

## UNRAVELLING THE PARADOX: GENERATIVE AI INFLUENCES ON ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

FX. Risang Baskara

English Letters Department, Faculty of Letters, Universitas Sanata Dharma  
[risangbaskara@usd.ac.id](mailto:risangbaskara@usd.ac.id)

### ABSTRACT

The advent of generative artificial intelligence (AI), typified by language models, has profound implications for higher education, meriting deep scrutiny. This study probes the interplay of generative AI and academic integrity, a novel and compelling area of enquiry. Previous discourse, albeit fruitful, has predominantly focused on practical applications of AI in education, leaving a lacuna in the theoretical understanding of its ethical implications. This study fills this gap, employing a quartet of prominent theories to construct a robust framework elucidating this nexus. Our central question explores how generative AI influences academic integrity in the digital age. The rationale stems from a surge in AI applications in academia and the emergent ethical considerations these entail. This investigation leverages the conceptual lenses of constructivism, the technology acceptance model, digital literacy, and academic integrity theory. Our enquiry yielded salient insights. Firstly, generative AI disrupts traditional notions of knowledge construction. Secondly, acceptance and effective use of this technology depends on users' perceptions of its usefulness and ease of use. Thirdly, the role of digital literacy emerges as critical in navigating the potential pitfalls of AI use. Finally, AI application calls for rediscovering academic integrity in the modern educational landscape. These findings contribute to the discourse on AI ethics in education, underpinning the necessity for informed policy-making, equitable technology use, and fostering a culture of integrity in the age of AI. The pertinence of these insights reverberates across disciplines, contexts, and geographies, charting the course for future research in higher education.

**Keywords:** Academic Integrity, Artificial Intelligence, Educational Technology, Generative AI, Theoretical Framework

### INTRODUCTION

#### **Unearthing the fertile intersection of generative AI and academic integrity**

As we stand on the cusp of a new dawn, we encounter a profound intersection: that of generative AI and academic integrity, two intertwined strands in the helix of higher education (Currie, 2023; De Silva et al., 2023; Fitts & Bovard, 2023; Mijwil et al., 2023; Moya et al., 2023; Sullivan, Kelly, & McLaughlan, 2023). Generative AI, a paradigm of learning, creating, and augmenting, infuses academia with a dimension of intrigue. Each algorithmic arrangement, each nuanced neural network, whispers of a revolution, a departure from familiar shores, and a foray into autonomous creativity, wherein knowledge is not merely consumed but born anew from the crucible of code.

Nevertheless, this transformative tool overlaps a delicate line, balancing precariously between creation and chaos (Floridi et al., 2018). In the flicker of binary codes, in the hum of hard drives, we find an echo of Pandora's box. Unleashed in its full potentiality, generative AI can shape the contours of academia for better or worse. Upon this pivot of potentiality rests academic integrity, an enduring network of scholastic virtue. This undisputable support, reliable in its values yet flexible in its application, guards the sanctity of education, ensuring that the light of learning remains shining in an age where artificial intelligence transforms pedagogy and practice.

#### **Sketching the research gap: a dearth of theoretical insight on AI's ethical implications**

In the rich tapestry of research, myriad threads intertwine, yet a crucial gap weaves a visible absence (Whittaker et al., 2018). From one horizon to the next, discourse stretches across the expanse, casting light on the many practical applications of AI in education (Luckin et al., 2016). However, beneath this radiant canopy, a shadow lurks, concealing a facet fundamental to our discourse—the ethical implications of AI (Jobin et al., 2019). Amid the rapid cadence of progress and the relentless march of innovation, we

often overlook the need to steer our journey with a theoretical compass, leaving this realm under-explored and lurking in the penumbra of discourse.

In this shadowy chasm, we pursue our mission—to illuminate the theoretical insight into AI's ethical dimensions (Floridi & Chiriatti, 2020). Beneath the surface of practical applications, we unearth the substrata of ethics, a dimension often neglected in the glare of technological advancements. In this process of unearthing, we do not merely cast light on uncharted territory; we set the stage for a richer, more nuanced conversation on the role of AI in education. We reveal the nuances, complexities, and challenges posed by the confluence of AI and academic ethics, thus adding depth to our understanding and a beacon to guide future discourse.

### **Gleaning light on how generative AI shapes academic integrity in the digital age?**

Thus, we find ourselves confronted by a question, a quiet echo resonating amidst the uproar of progress—how does generative AI shape academic integrity in this digital era? This inquiry sits at the crossroads of advancement and ethos, of technology and virtue, offering a challenge to our intelligence and wisdom (Awad et al., 2022). As the epoch of our time witnesses a metamorphosis hastened by technology, it grows increasingly critical to comprehend the evolving topography of learning and its implications for scholarly integrity. An understanding of this kind transcends the instrumental role of AI, leading us to a deeper exploration into the heart of education.

Our line of inquiry is no mere surface-level probe; it burrows into the very bedrock of knowledge construction and dissemination, grappling with its essence. It lays bare the unseen tendrils of AI's influence on academic integrity. We approach this through a unique lens, the refracted light of which paints a multidimensional mosaic—a complex yet coherent image of AI and academic integrity in the digital age. Each fragment of this mosaic adds to our understanding. However, we can begin to discern the larger picture in the interplay of these diverse elements, the discourse between individual pixels. We will scrutinize the confluence of generative AI and academic integrity through this lens.

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **Adopting an Argumentative Review Approach as Our Compass**

An unexplored wilderness, rife with concealed challenges and potential revelations, demands a guide of unparalleled reliability; in our intellectual expedition, such a role is valiantly performed by the argumentative review approach. More than a tool, this approach emulates a lantern, piercing the thicket of obscurity to illuminate the intricate interplay between generative AI and academic integrity. It navigates through this intellectual wild, unfurling the labyrinthine complexity that masks our subject, revealing hidden truths and new directions (Grant & Booth, 2009).

Acting as a seasoned guide, this approach conducts a meticulously discerning evaluation of multifaceted scholarly stances. It nurtures a stimulating environment conducive to academic discourse, encouraging the presentation of diverse arguments and thereby kindling the flames of debate (Aveyard, 2019). Placing contrasting perspectives into sharp relief allows us to discern the intricacies of our subject, fostering an understanding that runs deep and vast (Jesson et al., 2011). It invites us, with an open hand and an open mind, to question and probe, to argue and comprehend, acting as an irreplaceable companion in our quest for knowledge (Grant & Booth, 2009). Through the lens of the argumentative review, we find ourselves capable of venturing into uncharted territories, pushing the boundaries of our understanding (Aveyard, 2019).

### **Delving Into The Treasure Trove of Four Pivotal Theories: Constructivism, Technology Acceptance Model, Digital Literacy, and Academic Integrity Theory**

Four cardinal points guide our scholarly expedition, each a lantern shedding light on the intricate puzzle we seek to solve. First, Constructivism, the philosophical bedrock of knowledge creation, plays a pertinent role in our discourse. Generative AI's burgeoning capacity for content generation instigates disruptions in traditional knowledge paradigms, compelling us to reassess our understanding of learning and knowledge construction (Ultanir, 2012). In essence, it confronts us with the questions of what it means to 'know' and to 'create' in an age of artificial intellects (Bada & Olusegun, 2015).

Next, we turn to the Technology Acceptance Model, a beacon casting illumination on the intricate dance of user perception and technology integration. It offers a lens to view the complexities of AI tool adoption within academic spheres, unveiling the intricate interplay between perception, acceptance, and utilization (Taherdoost, 2018). After that, we gaze towards Digital Literacy, the navigational star guiding us through the vastness of the digital realm. It underscores the dire need for comprehensive skills to employ AI prudently, concurrently addressing the potential pitfalls of misuse, ignorance, and apathy (Hobbs, 2017). Finally, the Academic Integrity Theory, our moral compass, postulates an urgent necessity for a comprehensive redefinition of honesty in knowledge acquisition and dissemination amid the rise of AI (Bertram Gallant & Drinan, 2008). These theoretical cornerstones, far from merely providing reference points, act as crucial interpretative tools, aiding in charting a coherent, meaningful path through the undergrowth of our investigation.

### **Casting The Net Wide For Scholarly Writings, Threading Them into Our Analytical Loom**

Our quest necessitates casting a wide net, plunging into the rich depths of academic writing. Scholarly articles of immense rigour, profound thought pieces, and meticulously executed empirical studies provide the raw material for our exploration (Grant & Booth, 2009). They form the warp and weft on our analytical loom, threads of knowledge ready to be woven into a coherent narrative. As diverse as these strands are in their origins, perspectives, and implications, they are bound together by an invisible thread — their relevance to our central question (Jesson et al., 2011). With each weave, the tapestry becomes more intricate, telling, and closer to reflecting the complex interaction of generative AI and academic integrity. As this loom oscillates, the rhythmic interplay of warp and weft renders visible the underlying patterns (Kuhlthau, 2004). Through this interweaving of thoughts, theories, and research, connections begin to form, previously hidden pathways come to light, disparities surface and areas ripe for exploration become evident. Like seasoned cartographers, we trace these patterns, sketching a map that reveals the intricate dance between generative AI and academic integrity (Jesson et al., 2011). Each completed weave unveils a portion of the broader narrative, contributing to a complex tapestry that mirrors the nuances, the contrasts, and the symbiosis between artificial intellects and academic veracity (Grant & Booth, 2009).

## **RESULTS**

### **Generative AI as A Disruptor in Traditional Constructs of Knowledge**

Within the grand tableau of knowledge construction, generative AI emerges, not unlike a maverick artist, brandishing a palette replete with vibrant, disruptive hues. This innovative medium boasts unique capabilities such as content generation (Bommasani et al., 2021), adept pattern recognition (Anthropic, 2022), and potent learning enhancement that collectively jolt the very foundations of traditional constructs of knowledge, transforming how learners interact with and navigate this conceptual landscape. It would

not be an exaggeration to say that we have witnessed a seismic shift away from the staid unilateral flow of information, typically from educator to student.

Instead, we find ourselves amidst a breathtaking tableau where AI's deft brush strokes blend this erstwhile dichotomy into a dynamic continuum (Jabbar et al., 2022). This transformation is characterized by shared learning (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019), collaborative exploration (Alexa & Zuell, 2000), and the constant negotiation of meaning, thereby challenging and stretching the elastic boundaries of knowledge construction (Bundy, 2007). Gone are the days of passive absorption, replaced with an environment where learners and AI co-construct knowledge, each shaping and being shaped by the other (Van de Sande & Greeno, 2012).

Emphasizing the artistic metaphor further, AI paints not with static colours but with dynamic ones, ever-changing in intensity and hue in response to the learner's interaction. Like a responsive canvas, AI adapts, learns, and evolves, constantly redefining the learning landscape and stretching the boundaries of educational possibilities (Ertel, 2019). Thus, AI's foray into academia has transformed it from a placid lake into a maelstrom of creative energy, reshaping, revolutionizing, and rejuvenating the process of knowledge construction and dissemination (Luckin et al., 2016).

### **Perception's Crucial Role in AI Acceptance and Usage**

Emerging as the second gem in our exploration, the critical essence of perception in accepting and using AI tools presents itself with shimmering clarity (Lai, 2017). This truth is hardly surprising when viewed through the lens of the Technology Acceptance Model (Davis, 1989). In this framework, it becomes evident that individual perceptions, deftly shaped by perceived usefulness and ease of use, assert their undeniable influence on AI adoption within the academic sphere (Scherer et al., 2019). Perception here is not merely a passive spectator; it performs an active and indispensable role, determining the ebb and flow of AI's integration in educational landscapes.

Our understanding of the utility of AI tools, whether in the realm of enhancing learning outcomes (Luckin et al., 2016) or the domain of streamlining administrative tasks, is intricately linked to our perceptions. When coupled with the ease of interaction (Venkatesh & Davis, 2000), this perceived usefulness forms the bedrock upon which the willingness to integrate AI into educational praxis is founded. For instance, a teacher's perception of an AI tool's capacity to streamline administrative tasks will likely influence its adoption (Roll & Wylie, 2016).

Consequently, this jewel of wisdom underscores perception's crucial role - it is no mere observer casually spectating from the sidelines (Wang & Siau, 2019). Instead, it becomes an influential player in the AI adoption game, orchestrating movements and dictating strategies (Miltiadou & Yu, 2000). Thus, efforts to successfully embed AI within academia must include strategies that positively shape perceptions, facilitate ease of use, and demonstrate such technology's tangible benefits. A multi-pronged approach of this nature may be the key to unlocking AI's vast potential for transforming education (Wan et al., 2022).

### **Digital Literacy as an Essential Navigator in AI's Uncharted Waters**

Emerging as a radiant lodestar, digital literacy illuminates the path of the education vessel through the maelstrom of AI's uncharted waters (Hobbs, 2010). With each pulse of AI's imprint seeping more profoundly into the fabric of our learning institutions, an echo reverberates, underscoring the necessity for competent digital citizens (Couldry et al., 2014). These citizens, our students and educators, must be equipped to discern, critique, and responsibly leverage AI's tools. Their capacity to interpret AI-generated

content, navigate the maze of digital resources, and adhere to ethical standards in this increasingly complex terrain becomes the rudder steering the ship of education.

The need for a new breed of skills becomes undeniable in an educational landscape that is transformed and reshaped by the relentless advance of AI (Siddiq et al., 2016). These skills, encapsulated within digital literacy, include but extend beyond basic technical proficiency (Li & Ranieri, 2010). Instead, they envelop the ability to comprehend and interpret AI-generated content (Chesney & Citron, 2019), the skill to assess and critique these digital resources, and the wisdom to employ such tools responsibly and ethically (Floridi et al., 2022). These digitally literate individuals can harness AI's full potential, applying it to fuel, not foil, the pursuit of knowledge (Ng, 2012).

In conclusion, digital literacy transitions from an optional extra, a mere embellishment of the educational framework, to a fundamental necessity (Gretter & Yadav, 2018). This transformation positions digital literacy as the vigilant navigator ensuring the education vessel maintains its course towards enriched learning. Its role is to prevent a hapless detour into the murky waters of misuse or misunderstanding. Thus, digital literacy emerges as an essential refrain in the symphony of education in an AI-driven era. This theme resonates through every note and every chord, shaping the melody of academic success (Venturini & Rogers, 2021).

### **An Urgent Call for Academic Integrity's Redefinition in AI's Era**

With our journey near its final chapter, we arrive at the last luminous jewel in our exploration - a compelling call for rediscovering academic integrity within AI's epoch. As generative AI strides into the scholarly domain, it ushers in an era fraught with novel possibilities and equally novel conundrums (Yampolskiy, 2020). It compels us to rethink the tenets of academic integrity, previously carved out within a world dominated by written texts and spoken lectures. This terra incognita we now navigate is burgeoning with AI-aided research, automated content generation, and cooperative learning platforms (Stappenbelt & Rowles, 2010). This clarion call resonates not for a mere revision but a daring reimagination, fittingly suited for an epoch wherein technology and human intellect enmesh themselves in intricate, never-before-seen patterns of scholarship.

A whisper of change rides on the winds of AI advancements, prompting a reassessment of academic integrity as we know it. Generative AI, with its transformative entry into the scholarly world, beckons a kaleidoscope of potentialities while simultaneously stirring a pot filled with unprecedented ethical and intellectual dilemmas. Traditionally, the mores of academic integrity have been conceived and nurtured within an environment largely revolving around books, lectures, and direct human interaction (Harper et al., 2019). The recent seismic shifts in this landscape, propelled by AI-facilitated research, automated content creation, and dynamic learning platforms, demand a reassessment of these established norms. This change in tide does not call for a minor tweak or a superficial makeover of academic integrity. No, it signals a need for an audacious reimaging, a revisioning that captures the complexities of an era where technology and human intellect dance an intricate tango of scholarship. In this AI-driven age, academic integrity must evolve, adapting to a realm where human cognition and artificial intellect coalesce, manifesting in novel modes of knowledge generation, dissemination, and assimilation. Indeed, this final jewel in our investigative crown radiates an urgent plea for adaptation, resilience, and transformation in our academic ethos.

## **DISCUSSION**

### **Weaving our Threads: The Complex Tapestry of AI and Academic Integrity**

Set upon the loom of comprehension, a multifaceted tapestry begins to materialize, meticulously fashioned from the intricate threads of our exploration - AI and academic integrity. Generative AI, transcending its original guise as merely a tool, manifests as a revolutionary force, upending the established topography of knowledge formation. Indeed, within this transformed panorama, academic integrity takes on a chameleon-like nature, evolving and refracting new shades of understanding and application in response to the changing light of technological advances. The resultant blend forms a complex motif, resonating not only with the boundless potential of emerging technologies but also with the time-honoured values of scholarship that underpin the essence of academia.

In this academic tableau, generative AI is not merely an auxiliary apparatus but a transformation catalyst. These disruptive entity ushers in unprecedented changes, provoking a tectonic shift in the traditional landscapes that have hitherto defined the process of knowledge construction. Amidst these shifting sands, academic integrity reveals its fluid nature, adapting and morphing to reflect this digital revolution's novel demands and challenges.

As we probe deeper into this newly emerged panorama, we observe academic integrity echoing an evolutionary resilience, embodying an array of fresh nuances provoked by the disruptive presence of AI. Together, AI and academic integrity weave an intricate pattern. This beautifully complex motif resonates with the potential of technological advancements yet remains rooted in the enduring ethos of scholarly tradition (Yampolskiy, 2020). The pulsating rhythm of this pattern represents a captivating dichotomy—the marriage of innovation and tradition, disruption and continuity.

This woven testament, a harmonious blend of disruption and continuity, presents an arresting vista to behold and consider (Stappenbelt & Rowles, 2010). The interconnected threads of AI and academic integrity create a beautiful paradox—a testament to the duality of technological upheaval and the persistence of scholarship's enduring values (Harper et al., 2019). As we stand before this tapestry, we are not passive observers but active participants invited to engage with its intricacies and navigate the complex interplay between technology and scholarship. This panoramic view offers a striking point of contemplation as we delve deeper into understanding the dynamic dance between generative AI and academic integrity.

### **Scrutinizing Implications for Policy-Making, Equitable Technology Use, and Fostering An Integrity-Rich Culture**

Within the colourful threads of our intellectual tapestry, profound implications vibrate — spanning the realms of policy formulation, equitable technology application, and the cultivation of an environment steeped in integrity. As generative AI rapidly carves out its niche in our technological landscape, those tasked with policy-making confront the herculean task of outlining frameworks that deftly maneuver the nexus of technological innovation and ethical boundaries (Jobin et al., 2019). These are challenges not merely of regulation but of visionary thinking - an exercise in balancing the facilitation of progress without surrendering the hard-earned victories of academic propriety (Whittaker et al., 2018).

Pursuing equitable technology use, another crucial strand in our woven narrative thrusts the spotlight onto digital literacy. Such a lens underscores the necessity for wide-ranging educational initiatives to equip society with the know-how for responsible AI applications (Gretter & Yadav, 2018). This objective extends beyond mere operational proficiency; it encourages us to foster critical engagement with technology and nurture discernment and decision-making that balance benefit with potential risk (Chesney & Citron, 2019).

An environment rich in integrity, a staple in the hallowed halls of academia, necessitates fresh definitions and innovative frameworks responsive to the dawn of the AI era. This is no facile task. It demands an evolution of principles that have long governed scholarly behaviour, an adaptation that preserves core values whilst engaging dynamically with the transformative power of AI. An ambitious undertaking, indeed, yet a critical one, as we explore this newly-charted territory of technology-enhanced learning (Stappenbelt & Rowles, 2010).

These implications, intertwined with one another, construct a riveting narrative (Yampolskiy, 2020). It is a tale of a future inextricably shaped by and in response to the groundbreaking capabilities of generative AI. A story of not just adaptation but the pioneering of fresh paths. A narrative of reinvention in scholarship, charting a course in the sprawling ocean of opportunities presented by AI while retaining a steadfast grip on the rudder of academic integrity.

### **Insights Reaching Beyond Disciplines, Contexts, and Geographies**

Gleaned from our meticulous investigation, insights bubble up, their resonance far exceeding disciplinary confines, contextual particularities, and geographical delineations (Sclater, 2016). Unhindered by the nature of the subject matter, the influence of AI seeps into the pores of academia, metamorphosing learning experiences and inducing fresh discourses around academic integrity. The constraints of specific educational milieus do not shackle the ripples of these implications; instead, they echo through the myriad corridors of learning — from bustling urban classrooms to the serene digital platforms facilitating e-learning in rural expanses (Daniel, 2021).

Furthermore, the reverberations of these insights are not confined to the rigid boundaries of national territories. They spread across and beyond, piercing the walls of academic institutions around the globe, a testament to the borderless nature of knowledge in the age of AI. It is as though we have set afoot an invisible resonance, its soundwaves reaching both familiar and distant corners, inviting scholars from all walks to contribute to an ever-growing chorus of critical thinking (Stappenbelt & Rowles, 2010).

Thus, this study significantly adds to a broader dialogue in perpetual motion, morphing and adapting to the winds of change (Whittaker et al., 2018). This is more than an isolated inquiry; it is part of a collective rumination on the constantly evolving symbiosis between technology and ethics in higher education (Awad et al., 2022). A dialogue that goes beyond simple questions and answers, delving into the complexities that arise when tradition meets innovation and when academic conventions encounter the transformative power of AI.

In essence, our exploration carves out a platform for multifaceted contemplation. It engenders an academic dialogue that transcends geographical boundaries, disciplines, and contexts. It prompts academicians, educators, and scholars across the globe to ponder upon, discuss, and potentially redefine the interplay between technological advancement and the ethical cornerstones of higher education (Yampolskiy, 2020). It sets in motion a global conversation, inviting collective participation in steering the future of academia in the age of AI.

### **CONCLUSION**

Like a cosmic dance of ideas, our exploration has swirled around the symbiosis of generative AI and academic integrity. At each twist and turn of this intellectual tango, generative AI's transformative strides mirror a fluid reshaping of academic integrity's contours. As AI's capabilities blossom, the values and norms defining academic integrity adapt in a dynamic reflection of AI's impact. This dance, an intricate

kaleidoscope of disruption and adaptation, is an emblem of academia's resilience and receptivity in an era of profound technological change.

In embarking on this expedition, we have unearthed insights that form a robust foundation for future discourse on AI ethics in education. Generative AI's disruptive potential, the pivotal role of user perceptions, the need for digital literacy, and the urgent redefinition of academic integrity—each represent a cornerstone upon which subsequent dialogues can be built (Whittaker et al., 2018). In contributing these building blocks, our study nurtures an environment conducive to continued exploration, fostering a rich, multifaceted discourse that addresses the ethical dimensions of AI in education (Jobin et al., 2019).

As our journey reaches a close, we leave behind insights and an illuminated path for subsequent inquiries in higher education (Yampolskiy, 2020). By harnessing an argumentative review approach and integrating four pivotal theories, we have marked a trail from which future explorers might follow or deviate as they probe the ever-evolving relationship between technology and education (Stappenbelt & Rowles, 2010). As we have traversed this terrain, we have learned that the fusion of generative AI and academic integrity, while complex, is a fertile ground for investigation, promising a wealth of understanding for those who dare to tread.

## REFERENCES

- Alexa, M., & Zuell, C. (2000). Text analysis software: Commonalities, differences and limitations: The results of a review. *Quality and Quantity*, 34(3), 299-321.
- Anthropic. (2022). Introducing Claude. Anthropic. <https://www.anthropic.com>
- Aveyard, H. (2023). Doing a Literature Review in Health and Social Care: A Practical Guide 5e.
- Awad, E., Dsouza, S., Bonnefon, J. F., Shariff, A., & Rahwan, I. (2020). Crowdsourcing moral machines. *Communications of the ACM*, 63(3), 48-55.
- Bada, S. O., & Olusegun, S. (2015). Constructivism learning theory: A paradigm for teaching and learning. *Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 5(6), 66-70.
- Baidoo-Anu, D., & Owusu Ansah, L. (2023). Education in the era of generative artificial intelligence (AI): Understanding the potential benefits of ChatGPT in promoting teaching and learning. Available at SSRN 4337484.
- Bommasani, R., Hudson, D. A., Adeli, E., Altman, R., Arora, S., von Arx, S., ... & Liang, P. (2021). On the opportunities and risks of foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07258*.
- Bundy, A. (2007). Computational thinking is pervasive. *Journal of Scientific and Practical Computing*, 1(2), 67-69.
- Chesney, B., & Citron, D. (2019). Deep fakes: A looming challenge for privacy, democracy, and national security. *Calif. L. Rev.*, 107, 1753.
- Couldry, N., Stephansen, H., Fotopoulou, A., MacDonald, R., Clark, W., & Dickens, L. (2014). Digital citizenship? Narrative exchange and the changing terms of civic culture. *Citizenship Studies*, 18(6-7), 615-629.
- Currie, G. M. (2023, May). Academic integrity and artificial intelligence: is ChatGPT hype, hero or heresy?. In *Seminars in Nuclear Medicine*. WB Saunders.
- Daniel, S. J. (2020). Education and the COVID-19 pandemic. *Prospects*, 49(1), 91-96.
- Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS quarterly*, 319-340.



- De Silva, D., Mills, N., El-Ayoubi, M., Manic, M., & Alahakoon, D. (2023, April). ChatGPT and Generative AI Guidelines for Addressing Academic Integrity and Augmenting Pre-Existing Chatbots. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Industrial Technology (ICIT)* (pp. 1-6). IEEE.
- Ertel, W. (2019). *Artificial Intelligence and Society*.
- Fitts, J., & Bovard, R. (2023). *AI and the Future of Academic Integrity*.
- Floridi, L., Cowls, J., Beltracchi, M., Chatila, R., Chazerand, P., Dignum, V., ... & Vayena, E. (2021). An ethical framework for a good AI society: Opportunities, risks, principles, and recommendations. *Ethics, governance, and policies in artificial intelligence*, 19-39.
- Gallant, T. B., & Drinan, P. (2008). Toward a model of academic integrity institutionalization: Informing practice in postsecondary education. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 38(2), 25-43.
- Grant, M. J., & Booth, A. (2009). A typology of reviews: an analysis of 14 review types and associated methodologies. *Health information & libraries journal*, 26(2), 91-108.
- Gretter, S., & Yadav, A. (2016). Computational thinking and media & information literacy: An integrated approach to teaching twenty-first century skills. *TechTrends*, 60, 510-516.
- Harper, R., Bretag, T., Ellis, C., Newton, P., Rozenberg, P., Saddiqui, S., & van Haeringen, K. (2019). Contract cheating: A survey of Australian university staff. *Studies in Higher Education*, 44(11), 1857-1873.
- Hobbs, R. (2010). *Digital and Media Literacy: A Plan of Action. A White Paper on the Digital and Media Literacy Recommendations of the Knight Commission on the Information Needs of Communities in a Democracy*. Aspen Institute. 1 Dupont Circle NW Suite 700, Washington, DC 20036.
- Hobbs, R. (2017). *Create to learn: Introduction to digital literacy*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Jabbar, A., Li, X., & Omar, B. (2021). A survey on generative adversarial networks: Variants, applications, and training. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 54(8), 1-49.
- Jobin, A., Ienca, M., & Vayena, E. (2019). The global landscape of AI ethics guidelines. *Nature machine intelligence*, 1(9), 389-399.
- Kuhlthau, C. C. (2004). *Seeking meaning: A process approach to library and information services* (Vol. 2). Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited.
- Lacey, F. M., Matheson, L., & Jesson, J. (2011). Doing your literature review: Traditional and systematic techniques. *Doing Your Literature Review*, 1-192.
- Lai, P. C. (2017). The literature review of technology adoption models and theories for the novelty technology. *JISTEM-Journal of Information Systems and Technology Management*, 14, 21-38.
- Li, Y., & Ranieri, M. (2010). Are 'digital natives' really digitally competent?—A study on Chinese teenagers. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 41(6), 1029-1042.
- Luckin, R., & Holmes, W. (2016). *Intelligence unleashed: An argument for AI in education*.
- Mijwil, M. M., Hiran, K. K., Doshi, R., Dadhich, M., Al-Mistarehi, A. H., & Bala, I. (2023). ChatGPT and the future of academic integrity in the artificial intelligence era: a new frontier. *Al-Salam Journal for Engineering and Technology*, 2(2), 116-127.
- Miltiadou, M., & Yu, C. H. (2000). Validation of the Online Technologies Self-Efficacy Scale (OTSSES).
- Moya, B., Eaton, S. E., Pethrick, H., Hayden, K. A., Brennan, R., Wiens, J., ... & 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.
- Ng, W. (2012). Can we teach digital natives digital literacy?. *Computers & education*, 59(3), 1065-1078.
- Roll, I., & Wylie, R. (2016). Evolution and revolution in artificial intelligence in education. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, 26, 582-599.

- Scherer, R., Siddiq, F., & Tondeur, J. (2019). The technology acceptance model (TAM): A meta-analytic structural equation modeling approach to explaining teachers' adoption of digital technology in education. *Computers & Education, 128*, 13-35.
- Sclater, N. (2016). Developing a code of practice for learning analytics. *Journal of Learning Analytics, 3*(1), 16-42.
- Siddiq, F., Hatlevik, O. E., Olsen, R. V., Throndsen, I., & Scherer, R. (2016). Taking a future perspective by learning from the past—A systematic review of assessment instruments that aim to measure primary and secondary school students' ICT literacy. *Educational Research Review, 19*, 58-84.
- Stappenbelt, B., & Rowles, C. (2009). The effectiveness of plagiarism detection software as a learning tool in academic writing education.
- Sullivan, M., Kelly, A., & McLaughlan, P. (2023). ChatGPT in higher education: Considerations for academic integrity and student learning.
- Taherdoost, H. (2018). A review of technology acceptance and adoption models and theories. *Procedia manufacturing, 22*, 960-967.
- Ültanir, E. (2012). An epistemological glance at the constructivist approach: Constructivist learning in Dewey, Piaget, and Montessori. *International journal of instruction, 5*(2).
- van de Sande, C. C., & Greeno, J. G. (2012). Achieving alignment of perspectival framings in problem-solving discourse. *Journal of the Learning Sciences, 21*(1), 1-44.
- Venkatesh, V., & Davis, F. D. (2000). A theoretical extension of the technology acceptance model: Four longitudinal field studies. *Management science, 46*(2), 186-204.
- Venturini, T., & Rogers, R. (2019). "API-based research" or how can digital sociology and journalism studies learn from the Facebook and Cambridge Analytica data breach. *Digital Journalism, 7*(4), 532-540.
- Wan, Z., Compeau, D., & Haggerty, N. (2012). The effects of self-regulated learning processes on e-learning outcomes in organizational settings. *Journal of Management Information Systems, 29*(1), 307-340.
- Wang, W., & Siau, K. (2019). Artificial intelligence, machine learning, automation, robotics, future of work and future of humanity: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Database Management (JDM), 30*(1), 61-79.
- Whittaker, M., Crawford, K., Dobbe, R., Fried, G., Kaziunas, E., Mathur, V., ... & Schwartz, O. (2018). *AI now report 2018* (pp. 1-62). New York: AI Now Institute at New York University.
- Yampolskiy, R. V. (2020). Unexplainability and Incomprehensibility of AI. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Consciousness, 7*(02), 277-291.
- Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V. I., Bond, M., & Gouverneur, F. (2019). Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education—where are the educators?. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 16*(1), 1-27.