



Addressing Academic Dishonesty in Higher Education: A Systematic Review of Generative AI's Impact

RAMESH CHANDER SHARMA 

SUMAN KALYAN PANJA 

**Author affiliations can be found in the back matter of this article*



RESEARCH ARTICLE

ABSTRACT

Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI) introduces new opportunities for society. While some universities have adopted GAI with a more hostile stance, others have done so with a more progressive perspective. In light of this contradiction, the main query is what is causing this controversy. The ethical issues surrounding GAI and academic dishonesty in higher education, however, are the special focus of the current study. 23 previous studies published between 2022 and 2024 served as the foundation for this systematic literature review (SLR). Three educational theories—digital innovation, diffusion of innovation, and thing ethnography—form the basis of this study. A content analysis of the research corpus was done to find important themes. The findings are synthesized by employing a novel thematic analysis approach. Research questions determine the feasibility of academic integrity in the face of plagiarism or cheating. Considering GAI, existing curricula and assessment procedures show room for modification. There are technological, institutional, or individual issues around academic dishonesty. Furthermore, problems with legitimacy and ethics are also evident. The current guidelines are consistent rather than cohesive. Based on this idea, the current researchers proposed a thorough set of guidelines for the education community. The results of this study are thought to offer comprehensive insights into addressing academic dishonesty in higher education, especially in the age of GAI. The proposed ethical framework explains how it can theoretically contribute to higher education.

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Ramesh Chander Sharma

Dr B R Ambedkar University
Delhi, New Delhi, India

rc_sharma@yahoo.com

KEYWORDS:

generative artificial intelligence; academic dishonesty; academic integrity; digital innovation; diffusion of innovation; thing ethnography; higher education; systematic literature review; content analysis; thematic analysis

TO CITE THIS ARTICLE:

Sharma, R. C., & Panja, S. K. (2025). Addressing Academic Dishonesty in Higher Education: A Systematic Review of Generative AI's Impact. *Open Praxis*, 17(2), pp. 251–269. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.55982/openpraxis.17.2.820>

The 21st-century skills put significant importance on digitization and digital learning. Online and distance learning (ODL) and massive open online courses (MOOCs) have remained topics of much discussion for the last two decades. Through the continual evolution of lesson transactions and learning processes, themes like emerging technology marked its presence in the literature. MOOCs play a transformative role in blended learning models, with a focus on their alignment with academic performance and preferences for streamlined course structures. Altinay et al. (2024) emphasize the influence of faculty guidance alongside the need for tailored MOOCs designs, equitable access, and professional development to enhance learning outcomes and meet diverse student needs in the digital age.

The constant demand and the altering context of society drive the technology service providers to keep on bringing changes to their products or services. Such a technological evolution and revolution formed the genesis of digital innovation. If we are not wrong, the recent COVID-19 pandemic might have both catalyzed its momentum and mechanism.

Trailed by the notion of continually changing mechanisms, our pursuit of task automation introduced us to a relatively updated concept concerning artificial intelligence (AI). In a generalized form, AI may be described as a phenomenon where machines do the job of humans. The recent advent of generative artificial intelligence (GAI) has successfully overcome limitations. It presents a continuum of interaction between humans and computers. Additionally, GAI can produce human-like responses through texts, graphics, videos, etc. Multiple GAI tools are available to the community for specific purposes. Bozkurt et al. (2024) critically examine the integration of GAI in higher education, emphasizing its potential to personalize learning and enhance efficiency while cautioning against inherent biases and risks to equity, creativity, and human agency. They call for evidence-based research and conscious decision-making to ensure that GAI supports authentic learning experiences and upholds ethical educational responsibility.

The data mining approach of the generative and conversational agent (GAI tools here) provoked debate and dispersed different sections of society. While medical and health education (Newton & Dimopoulos-Bick, 2024; Raza et al., 2024; Small et al., 2024) have efficiently embraced this technology, the higher education sector remains uncertain. Most higher educational institutions (HEIs) have welcomed GAI with a progressive outlook (Kong et al., 2024; Lodge et al., 2023; Simms, 2024), whereas a few prefer to take an antagonistic stand (Michel-Villarreal et al., 2023).

Given this paradox, the key question is what factors fuel this debate. One significant factor is GAI's openness and flexibility. When misused, GAI's evolving nature can lead to a scenario where education is artificial rather than intelligent. The perceived anthropomorphic challenge necessitates a thorough examination of the existing literature.

LITERATURE REVIEW

DIGITAL INNOVATION THROUGH GAI

In pursuit of GAI model development for the provision of text and data mining (TDM), Dermawan (2024) presented a critical view on what the European Union (EU) member states could learn from the Japanese “non-enjoyment” purposes. It was argued that a flexible TDM built upon the German notion of non enjoyment purposes could become an opening clause to foster innovation and creativity in the age of GAI. An opening clause allowing TDM with “non-enjoyment” purposes could be permissible under a three-step test. It further suggested that if there is no political will to safeguard “the right to read should be the right to mine” and development of a legislative environment that will advocate for 72 hours of response if technological protection measures (TPMs) are preventing TDM, and Robot Exclusion Standard as a warning when TDM is not allowed on a website.

Shifting our attention from the regional or national level towards the institutional setting, Holmström and Carroll (2024) described, “How organizations can innovate with GAI?” To what extent can the launch of ChatGPT innovate organizational practices? Will the innovation disrupt the system or be manageable? Two key dimensions, automation/augmentation, and four

generic innovation strategies: traditional tools, basic automation, automated assistance, and assisted augmentation constituted the framework of the discussion. The strategies essentially differ not only in automation and augmentation for innovation but also in terms of risks and challenges faced in the process and available tactics for managing the process. They suggested that practitioners could harness ChatGPT effectively by aligning their innovation objectives with the appropriate strategy, whether enhancing creative processes or streamlining operational efficiency, thereby navigating the complexities of innovation with a more structured and strategic approach.

Ideating new product design sometimes appears to be a challenging task. Joosten et al. (2024) draw attention to even finer details. In the attempt, researchers compared the ideation quality of human beings and GAI. The blind expert evaluation showed that AI-generated ideas score significantly higher in novelty and customer benefit, while their feasibility scores are similar to those of human ideas. The findings suggest that, under certain circumstances, companies can benefit from integrating GAI into their traditional idea-generation processes.

The realm of digital innovation through GAI is not limited to the above discussion; instead, it touches upon other peripheries. To mention a few, areas like academic integrity (Duane, 2024), AI chatbots (Bridgelall, 2024), AI literacy (Sengewald & Tremmel, 2024), augmented reality (Shen et al., 2024), ChatGPT (Chiarello et al., 2024; Fount et al., 2024; Gupta & Yang, 2024; Ritala et al., 2024), customizable learning (Pesovski et al., 2024), ethical dilemmas (Singh et al., 2024), health science (Newton & Dimopoulos-Bick, 2024; Raza et al., 2024; Small et al., 2024), higher education (Rudolph et al., 2024), nutrition education (Barker et al., 2024), school education (Sattelmaier & Pawlowski, 2023), sustainable development (Nyhan & Marshall, 2024), and, so on. The literature indicates the scope of innovation areas associated with GAI. The content and context of GAI research are evolving constantly. When no unified consensus is reached regarding the innovation results, perhaps the situation will lead to a diffused state of affairs.

DIFFUSION OF INNOVATION ASSOCIATING GAI

“What drives European organizations to invest in GAI, and what challenges do they face in 2023–2024?” The findings indicate that European organizations are primarily motivated to adopt GAI to enhance competitive advantage, grow market share, and foster innovation in products and processes. At the same time, the most significant challenges are ethical concerns, data privacy issues, and the absence of clear regulatory frameworks. The study concludes that a balanced approach, combining innovation with responsibility, is key to unlocking the full potential of GAI while mitigating risks (Orozco & Welin, 2024).

Ghanaian academics come to the scenario to investigate why there is a slow pace of digital transformation in education in Ghana using ChatGPT. It was found that most of the authors of publications about ChatGPT were not from the African continent or were affiliated with international institutions. A thematic analysis of interview data involving 34 academics in Ghana about ChatGPT revealed that most academics had limited knowledge about ChatGPT and AI-powered chatbots. There were mixed views about the relevance and usefulness of ChatGPT in work-related tasks (Adarkwah et al., 2023).

A study conducted in the United Arab Emirates (UAE) examined factors such as technology and employee influence on the adoption of AI in e-innovative projects. The survey included 1,037 government employees. The analysis revealed that technology, as an external factor, significantly and positively contributed to adopting AI e-innovation technology. Further analysis indicated that employee-related internal factors directly influenced the adoption of AI e-innovation technology (Hirzallah & Alshurideh, 2023). Other nationwide studies were centered on the organizational processes for adopting breakthrough technology in Japanese firms (Hoshino & Hirao, 2024), AI adoption in Chinese higher education (Huang et al., 2024), South African higher education (Khoalenyane & Ajani, 2024).

Multiple isolated reports appeared, covering areas such as GAI adoption in the classroom (Ghimire & Edwards, 2024), ChatGPT adoption among management students (Abdalla et al., 2024), higher education (Ivanov et al., 2024), morality and ChatGPT usage (Urdan & Marson, 2024), responsible use of AI in health science (Al-Dhaen et al., 2023; Ball et al., 2024), teacher education (Nyaaba & Zhai, 2024), and many more. de Bem Machado and Sharma

(2024) conducted a bibliometric review to explore the integration of AI in higher education, analyzing 1,278 works authored by researchers from 91 countries. The study highlights various applications, including intelligent tutoring systems, adaptive platforms, and chatbots, which enhance personalized and inclusive learning. It emphasizes AI's role in transforming education by fostering digital pedagogy, addressing challenges like self-regulated learning (SRL) in online settings, and enabling personalized learning trajectories. Recommendations include adopting AI-driven tools to improve teaching methods and education governance.

The examples above signified the possible usage areas of GAI in diffused form. To what extent can such non-human entities (technological innovation through GAI here) influence the habitual behavior of human civilization? In search of an answer to this question, our subsequent discussion channelizes us towards examining the literature of thing ethnography, positioning GAI at the core.

THING ETHNOGRAPHY IN THE REALM OF GAI

The public hegemony of the things world concerning central objects and perceived asymmetry in the material culture system was portrayed by Lucas and Robb (2021). The study accommodates Neolithic European and early modern Iceland culture into their perspectives:

Material culture forms a relational system of distributed reality – a thingworld. But how do we get beyond simply saying that all material culture is meaningful and entangled to understanding the internal structure of such systems? Is it a flat terrain among co-equal things? Or are some objects more important than others, as we might intuitively suppose? And if so, why? This article presents an initial discussion of the problem. Using vignettes from two thingworlds – one from early modern Iceland, one from Neolithic Europe– the authors discuss what were the central material things in each, and for what reasons. This suggests that objects may be systemically central in different ways, for instance, things which connect and mediate relationships of different kinds, things which are non-substitutable, and things which span multiple roles and contexts. (p. 1)

Huang et al. (2021) appeared with a new interactive tool named “Thing Constellation Visualizer” (ThingCV) for visualizing the social network of objects based on their co-occurrence as computed from a large collection of photos. ThingCV enables perspective-changing design explorations over the network of objects with scalable links. The results of eight participants showed that designers were actively engaged in identifying interesting objects and their associated clusters of related objects. The designers projected social qualities onto the identified objects and their communities. Furthermore, the designers changed their perspectives to revisit familiar contexts and to generate new insights through the exploration process.

A time when more debate is going on regarding the usability of GAI in educational exercises, Michel-Villarreal et al. (2023) captured the perception of ChatGPT on the challenges and opportunities it presents in higher education. Positioning the thing ethnography approach the research findings emphasize the urgent need for clear policies, guidelines, and frameworks to responsibly integrate ChatGPT in higher education. It also highlights the need for empirical research to understand user experiences and perceptions.

Investigations were conducted associating “thing ethnography” and “incremental prompting” to examine the applicability of GAI in experiential learning for authentic assessment of higher education. The study's findings include the GAI's capacity to contribute to reflective thinking, hands-on learning experiences and augmenting authentic assessment, enhancing teaching-learning practices, and cultivating higher-order skills. The researchers further emphasized the importance of responsible usage of GAI for educational purposes (Salinas-Navarro et al., 2024a–b).

The body literature concerned is further enriched by accommodating ideas on doing the right thing (Webb, 2014), entangled ethnography (Murray-Rust et al., 2019), ethnographic possibilities (Michalko, 1980), more-than-human-design and AI (Nicenboim et al., 2020), Morse things (Wakkary et al., 2017), the importance of “waiting field” (Mannay & Morgan, 2015), things as co-ethnographers (Giaccardi et al., 2016), and many more to mention.

The literature exemplifies the possibility of innovation through the application of GAI in different fields of society (vide digital innovation through GAI and diffusion of innovation

associating with GAI). The diversified study findings accommodate data from academic and non-academic spheres of the community. The health science (Newton & Dimopoulos-Bick, 2024; Raza et al., 2024; Small et al., 2024) and engineering sector (Russo, 2024; Sundberg & Holmstorm, 2024) appear to have a positive outlook to embrace the technological movement. The higher education community (de Bem Machado & Sharma, 2024; Huang et al., 2024; Ivanov et al., 2024; Nyaaba & Zhai, 2024; Rudolph et al., 2024) is broadly diffused concerning the opportunities and challenges raised by GAI (Adarkwah et al., 2023; Bozkurt et al., 2024; Michel-Villarreal et al., 2023; Salinas-Navarro et al., 2024a–b). The debate extends to other conflicting issues such as organic vs. synthetic learning (similar to the nuance of Holmström & Carroll, 2024; Joosten et al., 2024; Shen et al., 2024), data saturation vs. data malignancy (trailing the notion of Dermawan, 2024), and ethical vs. unethical use of GAI (Singh et al., 2024). Such ongoing discourse necessitates further research associating GAI and (higher) education. Literature review shows that several isolated studies have been reported on similar concerns like academic integrity (Duane, 2024), ethical dilemmas (Singh et al., 2024), morality and ChatGPT usage (Urdan & Marson, 2024), responsible use of AI (Al-Dhaen et al., 2023; Ball et al., 2024). In such a context, hardly any collective research is noticed that was solemnized on addressing academic dishonesty in higher education, especially in the age of GAI. Such a knowledge gap in the existing literature necessitates the requirement of the present inquiry. Therefore, the current study focuses specifically on the ethical considerations (Orozco & Welin, 2024) of GAI usage towards addressing academic dishonesty in higher education.

METHODS

STUDY DESIGN

This study is focused on higher education (like Ivanov et al., 2024; Rudolph et al., 2024) and the theoretical underpinnings of digital innovation (e.g. Rudolph et al., 2024), diffusion of innovation (e.g. Ivanov et al., 2024) and thing ethnography (e.g. Michel-Villarreal et al., 2023). According to the literature review, we are now in a diffused condition when it comes to using GAI to achieve digital innovation in higher education. However, the media that appears here is within the field of thing ethnography. As a result, we structure the research design according to the theories. The systematic literature review (SLR) is articulated qualitatively using a thematic analysis approach (Bannister et al., 2023). Javadi and Zarea (2016), and Morgan (2022) discussed the concept of theme analysis and provided an agreement on its limitations. However, due to the technique's methodological adaptability, the researchers in this study chose to apply it for a thorough examination of the research problem. The aim is to examine the viability of academic misconduct associated with using GAI in higher education. Six specified research questions (RQs) are framed to guide the research direction. The RQs are presented below:

- RQ1. What is the viability of academic integrity in higher education in the age of GAI?
- RQ2. What could be the impact of GAI on plagiarism and cheating in higher education?
- RQ3. How far can GAI influence existing curriculum and assessment practices to inhibit academic dishonesty in higher education?
- RQ4. What could be the individual, institutional, and technical concerns in accommodating GAI in higher education?
- RQ5. What are the ethical and legitimate concerns coming into the picture while attempting to locate GAI in higher education?
- RQ6. What does the existing body of literature convey on the GAI policy matters towards tackling academic dishonesty in higher education?

DATA COLLECTION

Numerous studies have explored academic dishonesty, academic integrity, and related issues in the context of GAI. This SLR is constituted on these existing reports. Data collection was performed on 15th May 2024 using the largest academic database, *Scopus* (like Sozon et al., 2024a). Specific search terms were employed to filter titles, abstracts, and keywords within the literature published between 2022 and 2024. In the study, 2022 is considered the initial year of data search because in this year ChatGPT made its debut.

A robust search technique was followed using search terms “Academic Dishonesty”, “Generative Artificial Intelligence”, “generative ai” OR “Academic Misconduct”, “Generative Artificial Intelligence”, “generative ai” OR “Academic Integrity”, “Generative Artificial Intelligence”, “generative ai”. An additional inclusion criterion of English-language publications yielded a database of 23 documents, including journals, book chapters, and conference proceedings. The perceived association with the current difficulty informed the reasoning behind the search terms chosen and the selection of 23 documents in this investigation. Additionally, the documents included publications from multiple fields, such as chemical education, higher education, management education, and medical education. Unlike other studies (Bukar et al., 2024; Wang et al., 2024), this research retains conference publications due to their global acceptability and quality control as indexed by Scopus. Data inclusion/exclusion criteria are summarized in the following Table 1.

VARIABLE	INCLUSION CRITERIA	EXCLUSION CRITERIA
Database	Scopus	Other than Scopus.
Year span of publications	Publications within the year 2022–2024.	Publication beyond the year of 2022–2024.
Search terms	Availability of specified search terms in either of abstract, title, or keywords of publication.	Non-availability of specified search terms in either of abstract, title, or keywords of publication.
Language of publication	Published in the English language.	Published in a non-English language.

Table 1 Data inclusion/exclusion criteria.

DATA ANALYSIS

Following data collection, the researchers attempted data screening. For this task, the investigators intended to co-create the research output by leveraging the AI writing tool Rayyan (<https://www.rayyan.ai/>) to get a preliminary overview of the SLR. However, the researchers could not benefit much from the AI writing tool in their attempt. One possible reason might be the initial search from the Scopus database, which employed the AI technique at the beginning of the research. Secondly, our dataset was comprised of only 23 documents, and there was hardly any scope for further data screening (such as PRISMA or other methods).

Recognizing the minute details of Rowe and Ngwenyama (2024) for data analysis, human resources, rather than AI, that take the center stage. Each document was employed for its content analysis to identify relevant themes. To locate the themes, emphasis was placed on specific sections of the document, including title, abstract, keywords, results, and conclusion. In this way, a total of 22 themes were identified from the sample studies. The contour of themes and the research dataset are appended to the article (Annexure 1–4). The themes are academic writing and publishing, academic integrity, plagiarism, cheating, academic dishonesty/academic misconduct, personalized learning, transformative learning environment, privacy and bias, policy framework, policy guidelines, legitimacy, ethics, copyright, detection, risk/threat, accessibility, equity, assessment, critical thinking, responsible use, pedagogy, and AI literacy. For a precise presentation of the results, the 22 individual but inter-twined themes were clustered into six broad themes (Table 2). Such clustering was necessitated to align each micro-theme with the specified RQs and accompanying broad-themes.

RQ	Accompanying broad-themes	Relevant micro-themes
RQ1	Viability of academic integrity	Academic writing and publishing, academic integrity, academic dishonesty/academic misconduct
RQ2	Plagiarism and cheating	Plagiarism, cheating
RQ3	Curriculum and assessment	Pedagogy, assessment, detection
RQ4	Individual, institutional, and technical concerns	Personalized learning, critical thinking, interactive learning environments, accessibility, equity, privacy and bias, risk/threat
RQ5	Ethical and legitimacy concerns	Ethics, copyright, responsible use, legitimacy
RQ6	GAI policy matters	Policy frameworks, policy guidelines, AI literacy

Table 2 Cluster of broad-themes and relevant micro-themes.

The process of performing thematic analysis in qualitative research is not standardized (Joffe, 2011). “Furthermore, in thematic analysis importance of a theme is not necessarily dependent on quantifiable measures, but rather on whether it captures something important in relation to the overall research question” (Vaismoradi et al., 2013, p. 402). The sample documents in this study had explicit references to the themes. The RQs’ in-depth examination of the research challenge was the main focus. Thus, for data analysis in this study, researchers rely more on the themes’ contour plot (like Milatz et al., 2015) than on the coding and reliability measures (unlike Hemmler & Ifenthaler, 2024).

RESULTS

RQ1. What is the viability of academic integrity in higher education at the age of GAI?

In the context of GAI in higher education, many articles have expressed their concerns related to academic integrity and its viability. Our study has addressed the issue of positioning academic writing and publishing as the centrality of the entire discussion. Bozkurt (2024) investigates the complex interplay between GAI and human intellect in academic writing and publishing. The author examines the ‘organic versus synthetic’ paradox, emphasizing the implications of using GAI tools in educational and academic integrity contexts. The paper advocates for transparent reporting to uphold academic integrity. De Silva et al. (2023) perceived a primary challenge concerning the impact of ChatGPT on the academic integrity of scholarly work, where AI-generated content can be useful and detrimental in both teaching and research. The ability of the GAI tools to generate human-like responses with minimum instructions generates a grave concern among educators about students’ use of these tools for academic writing, which may constitute a breach of academic integrity (Kong et al., 2024).

A pool of researchers has identified the challenge of academic integrity with the usage of GAI on numerous occasions, such as Australian university educators’ perspective (Lee et al., 2024), business education (Fegade et al., 2023), challenges of GAI in education (Wang et al., 2024), the challenge of GAI for higher education as explained by ChatGPT (Michel-Villarreal et al., 2023), Co-regulated learning (Lodge et al., 2023), digital watermarking (Lancaster, 2023), higher education crisis (Song, 2024), nursing education (Simms, 2024), pedagogical model designing (Kong et al., 2024), promoting assignment integrity (Shanto et al., 2023), Turing’s imitation game (Matthews & Volpe, 2023). Sullivan et al. (2023) posited their research on Australia, New Zealand, the USA, and the UK to find out the effect of ChatGPT in higher education. One of the key themes that emerged was the issue of academic integrity. Per Watts et al. (2023), the emergence of GAI technology raises concerns regarding the value of open-ended writing tasks in the classroom. One such concern involves academic integrity and whether students will use these chatbots to produce sufficient responses to open-ended writing tasks. Locating ChatGPT, De Silva et al. (2023) perceived a primary challenge with its impact on the academic integrity of scholarly work, where AI-generated content can be useful and detrimental in both teaching and research. In a progressive outlook, Bozkurt (2024) discusses GAI’s diverse roles and advocates for transparent reporting to uphold academic integrity. While dealing with the problem, Bukar et al. (2024) precisely argued that focusing on specific capabilities of ChatGPT, such as developing tools to detect plagiarism and misinformation, may enhance resilience to such issues.

Any form of breach of academic integrity leads to academic dishonesty or academic misconduct. Through a multicultural study, a strong correlation was established between the cultural dimensions and the respondent’s view of GAI potential as academic dishonesty (Yusuf et al., 2024). The education community expressed its high concern about academic integrity, in that situation, Hassoulas et al. (2023) tried to investigate the reasons that constitute academic misconduct while dealing with such emerging technologies. With a perception that students will cheat in assignment submission with ChatGPT usage, a study was commissioned to seek ChatGPT’s advice on how to cheat in university exams. They further examined the workability of ChatGPT’s suggestions (Spennemann et al., 2024). To combat the higher education crisis and academic misconduct with GAI researchers argued for developing a clear institutional guideline (Shanto et al., 2023; Song, 2024). Even after accepting the concern of academic dishonesty posed by such large language models (LLMs), Blake (2024) advocates for the constructivist integration of GAI in education. Similarly, Lim et al. (2023) suggest embracing innovation with

institutional governance and strategic regulation. The way educational bodies and institutions conceptualize academic misconduct may need to be rethought as well, they opined.

RQ2. What could be the impact of GAI on plagiarism and cheating in higher education?

Plagiarism and cheating continue to be the top worries for the higher education community in the wake of GAI. In addition, according to Bukar et al. (2024), giving students access to ChatGPT puts them at risk for plagiarism and cheating. Song (2024) makes it apparent that an elevation of these problems is caused by college students' use of GAI tools. During an interview with ChatGPT, plagiarism concerns surfaced as one potential explanation for university bans on ChatGPT use (Michel-Villarreal et al., 2023). Shanto et al. (2023) propose a framework to prevent plagiarism, which will be covered in more detail later.

The rise of GAI has raised valid questions about academic integrity and, in particular, how easily these technologies could result in assessment cheating (Lodge et al., 2023). Spennemann et al. (2024) conclude that ChatGPT can be used successfully as a brainstorming tool to offer cheating advice through an inverted moral discussion. However, the effectiveness of this tool relies on the assignment markers' attentiveness and the cheating student's capacity to discern between options that seem feasible and those that are not.

RQ3. How far can GAI influence existing curriculum and assessment practices to inhibit academic dishonesty in higher education?

Numerous researchers have called for changes to the current curriculum and assessment procedures in light of the accessibility of GAI tools and the sustainability of academic integrity. A key element of curriculum transactions is pedagogy. To emphasize the necessity of updated instructional approaches in the AI era, Lodge et al. (2023) explore the link between students and AI. The researchers advocate for a more comprehensive strategy that places a strong emphasis on learning co-regulation and SRL. The idea is that teachers may better prepare students for an interconnected, AI-driven world by encouraging SRL and comprehending co-regulated dynamics. Blake (2024) argues against a regressive position and supports the positive inclusion of AI into educational processes, despite worries about academic dishonesty made possible by LLMs. Kong et al. (2024) use text-based GAI tools to create a pedagogical paradigm for SRL in academic writing. The model is intended to direct the creation of educational interventions and assist instructors and students in embracing GAI in the teaching-learning process. Simms (2024) offers a two-pronged strategy that uses AI as a scaffold for critical thinking development while integrating constructivist theories with Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development framework.

Another crucial component of instructional design is assessment. There is room for creative assessment design when it comes to ChatGPT's use in higher education (Sullivan et al., 2023). The goal of Hassoulas et al. (2023) is to examine marker accuracy in distinguishing between student-written university scripts and those generated with ChatGPT. Based on their findings, the researchers suggest responsible ways to incorporate GAI into assessment methods. Nearly half of respondents to a survey conducted at a top Australian institution use AI in their teaching responsibilities, with assessment design changes being the most common design change (Lee et al., 2024). Academics require assistance in constructing tests that successfully provide solid proof of students' mastery of learning objectives because they are unsure of the existing capabilities of GAI. Institutions must, therefore, evaluate the suitability of their assessment designs as well as other related issues (Matthews & Volpe, 2023). Simms's (2024) dual-purpose method consists of hands-on exercises that allow students to critically interact with AI-generated content, strengthening clinical judgment and preparing them for contexts in healthcare where AI is commonplace. Citing an organic chemistry assignment, research shows that chatbots react differently to various tasks. Additionally, chatbots generally do not engage in mechanical thinking at the same level as students (Watts et al., 2023).

Institutional procedures frequently use plagiarism detection during assignment submissions to assess whether there has been a violation of academic integrity. Bozkurt (2024) emphasizes the need for new methods to detect the use of GAI and urges a more thorough investigation of GAI tools. Focusing on particular ChatGPT features, including creating tools to identify plagiarism and false information, may improve resilience in some areas (like academic integrity), claim Bukar et al. (2024). An introduction to text-generation tools is given by Lancaster (2023), who also discusses the kinds of assessments that students can outsource, demonstrates the

types of prompts that can be used to generate text, and shows one potential watermarking technique that might make it possible to identify generated text. Using an inverted moral valence, Spennemann et al. (2024) demonstrate how effective the suggested solutions are and how much GAI may be utilized to get advice on how to avoid discovery while commissioning and submitting contract-written assignments.

RQ4. What could be the individual, institutional, and technical concerns in accommodating GAI in higher education?

The process of making accommodations for GAI in higher education could have a variety of effects on the state of education today. Individual (critical thinking, individualized learning), institutional, or technical factors (accessibility, equity, privacy and bias, risk/threat) may be affected.

Blake (2024) emphasizes education in his description of GAI's effects on the teaching-learning system, demonstrating how it may be used to customize content and change learning settings. Kong et al. (2024) demonstrate a self-directed learning design in academic writing. The significance of self-regulated and co-regulated learning is equivocated by Lodge et al. (2023). Personalization and interaction are highlighted by Wang et al. (2024) while talking about the technological affordances of GAI in education.

A pool of research has documented the use of GAI tools and the growth of critical thinking abilities. It is clear that students are developing their critical thinking abilities (Kong et al., 2024; Simms, 2024). The literature also contains a variety of report types. Evidence regarding the effectiveness of the increased critical thinking strategy is available (Kong et al., 2024). Students' needs for critical analysis in some subjects may not be met by an over-reliance on ChatGPT (Michel-Villareal et al., 2023).

Bozkurt (2024), focusing on institutional reforms, emphasizes the urgent necessity to use creative AI-inclusive techniques to adapt and change academic processes. A renowned Australian university serves as a lens for examining the effects of GAI in higher education. More than three-quarters of employees said they would like assistance, and less than a quarter believed the institution had prepared them sufficiently for AI (Lee et al., 2024). Management educators' paradoxical viewpoint (Lim et al., 2023) provides a vivid theoretical description of the transformative learning environment. Other scholars have studied the topic to varying degrees (Blake, 2024; Lodge et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2024).

Accessibility is one of the technical issues that is emerging in this setting. When it comes to GAI's accessibility and enforced limitations, management educators see a contradiction (Lim et al., 2023). According to Song (2024), AI literacy is seen as an essential instrument for guaranteeing equitable access to technology and avoiding the digital divide. Accessibility and the growing digital divide continue to be issues with technology affordances and the difficulties of GAI in education (Wang et al., 2024). According to Bukar et al. (2024), the use of GAI tools in higher education may increase the risk of educational inequality and the digital divide. Concerns about bias and data privacy have been raised by the training and operation of GAI tools (Fegade et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2024). Academic integrity is at risk due to the use of ChatGPT, according to a group of researchers (Lancaster, 2023; Sullivan et al., 2023; Zhong et al., 2024). Per Zhong et al. (2024), there are other risk variables linked to excessive reliance, teaching position, information transmission and knowledge level, ethical awareness, and ethical dangers.

RQ5. What are the ethical and legitimate concerns coming into the picture while attempting to locate GAI in higher education?

The section identifies difficulties related to the legitimacy, copyright, ethics, and appropriate use of GAI in higher education. The ethical and legal ramifications of authorship and ownership are discussed by Bozkurt (2024), particularly in light of copyright regulations and AI-generated work. According to Bukar et al. (2024), laws about ChatGPT have second-order impacts that might have both beneficial and bad repercussions. Fegade et al. (2023) looked for GAI use rules that were morally and responsibly conducted. Academic integrity has been a legitimate problem since GAI's development (Lodge et al., 2023). These authors advocate for the ethical use of GAI in higher education: Matthews and Volpe (2023); Shanto et al. (2023); Song (2024); Wang et al. (2024); and Yusuf et al. (2024).

Given the complexities, Hassoulas et al. (2023) advise thinking about how GAI might be ethically incorporated into evaluation techniques and broadening our understanding of academic misconduct to take into account this emerging technology. According to Michel-Villarreal et al. (2023), there must be explicit rules for using ChatGPT responsibly in higher education. Yusuf et al. (2024), based on the multicultural perspective, contended that while the ethical use of AI and the prevention of academic dishonesty may necessitate strong policies that take cultural norms into account, the responsible use of GAI tools might improve learning processes.

RQ6. What does the existing body of literature convey on the GAI policy matters towards tackling the challenge of academic dishonesty in higher education?

The availability of writing resources and upholding academic integrity continue to be the top concerns for scholars and practitioners in higher education following GAI. Clear policies, guidelines, and a framework are, therefore, desperately needed (Michel-Villarreal et al., 2023; Song, 2024).

Two relevant primary themes emerged from the analysis of the research dataset's content: the GAI framework and the GAI guidelines. Furthermore, there are distinct studies in which the need for AI literacy is mentioned. Researchers who adopt a holistic approach choose to take into account each of the three themes for the current conversation.

The study of English medium instruction (EMI) in general and GAI in particular is still ongoing. A GAI academic integrity policy development framework for global higher education cultures is presented by Bannister et al. (2023). The mixed method research provides a blueprint with four dimensions and nineteen descriptors to address the unique policy/practical features of GAI for EMI in tertiary education, using a virtual nominal group strategy. The most widely used GAI writing tool is still ChatGPT. A GAI policy-making approach based on the risk, reward, and resilience framework is presented by Bukar et al. in 2024. To provide components for the suggested decision-making framework, important aspects of ChatGPT concerns and motivations are methodically categorized under the risk, reward, and resilience categories. Using text-based GAI tools, a pedagogical design that is centered on the authoring cycle and SRL fosters students' critical thinking and self-regulation while they compose academic writing. There are six interactive stages in the design, informed by Kong et al. (2024). Shanto et al. (2023) provide another conceptual framework, called PAIGE, that highlights the ethical integration of GAI, encourages active student participation, and fosters chances for peer learning experiences to preserve assignment integrity.

There is a substantial body of research that discusses GAI guidelines for enhancing academic integrity and instructional activities in HEIs. These recommendations are occasionally given as potential lines of inquiry for further study. De Silva et al. (2023), Lancaster (2023), Lim et al. (2023), Sullivan et al. (2023), and Wang et al. (2024) are among the researchers in the pool. The presentation's prodigality restricts our ability to fully clarify the guidelines.

The crisis of academic dishonesty is expected to be lessened if AI literacy improves. Fegade et al. (2023) and Song (2024) placed a greater focus on AI literacy among students and/or teachers. However, the agenda is unable to produce a unified consensus. The technical aspects of learning, for example, are viewed with skepticism by Lodge et al. (2023), who instead place greater trust in the human-engaging aspects of learning.

DISCUSSION

The viability of academic integrity about GAI adoption in higher education is identified in RQ1. Academic writing and publication, academic integrity and its potential violations, academic dishonesty, and academic misconduct are all linked to academic viability. Balalle and Pannilage (2025) examine the dual role of AI tools in promoting and compromising academic integrity, which is comparable to our critical stance on the current study problem. In contrast to our reports on the many forms of academic integrity viability, Sozon et al. (2024a) concentrate on identifying contributing reasons for academic integrity violations and suggested actions to alleviate the situation in higher education. Academic misconduct and academic integrity have been correlated. Thematic evolution shows that the focus has shifted from academic misconduct-integrity to problems like online fraud (Suprpto et al., 2024). In such a context,

Surahman and Wang (2022) emphasize the importance of trustworthy assessment in order to address the problem of academic dishonesty in online education. According to Pilaez-Sanchez et al. (2024), the issue seems to be extremely concerning for school education, higher education in general (Liu et al., 2023), and other professional education fields (e.g. Miao et al., 2024).

As RQ2 provides, plagiarism and cheating with GAI assistance are serious concerns to academic integrity in action. Partly aligning with our observation, a report on the causes of plagiarism and cheating in higher education as well as solutions is included by Sozon et al. (2024b). Ahsan et al. (2022) review the literature on contract cheating and offer a conceptual framework to address the issue in higher education. According to Miranda-Rodríguez et al. (2024) “interventions with practical elements, such as plagiarism detection, paraphrasing, citation skills, in addition to using software to identify similarities, may reduce plagiarism” (p. 1). Hutson (2024), however, urges a reconsideration of plagiarism in the age of GAI due to the evolving nature of academic writing, plagiarism, and intellectual property rights. The current findings are consistent with earlier research that was based on either pre-ChatGPT databases (Moya et al., 2023) or post-ChatGPT databases (Peláez-Sanchez et al., 2024).

According to the RQ3, GAI has significant room to change the current curriculum and evaluation practices to prevent academic dishonesty in higher education. An empirical study that looked at how GAI may improve social work education using curricular navigation and assessment design in undergraduate course assignments corroborated our findings (Reimer, 2024).

In-service teachers noted that the adaptability of AI tools not only facilitated the creation of compelling lessons but also significantly improved students’ listening and speaking skills. The findings advocate for the strategic incorporation of AI in EFL teaching, suggesting that such technologies can lead to innovative pedagogical approaches that are attuned to the diverse needs of learners. (Yeh, 2024, p.1)

According to research, AI tools help students customize their self-evaluation, enhance learning support, contribute to improved academic performance, and develop collaborative learning environments (Cai et al., 2024). According to Labadze et al. (2023), students benefit most from AI-powered chatbots in three main areas: help with homework and studies, individualized learning, and skill development. The primary benefits for teachers are enhanced pedagogy and time-saving support. Thereby, the findings call for a shift in higher education’s existing pedagogy (Simms, 2024) and evaluation procedures (Foung et al., 2024).

To accommodate GAI in higher education, RQ4 addresses individual, institutional, and technical challenges. Regarding individual concerns, the results of this study corroborate those of Liu et al. (2023) about the views of critical thinking in a different context and individualized learning (partially). The findings of Moya et al. (2023) are combined with the results of institutional services such as creating an interactive learning environment and providing parity in the use of GAI. Urdan and Marson (2024) are completely in line with the current research output on technological aspects of accessibility and risk/threat related to data privacy and bias. Sozon et al. (2024a) highlighted five factors—individual, institutional, societal, cultural, and technical—while discussing the causes of academic integrity violations in higher education. Therefore, our results partially align with the relevant report.

The RQ5 focuses on the legitimacy (and copyright) issues and ethical (responsible) use requirements of GAI in higher education. The status of AI and academic integrity in higher education is investigated in a rapid scoping review. The findings demonstrate both limited and unrestricted ethical implications of AI. AI for cheating, AI as legitimate support, an equality, diversity, and inclusion lens into AI, and new suggestions to address AI’s ramifications in higher education are among the views presented (Moya et al., 2023). To find out how students and faculty at Lebanon’s universities see the role of AI tools, a qualitative study was carried out. The results urge the creation of precise rules and regulations for their ethical and responsible usage (Karkoulia et al., 2024). In the context of higher education, separate research by Bozkurt (2024) and Pilaez-Sanchez et al. (2024) offers comparable reports.

The RQ6 captures the need for GAI policy regulation in higher education. To address the opportunities and problems it presents for higher education, researchers invited ChatGPT. It highlights the urgent necessity for precise policies, guidelines, and frameworks to properly integrate ChatGPT in higher education while offering solutions to overcome challenges (Michel-

Villarreal et al., 2023). Nagpal (2024) made recommendations for universities, instructors, students, researchers, and staff to establish a comprehensive GAI guideline by comparing the policies and guidelines of the top twenty Canadian institutions as determined by the Times Higher Education World Rankings. In terms of the structuring and schematizing of the suggestion to degrees, the present study found some similarities and variances. According to a study on 40 institutions' inclusive GAI plans from six different global areas, our policy advice was found to have mixed analytical results (Jin et al., 2025). Connecting to the conversation above, Rudolph et al. (2024) recommend AI literacy among teachers and students.

WHAT MORE TO CARRY FORWARD?

RQ1–6 illustrate how various viewpoints on the use of GAI in higher education and academic dishonesty interact. The fact that individual RQ's concerns are intertwined with those of others highlights the significance of entangled thing ethnography (Murray-Rust et al., 2019) in this study.

It is seen in RQ6 that the GAI framework's output varies depending on the specific research topic (Bukar et al., 2024; Kong et al., 2024; Shanto et al., 2023). It may be argued that creating a new GAI framework may not remain equally appealing in all circumstances. Rather, there exists some overlap among the current GAI guidelines. In those investigations, the technique and/or the research goal were different. We suggest creating a comprehensive guideline (Table 3) to address academic dishonesty with GAI usage in higher education to support the existing limitation. We prefer to communicate the new guideline in three directions—individual, institutional, and technical concerns—by using an inductive approach (Lee et al., 2024). Since the new guideline is based on existing material, no additional discussion is included. Five elements that lead to academic integrity violations in higher education were emphasized by Sozon et al. (2024a) in the discussion of RQ4 results. It is believed that social and cultural elements are more under the influence of an academic institution's external environment. The said norms, however, can also be imprinted in an institution to varied degrees. By using this logic, we limited our discussion to individual, institutional, and technical concerns.

INDIVIDUAL CONCERNS	INSTITUTIONAL CONCERNS	TECHNICAL CONCERNS
Personalized learning skills development	Specifying discipline-specific AI interventions	Enhanced accessibility, ensuring equity to AI access
Self-directed learning skills development	Change of existing curricula and assessment practices, development of a clear institutional GAI policy	Minimizing data biases, protecting the data privacy of the users
Critical thinking skills development	Student and staff training on GAI	Framing copyright protection law, use of AI tools for plagiarism detection
Student-teacher-AI integration in teaching and learning	Fostering AI inclusive learning environment	Clearing GAI legitimacy issues
Ethical/responsible use of AI	Promoting awareness of academic integrity	Spreading AI literacy among the stakeholders

Table 3 Comprehensive GAI guideline for GAI usage in higher education.
Sources: Bannister et al. (2023); Bukar et al. (2024); Lancaster (2023); Lim et al. (2023); Michel-Villarreal et al. (2023); Song (2024); Sullivan et al. (2023); Wang et al. (2024).

EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS, LIMITATIONS, AND SCOPE FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The current study offers a thorough overview of academic dishonesty in higher education throughout the GAI era. This study offers a more contemporary picture than Moya et al. (2023), who used the pre-ChatGPT timeframe to finalize their dataset. The new study can also serve as a supplement to Liu et al.'s (2023) contextualized study on school education.

Comprehensive guidelines for using GAI to address academic dishonesty in higher education are given in Table 3. We believe the guideline is more complete now after including three distinct concerns in its framing, and will remain instrumental in addressing the issue of academic dishonesty in higher education. According to Kong et al. (2024), the guideline

could assist educational stakeholders in making the most of GAI tools' potential in higher education practices.

However, the research is not perfect. The qualitative approach used for the research makes it vulnerable to individual bias of the researchers in the data analysis. Future studies could use different research methods to confirm the limitations and remove the potential for researcher bias (Hemmler & Ifenthaler, 2024).

Thematic analysis is the method used in the literature review. What might occur if different kinds of study methodologies were used (Sareen & Mandal, 2024)?

Research indicates that the quality of the study is more significant during a review than the total number of studies ultimately taken into consideration (Moya et al., 2023). However, if a larger dataset is utilized to review the subject, the current findings may alter. Future inquiry may be conducted to evaluate the proposed GAI guideline's efficacy.

CONCLUSION

Addressing academic dishonesty in higher education during the GAI era is the aim of the study. The research is methodically guided by six RQs. The viability of academic integrity with GAI use in higher education is captured in RQ1. According to RQ2, the majority of these issues stem from GAI assistive writing tools and manifest as plagiarism or cheating. There is substantial room for improvement in the current curriculum and evaluation procedures to prevent academic dishonesty in higher education (RQ3 provides). RQ4 addresses GAI's individual, institutional, and technical concerns to transparently accommodate it inside the higher education environment. RQ5 highlights additional considerations, such as issues of legitimacy and ethics. As demonstrated by RQ6, there is no one-size-fits-all GAI framework for addressing the issue of academic dishonesty. The GAI guidelines of the relevant database show some degree of alignment.

To make the most of GAI's potential in higher education, a comprehensive guideline is included. The study calls for practical implications of the new GAI guideline in higher education to make the research output more engaging. For the stakeholders in higher education, educational consequences are appended. The effectiveness of the new GAI guideline may be examined in future studies using a different methodology (other than thematic analysis), approach (other than qualitative research), or both. The study's conclusions offer a thorough understanding of academic dishonesty associated with GAI in higher education. The research is presented from a critical yet optimistic standpoint. The study's outcome is to create a solid ethical foundation for the application of GAI in all academic endeavors.

DATA ACCESSIBILITY STATEMENT

The datasets used and/or analysed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS (SDGs)

This study is linked to the following SDG(s): Quality education (SDG 4), Industry, innovation and infrastructure (SDG 9), Reduced inequalities (SDG 10).

ADDITIONAL FILE

The additional file for this article can be found as follows:

- **Supplementary Material.** Contour of Themes and The Research Dataset: Annexure 1–4.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.55982/openpraxis.17.2.820.s1>

ETHICS AND CONSENT

The research was not done on any animal or human body, so no special ethical consideration was taken. However, conventional research ethics were followed when conducting this study.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS (CRediT)

Ramesh Chander Sharma: Conceptualization, methodology, formal analysis, investigation, data curation, visualization, writing—original draft preparation, writing—review and editing; Suman Kalyan Panja: methodology, formal analysis, supervision, project administration, writing—original draft preparation, writing—review and editing. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

AUTHOR AFFILIATIONS

Ramesh Chander Sharma  orcid.org/0000-0002-1371-1157

Dr B R Ambedkar University Delhi, New Delhi, India

Suman Kalyan Panja  orcid.org/0000-0002-9097-4938

Assam University, Silchar, India

REFERENCES

- Abdalla, A. A., Bhat, M. A., Tiwari, C. K., Khan, S. T., & Wedajo, A. D.** (2024). Exploring ChatGPT adoption among business and management students through the lens of diffusion of innovation theory. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 7, 100257. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100257>
- Adarkwah, M. A., Amponsah, S., van Wyk, M. M., Huang, R., Tlili, A., Shehata, B., Metwally, A. H. S., & Wang, H.** (2023). Awareness and acceptance of ChatGPT as a generative conversational AI for transforming education by Ghanaian academics: A two-phase study. *Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching*, 6(2), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2023.6.2.26>
- Ahsan, K., Akbar, S., & Kam, B.** (2022). Contract cheating in higher education: A systematic literature review and future research agenda. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 47(4), 523–539. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.1931660>
- Al-Dhaen, F., Hou, J., Rana, N. P., & Weerakkody, V.** (2023). Advancing the understanding of the role of responsible AI in the continued use of IoMT in healthcare. *Information Systems Frontiers*, 25(6), 2159–2178. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-021-10193-x>
- Altınay, Z., Ghai, A. S., Sharma, R. C., Baştaş, M., Jasola, S., Dağlı, G., & Kohli, D.** (2024). Embracing digital transformation in learning organizations using blended learning for academic excellence. *Pakistan Journal of Life and Social Sciences*, 22(1), 6754–6762. <https://doi.org/10.57239/PJLSS-2024-22.1.00492>
- Balalle, H., & Pannilage, S.** (2025). Reassessing academic integrity in the age of AI: A systematic literature review on AI and academic integrity. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 11, 101299. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2025.101299>
- Ball, R., Talal, A. H., Dang, O., Muñoz, M., & Markatou, M.** (2024). Trust but verify: Lessons learned for the application of AI to case-based clinical decision-making from postmarketing drug safety assessment at the US food and drug administration. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 26, e50274. <https://www.jmir.org/2024/1/e50274/>
- Bannister, P., Penalver, E. A., & Urbietta, A. S.** (2023). Transnational higher education cultures and generative AI: A nominal group study for policy development in English medium instruction. *Journal for Multicultural Education*, 18(1/2), 173–191. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JME-10-2023-0102>
- Barker, L. A., Moore, J. D., & Cook, H. A.** (2024). Generative artificial intelligence as a tool for teaching communication in nutrition and dietetics education – A novel education innovation. *Nutrients*, 16(7), 914. <https://doi.org/10.3390/nu16070914>
- Blake, J.** (2024). Unleashing the potential: Positive impacts of generative AI on learning and teaching. In *Generative AI in teaching and learning*, (pp. 31–45). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-0074-9.ch002>
- Bozkurt, A.** (2024). GenAI et al.: Cocreation, authorship, ownership, academic ethics and integrity in a time of generative AI. *Open Praxis*, 16(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.55982/openpraxis.16.1.654>
- Bozkurt, A., Xiao, J., Farrow, R., Bai, J. Y. H., Nerantzi, C., Moore, S., Dron, J., Stracke, C. M., Singh, L., Crompton, H., Koutropoulos, A., Terentev, E., Pazurek, A., Nichols, M., Sidorkin, A. M., Costello, E., Watson, S., Mulligan, D., Honeychurch, S., Hodges, C. B., Sharples, M., Swindell, A., Frumin, I., Tlili, A., Slagter van Tryon, P. J., Bond, M., Bali, M., Leng, J., Zhang, K., Cukurova, M., Chiu, T. K. F.,**

- Lee, K., Hrastinski, S., Garcia, M. B., Sharma, R. C., Alexander, B., Zawacki-Richter, O., Huijser, H., Jandrić, P., Zheng, C., Shea, P., Duarte, J. M., Themeli, C., Vorochkov, A., Sani-Bozkurt, S., Moore, R. L., & Asino, T. I. (2024). The manifesto for teaching and learning in a time of generative AI: A critical collective stance to better navigate the future. *Open Praxis*, 16(4), 487–513. <https://doi.org/10.55982/openpraxis.16.4.777>
- Bridgelall, R. (2024). Unraveling the mysteries of AI chatbots. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 57(4), 89–123. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10462-024-10720-7>
- Bukar, U. A., Sayeed, M. S., Razak, S. F. A., Yogarayan, S., & Amodu, O. A. (2024). An integrative decision-making framework to guide policies on regulating ChatGPT usage. *PeerJ Computer Science*, 10, e1845. <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj-cs.1845>
- Cai, L., Msafiri, M. M., & Kangwa, D. (2024). Exploring the impact of integrating AI tools in higher education using the Zone of Proximal Development. *Education and Information Technologies*, 1–74. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-13112-0>
- Chiarello, F., Giordano, V., Spada, I., Barandoni, S., & Fantoni, G. (2024). Future applications of generative large language models: A data-driven case study on ChatGPT. *Technovation*, 113, 103002. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2024.103002>
- de Bem Machado, A., Sousa, M. J., & Sharma, R. C. (2024). AI integration in higher education: A multidisciplinary bibliometric review of technological applications for enhanced learning and institutional growth. In H. Crompton & D. Burke (Eds.), *Artificial intelligence applications in higher education: Theories, ethics, and case studies for universities* (pp. 9–32). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003440178-2>
- Dermawan, A. (2024). Text and data mining exceptions in the development of generative AI models: What the EU member states could learn from the Japanese “nonenjoyment” purposes? *The Journal of World Intellectual Property*, 27(1), 44–68. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jwip.12285>
- De Silva, D., Mills, N., El-Ayoubi, M., Manic, M., & Alahakoon, D. (2023, April 4–6). ChatGPT and generative AI guidelines for addressing academic integrity and augmenting pre-existing chatbots. *Proceedings of the 2023 IEEE International Conference on Industrial Technology (ICIT)*, (pp. 1–6). Orlando, Florida, USA. IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICIT58465.2023.10143123>
- Duane, A. (2024, June 9–12). A study to measure the potential impact of generative artificial intelligence on academic integrity. In A. Puchihar, M. K. Borstnar, S. Blatnik, R. W. H. Bons, K. Smit & M. Heikkilä (Eds.), *37th Bled eConference Resilience through Digital Innovation: Enabling the Twin Transition*, (pp. 1–16). Bled, Slovenia. <https://doi.org/10.18690/um.fov.4.2024.1>
- Fegade, A., Raut, R., Deshpande, A., Mittal, A., Kaul, N., & Khanna, V. (2023, September). Unleashing the power of generative artificial intelligence: Exploring its boundless potential and overcoming challenges in academic environments. *Proceedings of the 2023 6th International Conference on Contemporary Computing and Informatics (IC3I)*, 1243–1249. IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IC3I59117.2023.10397917>
- Foung, D., Lin, L., & Chen, J. (2024). Reinventing assessments with ChatGPT and other online tools: Opportunities for GenAI-empowered assessment practices. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 6, 100250. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100250>
- Ghimire, A., & Edwards, J. (2024, May). Generative AI adoption in the classroom: A contextual exploration using the technology acceptance model (TAM) and the innovation diffusion theory (IDT). *Proceedings of the 2024 Intermountain Engineering, Technology and Computing (IETC)*, 129–134. IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IETC61393.2024.10564292>
- Giaccardi, E., Speed, C., Cila, N., & Caldwell, M. L. (2016). Things as co-ethnographers: Implications of a thing perspective for design and anthropology. In R. C. Smith, K. T. Vangkilde, M. G. Kjærsgaard, T. Otto, J. Halse & T. Binder (Eds.), *Design anthropological futures*, (pp. 1–18). Bloomsbury Academic. https://pure.hva.nl/ws/portalfiles/portal/1564950/Things_as_co_ethno_Giaccardi_et_al_distrib.pdf
- Gupta, V., & Yang, H. (2024). Study protocol for factors influencing the adoption of ChatGPT technology by startups: Perceptions and attitudes of entrepreneurs. *Plos One*, 19(2), e0298427. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0298427>
- Hassoulas, A., Powell, N., Roberts, L., Umla-Runge, K., Gray, L., & Coffey, M. (2023). Investigating marker accuracy in differentiating between university scripts written by students and those produced using ChatGPT. *Journal of Applied Learning & Teaching*, 6(2), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2023.6.2.13>
- Hemmler, Y. M., & Ifenthaler, D. (2024). Self-regulated learning strategies in continuing education: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review*, 45, 100629. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2024.100629>
- Hirzallah, M., & Alshurideh, M. (2023). The effects of the internal and the external factors affecting artificial intelligence (AI) adoption in e-innovation technology projects in the UAE? Applying both innovation and technology acceptance theories. *International Journal of Data and Network Science*, 7(3), 1321–1332. <https://doi.org/10.5267/j.ijdns.2023.4.006>
- Holmström, J., & Carroll, N. (2024). How organizations can innovate with generative AI. *Business Horizons*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2024.02.010>

- Hoshino, Y., & Hirao, T. (2024). Organizational processes for adopting breakthrough technology: Text mining of AI perception among Japanese firms. *Applied System Innovation*, 7(1), 13. <https://doi.org/10.3390/asi7010013>
<https://www.rayyan.ai/> (n.d). Retrieved on 15th–25th July 2024.
- Huang, Q., Kumarasinghe, P. J., & Jayarathna, G. S. (2024). Navigating the future: Exploring AI adoption in Chinese higher education through the lens of diffusion theory. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Information, Knowledge & Management*, 19, 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.28945/5277>
- Huang, Y. C., Cheng, Y. T., Liang, R. H., Hsu, J. Y. J., & Chen, L. L. (2021). Thing constellation visualizer: Exploring emergent relationships of everyday objects. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 5(CSCW2), 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3479866>
- Hutson, J. (2024). Rethinking plagiarism in the era of generative AI. *Journal of Intelligent Communication*, 3(2), 20–31. <https://doi.org/10.54963/jic.v4i1.220>
- Ivanov, S., Soliman, M., Tuomi, A., Alkathiri, N. A., & Al-Alawi, A. N. (2024). Drivers of generative AI adoption in higher education through the lens of the theory of planned behaviour. *Technology in Society*, 77, 102521. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2024.102521>
- Javadi, M., & Zarea, K. (2016). Understanding thematic analysis and its pitfall. *Journal of Client Care*, 1(1), 33–39. <https://doi.org/10.15412/J.JCC.02010107>
- Jin, Y., Yan, L., Echeverria, V., Gašević, D., & Martinez-Maldonado, R. (2025). Generative AI in higher education: A global perspective of institutional adoption policies and guidelines. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 8, 100348. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100348>
- Joffe, H. (2011). Thematic analysis. In D. Harper & A. R. Thompson (Eds.), *Qualitative Research Methods in Mental Health and Psychotherapy: A Guide for Students and Practitioners* (pp. 209–223). <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119973249.ch15>
- Joosten, J., Bilgram, V., Hahn, A., & Totzek, D. (2024). Comparing the ideation quality of humans with generative artificial intelligence. *IEEE Engineering Management Review*, 52(2), 153–164. <https://doi.org/10.1109/EMR.2024.3353338>
- Karkoulia, S., Sayegh, N., & Sayegh, N. (2024). ChatGPT unveiled: Understanding perceptions of academic integrity in higher education—A qualitative approach. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-024-09543-6>
- Khoalenyane, N. B., & Ajani, O. A. (2024). A systematic review of artificial intelligence in higher education—South Africa. *Social Sciences and Education Research Review*, 11(1), 17–26. <https://sserr.ro/wp-content/uploads/2024/07/sserr-11-1-17-26.pdf>
- Kong, S. C., Lee, J. C. K., & Tsang, O. (2024). A pedagogical design for self-regulated learning in academic writing using text-based generative artificial intelligence tools: 6-P pedagogy of plan, prompt, preview, produce, peer-review, portfolio-tracking. *Research & Practice in Technology Enhanced Learning*, 19, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.58459/rptel.2024.19030>
- Labadze, L., Grigolia, M., & Machaidze, L. (2023). Role of AI chatbots in education: Systematic literature review. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 20(1), 56. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00426-1>
- Lancaster, T. (2023). Artificial intelligence, text generation tools and ChatGPT – Does digital watermarking offer a solution? *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 19(1), 10. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-023-00131-6>
- Lee, D., Arnold, M., Srivastava, A., Plastow, K., Strelan, P., Ploeckl, F., Lekkas, D., & Palmer, E. (2024). The impact of generative AI on higher education learning and teaching: A study of educators' perspectives. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 6, 100221. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100221>
- Lim, W. M., Gunasekara, A., Pallant, J. L., Pallant, J. I., & Pechenkina, E. (2023). Generative AI and the future of education: Ragnarök or reformation? A paradoxical perspective from management educators. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 21(2), 100790. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2023.100790>
- Liu, M., Ren, Y., Nyagoga, L. M., Stonier, F., Wu, Z., & Yu, L. (2023). Future of education in the era of generative artificial intelligence: Consensus among Chinese scholars on applications of ChatGPT in schools. *Future in Educational Research*, 1(1), 72–101. <https://doi.org/10.1002/fer3.10>
- Lodge, J. M., de Barba, P., & Broadbent, J. (2023). Learning with generative artificial intelligence within a network of co-regulation. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice*, 20(7), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.53761/1.20.7.02>
- Lucas, G., & Robb, J. (2021). The terrain of thingworlds: Central objects and asymmetry in material culture systems. *Journal of Material Culture*, 26(2), 219–238. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13591835211002230>
- Mannay, D., & Morgan, M. (2015). Doing ethnography or applying a qualitative technique? Reflections from the 'waiting field'. *Qualitative Research*, 15(2), 166–182. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794113517391>
- Matthews, J. A., & Volpe, C. R. (2023). Academics' perceptions of ChatGPT-generated written outputs: A practical application of Turing's Imitation Game. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 39(5), 82–100. <https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.8896>

- Miao, J., Thongprayoon, C., Suppadungsuk, S., Garcia Valencia, O. A., Qureshi, F., & Cheungpasitporn, W. (2024). Ethical dilemmas in using AI for academic writing and an example framework for peer review in nephrology academia: A narrative review. *Clinics and Practice*, 14(1), 89–105. <https://doi.org/10.3390/clinpract14010008>
- Michalko, R. (1980). *The ethnographic possibility*. [Doctoral dissertation, University of British Columbia, Canada]. <https://open.library.ubc.ca/soa/cIRcle/collections/ubctheses/831/items/1.0095207>
- Michel-Villareal, R., Vilalta-Perdomo, E., Salinas-Navarro, D. E., Thierry-Aguilera, R., & Gerardou, F. S. (2023). Challenges and opportunities of generative AI for higher education as explained by ChatGPT. *Education Sciences*, 13(9), 856. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13090856>
- Milatz, A., Lüftenegger, M., & Schober, B. (2015). Teachers' relationship closeness with students as a resource for teacher wellbeing: A response surface analytical approach. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6, 1949. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01949>
- Miranda-Rodríguez, R. A., Sánchez-Nieto, J. M., & Ruiz-Rodríguez, A. K. (2024). Effectiveness of intervention programs in reducing plagiarism by university students: A systematic review. *Frontiers in Education*, 9, 1357853. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1357853>
- Morgan, H. (2022). Understanding thematic analysis and the debates involving its use. *The Qualitative Report*, 27(10), 2079–2091. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2022.5912>
- Moya, B. A., Eaton, S. E., Pethrick, H., Hayden, K. A., Brennan, R., Wiens, J., McDermott, B., & Lesage, J. (2023). Academic integrity and artificial intelligence in higher education contexts: A rapid scoping review protocol. *Canadian Perspectives on Academic Integrity*, 5(2), 59–75. <https://journalhosting.ucalgary.ca/index.php/ai/article/view/75990>
- Murray-Rust, D., Gorkovenko, K., Burnett, D., & Richards, D. (2019, November 19). Entangled ethnography: Towards a collective future understanding. In J. E. Fischer, S. Martindale, M. Porcheron, S. Reeves & J. Spence (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Halfway to the Future Symposium 2019*, 21, ACM International Conference Proceeding Series, ACM, 2019 Halfway to the Future Symposium: Exploring the Past, Present, and Future of HCI and Design-Based Research, HTTF 2019. Nottingham, United Kingdom. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3363384.3363405>
- Nagpal, H. (2024). *Policies, procedures, and guidelines: Are universities effectively ensuring AI (academic integrity) in the era of generative AI?* [M.Ed. Thesis, Lakehead University, Canada]. <https://knowledgecommons.lakeheadu.ca/handle/2453/5385>
- Newton, L., & Dimopoulos-Bick, T. L. (2024). Assessing early feasibility of a novel innovation to increase consumer partnership capability within an Australian health innovation organisation using a mixed-method approach. *BMJ Open*, 14(5), e080495. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2023-080495>
- Ngwenyama, O., & Rowe, F. (2024). Should we collaborate with AI to conduct literature reviews? Changing epistemic values in a flattening world. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, 25(1), 122–136. <https://doi.org/10.17705/1jais.00869>
- Nicenboim, I., Giaccardi, E., Søndergaard, M. L. J., Reddy, A. V., Strengers, Y., Pierce, J., & Redström, J. (2020). More-than-human design and AI: In conversation with agents. In R. Wakkary & K. Andersen (Eds.), *Proceedings of the DIS 2020 Companion – Companion Publication of the 2020 ACM Designing Interactive Systems Conference* (pp. 397–400). Association for Computing Machinery (ACM). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3393914.3395912>
- Nyaaba, M., & Zhai, X. (2024). Generative AI professional development needs for teacher educators. *Journal of AI*, 8(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.61969/jai.1385915>
- Nyhan, M. M., & Marshall, K. (2024). *The ethical application of generative artificial intelligence in supporting education for sustainable development globally*. New York: United Nations Interagency Task Team on Science, Technology & Innovation for the Sustainable Development Goals'. <https://hdl.handle.net/10468/16108>
- Orozco, J. M., & Welin, O. (2024). *What drives European organizations to invest in Generative AI, and what challenges do they face in 2023–2024?* [MBA thesis, Blekinge Institute of Technology, Sweden]. <https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1878310/FULLTEXT01.pdf>
- Peláez-Sánchez, I. C., Velarde-Camaqui, D., & Glasserman-Morales, L. D. (2024, June). The impact of large language models on higher education: Exploring the connection between AI and Education 4.0. *Frontiers in Education*, 9, 1392091. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1392091>
- Pesovski, I., Santos, R., Henriques, R., & Trajkovic, V. (2024). Generative AI for customizable learning experiences. *Sustainability*, 16(7), 3034. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16073034>
- Raza, M. M., Venkatesh, K. P., & Kvedar, J. C. (2024). Generative AI and large language models in health care: Pathways to implementation. *npj Digital Medicine*, 7(1), 62. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-023-00988-4>
- Reimer, E. C. (2024). Examining the role of generative AI in enhancing social work education: An analysis of curriculum and assessment design. *Social Sciences*, 13(12), 648. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci13120648>
- Ritala, P., Ruokonen, M., & Ramaul, L. (2024). Transforming boundaries: How does ChatGPT change knowledge work? *Journal of Business Strategy*, 45(3), 214–220. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JBS-05-2023-0094>

- Rudolph, J., Ismail, M. F. B. M., & Popenici, S. (2024). Higher education's generative artificial intelligence paradox: The meaning of chatbot mania. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice*, 21(6), 1–35. <https://doi.org/10.53761/54fs5e77>
- Russo, D. (2024). Navigating the complexity of generative AI adoption in software engineering. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology*, 33(5), 50. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3652154>
- Salinas-Navarro, D. E., Vilalta-Perdomo, E., Michel-Villarreal, R., & Montesinos, L. (2024a). Using generative artificial intelligence tools to explain and enhance experiential learning for authentic assessment. *Education Sciences*, 14(1), 83. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14010083>
- Salinas-Navarro, D. E., Vilalta-Perdomo, E., Michel-Villarreal, R., & Montesinos, L. (2024b). Designing experiential learning activities with generative artificial intelligence tools for authentic assessment. *Interactive Technology and Smart Education*, 1741–5659. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ITSE-12-2023-0236>
- Sareen, S., & Mandal, S. (2024). Challenges of blended learning in higher education across global north-south: A systematic and integrative literature review. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 10, 101011. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2024.101011>
- Sattelmair, L., & Pawlowski, J. M. (2023, October). Towards a generative artificial intelligence competence framework for schools. In M. D. Sulistiyo & R. A. Nugraha (Eds.), *Proceedings of the International Conference on Enterprise and Industrial Systems (ICOEINS 2023)*, 291–307. Advances in Economics, Business and Management Research 270. https://doi.org/10.2991/978-94-6463-340-5_26
- Sengewald, T., & Tremmel, A. (2024, May 29–June 01). Teaching AI literacy for innovation: Work in Progress: How can we teach the future workforce AI literacy to succeed in innovation? *Proceedings of the 2024 Computers and People Research Conference (SIGMIS-CPR '24)* 1–4, Murfreesboro, TN, USA. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3632634.3655874>
- Shanto, S. S., Ahmed, Z., & Jony, A. I. (2023). PAIGE: A generative AI-based framework for promoting assignment integrity in higher education. *STEM Education*, 3(4), 288–305. <https://doi.org/10.3934/steme.2023018>
- Shen, J., Yin, M., Wang, W., Hua, M., Choi, Y., Garaj, V., Lam, V., & Hyejin, K. (2024). Dwells in museum: The restorative potential of augmented reality. *Telematics and Informatics Reports*, 14, 100136. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.teler.2024.100136>
- Simms, R. C. (2024). Work with ChatGPT, not against 3 teaching strategies that harness the power of artificial intelligence. *Nurse Educator*, 49(3), 158–161. <https://doi.org/10.1097/NNE.0000000000001634>
- Singh, K., Chatterjee, S., & Mariani, M. (2024). Applications of generative AI and future organizational performance: The mediating role of explorative and exploitative innovation and the moderating role of ethical dilemmas and environmental dynamism. *Technovation*, 133, 103021. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2024.103021>
- Small, W. R., Malhotra, K., Major, V. J., Wiesenfeld, B., Lewis, M., Grover, H., Tang, H., Banerjee, A., Jabbour, M. J., Aphinyanaphongs, Y., Tesla, P., & Austrian, J. S. (2024). The first generative AI Prompt-A-Thon in healthcare: A novel approach to workforce engagement with a private instance of ChatGPT. *PLOS Digital Health*, 3(7), e0000394. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pdig.0000394>
- Song, N. (2024). Higher education crisis: Academic misconduct with generative AI. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 32(1), e12532. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5973.12532>
- Sozon, M., Pok, W. F., Sia, B. C., & Alkharabsheh, O. H. M. (2024b). Cheating and plagiarism in higher education: A systematic literature review from a global perspective, 2016–2024. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JARHE-12-2023-0558>
- Sozon, M., Sia, B. C., Pok, W. F., & Alkharabsheh, O. H. M. (2024a). Academic integrity violations in higher education: A systematic literature review from 2013–2023. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JARHE-12-2023-0559>
- Spennemann, D. H., Biles, J., Brown, L., Ireland, M. F., Longmore, L., Singh, C. L., Wallis, A., & Ward, C. (2024). ChatGPT giving advice on how to cheat in university assignments: How workable are its suggestions? *Interactive Technology and Smart Education*, 1741–5659. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-3365084/v1>
- Sullivan, M., Kelly, A., & McLaughlan, P. (2023). ChatGPT in higher education: Considerations for academic integrity and student learning. *Journal of Applied Learning & Teaching*, 6(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2023.6.1.17>
- Sundberg, L., & Holmström, J. (2024). Innovating by prompting: How to facilitate innovation in the age of generative AI. *Business Horizons*, 67, 561–570. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2024.04.014>
- Suprpto, N., Simamora, R. M., Mursid, A., & Ardha, M. (2024). Academic integrity vs. academic misconduct: A thematic evolution through bibliometrics. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-024-09580-1>
- Surahman, E., & Wang, T. H. (2022). Academic dishonesty and trustworthy assessment in online learning: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 38(6), 1535–1553. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12708>

- Urdan, A. T., & Masson, C. (2024). Morality and modeling of intention to use ChatGPT technology. *International Journal of Innovation-IJI*, 12(1), 1–42. <https://doi.org/10.5585/2024.26378>
- Vaismoradi, M., Turunen, H., & Bondas, T. (2013). Content analysis and thematic analysis: Implications for conducting a qualitative descriptive study. *Nursing & Health Sciences*, 15(3), 398–405. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nhs.12048>
- Wakkary, R., Oogjes, D., Hauser, S., Lin, H. W., Cao, C., Ma, L., & Duel, T. (2017, June 10–14). Morse things: A design inquiry into the gap between things and us. *Proceedings of the DIS 2017*, 503–514. Edinburgh, United Kingdom. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3064663.3064734>
- Wang, N., Wang, X., & Su, Y. S. (2024). Critical analysis of the technological affordances, challenges and future directions of generative AI in education: A systematic review. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 44(1), 139–155. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2024.2305156>
- Watts, F. M., Dood, A. J., Shultz, G. V., & Rodriguez, J. M. G. (2023). Comparing student and generative artificial intelligence chatbot responses to organic chemistry writing-to-learn assignments. *Journal of Chemical Education*, 100(10), 3806–3817. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jchemed.3c00664>
- Webb, R. (2014). *Doing the rights thing: An ethnography of a dominant discourse of rights in a primary school in England*. [Doctoral dissertation, University of Sussex, United Kingdom]. <https://hdl.handle.net/10779/uos.23409716.v1>
- Yeh, H. C. (2024). The synergy of generative AI and inquiry-based learning: Transforming the landscape of English teaching and learning. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 33(1), 88–102. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2024.2335491>
- Yusuf, A., Pervin, N., & Román-González, M. (2024). Generative AI and the future of higher education: A threat to academic integrity or reformation? Evidence from multicultural perspectives. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 21, 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00453-6>
- Zhong, J., Shu, H., & Han, X. (2024). Opportunities and challenges of education based on AI—The case of ChatGPT. In B. Wang et al., (Eds.), *Proceedings of the ICMTEL 2023, LNICST 535*, 32–41. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-50580-5_3

TO CITE THIS ARTICLE:

Sharma, R. C., & Panja, S. K. (2025). Addressing Academic Dishonesty in Higher Education: A Systematic Review of Generative AI's Impact. *Open Praxis*, 17(2), pp. 251–269. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.55982/openpraxis.17.2.820>

Submitted: 30 December 2024

Accepted: 05 March 2025

Published: 10 July 2025

COPYRIGHT:

© 2025 The Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC-BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited. See <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

Open Praxis is a peer-reviewed open access journal published by International Council for Open and Distance Education.