Práxis Educativa
ISSN 1809-4031
eISSN 1809-4309
https://doi.org/10.5212/PraxEduc.v.20.24871.016

Section: Ethics, Integrity and Artificial Intelligence

Academic Integrity vs. Artificial Intelligence: a tale of two AIs

Integridade Acadêmica *versus* Inteligência Artificial: uma história de duas IAs

Integridad académica *versus* Inteligencia Artificial: una historia de dos IAs

Christophe Premat[*]
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6107-735X

Alexandra Farazouli[**]
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7601-3850

Abstract: This paper examines how academic integrity is conceptualized and practiced in Swedish higher education in the context of generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools such as ChatGPT. It offers both an institutional and a student-centered perspective, drawing on university guidelines, pedagogical resources, and disciplinary cases, alongside a phenomenographic analysis of student reflections on AI use in academic work. The empirical data, gathered from 42 students in a course on academic writing, reveal a spectrum of attitudes—ranging from full transparency to pragmatic distinctions between substantial and auxiliary uses of AI. These reflections are situated within a broader cultural framework where academic integrity is treated not as a rigid code but as a relational and adaptive practice. The text argues that Sweden's approach to academic integrity emphasizes trust, pedagogical support, and context-sensitive reasoning, rather than surveillance or prohibition. By analyzing institutional responses, cultural values, and student reasoning together, the article offers insights into how academic ethics are evolving in an era of AI-driven transformation.
Keywords: Academic integrity. Generative AI. ChatGPT. Swedish universities. Institutional policy. Phenomenography. Ethics in Higher Education.

[*] Christophe Premat is Associate Professor of French Studies at Stockholm University, with a research focus on intercultural education and academic ethics, particularly in relation to how digital technologies reshape academic integrity and educational cultures in higher education (see https://www.su.se/profiles/chpr8162-1.195186). E-mail: <christophe.premat@su.se>.

[**] Alexandra Farazouli is a Ph.D candidate at Stockholm University focusing on the ethical implications of emerging AI-driven technologies in higher education and their impact on pedagogical practices and institutional stakeholders (see https://www.su.se/profiles/alfa7899-1.543489). E-mail: <alexandra.farazouli@edu.su.se>.

Resumo: Este artigo examina como a integridade acadêmica é conceituada e praticada no Ensino Superior sueco no contexto de ferramentas generativas de Inteligência Artificial (IA), como o ChatGPT. Oferece-se uma perspectiva institucional e centrada no aluno, com base em diretrizes universitárias, recursos pedagógicos e casos disciplinares, juntamente com uma análise fenomenográfica das reflexões dos alunos sobre o uso da IA no trabalho acadêmico. Os dados empíricos, coletados de 42 estudantes em um curso de escrita acadêmica, revelam um espectro de atitudes, que vai da transparência total a distinções pragmáticas entre usos substanciais e auxiliares da IA. Essas reflexões situam-se dentro de uma estrutura cultural mais ampla, na qual a integridade acadêmica é tratada não como um código rígido, mas como uma prática relacional e adaptativa. Argumenta-se que a abordagem sueca à integridade acadêmica enfatiza a confiança, o apoio pedagógico e o raciocínio sensível ao contexto, em vez de vigilância ou proibição. Ao analisar em conjunto as respostas institucionais, os valores culturais e o raciocínio dos alunos, o texto oferece reflexões sobre como a ética acadêmica está evoluindo em uma era de transformações impulsionadas pela IA.
Palavras-chave: Integridade acadêmica. IA generativa. ChatGPT. Universidades suecas. Política institucional. Fenomenografia. Ética no Ensino Superior.

Resumen: Este artículo examina cómo se conceptualiza y practica la integridad académica en la Educación Superior sueca en el contexto de herramientas generativas de Inteligencia Artificial (IA), como ChatGPT. Se ofrece una perspectiva tanto institucional como centrada en el estudiante, basada en directrices universitarias, recursos pedagógicos y casos disciplinarios, junto con un análisis fenomenográfico de las reflexiones de los estudiantes sobre el uso de la IA en el trabajo académico. Los datos empíricos, recopilados de 42 estudiantes en un curso de escritura académica, revelan un espectro de actitudes que va desde la total transparencia hasta distinciones pragmáticas entre usos sustanciales y auxiliares de la IA. Estas reflexiones se sitúan dentro de un marco cultural más amplio, en el que la integridad académica no se trata como un código rígido, sino como una práctica relacional y adaptativa. Se argumenta que el enfoque sueco hacia la integridad académica enfatiza la confianza, el apoyo pedagógico y el razonamiento sensible al contexto, en lugar de la vigilancia o la prohibición. Al analizar en conjunto las respuestas institucionales, los valores culturales y el razonamiento de los estudiantes, el texto ofrece reflexiones sobre cómo la ética académica está evolucionando en una era de transformaciones impulsadas por la IA.
Palabras clave: Integridad académica. IA generativa. ChatGPT. Universidades suecas. Política institucional. Fenomenografía. Ética en la Educación Superior.

Introduction

Artificial Intelligence (AI) technologies have been increasingly in the spotlight with regard to what they bring to educational practices, particularly within higher education (HE) contexts. Over the past decade, research focusing on piloting AI tools and systems within and for teaching, learning, and assessment has markedly expanded (Luckin et al., 2016; Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019). Most specifically, Swiecki et al. (2022) argue that AI is reshaping assessment practices in HE by offering opportunities for personalised and scalable assessment methods, while simultaneously raising critical issues around ethics, validity, and transparency.

More recently, an outbreak of numerous Generative AI (GAI) technologies, such as AI chatbots, image generators and AI search tools, followed the public release of the first commercialised AI chatbot in late 2022, ChatGPT. This marked a turning point, igniting a vigorous debate among HE stakeholders internationally (Ooi et al., 2023). This debate focused on identifying ways to harness GAI potential benefits for educational practices (Zhou et al., 2024) while safeguarding core educational values- such as the ones related to academic integrity (Bozkurt, 2024; Wise et al., 2024). Additionally, educational research on GAI cantered around harm prevention in relation to students' learning (Ellis & Slade, 2023; Essien et al., 2024), the quality of teaching practices (Baker et al., 2024) as well as the effectiveness and validity of assessment designs and methods (Gruenhagen et al., 2024; Nikolic et al., 2024).

Regarding assessment specifically, the existing scholarly discourse can be categorized broadly into two strands. One strand critically examines the risks GAI poses to the integrity and robustness of current assessment design and methods, focusing on identifying strategies to mitigate such perceived risks (Evangelista, 2025; Farazouli et al., 2024; Francis et al., 2024). The other strand explores innovative possibilities for using GAI technologies as supportive tools for assessing student performance and facilitating feedback processes (Floden, 2024; Kinder et al., 2025). In this article, our analysis explicitly concentrates on the former perspective, deeply embedded in concerns over academic integrity.

The availability of GAI tools to education stakeholders has triggered a significant and widespread response among higher education institutions internationally. Initially, many institutions promptly issued reactive policies and guidelines aimed at addressing anticipated risks associated with GAI technologies in educational contexts (An et al., 2025; Jin et al., 2025; Perkins, 2023). Media coverage frequently portrayed students leveraging these technologies for conducting academic dishonesty, while educators participated in forums and professional discussions voicing considerable alarm regarding detection and prevention strategies (Jensen et al., 2024). Yet, it is crucial to recognize that these early responses represented only one aspect of the broader institutional reactions. Over time, several prominent institutions revised and refined their initial guidelines, some retracting their early stances in favor of more balanced and nuanced policy frameworks, while others completely replaced initial prohibitive measures with supportive guidelines encouraging informed and responsible use by both students and educators (Dabis & Csáki, 2024). Such policy transformations range from initially stringent prohibitions and bans, often lacking detailed implementation strategies (de Fine Licht, 2024), to comprehensive guidelines explicitly designed to guide and facilitate productive educational applications of GAI. In addition to examining these institutional and policy developments, this article also incorporates student perspectives by analyzing empirical data drawn from student reflections on the ethical implications of using ChatGPT in academic work. These insights provide a grounded view of how learners interpret academic integrity in an era of generative AI. As we will show, many students adopt what we refer to as a pragmatic approach—a context-sensitive form of reasoning that emphasizes practical judgment and proportionality over rigid rule-following.

In the next sections, we focus on the Swedish context, where we first present a brief overview of the first reactions to AI chatbots from several universities, and we then discuss the venues through which academic integrity is enacted. Following these, we present the empirical part of our study, and we conclude with a discussion of the findings.

The initial response to AI chatbots

Sweden has seen a growing number of cases involving the misuse of AI tools by students in academic settings. According to the 2023 report from the Swedish Higher Education Authority (2024), 27 universities reported having dealt with cases involving AI-related academic misconduct, while 7 reported having no such cases. In total, 221 cases of AI-related disciplinary issues were reported, with 82 students suspended and 26 receiving warnings. In 83 cases, no action was taken due to insufficient evidence or unclear guidelines on AI use. Additionally, 25 cases were still under investigation by the end of 2023. AI tools have been primarily used by students for generating entire or partial texts for written assignments, restructuring or improving their own text, or answering examination questions directly using tools such as ChatGPT. Detection methods have included both manual review of submissions and the use of AI detectors, which have so far proved to be unreliable. Swedish higher education institutions and educators have noted difficulties in

establishing clear boundaries between acceptable and unacceptable uses of AI tools in their contexts.

In response to these challenges, several Swedish universities have begun implementing various strategies to mitigate AI-related academic misconduct. Some institutions have developed guidelines specifying when and how AI tools may be used (Lund University of Economics and Management, 9 January 2025; Uppsala University, 19 August 2024). Additionally, some universities have transitioned from take-home exams to supervised, in-person examinations to reduce opportunities for AI-related misconduct. Stockholm University has developed sporadic guidelines for teachers, researchers, and decision-makers regarding AI chatbot usage. The university acknowledged that AI tools like ChatGPT present both opportunities and risks, emphasizing the need for careful judgment in their application. The guidelines provide examples of recommended used and undesirable uses, stating that "letting an AI chatbot write a text that is more or less unedited and submitting it as the student's own in an attempt to mislead the examiner" (Stockholm University, 2024, October 15) is equivalent to ghost-writing or plagiarism and is typically considered cheating. Students are not prohibited from using AI for tasks such as refining their writing, identifying errors, and synthesizing information—provided they "clearly explain how the AI chatbot has been used" (Stockholm University, 2024, October 15). Rather than banning AI, Stockholm University aims to support students by identifying strategies that promote transparency in its use. This approach reflects a pragmatic balance, allowing for AI integration while maintaining academic accountability. There were specific cases from Swedish universities that illustrate the complexity of addressing AI-related misconduct in higher education. First, a student at Göteborg University was suspended for six weeks after submitting an assignment that contained text largely generated by ChatGPT (Swedish Higher Education Authority, 2024: 32-35). The student claimed that the AI tool was only used for grammar correction, but upon review, it was found that ChatGPT had added additional paragraphs and citations. The court determined that this use of AI did not meet the requirement of producing independent and intellectual work, emphasizing that students must ensure their submissions reflect their own scholarly efforts. Similarly, a student from Linnaeus University faced a ten-week suspension after it was discovered that 19 out of 62 references in their thesis were fictitious (Swedish Higher Education Authority, 2024: 36-40). The references were unverifiable and covered a substantial portion of the discussion section. The court upheld the university's decision, affirming that the use of non-existent references constituted fabrication and an attempt to mislead. In another case, a student at Karlstad University was suspended for six weeks after allegedly using an AI tool during a programming exam (Swedish Higher Education Authority, 2024: 25-26). The exam included hidden instructions designed to detect AI use, which the student completed. The court found that the student's explanation of using console logs for troubleshooting was unconvincing, further affirming the university's decision. These cases illustrate the complexity of addressing AI-related misconduct in higher education. Swedish universities are increasingly adopting measures as an attempt to detect and address AI misuse, but the boundaries between legitimate assistance and academic dishonesty remain blurred. The increasing reliance on AI tools by students for various aspects of their coursework necessitates a careful re-evaluation of existing academic integrity frameworks.

Academic Integrity

Universities are often called to strike a balance between encouraging technological literacy and upholding academic standards. As the use of AI tools continues to expand among students, institutions will need to continuously update and adapt their policies to address new ethical and practical challenges. As resource to offer guidance and support university teachers to cope with the issue of plagiarism and acts of academic dishonesty, the Centre for the Advancement of University

Teaching of Stockholm University, published the handbook *Preventing Plagiarism* was published in April 2022 (Bendixen et al., 2022) to address the rise of plagiarism cases at Stockholm University. It was based upon a succession of workshops on plagiarism held with university teachers (Premat, 2022). It helped to collect testimonies and experiences coming from different fields. Its purpose was to empower teachers to help their students avoid problematic learning strategies and to provide them with practical tools and recommendations for fostering academic integrity. The handbook was designed to be a comprehensive resource for understanding plagiarism, detecting it, and implementing preventive measures through pedagogical practices. To complement the handbook, a self-study course was created in 2023 to help students avoid plagiarism and deepen their understanding of academic integrity[1]. Teachers at Stockholm University are encouraged to promote this course among their students to enhance their awareness and competence in maintaining academic standards. This course forms part of a broader institutional effort to equip both staff and students with practical tools for navigating academic integrity in the age of AI.

The emergence of ChatGPT in November 2022 brought new challenges concerning the use of AI tools in educational settings. While students increasingly seek to automate parts of their learning process, the risk arises of generating texts without adequate control or genuine understanding of the subject matter. This technological evolution prompted a revision of the handbook, resulting in a new edition published in 2024 (Bendixen et al., 2024). The updated handbook acknowledges the implications of AI tools in student work, particularly generative AI, which can produce coherent and high-quality texts that may be misused if not properly attributed (Bendixen et al., 2024: 24). The following recommendations were made on the discussion of the use of chatbots in students' learning strategies: "Integrate reflection on AI chatbots as adequate support for knowledge acquisition [...]; Design assessments that require students to draw on recent events and contextual references that AI chatbots cannot include [...]; Assess students' text carefully and provide feedback that explains the adequacies of the text" (Bendixen et al., 2024: 24-25). The recommendations provided by Bendixen et al. (2024) highlight thoughtful and practical approaches to incorporating AI chatbots into students' learning strategies. The emphasis on integrating reflection indicates a need for students to critically evaluate how chatbots contribute to knowledge acquisition, rather than relying on them passively. Furthermore, designing assessments that require engagement with recent or contextualized information serves as a strategy to push students beyond mere AI-generated content, fostering original thinking and relevance. Finally, the recommendation to carefully assess student texts and provide explicit feedback underscores the importance of guiding students in understanding both the strengths and limitations of their AI-supported learning. Together, these recommendations advocate for a balanced and reflective use of AI tools within educational settings.

The student perspectives

The dataset consists of written reflections from 42 students enrolled in a course on academic integrity within the Modern Languages program at Stockholm University. According to Article 7 of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), the students' consent was obtained orally prior to the group activity. They agreed to participate on the condition that their data would remain anonymous[2]. Their answers, totalling 2,626 words, were collected in response to the

1 https://www.su.se/centre-for-the-advancement-of-university-teaching/resources-and-support/assessing-and-grading/teaching-to-avoid-plagiarism-1.782901?open-collapse-boxes=ccbd-academicintegrityacoursemodulethathelpsstudentsavoidplagiarism

(Last visit, 31 March 2025).

2 https://gdpr-info.eu/art-7-gdpr/ (Last visit, 9 April 2025).

question: "Should I mention that I used ChatGPT to complete an academic assignment?" This question was designed to generate debate about the ethical implications of using ChatGPT in academic work, encouraging students to critically assess their own practices and reasoning related to AI-assisted learning. Their reflections were collected anonymously via the Padlet platform[3] during a seminar on academic integrity held on 6 September 2024. By this point, students had already participated in preparatory activities aimed at deepening their understanding of ethical principles surrounding academic writing and the implications of using AI tools such as ChatGPT. This preparation included reading the handbook's recommendations on plagiarism and completing a self-study course on academic integrity, which featured three instructional videos followed by a quiz. The aim was to ensure that students had a foundational understanding of academic integrity principles before engaging in the reflection exercise.

The methodological approach adopted in this study is phenomenography, which seeks to explore the range of qualitatively different ways in which participants experience or conceptualize a phenomenon (Marton, 1986). Phenomenography is particularly suitable for examining student reflections on academic integrity because it allows for the identification of variations in understanding and the categorization of these variations into descriptive categories. According to Åkerlind (2008), phenomenography is not concerned with measuring the frequency of responses but with uncovering the diversity of perspectives held by participants. This approach is commonly used in educational research to capture how learners understand complex concepts and to reveal the underlying structure of their thinking.

The reflections were analyzed through a process of thematic categorization aimed at identifying the qualitatively distinct ways in which students perceive the relationship between AI tools like ChatGPT and academic integrity. The analysis process follows the guidelines outlined by Tight (2015), involving the extraction of keywords, topics, and connotations from the students' narratives to reveal a variety of experienced worlds. Rather than imposing preconceived categories, the phenomenographic approach allows the themes to emerge from the data itself, reflecting the range of student perspectives on the ethical implications of AI use in academic work. This approach is suitable for examining how students conceptualize transparency, citation practices, and the ethical boundaries between acceptable and unacceptable uses of AI tools. The reflections reveal a spectrum of attitudes, from strict adherence to traditional academic integrity principles to more flexible or pragmatic interpretations of ethical AI use. Additionally, the study applies the principle of variation theory, as described by Wright and Osman (2018), to examine how different students approach the same phenomenon from diverse perspectives.

Since students engaged with the handbook's recommendations and completed the self-study course beforehand, it is reasonable to argue that their reflections are informed or influenced by a basic understanding of academic integrity principles. The data analysis seeks to capture not only the range of perspectives but also how these perspectives are informed by prior learning experiences. The original responses, written in Swedish, were translated into English for the purposes of this study.

Findings and Discussion

Out of the 42 students who participated in the course on academic integrity and responded to the prompt "Should I mention that I have used ChatGPT to solve an academic assignment?", 24 students (57%) answered "yes" and provided explanations supporting their viewpoint. The

[3] Since the names were not anonymized on the Padlet platform, we do not provide access to the link. The platform will be deleted, and the anonymized data will be made available in a public repository.

students consistently noted that transparency is crucial in academia, especially in acknowledging all resources that contribute to scholarly work. They often cited transparency, adherence to academic integrity, and the need to properly acknowledge tools used in the production of academic work. In fact, all the answers reflected a nuanced understanding of ChatGPT, where students did not simply accept or reject its use outright. Instead of adhering to a rigid, normative stance that categorically excludes AI tools from academic work, students expressed conditional and context-sensitive views. Their reflections indicated an effort to evaluate how, when, and to what extent the tool could be used ethically and responsibly, depending on the purpose and nature of the task. Many of them argued that since ChatGPT contributes to content generation or formulation of ideas, it should be mentioned in the references or methodology section. They compared ChatGPT to traditional sources of retrieving information and literature and suggested that its use should be disclosed to maintain credibility and avoid accusations of plagiarism. Some students clearly emphasized the importance of transparency in academic work. One student stated, "If a fundamental part of academic assignments is to achieve transparency for other academics, the use of ChatGPT should be mentioned." The student highlights the principle that academia values openness and clarity, particularly when it comes to acknowledging all sources that contribute to a scholarly work. By situating ChatGPT within the broader framework of academic transparency, the student aligns AI usage with established citation practices, suggesting that mentioning ChatGPT enhances the credibility of the work. Another student provides a pragmatic approach, distinguishing between different uses of ChatGPT: "Yes, if the text is produced by ChatGPT, but not if ChatGPT has been used to find facts (which one then verifies, just like other search engines), to correct spelling errors (just like Google Translate, Word), etc." This can be considered a pragmatic approach because it does not apply a one-size-fits-all rule to AI usage. Instead, the student makes a distinction based on the function and impact of the tool in each instance—prioritizing transparency when the tool shapes the final output, and treating it as a background aid when it plays a minimal role. Such reasoning reflects a practical orientation to academic integrity, where ethical decisions are based on context, purpose, and proportionality rather than strict formalism. The student's comparison with tools like Google Translate and Word indicates that they perceive ChatGPT as part of a continuum of digital aids that do not always require acknowledgment. More broadly, students differentiated the use of ChatGPT for substantial content generation versus its role in auxiliary tasks.

The theme of transparency, closely tied to academic integrity, is prominent throughout the reflections. One student argues, "Yes, you must do so, to ensure academic integrity, as all resources directly used in your work must be mentioned." This response emphasizes that acknowledging ChatGPT is part of maintaining honesty and integrity in academic work, particularly when it plays a direct role in producing the final product. The insistence on disclosing all resources aligns with traditional academic standards where authorship and attribution are carefully documented. Other students take a minimalist approach, suggesting that ChatGPT should not be mentioned if it is only used in a limited capacity. One student explains, "No, I think one should not use ChatGPT so much that it needs to be mentioned. If you compare it to discussing with classmates/partners/others - it can be helpful to bounce ideas in a very early stage but then one should work entirely independently." The analogy with brainstorming sessions suggests that the student views ChatGPT as a tool for generating ideas rather than contributing content that requires formal citation. Additionally, the student's statement about ChatGPT's reliability – "ChatGPT's reliability regarding sources, etc., is also questionable since it is primarily a language model" – highlights concerns about the credibility of AI-generated content.

Another student highlights the distinction between using ChatGPT as a tool versus a scientific source: "ChatGPT can be used as a so-called tool when studying, but it is not a scientific source, which means that it cannot be referenced in the bibliography." This statement reflects a widespread concern that AI tools, unlike peer-reviewed articles or primary sources, lack the

credibility required for formal citation. The student's assertion that ChatGPT should not be the primary tool for writing reinforces the idea that it should only serve a supplementary role in academic work. Some students advocate for full transparency, stating that everything contributing to the assignment should be acknowledged. This reflects a broader scepticism about the credibility of AI tools in formal academic citation, a concern echoed by several peers who viewed ChatGPT's role as primarily auxiliary. One student writes, "Everything that is not one's own thoughts should be reported so that the reader has a clear understanding of where the information comes from." This perspective suggests a comprehensive approach to academic integrity, where acknowledging AI tools is part of maintaining clarity and honesty in scholarly communication.

Others suggest that the use of ChatGPT is acceptable depending on how and to what extent it is used. A student explains, "One should only use ChatGPT when solving an academic assignment if it can be done with academic integrity. It is more advantageous as a tool than as a source in most cases." This statement reflects a broader understanding that ChatGPT can be a valuable resource if used appropriately. The student distinguishes between using ChatGPT as a tool for refining work and as a source of content, suggesting that citation is only necessary when the latter applies. Several students view ChatGPT as a secondary source rather than a primary one. One student notes, "ChatGPT becomes a form of secondary source, much like Wikipedia, and should instead be used to find a more relevant source." The comparison to Wikipedia reflects scepticism about the credibility of AI-generated content (Premat, 2020), suggesting that ChatGPT should be used primarily for preliminary research rather than cited as a reliable academic source. Another student explicitly connects transparency to academic credibility, stating, "Just as one references other sources, it is also important to cite ChatGPT if it has been used as a source (or a tool). This makes the text more credible than if it were hidden." This quote underscores the practical benefits of transparency, suggesting that acknowledging ChatGPT use is not only an ethical requirement but also a way to enhance the credibility of one's work. However, some students take a negative stance, asserting that ChatGPT should not be mentioned at all. One student argues, "I would not cite an AI bot as a source in an academic text because I do not use AI bots as a source for specific knowledge. Instead, ChatGPT can be used as a search engine or a learning tool." This perspective highlights a common concern that AI tools are not credible enough to be formally acknowledged, particularly when their output is not verifiable.

Overall, the diversity of responses illustrates varying levels of awareness and understanding of academic integrity principles, as well as different interpretations of how AI tools fit within established citation practices. While a majority of students advocate for transparency and acknowledgement of AI usage, a significant proportion see it as voluntary or unnecessary depending on the nature of the AI's contribution. This spectrum of opinions underscores the need for clearer institutional guidelines and educational efforts to help students navigate the ethical implications of AI-assisted learning.

Conclusion: Towards a Pragmatic Ethic of AI Use

The findings show that most students in the study support disclosing the use of ChatGPT when it contributes directly to academic work, particularly in generating content or formulating ideas. However, many also adopt a pragmatic stance, reserving citation for cases where the tool plays a substantial role, while likening minor uses—such as proofreading or brainstorming—to tools like Google or Grammarly. This spectrum of perspectives reflects a context-sensitive approach within Swedish academic culture, where students apply practical reasoning rather than strict rule-following. Their responses suggest that ethical decision-making around AI is shaped both by institutional messaging and prior learning, such as handbooks and self-study courses. In this

sense, students' thinking mirrors evolving university guidelines that emphasize transparency and responsibility over prohibition. Rather than viewing academic integrity as a rigid code, students increasingly frame it as a relational, adaptive practice—one that requires discernment based on context, purpose, and proportionality. This emerging pragmatism highlights the need for nuanced policies that align with how students actually engage with AI. Instead of policing, institutions are called to cultivate ethical reflexivity through pedagogical tools and trust-based frameworks. As generative technologies become further embedded in academic life, integrity must evolve into an ethos of responsible innovation—rooted in guidance, not surveillance.

Limitations and future research

While the study offers valuable insights into students' reasoning about academic integrity in the age of generative AI, it has some limitations. First, the dataset is based on a relatively small group of 42 students enrolled in a single academic program at one Swedish university. Although the phenomenographic approach aims to explore variation in perception rather than representativeness, this context-specific focus limits the generalizability of the findings. Second, the reflections were collected during a structured seminar following prior exposure to institutional materials, which may have influenced student responses toward more normative or expected views. Additionally, since the data were collected in Swedish and translated into English, subtle nuances in students' phrasing may have been affected in the translation process. Future research could explore similar questions across diverse disciplines, universities, and cultural contexts, ideally combining student, teacher, and policy-maker perspectives. Longitudinal studies could also trace how student attitudes evolve as institutional policies and AI technologies continue to develop in Sweden.

References

An, Y., Yu, J. H., & James, S. (2025). Investigating the higher education institutions' guidelines and policies regarding the use of generative AI in teaching, learning, research, and administration. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *22*(1), 10. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-025-00507-3

Baker, C., Ghassemi, E., & Bowers, R. (2024). Student perceptions of generative artificial intelligence in didactic patient presentations. In *PHARMACY EDUCATION* (Vol. 24, Issue 1, pp. 590–597). INTERNATIONAL PHARMACEUTICAL FEDERATION. https://doi.org/10.46542/pe.2024.241.590597

Bendixen, C., Gunnerstad, A., Premat, C. (2022). *Preventing plagiarism*. Stockholm University. Report. https://doi.org/10.17045/sthlmuni.19664247.v2

Bendixen, C., Premat, C., Gunnerstad, A., Farazouli, A. (2024). *Preventing plagiarism Handbook for Stockholm University staff*. Second edition. Stockholm University. Educational resource. https://doi.org/10.17045/sthlmuni.27826344.v1

Bozkurt, A. (2024). GenAI et al.: Cocreation, Authorship, Ownership, Academic Ethics and Integrity in a Time of Generative AI. In *OPEN PRAXIS* (Vol. 16, Issue 1, pp. 1–10). INT COUNCIL OPEN & DISTANCE EDUCATION. https://doi.org/10.55982/openpraxis.16.1.654

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

de Fine Licht, K. (2024). Generative Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education: Why the "Banning Approach" to Student use is Sometimes Morally Justified. *Philosophy & Technology*, *37*(3), 113. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-024-00799-9

Ellis, A. R., & Slade, E. (2023). A New Era of Learning: Considerations for ChatGPT as a Tool to Enhance Statistics and Data Science Education. In *JOURNAL OF STATISTICS AND DATA SCIENCE EDUCATION* (Vol. 31, Issue 2, pp. 128–133). ROUTLEDGE JOURNALS, TAYLOR & FRANCIS LTD. https://doi.org/10.1080/26939169.2023.2223609

Essien, A., Bukoye, O. T., O'Dea, X., & Kremantzis, M. (2024). The influence of AI text generators on critical thinking skills in UK business schools. *Studies in Higher Education*, *49*(5), 865–882. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2024.2316881

Evangelista, E. D. L. (2025). Ensuring academic integrity in the age of ChatGPT: Rethinking exam design, assessment strategies, and ethical AI policies in higher education. *Contemporary Educational Technology*, *17*(1), ep559. https://doi.org/10.30935/cedtech/15775

Farazouli, A., Cerratto-Pargman, T., Bolander-Laksov, K., & McGrath, C. (2024). Hello GPT! Goodbye home examination? An exploratory study of AI chatbots impact on university teachers' assessment practices. In *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education* (Vol. 49, Issue 3, pp. 363–375). https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2023.2241676

Floden, J. (2024). Grading exams using large language models: A comparison between human and AI grading of exams in higher education using ChatGPT. In *BRITISH EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH JOURNAL*. WILEY. https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.4069

Francis, N. J., Jones, S., & Smith, D. P. (2024). Generative AI in Higher Education: Balancing Innovation and Integrity. *British Journal of Biomedical Science*, *81*, 14048. https://doi.org/10.3389/bjbs.2024.14048

Gruenhagen, J. H., Sinclair, P. M., Carroll, J.-A., Baker, P. R. A., Wilson, A., & Demant, D. (2024). The rapid rise of generative AI and its implications for academic integrity: Students' perceptions and use of chatbots for assistance with assessments. In *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence* (Vol. 7). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100273

Jensen, L. X., Buhl, A., Sharma, A., & Bearman, M. (2024). Generative AI and higher education: A review of claims from the first months of ChatGPT. *Higher Education*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-024-01265-3

Jin, Y., Yan, L., Echeverria, V., Gašević, D., & Martinez-Maldonado, R. (2025). Generative AI in higher education: A global perspective of institutional adoption policies and guidelines. In *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence* (Vol. 8). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100348

Kinder, A., Briese, F. J., Jacobs, M., Dern, N., Glodny, N., Jacobs, S., & Leßmann, S. (2025). Effects of adaptive feedback generated by a large language model: A case study in teacher education. In *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence* (Vol. 8). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100349

Luckin, R., Holmes, W., Griffiths, M., & Forcier, L. B. (2016). Intelligence Unleashed: An argument for AI in Education. In *UCL Knowledge Lab: London, UK*. [Report]. UCL Knowledge Lab.

https://www.pearson.com/content/dam/corporate/global/pearson-dot-com/files/innovation/Intelligence-Unleashed-Publication.pdf

Lund University School of Economics and Management (9 January 2025). Recommendations for mandatory information regarding student use of generative artificial intelligence. Retrieved from https://www.lusem.lu.se/internal/support-and-resources/digital-tools/what-about-ai/ai-related-recommendations-lusem/recommendations-mandatory-information-regarding-student-use-generative-artificial-intelligence

Marton, F. (1986). *Phenomenography: A research approach to investigating different understandings*. Journal of Thought, 21(3), 28–49.

Nikolic, S., Sandison, C., Haque, R., Daniel, S., Grundy, S., Belkina, M., Lyden, S., Hassan, G. M., & Neal, P. (2024). ChatGPT, Copilot, Gemini, SciSpace and Wolfram versus higher education assessments: An updated multi-institutional study of the academic integrity impacts of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) on assessment, teaching and learning in engineering. In *Australasian Journal of Engineering Education* (Vol. 29, Issue 2, pp. 126–153). https://doi.org/10.1080/22054952.2024.2372154

Ooi, K.-B., Tan, G. W.-H., Al-Emran, M., Al-Sharafi, M. A., Capatina, A., Chakraborty, A., Dwivedi, Y. K., Huang, T.-L., Kar, A. K., Lee, V.-H., Loh, X.-M., Micu, A., Mikalef, P., Mogaji, E., Pandey, N., Raman, R., Rana, N. P., Sarker, P., Sharma, A., … Wong, L.-W. (2023). The Potential of Generative Artificial Intelligence Across Disciplines: Perspectives and Future Directions. *Journal of Computer Information Systems*, *0*(0), 1–32. https://doi.org/10.1080/08874417.2023.2261010

Perkins, M. (2023). Academic Integrity Considerations of AI Large Language Models in the Post-Pandemic Era: ChatGPT and Beyond. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice*, *20*(2). https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1382355

Premat, C. E. (2020). Wikipedia Practices, Quick Facts, and Plagiarism in Higher Education. In E. Ezza, & T. Drid (Eds.), *Teaching Academic Writing as a Discipline-Specific Skill in Higher Education* (pp. 199-221). Hershey, PA: IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-2265-3.ch009

Stockholm University (2024, October 15). *Guidelines on using AI-powered chatbots in education and research.* Retrieved from https://medarbetare.su.se/en/our-su/communicate-su/communication-support/guidelines-on-using-ai-powered-chatbots-in-education-and-research

Swedish Higher Education Authority (2024). *Disciplinärenden 2023 vid universitet och högskolor, Rapport 2024:4*. Universitetskanslersämbetet. https://www.uka.se/

Swiecki, Z., Khosravi, H., Chen, G., Martinez-Maldonado, R., Lodge, J. M., Milligan, S., Selwyn, N., & Gašević, D. (2022). Assessment in the age of artificial intelligence. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *3*, 100075. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2022.100075

Tight, M. (2015). Phenomenography: the development and application of an innovative research design in higher education research. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, *19*(3), 319–338. https://doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2015.1010284

Uppsala University (19 August 2024). Using AI in Examinations. Retrieved from https://www.uu.se/en/staff/gateway/teaching/ai-in-teaching-and-learning/generative-ai-and-assessment/using-ai-in-examinations

Wise, B., Emerson, L., Van Luyn, A., Dyson, B., Bjork, C., & Thomas, S. E. (2024). A scholarly dialogue: Writing scholarship, authorship, academic integrity and the challenges of AI. In *HIGHER EDUCATION RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT* (Vol. 43, Issues 3, SI, pp. 578–590). ROUTLEDGE JOURNALS, TAYLOR & FRANCIS LTD. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2023.2280195

Wright, E., & Osman, R. (2018). *What is critical for transforming higher education? The transformative potential of pedagogical framework of phenomenography and variation theory of learning for higher education*. Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment, 28(3), 257–270. https://doi.org/10.1080/10911359.2017.1419898

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), 39. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0

Zhou, X., Teng, D., & Al-Samarraie, H. (2024). The Mediating Role of Generative AI Self-Regulation on Students' Critical Thinking and Problem-Solving. In *EDUCATION SCIENCES* (Vol. 14, Issue 12). MDPI. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14121302

Åkerlind, G. S. (2008). *A phenomenographic approach to developing academics' understanding of the nature of teaching and learning*. Teaching in Higher Education, 13(6). https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510802452350

Received: 02/02/2025
Accepted: 15/04/2025
Published online: 22/04/2025