

Rehumanizing Academic Integrity through Pedagogy of the Heart: A Virtue Ethics Framework for Higher Education in the AI Era

Erman Sepniagus Saragih,¹ Justice Zeni Zari Panggabean,² Jonas Franky Rudianto Panggabean³

¹ Fakultas Teologi, Institut Agama Kristen Negeri Tarutung, Indonesia

² Fakultas Pendidikan Kristen, Institut Agama Kristen Negeri Tarutung, Indonesia

³ Fakultas Sains dan Teknologi, Institut Agama Kristen Negeri Tarutung, Indonesia

*Corresponding author: ermansaragih@iakntarutung.ac.id

ABSTRACT

The use of Large Language Models (LLMs) in scientific writing has contributed to a decline in humanist thinking, diminished scholarly originality, and breaches of academic ethics. By integrating Paulo Freire's concept of humanisation with Aristotle's virtue ethics, the framework of rehumanization addresses the increasing prevalence of algorithm-based technologies. The central thesis of this study asserts that generative AI should not be regarded as autonomous, but rather as an extension of human agency guided by moral wisdom and ethical sensibility. Rehumanizing algorithmic devices involves recognizing generative AI as an integral part of humanity that must be managed conscientiously to address its inherent limitations. Through qualitative conceptual philosophical synthesis, this study demonstrates that a pedagogy of the heart prioritizes existential meaning, interpersonal relationships, and moral responsibility over mere efficiency. This discussion indicate that reclaiming AI as a tool in the pursuit of truth enables higher education to establish a robust ethical framework for academic integrity that extends beyond detection policies. A pedagogy of the heart thus provides a substantive and practical approach to rehumanizing algorithmic systems by emphasizing meaning, relationships, and wisdom. In this context, AI becomes a tool that supports the human quest for truth.

Keywords: Social Transformation, Pedagogy of the Heart, Rehumanization, Virtue Ethics, Conscientização

1. INTRODUCTION

Over the past decade, academic disciplines have experienced a growing ontological crisis, particularly in the scientific work produced by lecturers and students. The increasing use of Large Language Models (LLMs) in scientific writing has the potential to diminish originality and contribute to breaches of academic integrity (Perkins, 2023; Shahzad et al., 2025). The fundamental purpose of publishing scientific work is being undermined, eroding the core values of higher education. Students, when preparing papers or other scholarly outputs, often prioritize speed over scientific rigor and data accuracy (Giordano et al., 2025). Such practices result in irresponsible scholarship and inaccuracies in referencing (Hallett, 2026). The publication of scientific work has shifted from the dissemination of knowledge and ideas to the mere fulfillment of administrative requirements (Qu & Wang, 2025). Ultimately, efficiency is valued above ethical considerations. The educational process has become increasingly mechanical and impersonal, with a growing reliance on algorithms (Zhai et al.,

2024). Therefore, the current crisis in academic integrity is not solely attributable to AI technologies, but rather reflects an educational paradigm that emphasizes outcomes over the cultivation of character.

Artificial intelligence (AI) is a technological tool characterized by rapid response, high writing accuracy, and structured sentence construction (Marzuki et al., 2023). Despite these capabilities, AI is fundamentally the product of human designed code and remains a machine created and updated by humans (Gerlich, 2025). AI differs significantly from human intelligence, which is defined by relational, moral, and innate characteristics present from birth (Fair & Fasko, 2025). The human brain is receptive to existential truths believed to originate from a divine source (Agustinus) (Haratine, 2024). Algorithmic processes cannot surpass the complexity of human intelligence (Wang et al., 2026). The rise in academic integrity violations involving AI is largely due to the misconception that AI possesses intelligence superior to that of humans (Gretzky & Dishon, 2025). If unaddressed, this issue may undermine the development of graduates' attitudinal competencies. Science, fundamentally, is not value-neutral; it requires appreciation and contemplation grounded in human emotion and ethical reflection. This research proposes a philosophical concept of pedagogy of the heart to rehumanize academic integrity, offering a new framework for higher education in the AI era. The central argument is that the pedagogy of the heart prevents academic integrity violations by linking academic work not only to administrative requirements but also to scientific competence and emotional engagement in the learning process.

Numerous scholars have examined the concerns of higher education institutions regarding the integration of artificial intelligence in scientific work. To maintain academic integrity in the context of AI, universities are urged to restructure pedagogical approaches by enhancing institutional accountability and credibility (Gbadago et al., 2025). Restoring the intrinsic mission of universities necessitates the reliable differentiation between machine-generated assessments and human-centred assessment designs (Leaton Gray et al., 2025). Rather than viewing AI as a threat to authenticity, Chi-Ming Lam contends that a Confucian perspective can redirect technology toward cultivating moral character and advancing the common good (Lam, 2026). In agreement with Lam, Lina Sun proposes an ethical framework that is culturally grounded yet globally relevant (Sun, 2026). In contrast to Michelle Bedeker's position, the integration of AI tools in higher education should foster learning environments that empower students, rather than merely enforcing procedural compliance (Bedeker, 2026). To support student autonomy, Steph N. Dean introduces an outdoor learning model designed to rehumanize science education by recognising students and teachers as whole individuals and addressing cognitive, affective, physical, and interpersonal dimensions (Dean et al., 2025). Similarly, Krzysztof Skonieczny draws on neohumanist and posthumanist theories to guide the impact of these changes in a constructive direction (Skonieczny, 2026). A review of expert perspectives on generative AI in higher education indicates that current solutions are predominantly mechanistic, with a primary focus on AI-detection. In response, this paper

proposes a characterological approach. Few experts have addressed the centrality of the heart in human life. While much research is dedicated to improving the reliability of generative testing devices, this study advocates for renewed attention to the foundational aspects of human nature in education. Palmer asserts that the heart encompasses three essential dimensions of human existence: intellect, emotion, and spirituality (Palmer, 2011, pp. 4-5,11). Accordingly, the heart represents the centre of human totality, integrating intellect, emotion, and critical awareness, and is associated with the regulation of thought, memory, communication, and information storage.

Literature indicates that very few studies are sensitive to the fact that the heart is the center of human life, which integrates all the normal functions (Schuurman, 2026); thus, the higher education ecosystem is urgently needs to return to the essence of human-centered learning (Ardana & Christiana, 2026). Philosophically, this urgency is reinforced by Palmer's framework, which emphasizes that within the heart three integral dimensions are inseparable from human existence: intellectuality, emotion, and spirituality (Palmer, 2011, p. 11). Through this understanding, science should not be reduced to linear data processing; rather, it must involve deep appreciation and scientific contemplation, firmly rooted in the heart, feelings, and moral responsibility. The originality of this research lies in presenting a pedagogical blueprint that anchors the heart as the primary means of maintaining the authenticity and nobility of scientific culture in higher education, successfully going beyond the limitations of algorithmic surveillance systems.

2. METHODS

This qualitative research is based on an adaptation of the theory of heart pedagogy. The steps involved explaining the aims, approach to using the theory, and its potential contribution (Jaakkola, 2020). The central research question examines how heart pedagogy, informed by Conscientization (Freire) and Phronesis (Aristotle), can contribute to the rehumanization of algorithms in higher education during the era of artificial intelligence. The conceptual framework of heart pedagogy is analyzed to identify philosophical variables and indicators (Campodonico & Navarini, 2020). Relevant literature on heart pedagogy and virtue ethics is compared to develop a methodological synthesis. Ultimately, the study proposes a framework for higher education in the AI era grounded in the principles of heart pedagogy.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

3.1. Paradigm Restructuring Based on the Pedagogy of the Heart

The current policy of integrating artificial intelligence into higher education is stuck in a coercive approach, emphasizing fear of institutional sanctions rather than optimizing AI's role as a catalyst for student and faculty self-development. This systemic obstacle arises because existing regulations have not been aligned with the principles of humanistic education, thereby reducing the primary task of the academic community to mere oversight and bureaucratic

document compliance. Consequently, the space for creativity and freedom of thought is stifled, as the academic ecosystem is preoccupied with fulfilling administrative reports and managing technical penalties. Rather than acting as passive, binary supervisors, higher education institutions should position educators as active moral companions, helping academic subjects remain true to the authenticity of life and human values amid the uncertainty of algorithmic logic.

Empirically and conceptually, this regulatory disorientation overlooks the potential of technology. While data indicate that the appropriate use of AI significantly enhances instructional delivery efficiency and learning optimization (Stanislaus & Lee, 2021), failing to align this potential with humanistic values (Yin, 2026) distances the educator's role from its transformative mentoring function (Fahed, 2025). Therefore, the academic world must recognize that algorithmic machines are never neutral or separate from social reality, but rather an integral part of human existence itself that must be controlled for the sustainability of science. Higher education must be human existence controlled for the sustainability of science. Therefore, the reconstruction of policies from their original punitive-mechanistic nature to a humanistic-characterological framework is an absolute requirement for AI to be returned to its substantial function as a liberating instrument.

3.2. Theoretical and Empirical Pitfalls of AI Mystification

Ontologically, AI must be positioned strictly as a supporting dialectical instrument, not as the final determinant of conclusions in the search for scientific truth. This fundamental limitation arises because AI operates entirely through static binary code, lacking the internalization of life experience or existential awareness. Although algorithmic systems can be massively trained to recognize various moral theories, machines will never possess practical moral awareness (*phronesis*) or true human-like relational capabilities. Consequently, AI remains an object devoid of concern for humanity or the data it produces, and all synthetic data processing relies heavily on human intelligence as the primary subject. Positioning AI output as absolute truth without a dialectical process is an epistemic error that diminishes the essence of humanity itself.

This structural limitation of technology is confirmed by the fact that AI's work is limited to combining datasets that lack an understanding of the depth of human experience; thus, its ideas are highly susceptible to bias and must be subjected to dialectical testing (Useche et al., 2022). No matter how collaborative AI is developed through data training, it still lacks practical moral awareness and remains entirely dependent on human intelligence, lacking the ability to develop self-awareness (Corpuz, 2025). Ultimately, this distinction asserts that AI has neither the innate capacity to value human subjects nor the value of the knowledge it allocates (Sheftel & Zembrzycki, 2026). This boundaries clarifies the dichotomy that humans are the only relational subjects with moral authority, while AI is merely a relational tool whose existence must always be subject to the control of human consciousness and conscience.

3.3. Paradigma Restructuring Based on the Pedagogy of the Heart

Amid the era of metrics, aggressive competition, and automated disruption, higher education institutions are compelled to integrate the joy and inner morality of human beings into their learning systems to counter the fast-paced, stressful academic climate. Modern education tends to be trapped in quantitative standardization that ignores the dimension of emotional wellbeing, reducing knowledge acquisition to a mere mechanical repetition of results. True enjoyment in learning cannot be artificially measured through efficiency metrics; it can only be achieved when the academic ecosystem allows space for flexibility, patience, rigor, and inner healing. By shifting the focus toward a recognition of the morality and affection inherent in human nature, higher education can rekindle authentic interpersonal connections between educators and students.

Philosophically, the importance of positive affect has been emphasized since classical times by Aristotle, who noted that individuals who work with joy will always produce meticulous and accurate performance (Aristotle, circa 340 BC: 599-601). In the contemporary realm, empirical evidence shows that current institutional structures often hinder or even weaken the joy in the learning process; therefore, a radical transition towards a “pedagogy of joy” is needed to create an inclusive, generative, supportive, environment (White et al., 2026). The restoration of a pedagogy centered on happiness and intrinsic human morality is an essential bulwark against the world of education losing its soul under the hegemony of algorithms, while also restoring the essence of learning as a humanistic, liberating process.

The “Pedagogy of the Heart” serves as a transformative intervention to bridge the affective digital divide and address the neglect of the emotional-characterological dimension. Based on interviews with lecturers and students, a critical gap arises from a mismatched perceptions: lecturer tend to view AI idealistically as a dialectical debating partner, where student view it pragmatically as a tool for technical efficiency without malicious intent. Through a dialogical approach rooted in emotional management and critical imagination, this pedagogy shifts students’ orientation from merely pursuing quantitative outputs to substantial character outcomes. When educators open a space for honest dialogue by exposing the vulnerabilities and essential limitations of AI, the rigid academic climate dissolves into a caring relationship, fostering an intrinsic moral responsibility in students to produce original work as a form of relational respect.

Conceptually and empirically, imagination plays a crucial role in mobilizing affection and managing human emotions ((Willis & Leiman, 2013). Furthermore, research data shows that lecturers’ transparency about the cognitive limitations of AI effectively places a moral burden on students to contribute original content to maintain the dignity of academic relationships (Papakostas, 2025). Therefore, a pedagogy embedded in the heart must be built as a profound relationship through the articulation of three key elements of bold pedagogical hope: courage, imagination, and love (Jaime & Cho, 2017). The dialogic implementation of the Pedagogy of the Heart successfully engenders a shared understanding of the boundaries of true

scientific ethics—a substantial resolution has proven impossible to accommodate or formalize solely through rigid campus bureaucratic regulations.

The instrumental approach to education, obsessed with standardization and quantitative accountability, must be deconstructed through the application of values pedagogy to restore the holistic nature of learning. Based on interviews with campus policymakers, the failure of this instrumental model stems from the standardization of mass testing, which has reduced the essence of education to a mere accumulation of dry facts, undermined educators' professional autonomy, and triggered severe psychological stress among students. When moral values and character are positioned as the primary drivers of all learning activities, academic success is no longer pursued as a rigid, linear target but rather becomes a natural by-product of holistic human development via a whole-person approach. Teaching is essentially an art and a matter of the heart that demands reflective awareness; through equitable, values-based scientific communication, the educational ecosystem can engage the dimensions of emotion, imagination, and student well-being holistically, beyond the limits of mechanical metrics.

This fundamental critique of the instrumental model is supported by Terence Lovat, who asserts that mass testing systems have proven unsuccessful in substantially improving literacy skills, but instead force teachers into a shallow teaching pattern (teaching to the test) and degrade the learning process into mere memorization (Lovat, 2019). This return to an individualized, holistic learning environment aligns with the legacy of ancient wisdom passed down by thinkers such as Pythagoras, Socrates, and Al-Ghazali. Furthermore, this epistemological foundation is reinforced by Jürgen Habermas, who demonstrated that teaching that prioritizes human values and emancipatory communicative action produces far superior emotional impacts and cognitive performance. Thus, the transition to values-based pedagogy is a crucial step in freeing educational institutions from the mechanistic trap, ensuring that the pursuit of knowledge continues in line with the moral maturation and noble character of academic subjects.

The heart of education lies not in the rigidity of the curriculum, standardized testing methods, or piles of administrative paperwork, but rather in the institutional capacity to weave compassion and joy as the core ethos of transformative higher education governance. This radical restructuring is urgent because the bureaucratization and mechanization of modern education have alienated the emotional and human dimensions of the classroom. When compassion is no longer relegated to supplementary programs or secondary psychological services, it transforms into the foundation of leadership, curriculum design, and humane daily interactions. By positioning educators not as rigid administrative implementers but as reflective, creative agents, the classroom can be transformed into an incubator of transformative learning, a place for emotional healing, and a sustainable fosterer of hope. This integration of a realistic approach, emotional processing, and structured reflection enables institutions to produce graduates who are not only cognitively superior but also adaptive and resilient in facing the complexities of a dynamic social reality.

Conceptually, the argument for educators as drivers of creativity and hope is supported by Leggo, who holds that, by viewing themselves imaginatively (like a poet), lecturers can transform classrooms into environments of transformative learning and emotional healing (Leggo, 2005). This systemic urgency is reinforced by Gibbs, who argues that compassion must be structurally woven into all aspects of institutional governance to create a humane higher education ecosystem (Gibbs, 2017). Furthermore, in the realm of practitioner preparation, Korthagen's model methodologically demonstrates that reforms that integrate emotion, field practice, and structured reflection through a realistic approach have proven effective in producing educators who are far more competent and prepared to face complex field realities. Therefore, returning higher education's orientation to the "pedagogy of the heart" is a strategic step to restore academic dignity while ensuring that the entire process of knowledge transfer aligns with character development, psychological well-being, and the moral nobility of humanity.

The future of higher education in an era of technocentric disruption demands the courage of educators to engage in cultural resistance by integrating intellectual acumen and emotional management through the framework of "Pedagogy of the Heart." This radical transformation is urgent because the modern education system is increasingly trapped in the discreet charm of quantitative statistical data, standardized exam answer sheets, and rigid bureaucratic regulations, which conceal a reductionist ideology that is dangerous to the values of social justice. If the learning process focuses solely on the technical details of lesson content in a mechanical manner, the classroom will lose its soul and fail to humanize people. Therefore, teaching must return to its essence as an inner calling, based on nurturing, character building, and expanding affective capacity. By balancing intellectual-technical intelligence with moral intelligence, technology and curriculum will no longer be passive instruments of oppression, but will instead become a dialogical space that produces compassionate community service agents with critical awareness to carry out collective liberation from within the system.

This synthesis of arguments is strongly supported by Peter McLaren, who asserts that a tough and radical political struggle against an oppressive system must be driven by a heart full of deep compassion for humanity (McLaren, 2008), which aligns with Allen's view on the importance of repositioning the heart and soul as the center of pedagogy for the future of education (Allen, 2004). In practice, when educators teach from the heart with love, the entire school ecosystem has been shown to experience a large, sustainable positive impact (Paris, 2016), while simultaneously countering dangerous hereditarian ideologies that threaten social justice (Gelb, 1997). This foundation is strengthened by Freire, who emphasized that the primary task of education is to humanize humans through nurturing hope for a just world (Freire & Freire, 1997), where the use of imaginative knowledge is a crucial instrument so that graduates do not become mere mechanical workers but humanistic agents of change (Willis & Leiman, 2013). Thus, the implementation of Heart Pedagogy becomes a philosophical and practical resolution that cannot be negotiated to destroy the hegemony of mechanical

pragmatism, while ensuring that education remains loyal to its core as the main bastion of humanity and social justice.

3.4. Reconstruction of Substantive Moral Processes

In the era of artificial intelligence, technology should no longer be viewed merely as an instrumental technical tool, but rather must be epistemologically positioned as a “medium” in intellectual practices guided by virtue ethics. This redefinition is crucial because the use of technology unmoored from moral anchors tends to trap educational institutions in a procedural compliance vacuum and data-driven efficiency. As an intellectual medium, the integration of technology into academic spaces must be reclaimed as a pedagogical practice centered on critical inquiry, dialogue, and the empowerment of student agency. By grounding social and moral goodness as primary guiding principles, AI can be wisely directed to safeguard human well-being and prudence. This characterological approach simultaneously dispels concerns that focusing on the inner or “heart” dimension of the learning process will lead to individualistic egoism; instead, it strengthens the ethical responsibility of academic subjects within an inclusive moral community.

This theoretical urgency is supported by the notion that social and moral goodness are essential pillars of virtue ethics, guiding human prudence and existential wellbeing in the digital age (Farina et al., 2024). Therefore, technology-enhanced learning models must be designed to stimulate student agency and critical dialogue rather than mechanical standardization (Bedecker, 2026). Philosophically, the robustness of this characterological argument is strengthened by Schopenhauer’s distinctive virtue ethics, explanation how sincerity is made possible through his metaphysics and robustly defending against accusations of egoism, while also providing a unified theory of virtues and vices to explain the complexity of human character within an inclusive moral community (Hassan, 2022). Thus, conceptualizing AI as an intellectual medium guided by virtue ethics provides a strong philosophical resolution to ensure that the digitalization of higher education remains aligned with the maintenance of noble character and human dignity.

The ethical governance of AI in higher education requires a virtue ethics framework that focuses on structuring the internal motivations of human moral agents, rather than simply adherence to rigid formal codes of ethics. This characterological approach is crucial because ethical decision-making in the algorithmic era often fails not because of a lack of regulation, but because of bounded ethicality and hidden psychological forces that interfere with the consciousness of academic subjects. To overcome these psychological biases and structural pressures, the formation of basic human virtues cannot be partial; second-order virtues must strengthen them. Based on interviews with policymakers, academics can navigate technological disruption wisely by integrating fundamental moral principles, cultivating mental strengths, recognizing the limitations of digital tools, and consistently maintaining scientific honesty despite the pressures of pragmatic efficiency.

This theoretical urgency is supported by Hagendorff, who identified four basic virtues in the AI ecosystem: justice, honesty, responsibility, and care, all of these aspects serve as specific motivational settings that are absolute prerequisites for ethical decision-making (Hagendorff, 2022). Furthermore, Hagendorff emphasized that achieving these four basic virtues is effective only when supported by the second-order virtues of wisdom and fortitude. These two supporting elements serve as psychological-moral instruments to overcome hidden biases and ethical limitations that have often been overlooked in mainstream discourse on AI ethics (Hagendorff, 2022). Thus, adopting this multi-layered virtue framework provides a solid philosophical foundation for educational institutions to restore academic integrity by developing the character of educators and students who are resilient and wise in navigating algorithmic media.

3.5. Regulatory Sovereignty in Empathy, Relation, and Morals

The ideal function of artificial intelligence (AI) in scientific writing should be limited to an instrument for structuring thought and refining language, rather than as a primary idea generator. This distinction is crucial because the originality of an idea cannot be generated by artificial intelligence; rather, it emerges from the unique and diverse human experience. When educational institutions provide access to AI in coursework, evaluation methods must transform, emphasizing assessment of the ability to articulate and be accountable for oral delivery. This interactive assessment format serves as an epistemic filter, distinguishing the capacity of human and machine agents to internalize scientific virtues. Through interviews with lecturers and policymakers, educators can assess students' depth of character, honesty, and moral responsibility, thereby establishing a clear boundary between the mechanical output of algorithms and the authenticity of human intelligence.

Philosophically, this limitation of AI's function aligns with the thinking of Heidegger and Husserl, who assert that the meaning of an idea inherently emerges from the synthesis of accumulated particular human life experiences and cannot be replicated by technology (Bingaman, 2020). Therefore, oral testing is a relevant, authentic assessment scenario because it can represent various domains of virtue ethics, such as truth, justice, fear, wealth, and honor, which are unique to humans as moral agents (Gamez et al., 2020). Thus, shifting the focus of assessment towards oral performance is a strategic step in establishing an ethical demarcation between the binary intelligence of algorithms and the natural intelligence of humans, while ensuring that technology remains positioned as an elaborator rather than a substitute for intellectual originality.

The crisis of academic integrity in the era of artificial intelligence is not essentially a technological failure, but rather a manifestation of relational failure within the higher education system and a disorientation in the ethical relationship between educators and students. This phenomenon occurs because educational institutions are often trapped in a rigid technocentric approach and punitive oversight, rather than restoring the ethical contract that underlies the pedagogical process itself. While formal regulations related to AI remain very limited, mastery

of technical aspects such as algorithm coding cannot stand alone; it must be balanced with a humanistic approach that positions technology as a tool for dialogue, enabling deeper reflection on the human experience. By shifting the focus from sanction-based oversight to the development of a human-centered ecosystem, AI can catalyze testing and strengthening academic honesty beyond the confines of mechanical regulation. Therefore, a “Pedagogy of the Heart” is needed as a moral framework for redesigning the education system that prioritizes technological wisdom and restores the dignity of the relationship between lecturers and students within an authentic, dialogical corridor.

The urgency of restoring the ethical contract through a characterological approach is supported by empirical evidence that harmonious relationships between lecturers and students foster emotional closeness, personal respect, and an environment for effective communication. Based on this solid relational foundation, academic integrity is built much more effectively through a commitment to mutual trust than through a strict supervision system overshadowed by fear of institutional sanctions (Rahmadhani & Herdiansyah, 2025). This safe and harmonious academic climate, in turn, opens up a space for more intense, in-depth, and open discourse between students and lecturers in dissecting ethical issues and scientific morality. Thus, the implementation of Heart Pedagogy, grounded in a strong ethical philosophy, is a substantial solution to restoring academic integrity, not by curbing technological development, but by restructuring the humanistic-ethical relationship between educators and students as the highest moral defense.

Ontologically, artificial intelligence (AI) is an external projection of human cognitive capacity, whose existence must be subordinated to the telos (ultimate goal) of humanity, not treated as an autonomous entity that dictates the direction of education. This assertion is crucial because the infiltration of AI into academic spaces often triggers severe cognitive and emotional dissonance for both educators and students, thus demanding the transformation of classrooms into environments that prioritize interpersonal relationships, empathy, and honesty. When the teaching and learning process is reduced to mere cognitive calculations and the mechanical fulfillment of administrative needs, the essence of true education will collapse. Therefore, integrating moral-characterological guidelines is an urgent navigational tool to redirect academics’ digital activities, preventing them from becoming trapped in a crippling technological dependency and transforming them into a means of self-development and meaningful social change through real interactions with fellow human beings.

These ethical and theoretical limitations align with the fundamental principles of Aristotle’s *Nicomachean Ethics*, which argues that overreliance on artificial technology can divert authentic intellectual activity and diminish the intrinsic virtues necessary to achieve the highest academic goal, namely the development of the whole human mind (Daly, 2025; Vanacker, 2020). The urgency of this moral conditioning is reinforced by Joe Cruz and Patrick Lee Plaisance, who argue that a moral framework is crucial for redirecting digital-based activities toward constructive social change efforts focused on self-development, while

critically recognizing the strong and deeply rooted structural ethical challenges inherent in the algorithmic realm (Cruz & Plaisance, 2021). Therefore, higher education institutions must rehumanize the learning process by integrating the “heart” dimension, a theological-philosophical concept that views humans as moral beings with an existential calling to grow in authentic truth, transcending bureaucratic formalism and synthetic data automation.

The scientific decision-making process in the contemporary era requires a restoration of the virtue ethics framework and the concept of *phronesis* (practical wisdom) to overcome the hegemony of technocentric regulations that erode scientists’ moral autonomy. This urgency arises because the modern research ecosystem is currently dominated by technological standardization, mechanical instructions, and rigid bureaucratic regulations, which rob humans of the unconditional opportunity to exercise their authentic subjective judgment. When every consideration of scientific choices, both in practice and in substance, is automatically determined by algorithmic systems rather than made consciously by humans, the epistemological validity of the resulting knowledge becomes vulnerable to ethical shallowing. Therefore, mainstreaming character ethics is the only balancing instrument so that scientific decisions are not merely the product of dry procedural compliance, but rather a manifestation of mature intellectual and moral responsibility on the part of researchers.

These structural limitations and the need for ethical resolution are strongly supported by Thomas Dillern’s theoretical exploration, which asserts that integrating virtue ethics into the knowledge-building process has proven effective in enhancing a deeper understanding of both the epistemological and ethical aspects of scientific practice (Dillern, 2021). Furthermore, through a critical analysis of the mechanistic distortions of the contemporary world, Dillern specifically emphasizes that the framework of virtue ethics and the concept of *phronesis* are far more compatible with understanding the distinctiveness, complexity, and originality of human scientific practice than the modern bureaucratic mindset that relies on regulatory uniformity (Dillern, 2021). Thus, this methodological reorientation toward practical wisdom is a crucial contribution to maintaining the integrity of the academic world while ensuring that the pursuit of scientific truth remains guided by the highest human moral capacities amidst the siege of technological automation.

4. CONCLUSION

Rehumanization through the pedagogy of the heart approach prioritises relational aspects and moral character in education. Disciplines related to character depend on empirical analysis, reflection, ethical reasoning, and methodological competence. AI detectors cannot screen for compassionate relationships and ethical attitudes in the human heart. AI struggles to replicate the “inner voice” and profound subjective experiences, making pedagogy of the heart a natural shield and a dehumanising agent for academic integrity. Thus, pedagogy of the heart is a virtue ethic that enhances emotional and intellectual engagement in a more humane learning process. Virtue ethics is a principle of excellence that goes beyond graduating from college, achieving lecturer performance

indicators, and getting promoted. Pedagogy of the heart, as a virtue ethic, prioritises compassionate relationships, critical affection, and ethical contemplation. A concrete suggestion for universities is to build a system that prioritises relational practices within a community of learners who build on and complement each other. In addition to the existence of AI, the imbalance between the workforce and the number of university graduates each year creates a human resource gap. However, fundamentally, the business and industrial sector always requires human resources with heart and wisdom. However, this study did not address attitudinal competencies aligned with the corporate and labour market domains. Therefore, further research is needed on heart pedagogy materials that can enhance the affective competencies the business and industrial sector will need in the future.

5. REFERENCES

- Allen, L. A. (2004). In Search of Our Future: To Reclaim the Heart and Soul of School. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy*, 1(1), 30–32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15505170.2004.10411475>
- Ardana, S. G., & Christiana, M. (2026). AI detectors, student anxiety, and authorial alienation: A qualitative study of affective control. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2026.2643825>
- Bedeker, M. (2026). Navigating the university PedTech Wonderland: A Freirean critique of technology-enhanced learning in higher education. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 31(2), 323–337. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2025.2581970>
- Bingaman, K. A. (2020). Religious and Spiritual Experience in the Digital Age: Unprecedented Evolutionary Forces. *Pastoral Psychology*, 69(4), 291–305. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11089-020-00895-5>
- Campodonico, A., & Navarini, C. (2020). Virtue Ethics and Moral Psychology. Editorial Note. *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice*, 23(2), 273–276. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10677-020-10096-x>
- Corpuz, J. C. G. (2025). Faith and Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Catholic Education: A Theological Virtue Ethics Perspective. *Religions*, 16(8), 1083. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel16081083>
- Cruz, J., & Plaisance, P. L. (2021). Virtue Ethics and a Technomoral Framework for Online Activism. *International Journal of Communication*, 15, 19–19. <https://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/14318>
- Daly, T. (2025). A ‘low-tech’ Academic Virtue Ethics in the Age of Generative AI. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 24(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-025-09683-3>
- Dean, S. N., Alston, D. M., & Hawkins, J. (2025). Rehumanizing Science Education: Exploring Outdoor Learning as an Avenue Toward Holistic Wellbeing. *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, 36(5), 559–580. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560X.2024.2431371>
- Dillern, T. (2021). The Scientific Judgment-Making Process from a Virtue Ethics Perspective. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 19(4), 501–516. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-021-09399-0>
- Fahed, Z. (2025). Digital Shepherds in Lebanon: Christian Witness, Sacred Algorithms, and Theological Mission in a Surveilled Age. *Religions*, 16(12). <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel16121506>

- Fair, F., & Fasko, D. (2025). Intelligence and Moral Development: A Critical Historical Review and Future Directions. *Journal of Intelligence*, 13(7). <https://doi.org/10.3390/jintelligence13070072>
- Farina, M., Zhdanov, P., Karimov, A., & Lavazza, A. (2024). AI and society: A virtue ethics approach. *AI & SOCIETY*, 39(3), 1127–1140. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-022-01545-5>
- Gamez, P., Shank, D. B., Arnold, C., & North, M. (2020). Artificial virtue: The machine question and perceptions of moral character in artificial moral agents. *AI & SOCIETY*, 35(4), 795–809. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-020-00977-1>
- Gbadago, F. Y., Masud, I., Iddris, F., Koomson, S., Poku, P. K., & Zoiku, S. (2025). Ethical dilemmas in teaching and assessment in higher education: A literature synthesis towards an integrative model for policy, practice and academic integrity. *International Journal of Ethics and Systems*, 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOES-02-2025-0107>
- Gelb, S. (1997). Heart of Darkness: The Discreet Charm of the Hereditarian Psychologist. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 19(1), 129–139. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1071441970190110>
- Gerlich, M. (2025). AI Tools in Society: Impacts on Cognitive Offloading and the Future of Critical Thinking. *Societies*, 15(1), 6. <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc15010006>
- Gibbs, P. (Ed.). (2017). *The Pedagogy of Compassion at the Heart of Higher Education*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-57783-8>
- Giordano, G., Misuraca, M., & Restaino, M. (2025). Evaluating the speed of citation in scientific journals: A survival analysis-based approach. *Journal of Informetrics*, 19(3), 101714. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2025.101714>
- Gretzky, M., & Dishon, G. (2025). Algorithmic-authors in academia: Blurring the boundaries of human and machine knowledge production. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 50(3), 338–351. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2025.2452196>
- Hagendorff, T. (2022). A Virtue-Based Framework to Support Putting AI Ethics into Practice. *Philosophy & Technology*, 35(3), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-022-00553-z>
- Hallett, N. (2026). Moral responsibility and mental disorder: A philosophical exploration of the insanity defence. *Medicine, Science and the Law*, 66(1), 25–34. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00258024251329180>
- Haratine, T. P. (2024). Augustine on memory, the mind, and human flourishing. *British Journal for the History of Philosophy*, 32(6), 1220–1240. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09608788.2024.2315083>
- Hassan, P. (2022). Schopenhauerian virtue ethics. *Inquiry*, 65(4), 381–413. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0020174X.2019.1629337>
- Jaakkola, E. (2020). Designing conceptual articles: Four approaches. *AMS Review*, 10(1–2), 18–26. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13162-020-00161-0>
- Jaime, A. M., & Cho, J. (2017). A postcolonial reflection on the audacity of hope: Toward a pedagogy with/for an understanding heart. *Multicultural Education Review*, 9(4), 215–230. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2005615X.2017.1383809>
- Lam, C.-M. (2026). Confucian Self-Cultivation and the Ethics of Learning with Large Language Models. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11217-026-10045-8>

- Leaton Gray, S., Edsall, D., & Parapadakis, D. (2025). AI-Based Digital Cheating At University, and the Case for New Ethical Pedagogies. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 23(4), 2069–2086. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-025-09642-y>
- Leggo, C. (2005). The heart of pedagogy: On poetic knowing and living. *Teachers and Teaching*, 11(5), 439–455. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13450600500238436>
- Lovat, T. (2019). *The art and heart of good teaching*. Springer.
- Marzuki, Widiati, U., Rusdin, D., Darwin, & Indrawati, I. (2023). The impact of AI writing tools on the content and organization of students' writing: EFL teachers' perspective. *Cogent Education*, 10(2), 2236469. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2023.2236469>
- McLaren, P. (2008). This Fist Called My Heart: Public Pedagogy in the Belly of the Beast. *Antipode*, 40(3), 472–481. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2008.00616.x>
- Palmer, P. J. (2011). *Healing the heart of democracy: The courage to create a politics worthy of the human spirit* (1. ed). Jossey-Bass. https://books.google.co.id/books/about/Healing_the_Heart_of_Democracy.html?id=TOKmv4WvHjwC&redir_esc=y
- Papakostas, C. (2025). Artificial Intelligence in Religious Education: Ethical, Pedagogical, and Theological Perspectives. *Religions*, 16(5), 563. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel16050563>
- Paris, J. W. (2016). *Teach from the heart: Pedagogy as spiritual practice*. Cascade Books.
- 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), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.53761/1.20.02.07>
- Qu, Y., & Wang, J. (2025). The Impact of AI Guilt on Students' Use of ChatGPT for Academic Tasks: Examining Disciplinary Differences. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 23(4), 2087–2110. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-025-09643-x>
- Rahmadhani, D. S., & Herdiansyah, H. (2025). Cyber-Theology of The Polis: Renegotiating The Ethics of Participation In The Age of AI. *Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies*, 49–66. <https://www.thenewsri.sacri.ro/index.php/njsri/article/view/888>
- Schuurman, D. C. (2026). The Challenges and Opportunities of Artificial Intelligence: Reflections from a Christian Computer Scientist. *Christian Higher Education*, 25(1–2), 92–106. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15363759.2026.2639495>
- Shahzad, T., Mazhar, T., Tariq, M. U., Ahmad, W., Ouahada, K., & Hamam, H. (2025). A comprehensive review of large language models: Issues and solutions in learning environments. *Discover Sustainability*, 6(1), 27. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43621-025-00815-8>
- Sheftel, A., & Zembrzycki, S. (2026). *Main Essay: Oral History Is Not Just Data: Amplifying Humanistic Practices in the Age of Artificial Intelligence*. *The Oral History Review*, 53(1), 4–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00940798.2026.2618280>
- Skonieczny, K. (2026). Will generative AI 'change everything' in education, and if so, how could we know?: Assessing neohumanist and posthumanist answers. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 0(0), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopedu/qhag006>
- Stanislaus, I., & Lee, V. R. G. (2021). Shepherds for modern times: Designing a blended learning course for communication theology. *International Journal of Mobile Learning and Organisation*, 15(2), 179–211. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJMLO.2021.114517>

- Sun, L. (2026). Peace education as a transformative pathway in EFL teacher preparation: A values-based ethical framework from the Chinese context. *Journal of Peace Education*, 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17400201.2026.2639713>
- Useche, A. C., Galvis, Á. H., Díaz-Barriga Arceo, F., Patiño Rivera, A. E., & Muñoz-Reyes, C. (2022). Reflexive pedagogy at the heart of educational digital transformation in Latin American higher education institutions. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 19(1), 62. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-022-00365-3>
- Vanacker, B. (2020). The Situationist Critique of Virtue Ethics and Its Implications for the Media Ethics Classroom. *Journal of Media Ethics*, 35(3), 139–151. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23736992.2020.1779593>
- White, L., Mason, W., Grant, V., Romaine, A., Cleary, G., & Tulloch, S. (2026). Towards a pedagogy of joy. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2026.2652344>
- Willis, E., & Leiman, T. (2013). In defence of a pedagogy of the heart: Theory and practice in the use of imaginal knowledge. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 32(4), 660–671. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2012.706747>
- Yin, S. C. (2026). AI literacy in an uncertain world. *Journal of Applied Learning & Teaching*, 9(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.3316/informit.T2026021800004490553163126>
- Zhai, C., Wibowo, S., & Li, L. D. (2024). The effects of over-reliance on AI dialogue systems on students' cognitive abilities: A systematic review. *Smart Learning Environments*, 11(1), 28. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-024-00316-7>