



Perceived Effects of the Emergence of Genai on Teaching and Learning: The Case of Zimbabwe Open University

Richard Bukaliya¹ & Lloyd Chingwaro²

¹Department of Teacher Development

²Department of Accounting and Auditing
Zimbabwe Open University

Email: bukaliyar@zou.ac.zw/chingwarolr@zou.ac.zw

Abstract: *The study investigated lecturers' perceptions of the influence of the emergence and adoption of Generative Artificial Intelligence by university students. The qualitative case study focused on accounting and auditing students at Zimbabwe Open University. Responses were drawn from full-time lecturers in the accounting and auditing department. ZOU is a multi-campus institution complemented by campuses across all the ten provinces of Zimbabwe. Telephone interviews were conducted with purposively selected lecturers who directly engaged in curriculum development, assessment design and grading. Out of the six full-time lecturers in the department, five participated in the study. The study adopted thematic analysis. Findings show that GenAI adoption in academic writing by students has the potential to enhance assignment quality. Such improvements are evidenced through improved organization, readability and clarity. However, despite this, lecturers are concerned about the potential negative consequences towards student capabilities, such as reduced critical thinking and stagnation of creativity if students excessively rely on GenAI to execute academic tasks. To counter the effects of the negative implications, lecturers advocated for the adoption of assessment practices that are commensurate in the age of AI. These assessment practices include making use of in-person evaluations and project-based assessments. The study recommends that institutions of higher and tertiary learning develop comprehensive AI policies and detection tools, invest in training for both students and staff and redesign assessment models, such as having a greater emphasis on in-person or project-based tasks to align with the realities of GenAI. This ensures the effective adoption of GenAI at universities.*

Keywords: *Generative Artificial Intelligence, AI Policy Framework, Creative Stagnation, Critical Thinking, Teaching and Learning*

How to cite this work (APA):

Bukaliya, R. & Chingwaro, L. (2026). Perceived Effects of the Emergence of Genai on Teaching and Learning: The Case of Zimbabwe Open University. *Journal of Research Innovation and Implications in Education*, 10(2), 946 – 959.
<https://doi.org/10.59765/or46k>

1. Introduction

The 21st century is witnessing rapid advancement of technology, which is at the forefront of driving the fourth industrial revolution. These advancements have not spared the education sector, especially the emergence of artificial intelligence (AI). AI is booming and can alter every aspect of society, including education (Pedro,

Subosa, Rivas, & Valverde, 2019). There are various AI tools used in academia by both students and lecturers, such as Grammarly, Quillbot and Turnitin; these have gained prominence as supportive tools for grammar correction, paraphrasing and plagiarism detection, respectively. These tools have proven to enhance academic writing by students in meeting basic quality and integrity benchmarks (Pinzolit, 2024). However, the emergence of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI),

especially tools like OpenAI's ChatGPT, Bard by Google and Notion, has redefined the academic landscape, proving to be life savers for students and causing headaches for faculty staff who were caught unaware. This is because the potential implications of GenAI are still to be quantified (Mpofu & Sebele-Mpofu, 2024); hence, the basis and motivation for this study is to determine how GenAI adoption by students influence assignment quality for accounting and auditing students at ZOU.

GenAI is capable of producing content such as text, images and audio that mimic human creativity and style (Pearson, 2024). The release of ChatGPT in November 2022 by OpenAI marked a critical moment in AI technology because students are now able to generate human-like output which human evaluators have difficulty distinguishing from articles written by humans (Baek, Tate, & Warschauer, 2024). Earlier, AI tools such as Grammarly and Quillbot focused on enhancing human writing. However, GenAI can independently produce sophisticated and coherent outputs (Ghali, Farrag, Won, & Jin, 2025; Pearson, 2024), making it both revolutionary and controversial in academia. Hence, the quest for this study is to determine to what extent GenAI use in the assignment writing process enhances the quality of assignments for students in the accounting and auditing department at ZOU.

Educators and researchers around the world agree on the dual-edged nature of AI tools in academia. For example, GenAI tools have proven to enhance efficiency and creativity because they allow students to explore complex ideas, generate drafts for assignments and make them understand better (Chen, Tallant, & Selig, 2025; Manyukwe, 2023). However, significant concerns are being raised emanating from students' overreliance on GenAI tools, which can lead to reduced critical thinking and problem-solving skills. Manyukwe (2023) notes that about 40% of students surveyed worldwide admitted to using GenAI tools in completing assignments. In Finland, Suonpää, Heikkilä and Dimkar (2024) find that 80% of the students use GenAI tools for their studies. A major concern in this study is the lack of depth and originality in the content generated by GenAI, raising questions on GenAI's pedagogical and andragogical value and contribution to intellectual development, which is measured by assignment quality in this study. Further, Almobayed, Eleiwa, Badla, Khodor, Ruiz-Lozano and Elhusseiny (2025) and Khalifa and Albadowy (2024) agree that using AI tools to execute tasks in academia enhances the efficiency and quality of scientific research. They note that students and lecturers can use AI to aid in manuscript writing, data analysis, and literature searches. Therefore, tasks that may have taken ages to complete can now be completed almost instantaneously. On the other hand, Bin-Nashwan, Sadallah and Bouteraa (2023) raised critical negative consequences of adopting AI tools like ChatGPT in assignment writing. For example, the use of AI tools can

lead to the production of plagiarised work, leading to cases of academic dishonesty.

Patel and Ragolane (2024) found out that AI adoption in South Africa's higher education institutions can enhance educational outcomes and administrative efficiency, proving that AI adoption is paramount and should be embraced by universities in Africa. However, Patel and Ragolane (2024) opine that critical success factors such as addressing ethical concerns and coming up with AI strategic planning frameworks need to be addressed. Despite this, students in African universities are utilizing GenAI to complete their academic work, for example in the case of Zimbabwe Bulla-Musakwa (2024) notes that close to 80% of university assignments are AI-generated. More so, Manyukwe (2023) notes that GenAI for study purposes is most prominent in Kenya with a usage rate of 63%, Saudi Arabia and Spain sits at 62%. On the extreme lower end, the United States and United Kingdom sits at 20% and 19% respectively. Hence, this necessitates the need to understand the implications of GenAI use on the quality of assignments by university students in Zimbabwe, given that the approximate usage rate is at 80%.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Ndoro-Mkombachoto (2024) warns about the potential for AI to facilitate academic dishonesty as students are delegating AI tools to complete assignments on their behalf, hence compromising the quality of the assignments. Similarly, Bulla-Musakwa (2024) raises major concerns that close to 80% of university assignments in Zimbabwe are AI-generated. This is quite concerning, given that AI has the potential to generate content that is not entirely true (Cooperman, Olaniyan, & Brandão, 2025), which can pose poor integrity and poor quality issues. Hence, there is a need to examine the influence of GenAI adoption on assignment quality for university students at ZOU.

1.2 Research Objectives

The research objectives for this study are to:

1. assess lecturers' awareness of the different GenAI tools available
2. examine the perceived benefits of GenAI use by students when writing assignments.
3. examine the perceived drawbacks of GenAI use by students when writing assignments
4. explore how students are integrating GenAI tools in the assignment writing process
5. examine the influence of GenAI use on the quality of student assignments at ZOU

1.3 Research Questions

The following research questions guided this study:

1. What are the GenAI tools available for lecturers and students?
2. How beneficial is GenAI to students when writing assignments?
3. What are the perceived drawbacks of GenAI use by students when writing assignments?
4. In what ways are students at ZOU integrating GenAI in the assignment writing process?
5. How does GenAI influence the quality of student assignments at ZOU?

2. Literature Review

2.1 Lecturer and student awareness of GenAI tools

Guillén-Yparrea and Hernández-Rodríguez (2024) carried out a study to examine undergraduate engineering students' and professors' awareness of GenAI. Results of the study show that students understand and were aware of GenAI, with Chat GPT being the most popular GenAI tool. However, the professors had unfavourable attitudes towards GenAI use even though they were aware of GenAI. Similarly, Niño-Carrasco, Castellanos-Ramírez, Perezchica Vega and Sepúlveda Rodríguez (2025) conducted a study at a public university in Mexico. Their cross-sectional study collected data from 280 university students using questionnaires. They report that students were aware of GenAI tools. However, the students could not identify the implications of adopting GenAI tools on the quality of assignments or their critical thinking skills. This could be because most students were adopting GenAI and using it without formal training and direct assistance from the university, and this demands that universities act fast and provide direction to students through policies and frameworks so that students are well informed about the consequences of GenAI adoption in academic-related activities. However, other studies (Christ-Brendemühl, 2025; Imran, 2025; Wu, Zhang, & Carroll, 2024) report that leading universities in developed countries such as the USA, Australia and Germany have already established guidelines to govern responsible GenAI use, mainly focusing on key areas such as ethics.

Further, Aldossary, Aljindi and Alamri (2024) examined the role of GenAI in education, specifically assessing the perceptions of Saudi students. The study used quantitative methodologies and questionnaires which were distributed to a sample of 1,390 undergraduate students from 15 Saudi universities. Their results show that students held positive perceptions of the role of GenAI tools in their academic activities. This is supported by the fact that these students were found to have high levels of awareness and acceptance of GenAI tools. However, the results indicated a worrisome concern that students were unaware of the importance of ethical principles when using GenAI. This is similar to findings by Castillo, Zarate Hernandez, Gazca Herrera

and Garizurieta Bernabe (2024), who concluded that a majority of students were not aware of copyright laws governing content generated by GenAI, and this has implications of unintentional violation of intellectual property rights impacting academic integrity both for individual students and the university. Moreover, with regards to student awareness of GenAI tools and their effect, Aldossary et al. (2024) concur with Castillo et al. (2024), that students are aware of GenAI tools and are utilizing them to execute academic tasks, including writing assignments.

2.2 Benefits of GenAI use by students

A cross-sectional study was undertaken by Ahmad, Subih, Fawaz, Alnuqaidan, Abuejheisheh, Naqshbandi and Alhalaiqa (2024) in Asia and Africa. The main object of the study was to determine awareness, benefits, threats, attitudes and satisfaction among university students and staff in Asian and African universities. A sample of 815 participants was conveniently selected, and quantitative methodologies were used. The results show that GenAI use saves time. However, constant internet is needed to use GenAI. The problem of intermittent or no Internet connectivity is prevalent in many African countries. As a result, governments of these countries need to ensure the provision of adequate infrastructure, including hardware, electricity and reliable internet connection, so as to see the successful adoption of AI in schools, universities and industry.

On another note, Aldossary et al. (2024) also reveal that undergraduate students from the surveyed Saudi universities acknowledge that GenAI improves their understanding of complex concepts. Hence, this shows that even though some stakeholders in society have negative perceptions about the effect of GenAI adoption. If put to good use, the tool can assist students in enhancing their cognitive skills because it now takes them less time to understand a concept. This is made possible because they can query GenAI to explain complex concepts in various simple ways and provide instant responses to students, which may not be possible from a human tutor. This is similar to Coenen and Pfenninger (2024), who note that GenAI adoption provides personalized feedback to students, a great benefit to lecturers who teach large classes where they cannot manage to provide such personalized feedback. Therefore, what could be needed is to design a good AI adoption framework in universities so that both students and lecturers can capitalize on the benefits of adopting GenAI in the teaching and learning process.

Many researchers (Kohnke, Zou, & Su, 2025; Lokhande, Kinage, Kolunkar, Salunkhe, & Kale, 2024; Rakedzon, Tsabari, Segev, & Yosef, 2024; Subaveerapandiyan, Kalbande, & Ahmad, 2025) are reporting GenAI's usefulness in academic writing tasks relating to GenAI's capability of providing a quick and efficient way of error

checking, such as spelling, grammar correction, and improving sentence and paragraph coherence for both students and lecturers when executing academic tasks. As a result, this enhances the quality of scholarly work submitted by students. This is similar to Niño-Carrasco et al. (2025), who report that even though students are not cognizant of GenAI's implications on the quality of their academic assignments, students value the time savings emanating from GenAI use in executing academic tasks such as assignment writing.

2.3 Drawbacks of GenAI Use by Students

Ahmad et al. (2024) conducted a cross-sectional study in two countries (Africa and Asia). The study's primary goal was to ascertain university students' and staff's awareness, benefits, threats, attitudes and satisfaction. Quantitative approaches were employed, and a convenient sample of 815 participants was chosen. The findings indicate that GenAI use has a significant drawback of reducing creativity and critical thinking among students. In addition, Aldossary et al. (2024) show that GenAI has the risk of generating outdated output. However, this issue seems to be a thing of the past, given that many GenAI tools such as ChatGPT, Grok, and DeepSeek are now connected to the web, so they can provide real-time information as long as it's on the Internet. The rate at which AI is improving is unprecedented, and academicians should find ways to ride the AI wave, capitalize on its capabilities and impart those skills to their students.

Equally important, Castillo et al. (2024) point out that despite their benefits, excessive use of GenAI tools diminishes students' critical thinking, analytical abilities and information search skills. They unearthed this in a study they undertook at the Universidad Veracruzana, where they sampled 353 students from the Faculty of Social and Administrative Sciences and the Faculty of Accounting and Administration. Like many other researchers such as (Ahmad et al., 2024; Aldossary et al., 2024; Niño-Carrasco et al., 2025), Castillo et al. (2024), also employed quantitative methodologies to collect data and analyse their results, and they further explain that overreliance on GenAI can potentially negatively impact the quality of teaching and learning because of reduced human interaction between lecturers and students. Further, Niño-Carrasco et al. (2025) also raised similar concerns that the overuse of GenAI by students could potentially negatively affect their critical thinking skills. Students need these skills to succeed in their professions and for use in their daily lives.

In addition, GenAI has the potential to bias and generate misleading information (Ceyda, Muhammed, Furkan, Havva, Ogulcan, Kazım Timucin, Efe, & Sebnem, 2024; Choudhry, Sundarrajan, Sundaram, & Abirami K, 2024; Karpouzis, 2024; Mhatre, 2023; Singh, 2024); also, it is very difficult to discern the inaccuracies contained in GenAI-generated information because GenAI output

looks and sounds so real (Chen et al., 2025). In a related issue, Sysoyev (2024) also outlines that GenAI use by university students could lead to the spread of AI plagiarism. Moreover, GenAI does not only generate misleading information. Researchers also made a worrisome observation that GenAI tools such as ChatGPT, Bing Chat, Bard AI, and Neeva AI sometimes produce inaccurate and fabricated sources when used for searching sources (Aiumtrakul, Thongprayoon, Suppadungsuk, Krisanapan, Miao, Qureshi, & Cheungpasitporn, 2023; Dashti, Londono, Ghasemi, & Moghaddasi, 2023; Liu, Zhang, & Liang, 2023). As a result, students need not take everything generated by GenAI at face value. To safeguard against this, Chen et al. (2025) report that students cross-referenced the GenAI-generated information so that they could submit reliable assignments for grading. This cautious approach by students is applauded and shows that they are adopting GenAI fully aware that, in the meantime, the tool still has some loopholes that need to be considered when utilising it.

2.4 GenAI Use by Students in University

Suonpää et al. (2024) studied students' perceptions of GenAI usage and risks in a Finnish higher education institution. Quantitative research design was employed with 209 students studying an International Business Degree Programme. Results obtained by Suonpää et al. (2024) show that university students use GenAI for various purposes, including idea generation, editing text to make it better and language translation. Likewise, (Babo, Mendonca, Queiros, Pinto, Cruz, & Mascarenhas, 2024; Hernández González, Ramos Quiroz, Chávez Maciel, & Trejo Cázares, 2024; Niño-Carrasco et al., 2025; van Niekerk, Delpont, & Sutherland, 2025) also show that students frequently use GenAI to brainstorm and generate ideas for papers and assignments, and develop initial concepts that they refine and expand. Students reported that these GenAI use cases save them time and enable them to meet set deadlines.

Furthermore, Chen et al. (2025) explored GenAI literacy in higher education in the USA. They sampled 462 students studying 4-year degree programs from a stream of registered students across one public university in the southeastern USA. Quantitative methodologies were employed, with results mainly analyzed through descriptive statistics. They show that students use GenAI for various purposes in their academic activities, as follows: idea generation for research projects and assignments, information condensing in schoolwork, summarization, outline creation, research assistance, data analysis, generating bibliography, editing tasks, proofreading, and paragraph generation. The respondents revealed that they relied on GenAI for assistance and did not write the whole assignment or project. However, Chen et al. (2025) had students raise similar concerns to Castillo et al. (2024) that students

needed guidance on using GenAI ethically. These results identify a need for clear policies and frameworks on GenAI adoption, even for universities in developed countries like the USA.

3. Methodology

3.1 Design

The study was a case study, wherein the accounting and auditing department at ZOU was studied and analysed. The study was qualitative in nature. A case study design was adopted because it enabled an in-depth understanding of the influence of generative artificial intelligence on the quality of assignments for accounting and auditing students at Zimbabwe Open University (Zarestky, 2023). Being a qualitative study, the researcher used a structured interview guide with five questions as the research instrument. The interviews were used to gather qualitative data on the perspectives and insights of full-time lecturers regarding the impact of GenAI adoption on the quality of written assignments by accounting and auditing students at ZOU. The researchers also adopted interviews to enable them generate rich data for the study. Interviews also provided a better response rate since the interviewer could interact with the participant(s) in real time and obtained the needed responses. However, conducting traditional face-to-face interviews was costly and time-consuming (Selvam, Hu, Musselman, Raiche, McIsaac, & Moloo, 2022). As a result, the researchers capitalized on telephone interviews since lecturers at ZOU were dispersed across the different regional campuses.

3.2 Population and Sample

The population for this study consisted of lecturers in the Accounting and Auditing Department at ZOU. The accounting and auditing department at ZOU currently has 20 lecturers (6 fulltime and 14 part-time). Lecturers were selected as respondents because they were both involved in the assignment writing process, with students writing the assignments and lecturers setting the assignments and grading them to determine if they meet the expected criteria.

3.3 Data Collection Procedures

The researchers obtained ethical clearance on 19 December 2024 to proceed with the study and collect data. Coupled with that, the researchers sought permission to collect data at ZOU from the Registrar, which was granted in writing on 24 January 2025. The qualitative data were collected over three days between 30 March 2025 to 01 April 2025 and analysis and

presentation began from 30 March 2025 to 18 April 2025.

3.4 Qualitative Data Collection

Telephone interviews were conducted with 5 full-time lecturers from the different ZOU regional campuses. The interviews were conducted over three days from 30 March 2025 to 01 April 2025. Each interview was recorded after explicit permission was obtained from the participant, and transcription was done immediately after each interview. Telephone interviews were conducted in this study because they are more cost-effective than face (Koren, Kahn-D'angelo, Reece, & Gore, 2019). This benefit resonates with the current research because accounting and auditing lecturers at ZOU are scattered across the various ZOU regional campuses. Also, they provide convenience to both the researcher and participants, allowing for flexible scheduling, hence eliminating the need for travel (Laletas & Khasin, 2021; Selvam et al., 2022). In addition, with informed consent from each one of the participants, the researcher was able to audio record the interviews (Mosca & Kruger, 2024), and this provided an opportunity for the researcher to accurately transcribe verbatim each interview immediately, at the end of each interview.

3.5 Qualitative Data Analysis

Thematic analysis was employed for the qualitative study on the responses generated from 5 full-time lecturers in the department of accounting and auditing at ZOU. The interview responses were manually transcribed verbatim, and manually coded to facilitate generation of themes. The results were presented in narrative form in the final report. Direct quotes from the informants are also used in qualitative data analysis and presentation. Direct quotes are necessary because they enhance authenticity and credibility of the data presented (Brennan, 2022), this also preserves the original context and meaning of participants words (Gustafsson, Zander, Bondesson, Pettersson, Anbacken, & Östlund, 2022).

3.6 Trustworthiness

Trustworthiness refers to the degree of confidence in the data, data collection methods, and interpretation of the data to ensure quality in qualitative research (Korstjens & Moser, 2018). Trustworthiness encompasses several key criteria such as credibility, dependability, confirmability, and transferability. This study ensured trustworthiness as follows: For credibility, member checking was performed by sharing the preliminary findings with participants to confirm the accuracy and significance of their insights. More so, triangulation was conducted by collecting data from both students and lecturers; however, data collection from students was done using questionnaires to corroborate the data collected using interviews with the full-time lecturers. Dependability was addressed by maintaining a detailed

audit trail to document each step of the research process; this was facilitated by using technology in data collection. To enhance confirmability, the researchers engaged in regular reflexivity of the researcher's own preconceived biases and preconceptions. This was undertaken throughout the research process to ensure the findings are largely derived from participants' perspectives rather than the researcher's own preconceptions.

3.7 Ethical Considerations

To ensure the study is conducted ethically, ethical clearance was sought from the Teaching and Learning Institute at Marondera University of Agricultural Sciences and Technology (MUASt). The Registrar at ZOU also provided a written letter authorizing the researchers to proceed with data collection at ZOU in the department of accounting and auditing. Individual participant consent from students and lecturers was obtained through the written informed consent form attached to the introductory letter; in these consent forms, participants were adequately briefed about the purpose, scope and methods of the study. This allowed them to make an informed decision on whether to agree to participate in the study voluntarily or not. Confidentiality was maintained by securely keeping the data in a password-protected computer, and no unauthorised access was granted. In addition, anonymity was guaranteed by using pseudonyms. For example, in this qualitative study, pseudonyms were provided to the five lecturers interviewed as follows: P1, P2, P3, P4 and P5. This ensured that participants were not linked in any way to any response. In the final report, no participants' names or study level were written. Finally, academic integrity was upheld when writing the report by appropriately citing sources used.

4. Results and Discussion

This section covers the perceptions and insights of full-time lecturers in the accounting and auditing department. The lecturers expressed their views and opinions regarding the emergence and adoption of GenAI by students in the assignment writing process. Thematic analysis was used to analyse the responses from the interviews. Since the study was mixed methods, the interviews were mainly to corroborate the findings from the quantitative study, making the study results robust, comprehensive and more reliable.

4.1 Generation of Themes

Immediately after each interview, the researcher transcribed verbatim the interview responses by manually typing the responses into an MS Word document. After completing the 5 interviews, the researcher manually generated the codes and derived themes. An overview of the codes generated and themes

derived from the interview responses are shown in Table 1

Table 1: An overview of the codes and key themes derived from the interview responses

4.2 Stagnation of creativity and critical thinking

The interviews conducted revealed that lecturers strongly believe students increasingly use GenAI for their assignments, with P5 echoing that.

“students are over-relying on GenAI, and this is evident in the fake citations that are generated by AI, where students proceed to cite those without even verifying whether the AI-generated content is accurate in all respects.”.

Code	Theme	Excerpts of direct quotes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ Originality in written assignments significantly reduced ✚ Students' overreliance on GenAI-generated assignments increasing ✚ Analytical and research skills on the decline 	Stagnation of creativity and critical thinking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ "You give students assignments. They just go to GenAI, they just copy the question and paste it into the ChatBot, and they no longer think outside the box. ..." P1 ✚ "...we are at that stage in which we are grooming students who cannot think outside the box..." P1 ✚ "...Others even fail to modify the GenAI-generated assignment; they just copy it as it is..." P3 ✚ "...somehow, it affects the critical thinking of students if they just copy and paste GenAI-generated information without any of their input. ..." P4 ✚ "They are over-relying on GenAI; this is evident in the fake citations that are generated by AI, and students proceed to cite those without even verifying whether the AI-generated content is accurate in all respects." P5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ Grammar and presentation of assignments improving ✚ Improved access to information through enhanced GenAI search capabilities ✚ Improved assignment quality (superficial or substantive?) 	Enhanced assignment quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ "So sometimes the originality is affected, but the quality and the English would have improved significantly; you can see that the flow of work would have improved, but there won't be creativity on the part of the student..." P2 ✚ "To be honest with you, it's like the quality is appealing, but the creativity is a bit reduced..." P2 ✚ "Quality of student assignments is actually improving with the introduction of GenAI because now students can search deeply for information..." P4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ Risk of compromised academic integrity and plagiarism ✚ Detecting GenAI-generated content is difficult ✚ Gaps in AI policy to guide adoption evident 	Challenges to academic integrity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ "...students can plagiarise and go away without facing any consequences because of the power of GenAI tools to design a completely new assignment without it being detected by the lecturer..." P2 ✚ "The introduction of GenAI has made assessments difficult on my behalf because you know the student has used GenAI, but at the same time, the work appears good, correct and more appealing; then, you will be faced with a dilemma on how exactly to maneuver around that." P3 ✚ "It has made my life a little bit difficult, especially on coursework, because I am still setting those conventional assignments, and students are passing excessively." P4 ✚ "...you are not supposed to penalise the student using policies or systems that are non-existent..." P5 ✚ "Also, in the meantime, ZOU does not have AI tools that can detect AI generated text." P5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ Need for a shift to project-based/practical-based tasks and assignments ✚ Need for an upgrade of the curriculum to align with modern technological trends ✚ Timed quizzes and blended assessments 	Adaptation in assessment practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ "...I believe we need to be practically oriented in our assessments..." P1 ✚ "We also need to link the assignments that we set to the practical aspect because the practical work cannot be generated by GenAI..." P2 ✚ "...we can have a mix; instead of just having written assignments, we can have 3 sets of activities, one written assignment, one multiple choice quiz and one in-class test written physically at the various regional campuses of ZOU..." P3 ✚ "There is now a need to make use of quizzes to replace or supplement the written assignments..." P4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ Workshops and seminars on AI integration in academia ✚ AI policy at institutional and departmental level ✚ Educate students on ethical GenAI use ✚ Lecturers need training and awareness of GenAI tools 	Institutional guidelines and policy frameworks on GenAI adoption	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ "There should be training of students on the proper use of GenAI to enhance assignment quality." P1 ✚ "At the department level, we should have an AI policy to regulate its use in assignment writing..." P1 ✚ "I think as the department of accounting and auditing, what we need to do is, for example, to try and have some workshops with students and then try to educate them that the GenAI on its own should not work in isolation." P2 ✚ "...lecturers themselves need to be educated more on AI issues. For example, they can have workshops and learn about GenAI..." P3 ✚ "There have to be institutional mechanisms to guide on issues of AI adoption; these can support lecturers on how to make decisions regarding the use of GenAI on assignments." P5 ✚ "There has to be a policy that restricts lecturers from marking artificially generated content." P5 ✚ "There is a need for workshops; lecturers need to be taught and guided on how these new technologies work" P5

The students are doing so using GenAI tools such as ChatGPT which is mentioned most times as noted in the quantitative study in sections 4.1 and 4.2. These observations by P5 are contradicted by Chen et al. (2025) who show that GenAI provides accurate citations, hence leading to the production of work that is likely of high quality. The difference in these results could emanate from the fact that those in developed countries could be using paid AI tools, or their universities are subscribed to tools such as Elicit, Scite AI, Scopus AI and Science Direct AI, which provide citations that are almost always accurate. This is not normally the case for students and universities from developing countries such as ZOU. As a result, almost all participants agree that the use of GenAI for assignment writing stifles students' creativity and critical thinking, skills which universities seek to impart to the students. This is revealed by P1, who says, *"We are at that stage in which we are grooming students who cannot think outside the box"*. Hence, this continued reliance on GenAI for assignment writing is leading students to forego some critical research skills, with P4 noting that overdependence on GenAI for assignment writing *"affects the critical thinking of students if they just copy and paste GenAI-generated information without any of their input"*. In terms of assignments, lecturers believe that use of GenAI lead to the production of an assignment that is polished and readable but lacks genuine creativity that comes from independent thought of the student. Lecturers are worried that the adoption of GenAI may inadvertently lead to the grooming of students who are not independent thinkers, students who, when they need to do anything, first have to inquire from GenAI. If this trajectory continues and educators remain stagnant, this is likely to produce graduates who are lazy thinkers.

4.3 Enhanced Assignment Quality

While lecturers expressed concerns and worries about the erosion of students' creativity and critical thinking skills resulting from the adoption of GenAI in assignment writing. They acknowledge that GenAI adoption in assignment writing generally enhances the quality of assignments. One lecturer reports that GenAI contributes to the aesthetic and structural quality of written assignments and notes that

"Sometimes, the originality is affected, but the quality and the English would have improved significantly. You can see that the flow of work has improved, but there wouldn't be creativity on the part of the student".

This improvement in the quality of assignments is a positive development because it produces readable assignments and enhances readers' understanding. This is especially true for students whose first language is not English but who are expected to produce a well-

grounded written assignment with good grammar, punctuation, and spelling. As such, the emergence of GenAI has been an equaliser because almost all the students are now producing well-written assignments with good grammar. This enhancement in quality is made possible by GenAI's ability to rephrase the content and provide a refined structure; these sentiments were echoed by P4, who notes that *"quality of student assignments is actually improving with the introduction of GenAI because now students can search deeply for information which was impossible to locate without GenAI"*. Similar sentiments are also echoed by (Kohnke et al., 2025; Lokhande et al., 2024; Rakedzon et al., 2024; Subaveerapandiyani et al., 2025), who report that GenAI adoption improves the quality of student written work. However, it is critical to note that enhanced quality in terms of good grammar and presentation should not be mistaken to be a substitute for genuine academic rigour and deep learning expected of university students. Efforts, therefore, need to be taken by educators to ensure that academic rigour, deep learning, critical thinking and creativity continue to be imparted in students even if they are using GenAI to assist them with some tasks such as information search, polishing grammar and presentation.

4.4 Challenges to Academic Integrity

Some lecturers raised concerns about compromised academic integrity through plagiarism and undetected GenAI-generated outputs. This was well illustrated by P3, who narrates that

"The introduction of GenAI has made assessments difficult on my behalf because you know the student has used GenAI, but at the same time, the work appears good, correct and more appealing; then, you will be faced with a dilemma on how exactly to maneuver around that."

This is presenting challenges for lecturers especially given that some universities including ZOU are still to acquire Gen-AI detecting software, this is echoed by P5 who rightly notes that *"... in the meantime, ZOU does not have AI tools that can detect AI-generated text"*. Also, P2 raised concerns that it is extremely difficult to distinguish between independent work and GenAI-generated output; P2 worried that

"...the feedback in terms of assessment is no longer fair to an extent because a student who has produced original work may end up scoring lower marks compared to the one who has copied and paraphrased using GenAI".

This is highly likely because GenAI can fine-tune plagiarised work and make it so perfect that one cannot even tell if the work was GenAI-generated or

GenAI-edited. Moreover, some lecturers raised issues of GenAI's weakness of 'hallucinating', in that it produces fake citations. Since some students are over-reliant on GenAI, they simply copy the fake citations without even verifying the authenticity of the GenAI-generated output. Similarly, (Aiumtrakul et al., 2023; Dashti et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2023) also highlighted that GenAI has a weakness in producing inaccurate and fabricated sources. If left unchecked, such practices not only compromise the integrity of the academic process but also pose serious long-term implications for the credibility of students' scholarly work.

4.5 Adaptation in Assessment Practices

The interview results show that lecturers are noticing the need for a change in approach in how they assess students, especially in formative assessments. The traditional assignment is no longer effective because it does not instill in students the needed critical thinking skills. Lecturers acknowledged that GenAI is changing the way they assess students as it is now possible to provide personalised feedback, with P1 citing that *"the good part about this is that I have even changed my approach to assessments. I no longer give uniform feedback; I now give feedback that is personalised..."*. Also, lecturers can now upgrade their teaching and learning material with considerable ease as they can easily capitalise on GenAI. Regarding this, P1 alludes that *"...I no longer recycle assignment questions, even the course content of what I teach. My modules are regularly updated..."*. These results corroborate findings by Castillo et al. (2024) who reveal that instructors are utilising GenAI in their teaching practices, making GenAI a handy tool for university lecturers and students alike. Despite this, other lecturers report that they are finding it difficult to carry out formative assessments, especially with the traditional assignment. This is caused by the dual-edged nature of GenAI in that it is enhancing assignment quality in one way, and there is also a likely risk of academic misconduct, which can be difficult to detect given that universities such as ZOU currently do not have GenAI detection tools. This was exposed by one lecturer who pointed out that *"... in the meantime, ZOU does not have AI tools that can detect AI-generated text"*. In response to the difficulties presented by GenAI, such as difficulty in detecting GenAI-generated output, some lecturers are already beginning to adopt or consider adopting various assessment methods, such as practical assignments. For example, P2 cites that *"we also need to link the assignments that we set to the practical aspect because the practical work cannot be generated by GenAI; the work simply needs to be done..."*; also, some are considering doing away with the traditional assignment, choosing to adopt multiple choice quizzes or a blend of assessment tools; for instance, P3 echoes that: *"...we can have a mix; instead of just having written assignments, we can*

have 3 sets of activities, one written assignment, one multiple choice quiz and one in-class test written physically at the various regional campuses of ZOU".

It is critical that lecturers keep updating their curricula and adopting innovative assessment techniques to ensure that students can capitalise on GenAI capabilities such as quick information search, paraphrasing, grammar correction and good presentation of written assignments. These GenAI capabilities, combined with innovative assessment techniques such as project-based learning and a practically oriented curriculum centred on solving real-world problems using GenAI, can bring immense benefits to students and the wider society. Therefore, lecturers are currently at a crossroads where they have to find ways to capitalize on the benefits of GenAI and ensure that assessments remain robust and reflect students' true capabilities.

4.6 Institutional Guidelines and Policy Frameworks on GenAI Adoption

The results highlight a pressing need for universities at the institutional and departmental levels to design guidelines and policy frameworks to govern GenAI adoption. It is a good initiative that ZOU recently introduced its AI policy, but its dissemination seems poor because of all the lecturers interviewed; none were explicit about the fact that ZOU now has an AI policy in place. The participants were just alive to the fact that clear guidelines are needed which should delineate acceptable parameters for GenAI adoption. In light of this, P5 highlights that *"there have to be institutional mechanisms to guide on issues of AI adoption; these can support lecturers on how to make decisions regarding the use of GenAI on assignments"*, and this sentiment is echoed by other lecturers, who note that in the absence of an AI policy and clear guidelines, it would be difficult to handle AI dilemmas and its adoption. These insights closely aligns to Aldossary et al. (2024) and Castillo et al. (2024) who recommend that higher education institutions should urgently consider developing appropriate use policies of GenAI so that students can effectively use GenAI for the greater good. More so, as it currently stands, the university has not put in place formal mechanisms to teach students and lecturers about the awareness of GenAI and how it should be used. It seems students are discovering this important tool on their own and teaching themselves how to use it. This could be one of the reasons why some students are even using it to write the whole assignment. The reason is that there is no initiative and commitment from the university to formally introduce GenAI to students and teach them about the tool, its capabilities, and how the university expects the students to use the GenAI tools. As a result,

P1 calls for “...training of students on the proper use of GenAI to enhance assignment quality”.

Furthermore, lecturers also note that in the meantime, the university does not have GenAI detection tools in place to detect any instances of GenAI-generated output. This is a major concern because for lecturers to operate in the world of AI effectively, they need to be equipped with such tools to help detect GenAI-generated output so that their job is made easy. This can also enhance fair assessment of students because there will be an objective assessment using scientific tools to assess issues of plagiarism and GenAI-generated assignments.

4.7 Major Findings of the Study

The study reveals the following key findings that:

- Students and lecturers were highly aware of the emergency of GenAI tools, and students used various GenAI tools such as ChatGPT, Meta AI, Humanise, Copilot, and Notion to assist them in writing assignments, with ChatGPT being the most widely used GenAI tool. An insignificant number of students (7.56%) and lecturers (10.64%) misidentified GenAI tools.
- Even though GenAI tools are common among students, lecturers were not encouraging students to utilize them. This reluctance could be exacerbated by the university not committing resources and not formally introducing students to these tools.
- Students reported several benefits resulting from GenAI adoption in the assignment writing process, including time saving because GenAI tools can generate coherent and meaningful content quickly. GenAI tools also improved the grammar and style of the written assignments, leading to enhanced meaning and understandability by the readers of the assignments. Students also reported that GenAI tools provide benefits in idea generation, paraphrasing, content restructuring, referencing and mathematical computations. However, students were sceptical of the sources/citations supplied by GenAI. Similarly, lecturers were even more cautious than students about citations' reliability, accuracy, and enhancement of deeper learning resulting from GenAI adoption.
- Lecturers also agreed that GenAI tools tend to misinform by providing hallucinated content if used in writing assignments. Even though lecturers raised concerns about plagiarism, lack of originality and compromised integrity in the GenAI-generated assignments, they report that currently, it is difficult to detect GenAI-generated outputs due to a lack of institutional AI detection tools.

- Various GenAI use cases in the assignment writing process were identified. The most common uses identified by the study include brainstorming and idea integration, paraphrasing and rewriting, writing initial drafts, grammar refinement, mathematical computations, citations and references. Also, some students even acknowledged using GenAI to write an entire assignment on their behalf. On the other hand, Lecturers stated that the emergence of GenAI has led to a shift in their assessment practices, as they are moving towards project-based and practical assessments. Some lecturers even advocated for in-person, in-class assessments to ensure students do not use GenAI for unintended purposes. Other lecturers lamented that student GenAI adoption in assignment writing gave them assessment challenges as they were not adequately equipped with resources and clear policies to deal with GenAI-related issues. As such, they called for a curriculum overhaul to respond to GenAI realities.
- GenAI adoption in the assignment writing process enhanced assignment quality. The most impactful GenAI uses that enhanced such quality were paraphrasing and rewriting, mathematical computations, grammar refinement, and finding sources. Lecturers also confirmed that GenAI-generated assignments have commendable grammar and fluency and are well presented. However, they warned that overreliance on GenAI use leads to university graduating students lacking enhanced critical thinking skills. As a result, they called for new assessment models aligned with the era of GenAI, and the starting point could be an emphasis on practical-based assessments.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

5.1 Conclusion

The study concludes that:

1. Students at ZOU are capitalising on the capabilities of GenAI in assignment writing, as witnessed by the widespread awareness and use of these tools in academic writing, with ChatGPT being widely used.
2. There is a disconnect between GenAI realities and institutional readiness to formally support the effective adoption of GenAI, and this is causing lecturers to hesitate encouraging students to use GenAI for executing academic tasks.
3. The study established that GenAI is beneficial in assignment writing to accounting and auditing students at ZOU in many ways

including quick completion of assignments, enhanced grammar, support in idea generation, and better content restructuring, all of which contribute to overall assignment quality and student efficacy.

4. Students at ZOU are aware of the negative impact of GenAI, such as compromised critical thinking, lack of originality and hallucinated citations. As a result, most of them are not entirely delegating GenAI to write the whole assignment on their behalf. They are mainly using it as an assistant, capitalising on the capabilities of GenAI without compromising their critical thinking skills.
5. The emergence of GenAI is reshaping assessment strategies by lecturers in the accounting and auditing department at ZOU, with a growing shift toward project-based and in-person assessments to safeguard academic integrity.
6. Using GenAI for assignment writing enhances assignment quality, particularly through use cases such as paraphrasing, grammar refinement, writing drafts and mathematical computations. Therefore, students at ZOU must continue using GenAI responsibly and ethically for assignment writing, capitalising on the tools capabilities without compromising the originality of the assignments and their critical thinking skills.

5.2 Recommendations

Based on the research findings, the study proposes the following recommendations:

1. Higher Education institutions (HEIs) such as ZOU should invest in training programs for lecturers and students on the ethical use of GenAI tools. This can be done in-house through departments such as library services, and the Information and Communication Technology Department.
2. HEIs must develop clear frameworks/ policies and guidelines for ethical and effective GenAI use. To facilitate this, the university can ensure each faculty establishes an AI committee responsible for monitoring AI trends, identifying challenges and suggesting solutions through an all-inclusive stakeholder approach.
3. The university needs to develop or acquire effective AI detection tools to ensure that all written work submitted by students falls within an acceptable range in line with the AI policies and frameworks.
4. The traditional assessment models need to be reevaluated, and new assessment models must be designed to consider emerging technologies and the evolving educational landscapes. The starting point can be a move toward blended

assessment strategies such as project-based work, practical assignments and in-person evaluations.

References

- Ahmad, M., Subih, M., Fawaz, M., Alnuqaidan, H., Abuejheisheh, A., Naqshbandi, V., & Alhalaiqa, F. (2024). *Awareness, benefits, threats, attitudes, and satisfaction with AI tools among Asian and African higher education staff and students*.
- Aiumtrakul, N., Thongprayoon, C., Suppadungsuk, S., Krisanapan, P., Miao, J., Qureshi, F., & Cheungpasitporn, W. (2023). Navigating the Landscape of Personalized Medicine: The Relevance of ChatGPT, BingChat, and Bard AI in Nephrology Literature Searches. *Journal of Personalized Medicine*, 13(10), Article 1457. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jpm13101457>
- Aldossary, A. S., Aljindi, A. A., & Alamri, J. M. (2024). The role of generative AI in education: Perceptions of Saudi students. *Contemporary Educational Technology*, 16(4), Article ep536. <https://doi.org/10.30935/cedtech/15496>
- Almobayed, A., Eleiwa, T. K., Badla, O., Khodor, A., Ruiz-Lozano, R. E., & Elhousseiny, A. M. (2025). Do Ophthalmology Journals Have AI Policies for Manuscript Writing? *American Journal of Ophthalmology*, 271, 38-42. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajo.2024.11.003>
- Babo, L., Mendonca, J. M. P., Queiros, R., Pinto, C. M. A., Cruz, M., & Mascarenhas, D. (2024). *Exploring HEIs Students' Perceptions of Artificial Intelligence on their Learning Process*. EEITE 2024 - Proceedings of 2024 5th International Conference in Electronic Engineering, Information Technology and Education,
- Baek, C., Tate, T., & Warschauer, M. (2024). "ChatGPT seems too good to be true": College students' use and perceptions of generative AI. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 7, 100294. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100294>
- Bin-Nashwan, S. A., Sadallah, M., & Bouteraa, M. (2023). Use of ChatGPT in academia: Academic integrity hangs in the balance. *Technology in Society*, 75, 102370. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2023.102370>

- Brennan, N. M. (2022). Methodological insights: interview quotations in accounting research. *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal*, 35(9), 382-411. <https://doi.org/10.1108/AAAJ-06-2022-5843>
- Bulla-Musakwa, F. (2024, 05 May 2024). AI slowly redefining academic dishonesty *The Sunday Mail*. <https://www.sundaymail.co.zw/ai-slowly-redefining-academic-dishonesty>
- Castillo, K. C., Zarate Hernandez, X. M., Gazca Herrera, L. A., & Garizurieta Bernabe, J. (2024). *Study of perception on the use of generative artificial intelligence in higher-level students*. 2024 IEEE International Conference on Engineering Veracruz, ICEV 2024,
- Ceyda, U., Muhammed, T. Z., Furkan, K., Havva, D., Ogulcan, G., Kazım Timucin, U., Efe, Y., & Sebnem, O. (2024). Ex Machine, Next Machine, and Still Biased Machine. In *Artificial Intelligence: Technical and Societal Advancements* (pp. 208-234). <https://doi.org/10.1201/9781003483571-14>
- Chen, K., Tallant, A. C., & Selig, I. (2025). Exploring generative AI literacy in higher education: student adoption, interaction, evaluation and ethical perceptions. *Information and Learning Science*, 126(1-2), 132-148. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ILS-10-2023-0160>
- Choudhry, M. D., Sundarajan, M., Sundaram, K., & Abirami K, R. K. (2024). Bias and fairness in generative AI. In *Generative AI and LLMs: Natural Language Processing and Generative Adversarial Networks* (pp. 177-192). <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111425078-009>
- Christ-Brendemühl, S. (2025). Leveraging Generative AI in Higher Education: An Analysis of Opportunities and Challenges Addressed in University Guidelines. *European Journal of Education*, 60(1), Article e12891. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12891>
- Coenen, C., & Pfenninger, M. (2024). Transforming learning experiences and assessments through AI-empowered cocreation of quality feedback. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.20628>
- Cooperman, S. R., Olaniyan, A., & Brandão, R. A. (2025). AI discernment in foot and ankle surgery research: A survey investigation. *Foot and Ankle Surgery*, 31(3), 214-219. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fas.2024.10.001>
- Dashti, M., Londono, J., Ghasemi, S., & Moghaddasi, N. (2023). How much can we rely on artificial intelligence chatbots such as the ChatGPT software program to assist with scientific writing? *Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.prosdent.2023.05.023>
- Ghali, M.-K., Farrag, A., Won, D., & Jin, Y. (2025). Enhancing knowledge retrieval with in-context learning and semantic search through generative AI. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 311, 113047. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.knosys.2025.113047>
- Guillén-Yparrea, N., & Hernández-Rodríguez, F. (2024). Unveiling Generative AI in Higher Education: Insights from Engineering Students and Professors. 2024 IEEE Global Engineering Education Conference (EDUCON),
- Gustafsson, L.-K., Zander, V., Bondesson, A., Pettersson, T., Anbacken, E.-M., & Östlund, G. (2022). Actions taken to safeguard the intended health care chain of older people with multiple diagnoses - a critical incident study. *BMC Nursing*, 21(1), 260. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-022-01039-1>
- Hernández González, M., Ramos Quiroz, J. M., Chávez Maciel, F. J., & Trejo Cázares, M. C. (2024). Advantages and risks of Generative Artificial Intelligence from higher education student's perception in Mexico. *European Public and Social Innovation Review*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.31637/epsir-2024-495>
- Karpouzis, K. (2024). Plato's Shadows in the Digital Cave: Controlling Cultural Bias in Generative AI. *Electronics (Switzerland)*, 13(8), Article 1457. <https://doi.org/10.3390/electronics13081457>
- Khalifa, M., & Albadawy, M. (2024). Using artificial intelligence in academic writing and research: An essential productivity tool. *Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine Update*, 5, 100145. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmpbu.2024.100145>
- Kohnke, L., Zou, D., & Su, F. (2025). Exploring the potential of GenAI for personalised English teaching: Learners' experiences and perceptions. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 8, Article 100371. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2025.100371>

- Koren, A., Kahn-D'angelo, L., Reece, S. M., & Gore, R. (2019). Examining Childhood Obesity From Infancy: The Relationship Between Tummy Time, Infant BMI-z, Weight Gain, and Motor Development—An Exploratory Study. *Journal of Pediatric Health Care*, 33(1), 80-91. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pedhc.2018.06.006>
- Korstjens, I., & Moser, A. (2018). Series: Practical guidance to qualitative research. Part 4: Trustworthiness and publishing. *European Journal of General Practice*, 24(1), 120-124. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13814788.2017.1375092>
- Laletas, S., & Khasin, M. (2021). Children of high conflict divorce: Exploring the experiences of primary school teachers. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 127, 106072. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2021.106072>
- Liu, N. F., Zhang, T., & Liang, P. (2023). *Evaluating Verifiability in Generative Search Engines*. Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023,
- Lokhande, H. A., Kinage, L. J., Kolunkar, P. M., Salunkhe, J. M., & Kale, S. (2024). *Enhancing Text Quality with Bi-LSTM: An Approach for Automated Spelling and Grammar Correction*. 2024 International Conference on Advances in Data Engineering and Intelligent Computing Systems, ADICS 2024,
- Manyukwe, C. (2023). *40% of students have used AI in their studies – Survey*. University World News. <https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20231128122611248>
- Mhatre, A. (2023). *Detecting the presence of social bias in GPT-3.5 using association tests*. Proceedings of 3rd International Conference on Advanced Computing Technologies and Applications, ICACTA 2023,
- Mosca, C. G., & Kruger, J. P. (2024). Financial medicine: A multi-dimensional concept moving towards contextually specific working definitions for use in the South African prehospital setting. *African Journal of Emergency Medicine*, 14(2), 115-121. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.afjem.2024.03.004>
- Mpofu, Q., & Sebele-Mpofu, F. (2024). A Comparative Review of the Incorporation of AI Technology in Accounting Education: South Africa and Zimbabwe Perspective. *International Journal of Social Science and Religion (IJSSR)*, 329-354.
- Niño-Carrasco, S. A., Castellanos-Ramírez, J. C., Perezchica Vega, J. E., & Sepúlveda Rodríguez, J. A. (2025). Perceptions of University Students on the Uses of Artificial Intelligence in Education. *Revista Fuentes*, 27(1), 94-106. <https://doi.org/10.12795/revistafuentes.2025.26356>
- Patel, S., & Ragolane, M. (2024). The implementation of artificial intelligence in South African higher education institutions: Opportunities and challenges. *Technium Education and Humanities*, 9, 51-65.
- Pearson, A. (2024). Creativity: Firing on all generative AI cylinders. *Journal of Digital and Social Media Marketing*, 12(1), 52-64. <https://doi.org/10.69554/vsk15622>
- Pedro, F., Subosa, M., Rivas, A., & Valverde, P. (2019). *Artificial intelligence in education: Challenges and opportunities for sustainable development*.
- Pinzolits, R. (2024). AI in academia: An overview of selected tools and their areas of application. *MAP Education and Humanities*, 4, 37-50.
- Rakedzon, T., Tsabari, A. B., Segev, E., & Yosef, R. (2024). *Extended Abstract: The Impact of Interactive AI Feedback on STEM Students' Writing of Lay Research Summaries*. IEEE International Professional Communication Conference,
- Selvam, R., Hu, R., Musselman, R., Raiche, I., McIsaac, D. I., & Moloo, H. (2022). Video-Based Interviewing in Medicine: A Scoping Review. *Systematic Reviews*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-022-01959-8>
- Singh, A. (2024). *Diverse Yet Biased: Towards Mitigating Biases in Generative AI*. Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence,
- Subaveerapandiyan, A., Kalbande, D., & Ahmad, N. (2025). Perceptions of effectiveness and ethical use of AI tools in academic writing: A study Among PhD scholars in India. *Information Development*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02666669251314840>
- Suonpää, M., Heikkilä, J., & Dimkar, A. (2024). Students' Perceptions of Generative AI Usage and Risks in a Finnish Higher Education Institution. *INTED2024 Proceedings*.

Sysoyev, P. V. (2024). Ethics and AI-Plagiarism in an Academic Environment: Students' Understanding of Compliance with Author's Ethics and the Problem of Plagiarism in the Process of Interaction with Generative Artificial Intelligence. *Vysshee Obrazovanie v Rossii*, 33(2), 31-53. <https://doi.org/10.31992/0869-3617-2024-33-2-31-53>

van Niekerk, J., Delpont, P. M. J., & Sutherland, I. (2025). Addressing the use of generative AI in academic writing. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 8, Article 100342. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100342>

Zarestky, J. (2023). Case studies. In *Mapping the Field of Adult and Continuing Education: An International Compendium: Volume 4: Inquiry and Influences* (pp. 607-608). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003445944-20>