



Regular Article

Academic integrity and generative AI: Disciplinary teachers' perspectives on ethical dilemmas in assessing writing in EMI universities

Sheikh Nahiyen^{a,b,*}, Arifa Ghani Rahman^a^a Department of English and Humanities, University of Liberal Arts Bangladesh, Bangladesh^b School of Languages, Literacies & Translation, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Generative AI
Academic writing
Academic integrity
Ethical dilemmas
Higher education
English medium instruction
Disciplinary teachers
Assessing writing

ABSTRACT

The advent of generative AI (GenAI) tools, such as ChatGPT and others, has transformed academic writing practices in the last few years. This has raised significant challenges for disciplinary teachers in upholding academic integrity in English Medium Instruction (EMI) universities, especially in the Global South. This study, grounded in the Theory of Planned Behaviour and the Four Component Model of Morality, investigated these concerns. Using a qualitative research design, this study reveals that disciplinary teachers in Bangladeshi EMI universities hold diverse attitudes towards GenAI tools, with most educators expressing concerns regarding their suitability for developing students' academic writing skills. The findings illustrate the need for policy development and implementation, and, most importantly, improving students' ethical literacy to ensure that GenAI is used as a tool to enhance their learning experiences. This study has several implications for policymakers, teachers, administrators, and students in higher education institutions, contributing significantly to the evolving discourse on academic integrity and the use of GenAI in higher education, offering practical and theoretical insights from the Global South.

1. Introduction

In recent years, artificial intelligence (AI) has transformed multiple sectors, including business, healthcare, and education. Besides facilitating new methods of learning, teaching, and assessment (Cai et al., 2025), Generative AI (GenAI) tools such as ChatGPT, DeepSeek, Grok, and Claude are readily available for producing academic and creative content (Darvishi et al., 2024). The rapid adoption of GenAI by students in higher education (HE) has raised ethical concerns among disciplinary teachers regarding academic integrity, especially in universities that implement English medium instruction (EMI). As English is the universal second language and medium of communication in global higher education (Brumfit, 2004), most universities in Global South countries such as Bangladesh have adopted EMI (Rahman & Hu, 2025b). English has transformed from being a “compulsory subject taught in schools” to being used as the “primary language for teaching and learning” in higher education in Bangladesh (Rahman & Hu, 2025a, p. 2). However, studies have reported that the inconsistency of medium of instruction (MOI) policies across various educational levels affects the development of students' English language proficiency (Rahman et al., 2019). As a

result, many students have weak academic writing skills which greatly hinder their academic preparedness for EMI education (Sultana, 2014).

Disciplinary teachers in EMI universities view English academic writing as an important activity through which students must demonstrate their ability to read, understand, analyse information, and present it in various forms (Aitchison, 2015). This view is especially pronounced in the fields of humanities, language studies, and liberal arts, as learning and teaching across these writing-intensive disciplines are centred on critical thinking, creativity, and the development of independent thought. Additionally, assessments across these disciplines require students to complete academic writing tasks, such as writing descriptions, narratives, enumerations, and reports to support their thesis statements. Studies conducted on Bangladeshi EMI universities show that students in writing-intensive disciplines face academic writing challenges (Nahiyen et al., 2025), such as facing difficulty in synthesising information from multiple texts and producing structured and coherent essays (Patwary et al., 2023).

As most Bangladeshi EMI universities implement a trimester system (Alam et al., 2024), disciplinary teachers have 12 weeks to complete their academic activities. This span of time is inadequate for disciplinary

* Corresponding author. 688, Beribadh Road, Mohammadpur. Dhaka, Bangladesh.

E-mail addresses: sheikh.nahiyen@ulab.edu.bd (S. Nahiyen), arifa.rahman@ulab.edu.bd (A.G. Rahman).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2026.102729>

Received 6 February 2025; Received in revised form 16 February 2026; Accepted 23 March 2026

Available online 14 April 2026

2590-2911/© 2026 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

teachers to provide individualised support and help students overcome their academic writing challenges. Additionally, this limited time of the trimester system places students under immense academic pressure, and their deficient independent learning skills hinder their self-efficacy (Nahiyani et al., 2025). These students experience varying levels of assessment anxiety as they are unable to develop discipline-specific writing skills (Hamid & Sultana, 2024; Islam et al., 2021). As a result, many students in Bangladeshi universities rely on GenAI tools (Howlader et al., 2025) to complete academic writing tasks and cope with the demands of EMI education (Sultana, 2014). Students mainly receive assistance from GenAI tools to generate information and enhance the language of their writing by making it more grammatically correct (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019). Therefore, academic integrity in Bangladeshi EMI universities – a context within the Global South – has become a pressing issue as students have become increasingly reliant on GenAI, particularly in writing-intensive disciplines.

Furthermore, students' over-reliance on GenAI challenges the essence of academic integrity, as it intensifies disciplinary teachers' concerns regarding plagiarism and cheating (Macfarlane et al., 2014). Some students have better access to AI tools compared to others in Global South contexts such as Bangladesh. As a result, those who have access to GenAI often perform better academically than those who do not. This raises questions about fairness and equity in EMI universities (Hamid & Sultana, 2024). It also posits the need to understand how disciplinary teachers in Bangladeshi EMI universities perceive students' GenAI use for completing academic writing tasks of courses in writing-intensive disciplines. Disciplinary teachers in Bangladeshi universities are crucial stakeholders in EMI education, as they teach, communicate, and assess students' writing performance. As disciplinary teachers' roles across EMI universities in the Global South are the same (Gu et al., 2024), it is important to uncover the strategies they utilise to address students' GenAI use while upholding academic integrity.

Currently, few studies have investigated disciplinary teachers' views and approaches to mitigate students' unethical use of GenAI in academic writing. In their study, Barrett and Pack (2023) underscored that in the absence of institutional policies regarding GenAI use, classroom honour codes limit the extent of its use by students. Furthermore, Wang et al. (2021) found that disciplinary teachers experience anxiety and suffer from low self-efficacy regarding their ability to detect the presence of GenAI in students' writing. While Kaplan-Rakowski et al. (2023) reiterate these findings, Zhai et al. (2021) reports that GenAI misuse hampers the development of students' academic literacy skills. According to Söğüt (2024), this is due to their overreliance on GenAI which hampers their classroom learning and undermines mutual respect in HE classrooms. The lack of institutional support to detect GenAI use makes disciplinary teachers suspect students for the possible misuse of AI tools in their writing (Lee et al., 2024).

Several key takeaways emerge from these studies. First, it is unclear how university teachers address GenAI issues in writing-intensive disciplinary courses. While concerns about the impact of GenAI on students' language skills development are widespread, there is a knowledge gap pertaining specifically to writing-intensive disciplines. Furthermore, the use of GenAI, such as ChatGPT, has become increasingly popular among students in Global South countries (Yeo, 2023; Zhu et al., 2025). Given that these students already face challenges in academic writing tasks (Rahman et al., 2019), current studies have not adequately considered this contextual factor. Additionally, the above studies do not report disciplinary teachers' perspectives on how GenAI use affects the development of students' academic literacy skills, especially their discipline-specific writing skills in EMI universities in Global South countries such as Bangladesh, where English is the second language (Chowdhury & Kabir, 2014; Rahman et al., 2019). Moreover, studies report that the effectiveness of EMI in HE largely depends on the competency of disciplinary teachers (Rahman et al., 2020, p. 12). Although disciplinary teachers play a pivotal role in writing-intensive disciplines across Bangladeshi universities (Hamid & Sultana, 2024;

Macaro, 2018), EMI introduces language-related challenges that affect their instructional and assessment practices (Sultana, 2014). With GenAI now readily available to students for creating academic content, there is a significant lack of information on how disciplinary teachers in the Global South, such as in Bangladesh, address these situations. This raises significant concerns regarding academic integrity in EMI education. Therefore, this study examined these issues from the perspective of key stakeholders, such as teachers of writing-intensive disciplinary courses, who are responsible for facilitating students' academic writing development in EMI universities (Rahman & Singh, 2020; Nahiyani et al., 2025). Considering this information, this study aimed to:

1. Explore the perspectives of disciplinary teachers regarding students' use of GenAI in EMI universities.
2. Report the challenges disciplinary teachers face to detect students' GenAI misuse and its impact on academic integrity in EMI universities.
3. Describe the ethical dilemmas faced by disciplinary teachers in upholding academic integrity while managing students' GenAI misuse in the assessments of writing-intensive disciplinary courses at EMI universities.

2. Ethical perspectives on academic integrity in EMI universities

As neoliberal institutions, EMI universities play a vital role in today's knowledge-driven world and significantly impact the socioeconomic development of Global South countries (Rahman & Hu, 2025a, 2025b). These institutions are responsible for "producing individuals who can accelerate economic growth, prosperity, and development" (Chetty, 2012, p. 6). Studies (e.g., Kimenyi, 2011; Peercy & Svenson, 2016) have highlighted the important role of HE in driving national economic growth and predicted (OECD, 2019) that this trend would continue. Thus, EMI universities, as global institutions (Preece, 2022), are subject to intense scrutiny regarding the quality of education (Akıncioğlu, 2024), which is conceptualised as purposeful, exceptional, transformative, and accountable (De Wit & Altbach, 2021).

Academic integrity is a crucial element of quality education (McCulloch & Indrarathne, 2023) as it endorses the credibility of universities in preparing graduates who can contribute to the knowledge economy. It also ensures the foundation of quality assurance by establishing standards that ensure originality, prevent plagiarism, and promote ethical behaviour (Gallant & Drinan, 2006). Therefore, academic integrity policies must be transparent to ensure that stakeholders (e.g., disciplinary teachers) are well-informed and can act as successful change agents. Additionally, resources such as plagiarism detection tools and training enable disciplinary teachers to offer the appropriate support that students need (Whitley & Keith-Spiegel, 2001). This approach aligns with teachers' moral awareness, enabling them to identify breaches in ethical practices as critical areas for improvement (Narvaez & Rest, 1995, pp. 385–400). Collectively, these initiatives foster a cultural shift within EMI universities, making ethical behaviour the core of pedagogical practice.

Disciplinary teachers in EMI universities also serve as key intermediaries who implement institutional guidelines through actionable strategies (Rahman et al., 2020). As their response to academic dishonesty is crucial for maintaining academic integrity, they must exercise strong moral judgment (Narvaez & Rest, 1995). However, Bangladeshi EMI university teachers face a moral dilemma when assessing students' writing, as GenAI has made it increasingly difficult to differentiate between students' original writing and AI-generated content (Cotton et al., 2024; Giray et al., 2025). Existing studies in Bangladesh provide little information on institutional guidelines, available resources, and staff training for detecting and addressing students' GenAI use. Given this paucity, it is important to explore how disciplinary teachers maintain academic integrity in their courses.

3. Generative AI and disciplinary teachers' principled decision-making for academic writing practices

Although GenAI has potential benefits, university students have become over-reliant on it for completing academic writing tasks across EMI universities, as they are able to produce sophisticated versions of academic writing excerpts with minimal effort (Kim et al., 2025). These superficially polished texts lack critical reasoning, which greatly affects pedagogical and assessment practices in EMI universities. Studies caution that biases in AI training data lead GenAI to reproduce discriminatory views, which can undermine students' critical stance-taking and thinking skills (Holmes & Miao, 2023). Therefore, universities must provide guidance regarding GenAI use (Burkhard, 2022), as it potentially hinders the development of students' academic writing skills, cognition, beliefs, and ethical practices.

While previous new technologies were introduced with clear objectives, the true benefits of GenAI in EMI universities remain unclear due to contextual factors, including AI literacy and the lack of or therein institutional policies regulating its ethical use (Kaplan-Rakowski et al., 2023). AI is ubiquitous, and students use the different avenues of GenAI to not only facilitate brainstorming, outlining, or receiving grammar or style suggestions, they can also resort to generating information without disclosure, paraphrasing to circumvent attribution, and submitting that as original work.

As AI detection technology remains unreliable owing to the lack of robustness in detection reports (Giray et al., 2025), disciplinary teachers' monitoring practices to detect GenAI misuse have become more difficult. Furthermore, the paucity of information regarding university-level policies and departmental guidelines regarding students' GenAI use suggests that disciplinary teachers must rely on their ethical prudence to assess whether students' have misused GenAI in their academic writing (Jia & Pun, 2025; Mijwil et al., 2023). In relation to that, there is limited information on how disciplinary teachers monitor and address students' GenAI use as well as misuse in the EMI universities of Bangladesh. In light of this, it is crucial to understand how teachers of writing-intensive disciplines overcome ethical dilemmas regarding students' GenAI use and misuse, and how their moral awareness and moral judgment affect their actions to uphold academic integrity in the EMI classroom.

4. Conceptual framework

The conceptual framework of our study is grounded in James Rest's Four Component Model of Morality (Narvaez & Rest, 1995, pp. 385–400) and Icek Ajzen's Theory of Planned Behaviour (Ajzen, 1991) to explore how disciplinary teachers in Bangladeshi EMI universities perceive students' GenAI use and the ethical dilemmas they face in upholding academic integrity while assessing writing-intensive disciplinary courses at EMI universities in light of students' potential GenAI misuse.

First, the Four Component Model of Morality (FCMM) includes the internal psychological processes of moral sensitivity, moral judgment, moral motivation, and moral implementation (Narvaez & Rest, 1995, pp. 385–400). The FCMM states that individuals must be able to recognise ethical issues in their everyday practices and consider the possible actions they need to take. This is their moral sensitivity (Prisacariu & Shah, 2016). Subsequently, individuals must consider who might be affected by their actions and the outcomes of their actions. This is their moral judgement. Next, individuals must evaluate which decision is the most ethical and ensure that moral values take precedence over everything else. This is their moral motivation for completing an action. Finally, individuals must demonstrate resolve and carefully consider all factors when undertaking actions that comply with moral principles. This is their moral implementation (Narvaez & Rest, 1995, pp. 385–400). Disciplinary teachers in EMI universities must recognise and reflect on how students' GenAI use can violate academic integrity

policies. Subsequently, they must respond to such violations in an ethically appropriate manner. While they can undertake decisions such as strictly enforcing academic honesty policies, these must be grounded in ethical principles.

The Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) has three components. The first is an individual's attitude towards a behaviour, subjective norms, and perceived behavioural control (Ajzen, 1991). The TPB posits that a person's behaviour is determined by their intentions and understanding of any given phenomenon (Ryan & Worthington, 2021). It also underscores specificity, stating that intentions can be better predictors of behaviour if they are asserted clearly. In the context of our study, it is important to understand how disciplinary teachers' attitudes towards GenAI use in discipline-specific writing assessments are influenced. It is equally important to know how disciplinary teachers approach upholding academic integrity in light of GenAI misuse. Disciplinary teachers' attitudes must be balanced regarding the pros and cons of GenAI. For example, GenAI can be used for scaffolding and idea generation in writing-intensive EMI disciplines. This is a positive aspect of GenAI use. In contrast, the negative aspects of GenAI use are blurred authorship which threatens assessment validity. In light of the TPB, institutional policies and collegial expectations are subjective norms that influence disciplinary teachers' decision-making. Existing studies have utilised the TPB to understand how university teachers adopt new learning technologies and found that their perceived behavioural control influences their classroom practices (Dierendonck et al., 2024). Similarly, we utilised the TPB to better understand how disciplinary teachers uphold academic integrity in light of the emergence of new technology.

In the context of our study, disciplinary teachers in Bangladesh deal with large classes and limited resources. Hence, it is important to know how teachers can realistically monitor and support students' learning in light of potential GenAI misuse. The TPB helped us uncover how disciplinary teachers' decisions regarding GenAI use are context-dependent. For instance, TPB helped us better understand how disciplinary teachers' perceived behavioural control in Bangladeshi EMI universities affects their self-efficacy in addressing students' GenAI misuse and upholding academic integrity. As there is very little published research on this, both FCMM and TPB helped us understand how disciplinary teachers navigate students' GenAI misuse based on their moral awareness and moral judgement to uphold academic integrity while also supporting students' learning.

5. Methodology

This qualitative inquiry (Creswell, 2012) adopted a descriptive research design (Sandelowski, 2000) to explore the perspectives and experiences of disciplinary teachers regarding students' use of GenAI. Because of its suitability to describe participants' real-life experiences (Munhall, 2010), this design allowed us to deeply focus (Astalin, 2013) on disciplinary teachers' experiences and ethical dilemmas amid the challenges they face while assessing students in EMI universities. We used an open-ended questionnaire to collect the data. We adapted the items at the level of content domains (e.g., perceptions of academic honesty, plagiarism, and preventive measures) from Calovic Nenezic et al.'s (2023) study by rephrasing them as open-ended questions to gather rich qualitative responses from the participants. We reached out to two experts of Applied Linguistics to review the instrument for relevance and clarity, and to ensure its adequacy. We refined the wording and sequencing of the questionnaire based on their feedback. The instrument questioned participants about students' GenAI use to complete academic writing tasks in the courses they teach. It probed disciplinary teachers' views on GenAI, their strategies to address GenAI misuse, what they consider as acceptable use of GenAI, and the role of policies in affecting their decisions to tackle GenAI misuse. We used purposeful sampling (Creswell, 2012) and some predetermined criteria adapted from Rahman and Hu (2025a) to select the participants. The inclusion

criteria are as follows:

- Disciplinary teachers must come from writing-intensive fields such as humanities, liberal arts, and social sciences.
- Disciplinary teachers must have experience of teaching and assessing academic writing in writing-intensive courses across these disciplines.
- Disciplinary teachers must have direct familiarity with students' GenAI use (e.g., take-home assignments and term papers).
- Disciplinary teachers must be currently teaching at an EMI university.
- Disciplinary teachers must have at least two years of teaching experience at EMI universities.

We focused on disciplinary teachers as the participants for this study as they are one of the essential micro-level stakeholders in the implementation of EMI education in higher education institutions (HEIs) in Bangladesh (Rahman & Hu, 2025a,b). Their experiences provided contextually grounded and transferable insights into principled decision-making about GenAI and academic writing in a Global South context, where English serves as the medium of instruction but is not the primary language for most participants in this study (Rahman et al., 2019). We reached out via email to 25 teachers of writing-intensive disciplines across 10 EMI universities in Bangladesh through our network of colleagues and professional acquaintances. We explained the purpose of our study and asked whether they would participate voluntarily. We also informed them that their institutional affiliations and personal details would be anonymised if they participated in the study. We could not offer any incentives to the participants because this was an unfunded independent study.

Furthermore, in-person data collection was not possible because the participants' universities were located in different areas, and no funding was available to travel to the participants' universities or invite them to the host university for the interviews. Therefore, we distributed an open-ended questionnaire (see Appendix A) hosted on Google Forms via email to the participants. Studies (e.g., Pitura, 2023) note that administering questionnaires via email is a practical alternative that helps researchers overcome geographical and financial barriers while simultaneously allowing participants to provide detailed responses at their convenience. The structure of the open-ended questions ensured consistency across participants' responses and allowed them to share their in-depth experiences. Participants' consent (Klykken, 2022) is implied by their voluntary completion of the form as noted in the form's instructions and information. We reminded them that they could withdraw from the study at any time. A sample size of 10 is sufficient for qualitative studies involving homogeneous populations (Sandelowski, 1995). As the 15 participants in our study were drawn from a homogeneous group, e.g., teachers of writing-intensive disciplines in EMI universities, the sample size is justified.

In addition to the medium of data collection, the type of data that was collected comprised of participants' experiences, so no physical risk was anticipated. Additionally, the risk of indirect identification through quotes or contextual details (e.g., a disciplinary teacher's background) has been removed as selected quotations have been used for data reporting so that no participant is identifiable. It was also clarified to the participants that this study did not aim to evaluate their ability or professional competence. Rather it aimed to explore their overall experiences of teaching writing-intensive courses amidst potential GenAI use by the students. Considering these factors, this study was considered as low risk and received a retrospective ethical waiver from the research-site university. We, the authors, acknowledge that we carried out this study ethically, and only responses of those who participated voluntarily are included.

After data collection was completed, we tabulated the information using Microsoft Excel to ensure its accuracy. Subsequently, thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006) was conducted. The conceptual

framework (Ajzen, 1991; Narvaez & Rest, 1995) guided the initial coding and helped identify keywords related to attitudes, ethical concerns, and pedagogical practices. In the next stage, we used focused coding (Braun & Clarke, 2006), which helped us refine the emerging themes. To enhance the credibility of this study, the authors independently coded the initial subset of responses, and any discrepancies that arose were resolved through discussion. We then shared the draft with an expert in Applied Linguistics. They provided expert feedback to refine the themes (Saldaña, 2014). The themes were then interpreted to connect the teachers' attitudes, beliefs, and practices to address their dilemmas in light of students' GenAI usage across writing-intensive disciplines (Tan et al., 2018). This approach ensured that the data analysis was grounded in the participants' experiences while also being systematically informed by the conceptual framework, providing suitable reasoning to address the research objectives.

6. Findings

The first research objective was to explore disciplinary teachers' perspectives on students' GenAI use in the writing-intensive disciplinary courses at EMI universities.

6.1. Disciplinary teachers' perspectives on students' GenAI use in academic writing

The ease of access and proliferation of GenAI tools such as ChatGPT, DeepSeek, etc., are deeply impacting academic writing practices in EMI universities today. Disciplinary teachers' varied responses reflect a balance between the perceived advantages of GenAI use and ethical concerns, i.e., moral sensitivity (Ajzen, 1991; Narvaez & Rest, 1995, pp. 385–400). While disciplinary teachers support the limited use of GenAI for specific tasks such as improving grammar and structure and fostering critical thinking, they renounce its use for creative and applied tasks as it hinders mastery of the academic genre and originality. T7 stated, "*Using them in certain cases is okay. They can help illustrate more concrete ideas in the text. But they cannot be the ultimate move.*" This perspective aligns with the findings of Barrett and Pack (2023). Disciplinary teachers think that students may consider using AI-generated essays as a model, but it is inappropriate to blindly use the generated content as it hampers the development of their writing abilities. The following statements reflect disciplinary teachers' positive beliefs about the benefits of limited GenAI use, as well as an initial ethical evaluation of its boundaries (Narvaez & Rest, 1995, pp. 385–400). These are:

T1: [...] can be treated as a source of information and reference

T6: AI is here to stay. There is no point in behaving like an ostrich. We might as well make sure that our students learn to maneuver it well.

T8: Like Google, it may be used only to facilitate the human brain not to let human brain go to the backyard.

T10: AI can be used to take help with minor grammar or structural issues, not on content.

Additionally, teachers shared that GenAI could be used to initiate brainstorming in writing classrooms, but with specific guidance. T11 shared, "*I work on generating unique prompts to reduce the impact of AI in my writing classroom. There are risks, but I believe AI can be a good pedagogical tool, at least at the brainstorming level.*" This statement illustrates that students' GenAI use has enhanced disciplinary teachers' perceived behavioural control (Ajzen, 1991), fostering intentions to permit limited GenAI use while maintaining task integrity (Narvaez & Rest, 1995, pp. 385–400). Additionally, this opinion aligns with Woo, Wang, Yung, and Guo's (2024) study that GenAI can help students improve critical thinking and brainstorming in academic writing.

On the other hand, most participants shared their unease about the

risks associated with GenAI use in academic writing, especially regarding developing students' discipline-specific writing skills. The pragmatic nature of the concerns expressed by the disciplinary teachers is grounded and practical, and shows their increased moral sensitivity (Narvaez & Rest, 1995, pp. 385–400) regarding the potential harm that GenAI is causing to students' development of essential writing and creativity skills. These concerns are highlighted in the following responses:

T4: [...] You can no longer teach the 5 paragraph form or any type of formal genres that are going to be assessed in terms of correctness primarily. That won't work because AI can generate that pretty well. [...]

T13: I have observed that students tend to rely completely on AI writing tools for their coursework and thesis work [...] due to a lack of practice in creative and academic writing, the skills of the students are not developing as well which would, unfortunately, render them less productive in the workplace.

T14: Mostly the tendency of copying and pasting, or sometimes paraphrasing the required material from a composition.

T15: [...] the dearth of originality, lack of skill production [...]

Disciplinary teachers' responses indicate that students' learning is hampered because GenAI allows them to bypass the intellectual rigor of academic writing tasks. These comments align with Sögüt's (2024) findings that GenAI hampers the development of students' creativity, productivity, and critical thinking skills, leading to deficient learning outcomes in the writing classroom. Overall, disciplinary teachers' intentions regarding GenAI involve balancing perceived benefits and potential harms, and are shaped by institutional expectations and practical classroom controls (Ajzen, 1991). The boundaries they set are guided by ethical considerations, including moral sensitivity, judgment, and motivation (Narvaez & Rest, 1995, pp. 385–400).

6.2. Disciplinary teachers' challenges in detecting students' GenAI use in academic writing assessments

The second research objective was to report the challenges that disciplinary teachers face in detecting and evaluating students' misuse of GenAI tools in academic writing and their impact on academic integrity. We found that the disciplinary teachers observed a stark discrepancy between the work students produced in the classroom and the take-home assignments. Through the lens of TPB (Ajzen, 1991), disciplinary teachers' responses show their cautious attitude towards students' independent use of GenAI. Additionally, disciplinary teachers maintain academic integrity by strategising assessment practices, such as assigning a greater percentage of marks to presentations and verbal defences. T14, a senior level disciplinary teacher of Language Studies shared, "Though majority of the writing tasks have to be in-class, hand-written, and non-tech supported, the home tasks the students submit have to be defended through verbal presentation." Disciplinary teachers include real-life scenarios and creative questions to assess their students. For instance, T8, a teacher of the Humanities discipline shared, "Unfamiliar topics which cannot be structured with AI or can easily be detected [...] have reduced the usage and students took the initiative to finish the tasks on their own." Similar strategies were reported by Moorhouse and Kohnke (2024), who stated that reconceptualising assessments could address the needs and challenges posed by GenAI. The above strategies that disciplinary teachers utilise show that their moral motivation and action are dependent on the need to ensure fair grading and evaluate students based on their actual attainment in EMI education (Hasan et al., 2026; Kabir, 2015).

Disciplinary teachers' actions to detect GenAI misuse demonstrate their moral awareness and show how their behavioural controls help them exercise ethical judgement (Narvaez & Rest, 1995, pp. 385–400) in

the EMI classroom. They also shared that as students generate entire assignments without understanding the content, it greatly compromises academic dynamics, leading to poor learning outcomes. Cummings et al. (2024) voiced similar observations and stated that GenAI use hinders students' authorial voice, which is an essential attribute of academic language skill development in EMI universities. Additional responses from disciplinary teachers regarding various strategies to address GenAI misuse are as follows:

T5: My requirements from student assignments have changed. I ask for the following things: specific examples from the text under analysis; quotes; correct citation. If an answer is too generic, I put a C or less on it.

T8: I sit with my students regularly. I do not mark them low for poor grammar [...] I ask them [...] to submit weekly journals on their readings [...] to tell me about the preparation of their assignment drafts [...] I give constant feedback. Their journal submissions and my responses help us stay connected.

T10: I give them some discussion prompts.

The above responses indicate that teachers in writing-intensive disciplines are adopting proactive assessment strategies, such as integrating AI discussion prompts to innovate their pedagogical practices. These strategies enhance disciplinary teachers' perceived behavioural control and set clearer norms in writing classrooms (Ajzen, 1991). Their moral motivation and moral judgement (Narvaez & Rest, 1995, pp. 385–400) are also reflected in these actions; that is, the permissible practice of GenAI demonstrates their commitment to maintaining academic integrity in the disciplinary classroom of EMI universities in Bangladesh. In contrast, other disciplinary teachers shared that stronger institutional support was needed to better tackle the challenges posed by GenAI. T9 shared, "These strategies do not always work and they put a lot of pressure on the teachers, but they have mostly been effective in the larger scenario of academic integrity." This response demonstrates disciplinary teachers' moral motivation and character (Narvaez & Rest, 1995, pp. 385–400) as they continue to uphold academic integrity even when institutional policies and technological solutions are inadequate. Stronger institutional norms and support to tackle GenAI use among students in EMI universities, such as educating them about its proper use for learning, would ideally enhance disciplinary teachers' perceived control in disciplinary classrooms, enabling a more consistent and equitable application of ethical judgements (Ajzen, 1991). Until such measures are implemented, disciplinary teachers must rely on their personal ethical beliefs when evaluating students' writing.

6.3. Disciplinary teachers' ethical dilemmas in managing students' GenAI use and upholding academic integrity

The third research objective was to report the ethical dilemmas that disciplinary teachers face in upholding academic integrity and managing students' GenAI use. Disciplinary teachers reported that their primary ethical dilemma involved balancing GenAI's value as an educational tool against its potential to undermine academic integrity by indirectly encouraging academic misconduct among students in the EMI classroom. T12, a teacher of Liberal Arts, shared, "AI has surely threatened the plagiarism clause, which is an important aspect of academic integrity. Every university needs to address the prevalence of AI and decide on policies and other ways to work around it/with it instead of ignoring it." By using the phrase 'plagiarism clause', T12 referred to the existing policies and rules in the EMI university that define, recognise, and penalise academic plagiarism. Plagiarism policies in EMI universities were originally implemented to discourage students from directly copy-pasting information from other sources without proper referencing. However, existing policies do not address the problems associated with AI-generated content. Disciplinary teachers like T12 are concerned that existing plagiarism policies implemented by EMI universities are not

enough to regulate students' GenAI misuse. The excerpt shows the influence of subjective norms (Ajzen, 1991), as disciplinary teachers voice the need for EMI universities in Bangladesh to establish new guidelines for the regulation and assessment of AI-generated information. According to the FCMM, T12's perspective also demonstrates moral awareness of emerging risks related to academic integrity and moral judgment (Narvaez & Rest, 1995, pp. 385–400) in recognising the necessity of redrawing boundaries in light of GenAI misuse.

Next, concerns about students' academic misconduct were prominent in most of the disciplinary teachers' responses. One of their biggest worries is that GenAI has made it increasingly difficult to verify the authenticity of students' assignments. T2, a teacher of English Studies, shared, *"Authenticity [...] has reduced since the incorporation of AI-based tools. Students are now more likely to cheat in exams using their AI tools."* This concern is supported by Yusuf et al. (2024) and studies (e.g., Shamsuzzaman et al., 2018) suggest that students who have low critical thinking and lack knowledge about the academic writing processes tend to resort to unethical means to complete tasks. Such concerns are a hindrance to disciplinary teachers' perceived behavioural control (Ajzen, 1991) in the EMI classroom, as the potential for false accusations risks an unbiased evaluation of students' writings. This becomes a barrier to upholding academic integrity, diminishing teachers' moral motivation in their capacity to act effectively and equitably (Narvaez & Rest, 1995, pp. 385–400). Similar responses from other disciplinary teachers include:

T6: A key challenge is [...] plagiarism. It is also difficult to track the exact percentage of AI usage. For instance, a student may have used AI for one portion or step of their assignment. In this case, the teacher finds it difficult to quantify how much academic integrity has been violated.

T8: The idea of integrity cannot be policed anymore in the classroom writing context [...] there is no practical way for teachers to catch improper use in the formal student essay genre [...].

The above responses show that disciplinary teachers' perceived ability (Ajzen, 1991) to identify and address students' GenAI use is negatively impacted by the unreliability of current iterations of AI-detection tools. The emergence of tools that offers to humanise to hide AI-generated texts greatly impacts moral judgement and action (Narvaez & Rest, 1995, pp. 385–400). Disciplinary teachers were further probed regarding their approaches to addressing ethical dilemmas and maintaining academic integrity in EMI classrooms. They emphasised that as the ethical boundaries of GenAI use in academic writing have become blurred since 2022, disciplinary course syllabi in EMI universities should explicitly articulate a zero-tolerance policy towards its use. T7 added, *"AI may be allowed for personal interest. However, I think AI should absolutely be banned for producing writing assignments and such AI-generated assignments should be severely punished."* These responses show disciplinary teachers' support for stricter norms (Ajzen, 1991) to regulate GenAI use based on their moral judgement of the importance of authenticity in academic writing (Narvaez & Rest, 1995, pp. 385–400).

Conversely, some disciplinary teachers expressed that instead of banning GenAI, students should be educated to use the tools properly. They shared:

T3: The teachers and authority should take it upon themselves to educate the students on the proper use of AI tools.

T6: New policies should be made.

T8: The university has to develop its own AI ethical rules and integrity policies by keeping in mind the kind of student community they are addressing, which should be dept./school specific.

T15: I don't think Bangladesh is prepared to strike that balance up to now due to a lack of foundation in the students' earlier academic infrastructure. The lines between ethical and unethical behaviour are

blurred in the students' consciousness. I believe that the entire infrastructure needs to be reevaluated for the proper incorporation of AI tools to benefit educational institutes.

Their responses indicate that academic integrity should be established early in students' educational journeys. To achieve this, regulatory bodies such as the Ministry of Education and University Grants Commission should collaborate with relevant bodies to develop and implement policies that foster a culture of integrity and promote the responsible use of GenAI. Several studies (e.g., Chan, 2023) have stated that such measures can uphold academic integrity in EMI universities.

7. Discussion and conclusion

Our study explored teachers' perspectives on students' GenAI use across writing-intensive disciplines in Bangladeshi EMI universities and the strategies they utilise to navigate ethical dilemmas and uphold academic integrity in the classroom. We found that disciplinary teachers' concerns regarding the risks of GenAI in academic writing reflected their increased moral sensitivity (Narvaez & Rest, 1995, pp. 385–400). Even though they are optimistic about the positive aspects of AI-tools, disciplinary teachers shared that the lack of an academic policy governing AI use in EMI universities complicated their efforts to uphold academic integrity. Disciplinary teachers rely on their moral reasoning (Narvaez & Rest, 1995, pp. 385–400) to take equitable actions when assessing students' academic writing in Bangladeshi EMI universities. Such strategies are susceptible to inconsistencies across disciplines, as teachers interpret AI-generated content differently across academic fields. We also found that many disciplinary teachers adopted proactive assessment techniques to minimise GenAI misuse. As reliable GenAI detection tools are unavailable, our findings show that disciplinary teachers' moral motivation and moral character influence their planned behaviour (Ajzen, 1991; Narvaez & Rest, 1995, pp. 385–400). While innovative assessment techniques are labour-intensive and take up a lot of time, disciplinary teachers in EMI universities need better support to succeed in their efforts to uphold academic integrity.

The findings of our study highlight the changing landscape of academic integrity in EMI universities owing to the unique challenges faced by teachers in identifying AI-generated content. We found that maintaining ethical standards of assessment is a subjective norm that disciplinary teachers abide by. This is a form of perceived behavioural control (Ajzen, 1991), which reflects their moral character and shapes their actions in upholding academic integrity (Narvaez and Rest, 1995). Additionally, as disciplinary teachers try to build rapport with their students, it shows their endeavour to foster an environment of mutual respect and openness in EMI classrooms. These instances from our findings show how disciplinary teachers in Bangladeshi EMI universities navigate ethical dilemmas to uphold academic integrity. In the same vein, disciplinary teachers' views on GenAI affect their decisions and we found that disciplinary teachers such as T2 and T11 disregarded the use of GenAI, while T6, T8, and T15 saw it as a means to enhance students' learning. This discrepancy among disciplinary teachers' views shows that, in the absence of institutional policies regulating GenAI use, their subjective norms shape their moral awareness and decision-making (Ajzen, 1991; Narvaez & Rest, 1995, pp. 385–400) regarding GenAI in academic writing. The findings of our study reassert Barrett and Pack's (2023) statement that policies regulating GenAI use are essential in HE. Additionally, our findings align with those of several other studies (Kaplan-Rakowski et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2021) which reported similar challenges faced by university teachers in detecting and mitigating unethical Gen AI use in their classrooms.

Our study addresses several gaps in the literature. First, the findings show how disciplinary teachers in EMI universities in the Global South context navigate GenAI-related issues in writing classrooms. Disciplinary teachers in Bangladeshi EMI universities undertake various measures to manage students' GenAI use, showing their willingness to

overcome any pedagogical limitations and engage students in meaningful learning practices (Narvaez & Rest, 1995, pp. 385–400). This finding directly addresses the gap observed by Niloy et al. (2024), who found that pedagogical limitations influence students' engagement with AI tools to complete their assignments. Second, we found that some disciplinary teachers, such as T5, T8, and T10, utilised GenAI to support students' learning, e.g., brainstorming, providing feedback, and offering language support. These examples support Khlaif et al.'s (2024) findings and address the gap identified by Yeo (2023) by illustrating how disciplinary teachers in EMI universities use GenAI positively. Third, the testimonies of disciplinary teachers, such as T2, T6, and T8, indicate that students' discipline-specific writing development is hindered by their reliance on GenAI. Conversely, the responses of T1, T7, and T10 revealed teachers' anticipation that students would use GenAI to enhance their writing skills. However, the situation appears to be the opposite in writing-focused disciplines at Bangladeshi EMI universities.

We also found that disciplinary teachers need reliable ways to verify the authenticity of students' writing. Hence, our study shows how disciplinary teachers' moral motivation and perceived behavioural control helps them evaluate students' writing equitably (Ajzen, 1991; Narvaez & Rest, 1995, pp. 385–400). These findings are useful for teachers in other EMI settings who are experiencing similar issues regarding students' Gen AI use. The insights provided by our study are useful for administrators and policymakers of EMI universities who deal with AI-related writing challenges. Our study emphasises on the importance of creating institutional guidelines, offering GenAI literacy training to teachers and students, and promoting ethical GenAI use in HE. Based on our findings, we suggest that universities should include and consult teachers who are at the forefront of dealing with GenAI misuse and upholding academic integrity in order to develop policies regarding ethical AI use. Subsequently, universities can refer to the UNESCO framework for AI in education (UNESCO, 2021) and gather input from other stakeholders to develop local GenAI usage policies in the Global South and similar contexts.

As our study provides contextual insights from a Global South country, it contributes to the predominantly Western-focused debate on ethical AI use (Aler Tubella et al., 2024; Crompton & Burke, 2023; Dabis & Csáki, 2024). Through the lens of TPB and FCMM (Ajzen, 1991; Narvaez & Rest, 1995, pp. 385–400), our study demonstrates how disciplinary teachers take ethically-driven actions to mitigate the challenges posed by GenAI in L2 academic writing with limited resources and training. While macro- and meso-level policies on GenAI use are progressing in other regions, this study corroborates that the lack of a comprehensive policy exacerbates the challenges faced by disciplinary teachers in upholding academic integrity within EMI universities in Bangladesh, a concern underscored by other researchers (Sultana & Faruk, 2024; Tamanna & Sinha, 2025).

Given the challenges that disciplinary teachers face in detecting students' GenAI use, EMI universities need to offer training and workshops that integrate academic evaluation with technological tools to effectively identify and manage these issues (Perkins, Roe, Postma, McGaughran, & Hickerson, 2024). This will allow disciplinary teachers to share their experiences of how they are mitigating the challenges. For instance, the disciplinary teachers in our study shared how they identified discrepancies among students' writing by comparing their in-class assessments with take-home assignments. Universities can also foster interdisciplinary collaboration and standardise assessment criteria for academic writing across disciplines to uphold academic integrity. EMI universities can integrate ethical use of AI into existing undergraduate ethics courses to enhance students' understanding of responsible GenAI use (Chiu & Sanusi, 2024). Such initiatives can enable students to utilise GenAI's benefits while maintaining academic integrity. In summary, policymakers and administrators of EMI universities should create institutional guidelines to (a) clearly define what constitutes acceptable and unacceptable use of GenAI, with examples specific to each discipline; (b) require brief disclosures of GenAI use for key assignments such

as research proposal or thesis writing; (c) create assessment rubrics that emphasise reasoning, source integration, and the revision process rather than merely surface-level accuracy; and (d) provide teachers with training on redesigning assessments that allow students to explain and justify their work.

As our study is context-specific, we suggest that the findings be viewed as time-sensitive, given the rapid development of AI-tools and related policies across EMI universities. In conclusion, our study demonstrates that enhancing disciplinary teachers' perceived behavioral control by establishing clear norms and transparent processes provides the most effective groundwork for equitable decision-making when assessing students' writing in the context of potential GenAI misuse.

CRediT authorship contribution statement

Sheikh Nahiyani: Conceptualisation, Investigation, Methodology, Formal Analysis, Writing - Original Draft, Editing. **Arifa Ghani Rahman:** Conceptualisation, Investigation, Methodology, Writing - Original Draft, Reviewing, and Editing.

Declaration of the use of AI assisted technologies

The authors did not use any AI-related tools in this study.

Ethics in publishing statement

This research presents an accurate account of the work performed, all data presented are accurate and methodologies detailed enough to permit others to replicate the work.

This research was conducted as an online open-ended survey and participants' consent was indicated by their filling out of the Google form.

We, the authors, acknowledge that we have carried out this study ethically and we only selected participants who agreed to participate voluntarily.

This manuscript represents entirely original work and if work and/or words of others have been used, that this has been appropriately cited or quoted and permission has been obtained where necessary.

This material has not been published in whole or in part elsewhere.

All authors have been personally and actively involved in substantive work leading to the manuscript and will hold themselves jointly and individually responsible for its content.

Funding statement

This independent study was undertaken by the researchers with no funding from any public, commercial or non-profit sectors.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors have no conflict of interest regarding this study. The authors declare that there are no competing financial or personal relationships that could have influenced this study in any way.

Acknowledgement

We are grateful to the teachers who participated in this study amidst their busy schedules. This study received a retrospective waiver (No: ERC2026S-002) from the Ethical Review Committee at the University of Liberal Arts Bangladesh (ULAB).

Appendix A. Supplementary data

The open-ended questionnaire used to collect the data for this article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2026.102729>.

Data availability statement

The research data is unavailable as it contains information about the participants.

References

- Aitchison, C. (2015). Writing the practice/practise the writing: Writing challenges and pedagogies for creative practice supervisors and researchers. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 47(12), 1291–1303. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2015.1035629>
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(1), 179–211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T)
- Akincioglu, M. (2024). Rethinking of EMI in higher education: A critical view on its scope, definition and quality. *Language Culture and Curriculum*, 37(2), 139–154. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2023.2251519>
- Alam, M. R., Islam, M. S., Ansarey, D., Rana, M. M., Milon, M. R. K., Halim, H. A., Jahan, S., & Rashid, A. (2024). Unveiling the professional identity construction of in-service university English language teachers: Evidence from Bangladesh. *Ampersand*, 12, Article 100178. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amper.2024.100178>
- Aler Tubella, A., Mora-Cantallos, M., & Nieves, J. C. (2024). How to teach responsible AI in higher education: Challenges and opportunities. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 26(1), 3. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-023-09733-7>
- Astalin, P. K. (2013). Qualitative research designs: A conceptual framework. *International Journal of Social Science and Interdisciplinary Research*, 2(1), 118–124. <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Qualitative-Research-Designs%3A-A-Conceptual-Astalin/baa7c8f5577b0b1798b5e9f559f5cbac32bf1a36>
- Barrett, A., & Pack, A. (2023). Not quite eye to AI: Student and teacher perspectives on the use of generative artificial intelligence in the writing process. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 20(59), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00427-0>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp0630a>
- Burkhard, M. (2022). Student perceptions of AI-Powered writing tools: Towards individualized teaching strategies. In *19th international conference on cognition and exploratory learning in digital age (CELDA 2022)*. International Association for Development of the Information Society. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED626893>
- Cai, L., Msafiri, M. M., & Kangwa, D. (2025). Exploring the impact of integrating AI tools in higher education using the zone of Proximal development. *Education and Information Technologies*, 30(6), 7191–7264. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-13112-0>
- Calovic Nenezic, S., Krtolica, M., Jelic, M., & Sekaric, S. (2023). Perceptions of students and teachers of the university of Montenegro on academic integrity. *CEPS Journal*, 13(3), 75–104. <https://doi.org/10.26529/cepsj.1589>
- Chan, C. K. Y. (2023). *Is AI changing the rules of academic misconduct? An in-depth look at students' perceptions of 'AI-giarism'*. arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.03358.
- Chetty, R. (2012). Bounds on elasticities with optimization frictions: A synthesis of micro and macro evidence on labor supply. *Econometrica*, 80(3), 969–1018. <https://doi.org/10.3982/ECTA9043>
- Chiu, T. K., & Sanusi, I. T. (2024). Define, foster, and assess student and teacher AI literacy and competency for all: Current status and future research direction. *Computers and Education Open*, Article 100182. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeo.2024.100182>
- Chowdhury, R., & Kabir, A. H. (2014). Language wars: English education policy and practice in Bangladesh. *Multilingual Education*, 4(1), 21. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13616-014-0021-2>
- Cotton, D. R., Cotton, P. A., & Shipway, J. R. (2024). Chatting and cheating: Ensuring academic integrity in the era of ChatGPT. *Innovations in Education & Teaching International*, 61(2), 228–239. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2023.2190148>
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Pearson Higher Ed.
- Crompton, H., & Burke, D. (2023). Artificial intelligence in higher education: The state of the field. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 20(1), 22. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00392-8>
- Cummings, R. E., Monroe, S. M., & Watkins, M. (2024). Generative AI in first-year writing: An early analysis of affordances, limitations, and a framework for the future. *Computers and Composition*, 71(102827), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2024.102827>
- Dabis, A., & Csáki, C. (2024). AI and ethics: Investigating the first policy responses of higher education institutions to the challenge of generative AI. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 11(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-03526-z>
- Darvishi, A., Khosravi, H., Sadiq, S., Gašević, D., & Siemens, G. (2024). Impact of AI assistance on student agency. *Computers & Education*, 210, Article 104967. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2023.104967>
- De Wit, H., & Altbach, P. G. (2021). Internationalization in higher education: Global trends and recommendations for its future. *Policy Reviews in Higher Education*, 5(1), 28–46. <https://doi.org/10.1080/108023322969.2020.1820898>
- Dierendonck, C., Poncelet, D., & Tinnes-Vigne, M. (2024). Why teachers do (or do not) implement recommended teaching practices? An application of the theory of planned behavior. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15, Article 1269954. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1269954>
- Gallant, T. B., & Drinan, P. (2006). Organizational theory and student cheating: Explanation, responses, and strategies. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77(5), 839–860. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2006.11778946>
- Giray, L., Sevnarayan, K., & Ranjbaran Madiseh, F. (2025). Beyond policing: AI writing detection tools, trust, academic integrity, and their implications for college writing. *Internet Reference Services Quarterly*, 29(1), 83–116. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10875301.2024.2437174>
- Gu, M. M., Li, Z. J., & Jiang, L. (2024). Navigating the instructional settings of EMI: A spatial perspective on university teachers' experiences. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 45(2), 564–578. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2021.1914064>
- Hamid, M. O., & Sultana, S. (2024). English-medium instruction in higher education in Bangladesh. In K. Bolton, W. Botha, & B. Lin (Eds.), *The routledge handbook of english-medium instruction in higher education* (pp. 352–364). Routledge.
- Hasan, Md. M., Fatema, K., & Mahmud, R. (2026). Bangladeshi university EFL teachers' vision for the future role of artificial intelligence in teaching and teachers' new identity. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, 15(1), 837. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v15i1.33638>
- Holmes, W., & Miao, F. (2023). *Guidance for generative AI in education and research*. UNESCO Publishing.
- Howlader, M. H., Tohan, M. M., Zaman, S., Chanda, S. K., Jiaxin, G., & Rahman, M. A. (2025). Factors influencing the acceptance and usage of ChatGPT as an emerging learning tool among higher education students in Bangladesh: A structural equation modeling. *Cogent Education*, 12(1), Article 2504224. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2025.2504224>
- Islam, M. S., Hasan, M. K., Sultana, S., Karim, A., & Rahman, M. M. (2021). English language assessment in Bangladesh today: Principles, practices, and problems. *Language Testing in Asia*, 11(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-020-00116-z>
- Jia, W., & Pun, J. (2025). Exploring EMI teachers' agency in addressing language-related challenges with ChatGPT: A multiple case study. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2025.2511061>
- Kabir, M. S. (2015). Testing English at tertiary level: An overview. *Crossings: Journal of Migration & Culture: Journal of English Studies*, 6(1), 196–213. <https://journals.ulab.edu.bd/index.php/crossings/article/view/227>
- Kaplan-Rakowski, R., Grotewold, K., Hartwick, P., & Papin, K. (2023). Generative AI and teachers' perspectives on its implementation in education. *Journal of Interactive Learning Research*, 34(2), 313–338. <https://www.learnlib.org/primary/p/222363/>
- Khlaif, Z. N., Ayyoub, A., Hamamra, B., Bensalem, E., Mitwally, M. A., Ayyoub, A., Hattab, M. K., & Shadid, F. (2024). University teachers' views on the adoption and integration of generative AI tools for student assessment in higher education. *Education Sciences*, 14(10), 1090. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14101090>
- Kim, J., Yu, S., Detrick, R., & Li, N. (2025). Exploring students' perspectives on generative AI-assisted academic writing. *Education and Information Technologies*, 30(1), 1265–1300. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-12878-7>
- Kimenyi, M. S. (2011). Contribution of higher education to economic development: A survey of international evidence. *Journal of African Economies*, 20(suppl_3), iii14–iii49. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jae/ejr018>
- Klykken, F. H. (2022). Implementing continuous consent in qualitative research. *Qualitative Research*, 22(5), 795–810. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14687941211014366>
- Lee, Y. J., Davis, R. O., & Ryu, J. (2024). Korean in-Service teachers' perceptions of implementing artificial intelligence (AI) education for teaching in schools and their AI teacher training programs. *International Journal of Information and Education Technology*, 14, 214–219. <https://doi.org/10.18178/ijiet.2024.14.2.2042>
- Macaro, E. (2018). *English medium instruction*. Oxford University Press.
- Macfarlane, B., Zhang, J., & Pun, A. (2014). Academic integrity: A review of the literature. *Studies in Higher Education*, 39(2), 339–358. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2012.709495>
- McCulloch, S., & Indrarathne, B. (2023). Plagiarism in EMI higher education: conceptual understanding of staff and students in four South Asian countries. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 42(3), 694–713. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2022.2102589>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.55145/ajest.2023.02.02.015>
- Moorhouse, B. L., & Kohnke, L. (2024). The effects of generative AI on initial language teacher education: The perceptions of teacher educators. *System*, 122(103290), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2024.103290>
- Munhall, P. L. (2010). *The landscape of qualitative research in nursing*. Nursing research: A qualitative perspective. Jones & Bartlett Publishers.
- Nahiyan, S., Al Amin, M., & Rahman, M. M. (2025). Academic literacy development and EAP in English medium instruction: A needs-based inquiry at a Bangladeshi private university. *Training, Language and Culture*, 9(1), 53–64. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2521-442X-2025-9-1-53-64>
- Narvaez, D., & Rest, J. (1995). The four components of acting morally. *Moral development: An introduction*. Allyn & Bacon. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/313099978_The_four_components_of_acting_morally_Moral_behavior_and_moral_development_An_introduction
- Niloy, A. C., Hafiz, R., Hossain, B. M. T., Gulmeher, F., Sultana, N., Islam, K. F., ... Kabir, S. (2024). AI chatbots: A disguised enemy for academic integrity? *International Journal of Educational Research Open*, 7, Article 100396. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2024.100396>
- OECD. (2019). An OECD Learning Framework 2030. In *The future of education and labor* (pp. 23–35). Cham: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-26068-2_3
- Patwary, M. N., Reza, M. M., Akhter, H., & Chowdhury, S. (2023). Exploring academic writing proficiency of tertiary EFL learners of Bangladesh: A pedagogical

- implication. *Integrated Journal for Research in Arts and Humanities*, 3(5), 89–102. <https://doi.org/10.55544/ijrah.3.5.8>
- Peercy, C., & Svenson, N. (2016). The role of higher education in equitable human development. *International Review of Education*, 62, 139–160. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11159-016-9549-6>
- Perkins, M., Roe, J., Postma, D., McGaughran, J., & Hickerson, D. (2024). Detection of GPT-4 generated text in higher education: Combining academic judgement and software to identify generative AI tool misuse. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 22(1), 89–113. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-023-09492-6>
- Pitura, J. (2023). Using the e-questionnaire in qualitative applied linguistics research. *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*, 2(1), Article 100034. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rmal.2022.100034>
- Preece, S. (2022). Developing the multilingual agenda in EMI higher educational institutions. *ELT Journal*, 76(2), 183–193. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccab087>
- Prisacariu, A., & Shah, M. (2016). Defining the quality of higher education around ethics and moral values. *Quality in Higher Education*, 22(2), 152–166. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13538322.2016.1201931>
- Rahman, M. M., & Hu, G. (2025a). EMI policy and practice divides in China, Japan, Malaysia and Nepal: Policymakers' neoliberal ideologies and multilingual classroom realities in higher education. *English Today*, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078425000136>
- Rahman, M. M., & Hu, G. (2025b). From hypernationalism to neoliberalism: A multi-level policy analysis of English medium instructional practices, management, and ideologies in Bangladeshi (private) higher education. *English Today*, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078424000221>
- Rahman, M. M., Islam, M. S., Karim, A., Chowdhury, T. A., Rahman, M. M., Seraj, P. M. I., & Singh, M. K. M. (2019). English language teaching in Bangladesh today: Issues, outcomes and implications. *Language Testing in Asia*, 9, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-019-0085-8>
- Rahman, M. M., & Singh, M. K. M. (2020). Language ideology of english-medium instruction in higher education: A case study from Bangladesh. *English Today*, 36(4), 40–46. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078419000294>
- Rahman, M. M., Singh, M. K. M., Johan, M., & Ahmed, Z. (2020). English medium instruction ideology, management and practices: A case study of Bangladeshi private university. *English Teaching & Learning*, 44(1), 61–79. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42321-019-00036-z>
- Ryan, J. M., & Worthington, A. K. (2021). Application of the theory of planned behavior. In A. K. Worthington (Ed.), *Persuasion theory in action: An open educational resource*. University of Alaska Anchorage. <https://ua.pressbooks.pub/persuasioneoryinaction/chapter/application-of-the-theory-of-planned-behavior/>
- Saldana, J. (2014). Coding and analysis strategies. In *The Oxford handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 581–605). Oxford Library of Psychology. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199811755.013.001>
- Sandelowski, M. (1995). Sample size in qualitative research. *Research in Nursing & Health*, 18(2), 179–183. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nur.4770180211>
- Sandelowski, M. (2000). Whatever happened to qualitative description? *Research in Nursing & Health*, 23(4), 334–340. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-240X\(200008\)23:4%3C334::AID-NUR9%3E3.0.CO;2-G](https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-240X(200008)23:4%3C334::AID-NUR9%3E3.0.CO;2-G)
- Shamsuzzaman, M., Everatt, J., & McNeill, B. (2018). Cross-linguistic Composition:: Writing Skills and Self-report Strategies of University Students in Bangladesh. *Crossings: A Journal of English Studies*, 9, 179–197. <https://doi.org/10.59817/cjes.v9i.118>
- Sögüt, S. (2024). Generative artificial Intelligence in EFL writing: A pedagogical stance of pre-service teachers and teacher trainers. *Focus on ELT Journal*, 6(1), 58–73. <https://doi.org/10.14744/felt.6.1.5>
- Sultana, S. (2014). English as a medium of instruction in Bangladesh's higher education: Empowering or disadvantaging students? *Asian EFL Journal*, 16(1), 11–52.
- Sultana, R., & Faruk, M. (2024). Does artificial intelligence increase learners' sustainability in higher education: Insights from Bangladesh. *Journal of Data, Information and Management*, 6(2), 161–172. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42488-024-00121-4>
- Tamanna, M., & Sinha, B. (2025). A conceptual analysis of artificial intelligence (AI) on academic opportunities and challenges: A case study based on higher educational institutions in Bangladesh. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 33(2), 218–236. <https://doi.org/10.1108/QAE-03-2024-0050>
- Tan, Y. S., Teo, S. W. A., Pei, Y., Sng, J. H., Yap, H. W., Toh, Y. P., & Krishna, L. K. (2018). A framework for mentoring of medical students: Thematic analysis of mentoring programmes between 2000 and 2015. *Advances in Health Sciences Education*, 23, 671–697. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10459-018-9821-6>
- UNESCO. (2021). *AI and education: Guidance for policy-makers*. UNESCO. <https://doi.org/10.54675/PCSP7350>
- Wang, W., Wang, G., & Ding, X. (2021). In B. Zhang (Ed.), *Artificial intelligence in education and teaching assessment*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-6502-8>
- Whitley, B., & Keith-Spiegel, P. (2001). Academic integrity as an institutional issue. *Ethics & Behavior*, 11(3), 325–342. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327019EB1103_9
- Woo, D. J., Wang, D., Yung, T., & Guo, K. (2024). Effects of a prompt engineering intervention on undergraduate students' AI self-efficacy, AI knowledge and prompt engineering ability: A mixed methods study. arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.07302, 1–34 <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2408.07302>
- Yeo, M. A. (2023). Academic integrity in the age of Artificial Intelligence (AI) authoring apps. *TESOL Journal*, 14(3), Article e716. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.716>
- Yusuf, A., Pervin, N., & Román-González, M. (2024). Generative AI and the future of higher education: A threat to academic integrity or reformation? Evidence from multicultural perspectives. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 21(1), 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00453-6>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0>
- Zhai, X., Chu, X., Chai, C. S., Jong, M. S. Y., Istenic, A., Spector, M., ... Li, Y. (2021). A Review of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Education from 2010 to 2020. *Complexity*, 2021(1), 8812542. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/8812542>
- Zhu, Y., Liu, Q., & Zhao, L. (2025). Exploring the impact of generative artificial intelligence on students' learning outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Education and Information Technologies*, 30(11), 16211–16239. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-025-13420-z>

Further reading

- Christou, P. A. (2022). How to use thematic analysis in qualitative research. *Journal of Qualitative Research in Tourism*, 3(2), 79–95. <https://doi.org/10.4337/jqtr.2023.0006>
- Foltýnek, T., & Dlabolová, D. (2020). Academic integrity in eastern Europe: Beyond corruption and plagiarism. In T. Bretag (Ed.), *A research agenda for academic integrity* (pp. 40–54). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781789903775.00010>
- Gasaymeh, A. M. M., Beirat, M. A., & Abu Qbeita, A. A. A. (2024). University students' insights of generative artificial intelligence (AI) writing tools. *Education Sciences*, 14(10), 1062. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsc14101062>
- Glendinning, I. (2022). Aligning academic quality and standards with academic integrity. In S. E. Eaton, G. J. Curtis, B. M. Stoesz, J. Clare, K. Rundle, & J. Seeland (Eds.), *Contract cheating in higher education* (pp. 199–218). Cham: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-12680-2_14
- Jargon, J. (2025). Students are humanizing their writing—By putting it through AI. *The Wall Street Journal*. <https://www.wsj.com/tech/personal-tech/ai-student-papers-humanize-school-6b13240a>
- Welzant, H., Schindler, L., Puls-Elvidge, S., & Crawford, L. (2011). Definitions of quality in higher education: A synthesis of the literature. *Higher Learning Research Communications*, 5(3), 3–13. <https://doi.org/10.18870/hlrc.v5i3.244>