel, J., and Mayer, J. 2023. "Artificial Intelligence in Studies - Use of ChatGPT and Ai-Based Tools Among Students in Germany," *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications* (10:1), p. 799.
- Voshaar, J., Knipp, M., Loy, T., Zimmermann, J., and Johannsen, F. 2023a. "The impact of using a mobile app on learning success in accounting education," *Accounting Education*, pp. 222-247.
- Voshaar, J., Wecks, J. O., Johannsen, F., Knipp, M., Loy, T., and Zimmermann, J. 2023b. "Supporting Students in the Transition to Higher Education: Evidence from a Mobile App in Accounting Education," *International Conference in Information Systems, Hyderabad*.
- Walters, W. H. 2023. "The Effectiveness of Software Designed to Detect AI-Generated Writing: A Comparison of 16 AI Text Detectors," *Open Information Science* (7:1), p. 20220158.
- Weber-Wulff, D., Anohina-Naumeca, A., Bjelobaba, S., Foltýnek, T., Guerrero-Dib, J., Popoola, O., Šigut, P., and Waddington, L. 2023. "Testing of Detection Tools for AI-Generated Text," *International Journal for Educational Integrity* (19:1), p. 26.

- Wecks, J. O., Voshaar, J., and Zimmermann, J. 2023. "Using Machine Learning to Address Individual Learning Needs in Accounting Education," *Available at SSRN*.
- Wijesundara, T. R., and Xixiang, S. 2018. "Social Networking Sites Acceptance: The Role of Personal Innovativeness in Information Technology," *International Journal of Business and Management* (13:8).
- Wilson, D., Burnett, P., Valacich, J. S., and Jenkins, J. 2023. "Human or AI? Using Digital Behavior to Verify Essay Authorship," *ICIS 2023 Proceedings*.
- Wooldridge, J. M. 1995. "Selection Corrections for Panel Data Models Under Conditional Mean Independence Assumptions," *Journal of Econometrics* (68:1), pp. 115-132.
- Wu, H., Wang, W., Wan, Y., Jiao, W., and Lyu, M. R. 2023. "ChatGPT or Grammarly? Evaluating ChatGPT on Grammatical Error Correction Benchmark," *available at ArXiv: 2303.13648*.
- Yuan, Z., and Chen, H. 2023. "The Impact of ChatGPT on the Demand for Human Content Generating and Editing Services: Evidence from an Online Labor Market," *ICIS 2023 Proceedings*.
- ZeroGPT. 2024. "AI Text Detector." from <https://www.zerogpt.com>
- Zhu, Q., Zhang, X., and Luo, J. 2023. "Biologically Inspired Design Concept Generation Using Generative Pre-Trained Transformers," *Journal of Mechanical Design* (145:4), p. 041409.

Figures and Tables





Group	<i>Pre GenAI</i>	<i>Post GenAI</i>	Mean Diff
<i>GenAI User</i> (<i>N</i> = 15)			12.76**
<i>Non-User</i> (<i>N</i> = 12)			18.91***
Mean Diff	6.86	0.72	

Figure 1 presents the bootstrap distributions (1,000 replications) and the 95% confidence interval of the exam score from the four groups of (*Pre*) *GenAI User* and *Non-User* before and after the public release of GenAI. Also, the mean differences between GenAI user and non-user performance are reported as absolute values and tested by a paired sample (two-sample) *t*-test for within- (between-)group difference. ***, **, * indicate statistical significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% level, respectively (two-tailed).

Figure 1. Results of the Identification Strategy

Panel A:						
Student Data	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Median</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>P25</i>	<i>P75</i>
<i>Exam Score</i>	193	45.39	45.83	22.23	27.50	61.11
<i>GenAI User</i>	193	0.306		0.462		
<i>ZeroGPT</i>	193	0.354	0.296	0.277	0.119	0.556
<i>A-Level Grade</i>	193	2.290	2.200	0.607	1.800	2.700
<i>Attempt</i>	193	1.425	1	1.223	1	1
<i>Attendance (relative)</i>	193	0.447	0.444	0.322	0.111	0.778
<i>Vocational Training</i>	193	0.135		0.342		
<i>Voluntary Service</i>	193	0.363		0.482		
<i>Female</i>	193	0.472		0.500		
<i>LinkedIn User</i>	193	0.192		0.395		

Panel B:						
Student Data by GenAI Usage	<i>GenAI User</i>		<i>Non-User</i>		<i> Diff./</i>	
Variables	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>		
<i>Exam Score</i>	59	39.120	134	48.147	9.027 ***	
<i>A-Level Grade</i>	59	2.184	134	2.337	0.152 *	
<i>Attempt</i>	59	1.763	134	1.276	0.486 **	
<i>Attendance (relative)</i>	59	0.413	134	0.463	0.051	
<i>Vocational Training</i>	59	0.085	134	0.157	0.072	
<i>Voluntary Service</i>	59	0.322	134	0.381	0.059	
<i>Female</i>	59	0.390	134	0.508	0.118	
<i>LinkedIn User</i>	59	0.221	134	0.179	0.041	

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics of student characteristics in Panel A. For binary variables, only means and standard deviations are presented. Panel B shows student characteristics disaggregated by GenAI usage. The last column presents the difference in mean values and the significance level of a two-tailed *t*-test (chi-squared test) for continuous (binary) variables. ***, **, * indicate statistical significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% level, respectively.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

Variables	(1)	(2)	(3)
GenAI User	-8.48 **	-6.32 **	-6.71 **
	(-2.40)	(-2.01)	(-2.17)
<i>A-Level Grade</i>		12.04 ***	11.42 ***
		(4.98)	(4.79)
<i>Attempt</i>		0.93	0.76
		(0.77)	(0.63)
<i>Attendance (relative)</i>		17.99 ***	18.30 ***
		(3.73)	(3.86)
<i>Vocational Training</i>		10.54 **	10.80 **
		(2.41)	(2.52)
<i>Voluntary Service</i>		2.20	1.76
		(0.72)	(0.59)
<i>Female</i>		-9.54 ***	-10.16 ***
		(-3.23)	(-3.50)
<i>LinkedIn User</i>			9.60 ***
			(2.75)
<i>Constant</i>	Included	Included	Included
<i>Course of Study-Fixed Effects</i>	Included	Included	Included
<i>N</i>	193	193	193
<i>Adj. R²</i>	0.03	0.28	0.30

Table 1 presents the results of regressing GenAI usage on the exam score. Column (1) depicts the standalone effect of the GenAI usage dummy. In column (2), we add control variables commonly found in literature explaining exam performance. Column (3) adds another control variable to better explain the independent variable representing our main results. Bold font indicates the variable of interest. ***, **, * indicate statistical significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% level (two-tailed), respectively. *t*-values are presented in parentheses. All variables are defined in Appendix A (<https://tinyurl.com/zjehfa3n>).

Table 2. Regression Results on the Impact of GenAI Usage on Exam Performance

Variables	(1) Threshold 0.4	(2) Threshold 0.6	(3) Originality.AI	(4) German Detector	(5) Manual Computation	(6) Balanced Sample
<i>GenAI User</i>	-7.10 ** (-2.43)	-7.17 ** (-2.02)	-4.14 (-1.38)	-8.53 *** (-2.90)	-2.66 *** (-2.70)	-6.51 ** (-2.07)
<i>A-Level Grade</i>	11.64 *** (4.92)	11.42 *** (4.78)	11.42 *** (4.73)	11.21 *** (4.75)	11.62 *** (4.87)	8.88 *** (3.03)
<i>Attempt</i>	0.89 (0.74)	0.84 (0.69)	0.29 (0.24)	0.94 (0.79)	0.79 (0.66)	2.05 ** (1.98)
<i>Attendance (relative)</i>	17.70 *** (3.75)	18.38 *** (3.87)	18.01 *** (3.78)	16.81 *** (3.58)	15.55 *** (3.25)	17.75 *** (2.95)
<i>Vocational Training</i>	10.37 ** (2.41)	11.25 *** (2.63)	11.98 *** (2.79)	10.93 ** (2.58)	12.09 *** (2.86)	8.75 (1.65)
<i>Voluntary Service</i>	1.81 (0.60)	2.07 (0.69)	2.13 (0.71)	1.57 (0.53)	1.24 (0.41)	1.52 (0.45)
<i>Female</i>	-10.14 *** (-3.50)	-9.29 *** (-3.18)	-9.97 *** (-3.41)	-10.20 *** (-3.54)	-10.18 *** (-3.50)	-10.49 *** (-3.22)
<i>LinkedIn User</i>	10.75 *** (3.05)	9.25 *** (2.65)	9.05 ** (2.58)	10.26 *** (2.96)	7.89 ** (2.25)	10.53 *** (2.82)
<i>Constant</i>	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included
<i>Course of Study-FE</i>	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included
<i>N</i>	193	193	193	193	193	193
<i>Adj. R²</i>	0.31	0.30	0.29	0.32	0.31	0.20

Table 3 presents the results of the robustness checks. In columns (1) and (2), we reduced (> 0.4) or increased (> 0.6) the threshold of the AI detector value to be classified in the *GenAI User* group. Columns (3) and (4) use alternative AI detectors. Column (5) includes a manual computed score that represents AI detection. In column (6), we again present our main results but with an entropy-balanced sample. Bold font indicates the variable of interest. ***, **, * indicate statistical significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% level (two-tailed), respectively. *t*-values are presented in parentheses. All variables are defined in Appendix A (<https://tinyurl.com/zjehfa3n>).

Table 3. Results of Robustness Checks

Variables	(1) Higher A-Level Grade	(2) Lower A-Level Grade	(3) Higher Attendance	(4) Lower Attendance
ChatGPT User	-12.27 *** (-2.73)	2.09 (0.46)	-11.90 *** (-2.74)	-2.92 (-0.64)
<i>A-Level Grade</i>	11.96 ** (2.37)	24.13 *** (3.25)	11.58 *** (3.60)	12.64 *** (3.31)
<i>Attempt</i>	-2.03 (-0.87)	1.21 (0.87)	-1.78 (-0.71)	2.27 (1.44)
<i>Attendance (relative)</i>	17.18 ** (2.24)	12.07 * (1.89)	18.62 (1.65)	34.93 * (1.83)
<i>Vocational Training</i>	4.41 (0.76)	24.40 *** (3.80)	10.33 * (1.77)	11.93 * (1.76)
<i>Voluntary Service</i>	-1.17 (-0.27)	3.97 (0.94)	-2.80 (-0.67)	8.47 * (1.83)
<i>Female</i>	-9.65 ** (-2.25)	-9.44 ** (-2.30)	-11.07 *** (-2.76)	-8.22 * (-1.71)
<i>LinkedIn User</i>	9.87 ** (2.12)	6.00 (1.12)	16.44 *** (3.37)	0.81 (0.15)
<i>Constant</i>	Included	Included	Included	Included
<i>Course of Study-FE</i>	Included	Included	Included	Included
<i>N</i>	103	90	104	89
<i>Adj. R²</i>	0.27	0.28	0.30	0.12

Table 4 presents the regression results using split samples. In columns (1) and (2), we repeat our main regression analysis on a restricted sample only containing students with above- (below-)median *A-Level Grade*. Columns (3) and (4) present the main regression separately for students with above- and below-median attendance. Bold font indicates the variable of interest. ***, **, * indicate statistical significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% level (two-tailed), respectively. *t*-values are presented in parentheses. All variables are defined in Appendix A (<https://tinyurl.com/zjehfa3n>).

Table 4. Results of Split Sample Regressions