ACADEMIC SCIENCE PRESS

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION AND PHILOLOGICAL SCIENCES
ISSN: 3143-6218

Administrative Strategies for Regulating the Use of Artificial Intelligence to Promote Academic Integrity among Students in Rivers State Universities

Boma-Iyaye, Joy [1] Wey-Amaewhule, B [1]

[1] Department of Educational Management, Faculty of Education, Rivers State University, Port-Harcourt
* Corresponding authors' email: boma-iyaye.joy@rsu.edu.ng

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:
Administrative,
Strategies,
Regulating,
Artificial Intelligence,
Academic Integrity.

Vol.01, **No**.04, 2026

https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22688826

Copyright © 2026 by author(s) and Scientific Research Publishing Inc. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CCBY4.0).

http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/
Open Access

ABSTRACT

The study examined "administrative strategies for regulating the use of artificial intelligence to promote academic integrity among students in Rivers State Universities". The study was guided by three specific objectives, three research questions and three null hypotheses. The study adopted a descriptive survey research design and was carried out in Rivers State. The population of this study was 4,063 comprising 3,833 lecturers and 230 administrators in the two universities in Rivers State. The sample size of the study was 443 which comprises 351 lecturers and 92 administrators selected using proportionate stratified random sampling technique and cluster sampling technique. A self-structured questionnaire titled "Administrative Strategies for Regulating the Use of Artificial Intelligence to Promote Academic Integrity among Students Questionnaire" was used for data collection for the study. To ensure the validity of the research instrument, the questionnaire was subjected to face and content validation. The research instrument was subjected to reliability test using Cronbach Alpha method which gave an overall reliability index of 0.84 for the three clusters in the instrument. Mean and standard deviation were used to answer the research questions. To test the formulated null hypotheses, the z-test statistical technique was employed at the 0.05 level of significance. The study revealed that policy development, supervisory strategies and capacity development of staff can regulate the use of artificial intelligence to a high extent, thereby promoting academic integrity among students. Based on the findings of the study, it was recommended that university management should formulate and disseminate a comprehensive, institution-wide artificial intelligence policy that clearly defines acceptable and unacceptable use of artificial intelligence tools in teaching, learning and assessment rather than allowing individual, faculties or departments to develop fragmented and inconsistent guidelines.

Introduction

Education has been described by scholars as a veritable instrument for human development which in turn contributes in transforming the nation and the world from Dark Age to a digital world. The Nigerian system of education has made so much impact on human development irrespective of the controversies surrounding the system. The system is designed to develop manpower in different areas of specialization that will help in all round development of the country. Meanwhile, there is a paradigm shift in Nigerian educational system, whereby different technologies are introduced to enhance the system. Alonsode-Castro and García-Penalvo (2022) asserted that the global advancement of technology has influenced people's ways of living, cutting across employment, health, education and training and that these effects can be both positive and harmful. One of the technologies that is recently dominating the educational system is Artificial Intelligence (AI).

Artificial intelligence (AI) is a broad field encompassing various technologies that have been developed in recent years to enable machines to perform tasks that traditionally requires human intelligence (Ergen, 2019). These tasks include perceiving, reasoning, learning, and interacting. Similarly, Hui (2020) described artificial intelligence as computer systems capable of performing tasks that typically require human intelligence, such as reasoning, learning, problem-solving, and decision making. AI is a rapidly evolving technology designed to imitate human cognitive abilities, enabling them

to handle complex and ill-defined problems in an intentional, intelligent, and adaptive manner (Venture, & Lopez, 2024).

The recent outburst of the use of artificial intelligence has revealed the potentials embedded in its application. According to Njoku and Wey-Amaewhule (2025) artificial intelligence can augment human capabilities, enabling scientists, engineers, mathematicians and others to solve complex problems more effectively and drive innovation. AI powered tools and applications are now being used in many industries, including education, to enhance the quality of services provided to students and teachers (Wey-Amaewhule & Mohammed, 2026). The integration of AI in education has introduced dynamic changes, shifting from traditional, teacher-centered methods to more interactive and student-focused approaches. Technologies such as Augmented Reality (AR), Virtual Reality (VR), and AI-driven platforms enhance engagement by providing immersive and adaptive learning experiences. AI systems can analyze vast amounts of data to identify learning patterns, recommend tailored resources, and predict academic success, thereby improving decision-making in educational management (Nwile, et al., 2025).

Despite AI's growing presence in universities, research evidence shows that students seemed to differ in their efficiency in leveraging those tools to learn, with some knowing how to retrieve useful information from them and employ them to engage in meaningful and deep learning. Whereas others tends to adopt AI output uncritically and utilize them as learning shortcuts (Abdelhalim, 2024). According to Muhammad et al (2024), students over dependent on AI-based education limits their critical abilities including thinking, logic, and memory which is a big drawback. In other words, students will be depending too much on machines which can hinder their learning and making full use of their potential. Such means of using artificial intelligence tend to compromise academic integrity which in turn affect the rate of students' academic accomplishments (Abdelhalim, 2024).

Academic integrity is the most important thing in realizing educational goals. Academic integrity is the cornerstone of ethical academic practice and is premised on a set of values most commonly described by the International Center for Academic Integrity (ICAI) as honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility (ICAI, 1999 a cited in Bretag, 2020). Academic integrity is basic guiding principle for all academic activity, allowing the pursuit of academic activities in an open, honest, and responsible manner (Kezar, 2000). From the foregoing, academic integrity could be described as a commitment to academic values that are manifested in behaviors, namely honesty, trust, justice, respect and responsibility in carrying out academic demands.

The rise in the engagement of artificial intelligence in academic activities by students has become issue of concern as pertaining the assurance of academic integrity. The increasing accessibility of AI tools for generating essays, solving complex problems, and completing assignments has created new ethical dilemmas within educational institutions. While these technologies offer opportunities to enhance learning and productivity, they also raise questions about originality, authorship, and the authenticity of students submitted work (Oliver, 2023). In many cases, educators find it increasingly difficult to distinguish between independently produced academic efforts and AI assisted outputs. This situation challenges long established standards of honesty, fairness, and accountability in education (Zhai, 2022). Consequently, institutions are compelled to reconsider regulatory means such as assessment methods, develop clearer policies on acceptable AI use, and promote a culture that balances technological innovation with the preservation of academic integrity.

One of the regulatory systems of artificial intelligence in tertiary institution is the development of usage policy. AI usage policy could be expressed as a guide that directs the behaviour of a people towards the use of artificial intelligence. Since the use of artificial intelligence in academic activities has become widespread among students, which questions the integrity of academic achievement. It is necessary that administrators of higher institutions need to develop ethics and policies that guides the use of artificial intelligence in academic activities. UNESCO (2025) recommended few policies which could help monitor the use of artificial intelligence in education, these include among others that set out cross-cutting strategic objectives, and plan regulations and programmes, to ensure the equitable and inclusive use of AI in education, leverage AI to boost and upgrade education management and delivery, cultivate learner-centred use of AI to enhance learning and assessment among others. The organization proposed that universities and schools should develop written policies that define what constitutes acceptable and unacceptable AI use. For example, using AI to brainstorm ideas may be permitted, but submitting AI

generated essays as original work may be classified as academic misconduct. These policies should balance innovation with accountability, promote transparency, and foster academic values (Selwyn, 2023).

Perhaps, academic integrity in AI era will not be fully achieved in tertiary institutions when lecturers are effectively trained in artificial intelligence. Despite the increasing use of AI tools in universities, there seems to be limited awareness among lecturers about the legal implications of these technologies especially concerning the Copyright and Neighboring Rights Act of 1999, which governs intellectual property protection. This legislation grants rights exclusively to works created by natural persons, meaning AI-generated content falls into a legal grey area. As educators are expected to guide students in ethical and lawful academic practices, a lack of clarity about copyright ownership, fair use, and authorship in relation to AI-generated content requires capacity building in artificial intelligence (Dimitrova, 2023).

The rise in the use of artificial intelligence in academic activities calls for intervention in students' supervisory techniques used in tertiary institution. Supervisory strategies for AI use among students involve shifting from mere detection to process-oriented supervision. This strategy requires transparency and process tracking of students in their academic work. According to Nguyen and Goto (2024), some of the strategies of supervision that may be adopted include mandating that students submit their AI interaction logs, chat transcripts, or "reflection statements" detailing how they utilized AI for brainstorming, outlining, or editing. Also, research project supervision has never been a passive responsibility, but the advent of AI has expanded the role significantly. Supervision is now beyond the final written document and closer attention to the research process itself. Without this oversight, AI-generated content can easily mask gaps in student understanding. Due to the increasing use of AI in research process, effective supervision today requires: ongoing engagement at every stage of the project, instead of reviewing only final drafts, targeted questioning that confirms a student can defend the concepts presented, guidance on appropriate AI use, emphasizing transparency, verification, and critical thinking, monitoring of writing style consistency, since sudden shifts in tone often indicate unprocessed AI-generated input (Wey-Amaewhule & Eberechi, 2024) The objective is not to eliminate AI from research but to ensure that it supports, rather than replaces, the student's intellectual involvement (Yeo, 2023).

It is also crucial to strike the balance between utilizing of AI tools and traditional teaching methods and ensure that students have a positive impact on their overall development are reinforcing their creativity, critical thinking, foundational and social skills. With the increase in AI usage by students coupled with the problems associated with it as regards academic integrity which is a major aim of education, it is necessary to investigate administrative strategies for regulating AI usage amongst students. It is against this backdrop the researcher deemed it fit to investigate if some administrative strategies found to be appropriate in regulating the use of artificial intelligence students for promoting academic integrity in Rivers State Universities.

Statement of the Problem

In recent months, there has been a growing concern in the academic settings about the use of text generative artificial intelligence (AI), such as ChatGPT, Bing and the latest, Co-Pilot integrated within the Microsoft Office suite. One of the main concerns not only in Rivers State University but also in other tertiary institutions in Nigeria is that students use generative AI tools to cheat or plagiarize their written assignments, projects, thesis and exams. In fact, a recent survey of university students found that nearly one in three students had used a form of AI, such as essay-generating software, to complete their coursework (Olomu & Ariyibi, 2026). This problem has continued to reduce academic standards by altering students learning outcome. If this concern is not addressed in Nigerian Universities, academic integrity violations such as plagiarism, cheating, contract cheating, fabrication and falsification of data, and misuse of artificial intelligence tools will continue to be reported among students. It is this backdrop that informs a study of this nature.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to examine administrative strategies for regulating the use of artificial intelligence to promote academic integrity among Students in Rivers State Universities. In specific terms, the study sought to;

1. Determine the extent to which AI usage policy regulates the use of artificial intelligence to promote academic integrity in Rivers State universities;
2. **Assess the extent to which adoption of** supervisory strategies regulate the use of artificial intelligence to promote academic integrity in Rivers State universities;
3. **Examine the extent to which** capacity building for academic staff regulates the use of artificial intelligence to promote academic integrity in Rivers State universities;

Research Questions

The following research questions guided the study

1. To what extent AI use policies regulate the use of artificial intelligence to promote academic integrity in Rivers State universities?
2. To what extent do adoption of supervisory strategies regulate the use of artificial intelligence to promote academic integrity in Rivers State universities?
3. To what extent does capacity building for academic staff regulates the use of artificial intelligence to promote academic integrity in Rivers State universities?

Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were tested at .05 level of significance;

1. There is no significant difference between the mean responses of administrators and lecturers on the extent to which AI use policies regulate the use of artificial intelligence to promote academic integrity in Rivers State universities
2. There is no significant difference between the mean responses of administrators and lecturers on the extent to which adoption of supervisory strategies regulate the use of artificial intelligence to promote academic integrity in Rivers State universities
3. There is no significant difference between the mean responses of administrators and lecturers on the extent to which capacity building for academic staff regulates the use of artificial intelligence to promote academic integrity in Rivers State universities

Methodology

This study adopted a descriptive survey research design. This design is considered suitable for the study as it helps obtain, organise and interpret primary data so as to gain meaningful insight to a phenomenon. According to Manjunatha (2019) descriptive research design is defined as a research method aimed at casting light on current issues or problems through a process of data collection that enables researcher to describe the situation more completely than was possible. The study was carried out in Rivers State. There is adequate representation of tertiary institution in the study area, hence the suitability of the study. The population of this study consisted of all lecturers and principal administrators in the two universities in Rivers State. Hence, the total population of the study was 4,063 comprising 3,833 lecturers and 230 administrators in the two universities in Rivers State (**Bursary Records, 2025).** The sample size of the study was 443 which comprises 351 lecturers and 92 administrators. Based on the large population of the study, Krejcie and Morgan (1970) sample size determination table was used to obtain a minimum sample size of 351 for the lecturers. Proportionate Stratified random sampling technique was used to select 190 lecturers from Rivers state University and 161 lecturers from Ignatius Ajuru University of Education. Cluster sampling technique was adopted to select lecturers across each faculties and departments in the institutions involved in the study. For the administrators, the researcher engaged only 40 percent of the population in the study. Hence, 92 administrators, 60 from RSU and 32 from IAUE were selected to participate in the study.

A self-structured questionnaire titled "Administrative Strategies for Regulating the Use of Artificial Intelligence to Promote Academic Integrity among Students Questionnaire (ASRUAIPAIASQ) was used for data collection in the study. The questionnaire was designed in four-point rating scale of Very High Extent, High Extent, Low Extent and Very Low Extent with corresponding values of 4, 3, 2, and 1 respectively. To ensure the validity of the research instrument, the questionnaire was subjected to face and content validation by three experts in Educational Management and Measurement and Evaluation. The research instrument was subjected to reliability test using Cronbach Alpha reliability which 0.78, 0.81, and 0.92. At the end of the administration exercise, 443 copies of the instrument were administered, however only 401 copies were retrieved comprising 325 responses from lecturers and 76 responses from administrators representing 90.5 percent of the sample

size. Mean and standard deviation were used to answer the research questions. The mean was used to determine the average response of the respondents on each item, while the standard deviation indicates the degree of variation or dispersion in the respondents' responses. For decision making, items with a mean value of 2.50 and above were regarded as "High Extent," whereas items with mean values below 2.50 were considered "Low Extent." To test the formulated null hypotheses, the z-test statistical technique was employed at the 0.05 level of significance. The use of the z-test is considered appropriate for this study because it is suitable for comparing sample means or proportions with a known population parameter, particularly when the sample size is greater than thirty. The hypotheses were tested using the following decision rule; null hypothesis was accepted if the calculated z-value is less than the critical z-value or when the p-value is greater than the 0.05 level of significance (z-cal < z-crit or p-value > 0.05) and vice versa.

Result

Research Question 1: To what extent do AI use policies regulate the use of artificial intelligence to promote academic integrity in Rivers State universities?

Table 1: Mean Responses on the Extent AI Use Policies Regulate the Use of Artificial Intelligence to Promote Academic Integrity

		Lecturers (n) = 325			Administrators(n)= 76			
S/N	**Item**	**Mean ($\bar{x}_1$)**	**SD_1**	**Rmk**	**Mean ($\bar{x}_2$)**	**SD_2**	**Rmk**	**$\frac{\bar{x}_1 + \bar{x}_2}{2}$**
1	Clear consequences outlined in AI ethical policies deter students from submitting dishonest academic work.	2.85	0.96	HE	3.11	0.95	HE	2.98
2	Institutional policies that hold students accountable for AI misuse strengthen academic integrity in assessments.	2.95	0.97	HE	2.75	0.90	HE	2.85
3	Ethical policies that protect students' academic data discourage irresponsible use of AI tools in assignments.	2.87	0.95	HE	2.96	0.97	HE	2.92
4	Policies that regulate AI tool usage ensure fairness and equal academic standards among all students.	2.92	0.90	HE	3.16	0.85	HE	3.04
5	Guidelines that restrict the sharing of confidential academic work with AI platforms promote responsible student conduct.	2.89	0.96	HE	2.96	1.05	HE	2.93
6	Policies that regulate AI tool usage ensure fairness and equal academic standards among all students.	3.00	0.90	HE	2.93	0.98	HE	2.97
7	Ethical guidelines that control AI access prevent unfair academic advantages among students during assessments.	2.82	0.99	HE	2.86	0.9	HE	2.84
8	Institutions that enforce originality policies reduce the tendency of students to misuse AI tools in assignments	2.84	0.95	HE	2.82	1.03	HE	2.83
9	Policies that prohibit students from submitting fully AI-generated content as their own protect academic originality.	2.87	1.00	HE	2.89	0.96	HE	2.88

10	Institutional policies that require students to acknowledge AI assistance reduce dishonest academic practices.	2.85	0.96	HE	2.96	0.86	HE	2.91
	Grand Mean	**2.89**			**2.94**			

Source: Field Survey, 2026

Table 1 presents the mean responses of lecturers and administrators on the extent administrative policy strategies regulate the use of artificial intelligence to promote academic integrity in state-owned universities in Rivers State. From the responses of lecturers, the mean values for item 1-10 include 2.85, 2.95, 2.87, 2.92, 2.89, 3.00, 2.82, 2.84, 2.87, and 2.85 respectively. The responses from administrators on item 1-10 showed the mean values of 3.11, 2.75, 2.96, 3.16, 2.96, 2.93, 2.86, 2.82, 2.89 and 2.96. The mean values obtained from both categories of respondents were all greater than the criterion mean of 2.50, which shows that majority of the respondents indicated "High Extent" to all the items posed in table 1. The grand mean values of 2.89 and 2.94 jointly confirmed that both lecturers and university administrators have similar opinion on the extent AI use policy regulate the use of artificial intelligence to promote academic integrity. The values of the standard deviation show how deviated the responses are to the mean value.

Research Question 2: To what extent do adoption of supervisory strategies regulate the use of artificial intelligence to promote academic integrity in Rivers State universities?

Table 2: Mean Responses on the Extent Adoption of Supervisory Strategies Regulate the use of Artificial Intelligence Promote Academic Integrity

		Lecturers = 325			**Administrators = 76**			
S/N	**Item**	**Mean ($\bar{x}_1$)**	**SD_1**	**Rmk**	**Mean ($\bar{x}_2$)**	**SD_2**	**Rmk**	**$\frac{\bar{x}_1 + \bar{x}_2}{2}$**
11	University administrators mandate a regularly monitoring of students' use of artificial intelligence tools in academic activities	2.78	0.91	HE	3.01	0.9	HE	2.90
12	University management collaborates with lecturers to monitor and discourage unethical use of artificial intelligence tools.	2.90	0.93	HE	2.96	0.9	HE	2.93
13	Faculties and departments conduct routine checks to ensure compliance with regulations governing artificial intelligence use.	2.91	0.97	HE	2.89	0.86	HE	2.90
14	Heads of departments and faculty administrators supervise compliance with institutional guidelines on the use of artificial intelligence.	2.92	0.94	HE	2.89	1.04	HE	2.91
15	Academic staff are required to scrutinize assignments and projects for evidence of inappropriate use of artificial intelligence.	2.89	0.94	HE	2.75	0.93	HE	2.82
16	Supervisory mechanisms are in place to detect AI-assisted plagiarism and academic dishonesty among students.	2.86	0.97	HE	3.05	0.81	HE	2.96

17	University administrators periodically review academic work to ensure adherence to ethical standards regarding artificial intelligence use.	2.92	0.87	HE	2.88	0.85	HE	2.90
18	Supervisors provide timely feedback to students on the acceptable use of artificial intelligence in learning activities.	2.83	0.97	HE	2.83	0.96	HE	2.83
20	Faculties and departments conduct routine checks to ensure compliance with regulations governing artificial intelligence use.	2.89	0.96	HE	2.87	0.88	HE	2.88
	Grand Mean	**2.88**			**2.90**			

Source: Field Survey, 2026

Table 2 displays the mean responses of lecturers and administrators on the extent administrative supervisory strategies regulate the use of artificial intelligence promote academic integrity in state-owned universities in Rivers State. Data gathered from lecturers on item 11-20 of research question two have the mean responses of 2.78, 2.90, 2.91, 2.92, 2.89, 2.86, 2.92, 2.83, 2.94, and 2.89. While the mean responses from administrators on item 21-30 are 3.01, 2.96, 2.89, 2.89, 2.75, 3.05, 2.88, 2.83, 2.89 and 2.87. Mean values from both categories of respondents are higher than the criterion mean which shows that majority of the respondents indicate "High Extent" on item 11-20 posed in research question two. The grand mean values of 2.88 and 2.90 further revealed that all the items stated in table 2 aligns with the opinion of the respondents. The standard deviation values revealed how distant each of the responses are to the mean.

Research Question 3: To what extent does capacity building for academic staff regulates the use of artificial intelligence to promote academic integrity in Rivers State universities?

Table 3: Mean Responses on the Extent Capacity Building for Academic Staff Regulate the use of Artificial Intelligence to Promote Academic Integrity

		Lecturers = 325			**Administrators =76**			
S/N	**Item**	**Mean ($\bar{x}_1$)**	**SD_1**	**Rmk**	**Mean ($\bar{x}_2$)**	**SD_2**	**Rmk**	**$\frac{\bar{x}_1 + \bar{x}_2}{2}$**
21	Regular training of lecturers on AI tools reduces incidents of academic misconduct among students.	2.88	0.94	HE	2.79	1.04	HE	2.84
22	Lecturers who receive AI training provide clearer instructions that guide students toward honest academic conduct.	2.79	0.94	HE	2.74	1.01	HE	2.77
23	Continuous capacity development programs equip lecturers to effectively enforce academic integrity policies on AI use.	2.82	0.95	HE	2.88	0.85	HE	2.85
24	Lecturers with strong AI skills are better equipped to identify AI-generated content in student submissions.	2.89	0.92	HE	2.86	0.9	HE	2.88
25	Workshops on AI tools improve lecturers' ability to detect and address AI misuse in academic assignments.	2.86	0.91	HE	2.88	0.92	HE	2.87

26	Lecturers' digital competence in AI strengthens institutional control over dishonest academic practices among students.	2.88	0.97	HE	2.88	0.99	HE	2.88
27	AI training helps lecturers design assessments that uphold academic integrity and minimize student reliance on AI tools.	2.91	0.92	HE	2.89	0.86	HE	2.90
28	Lecturers knowledgeable in AI develop assignment tasks that encourage original and independent student work.	2.91	0.96	HE	2.93	1.00	HE	2.92
29	AI awareness among lecturers discourages students from engaging in unethical academic practices in assignments.	2.9	0.87	HE	2.89	0.95	HE	2.90
30	Skilled lecturers who understand AI tools discourage students from misusing them for dishonest academic gain.	2.83	0.96	HE	2.92	0.99	HE	2.88
	Grand Mean	**2.87**			**2.87**			

Source: Field Survey, 2026

Table 3 shows the mean response of lecturers and administrators on the extent administrative capacity development strategies regulate the use of artificial intelligence to promote academic integrity in state-owned universities in Rivers State. From the table, it is revealed that the responses from lecturers on each of the items displayed was 2.88, 2.79, 2.82, 2.89, 2.86, 2.88, 2.91, 2.91, 2.90, and 2.83 for item 21-30 whereas the responses for university administrators on item 21-30 has mean values of 2.79, 2.74, 2.88, 2.86, 2.88, 2.88, 2.89, 2.93, 2.89 and 2.92 respectively. All the mean responses are higher than the criterion mean values indicating that majority of the respondents agreed that to a high extent capacity development strategies would regulate the use of artificial intelligence to promote academic integrity in state-owned universities in Rivers State. The grand mean values of 2.87 for both categories further affirmed that majority of the items has mean values higher than the criterion mean.

Test of Hypotheses

H_{01}: There is no significant difference between the mean responses of administrators and lecturers on the extent do AI use policies regulate the use of artificial intelligence to promote academic integrity in Rivers State universities

Table 4: z-test Analysis on Extent AI Use Policy Regulate the Use of Artificial Intelligence to Promote Academic Integrity

Respondents	N	Mean	S.D.	df	α	z-cal	z-crit	Remark
Lecturers	325	2.89	0.95					
				399	0.05	0.410	1.96	Failed to Reject
Administrators	76	2.94	0.95					

Source: Research Data, 2026

Table 4 shows z-test analysis on lecturers' and administrators' responses on the extent AI use policy regulate the use of artificial intelligence promote academic integrity in state-owned universities in Rivers State. With 399 degrees of freedom, and 0.05 level of significance the z-critical value obtained was 1.96. The z-test analysis between the means of the two categories of responses gave z-calculated value of 0.410. Since the z-critical of 1.96 is less than the z-cal (0.410), the null hypotheses, failed to reject. This indicates that there is no significant difference between the mean responses of administrators and lecturers on the extent AI use policy regulates the use of artificial intelligence to promote academic integrity in state-owned universities in Rivers State.

H_{02}: There is no significant difference between the mean responses of administrators and lecturers on the extent supervisory strategies regulate the use of artificial intelligence to promote academic integrity in state-owned universities in Rivers State

Table 5: z-test Analysis on Extent Administrative Supervisory Strategies Regulate the Use of Artificial Intelligence to Promote Academic Integrity

Respondents	N	Mean	S.D.	df	α	z-cal	z-crit	Remark
Lecturers	325	2.88	0.94					
				399	0.05	0.172	1.96	Failed to Reject
Administrators	76	2.90	0.91					

Source: Research Data, 2026

Table 5 presents the z-test analysis of lecturers' and administrators' responses regarding the extent to which administrative supervisory strategies regulate the use of artificial intelligence to promote academic integrity in state-owned universities in Rivers State. At 0.05 level of significance and 399 degrees of freedom, the critical z-value was 1.96, while the calculated z-value was 0.172. Since the calculated z-value is less than the critical z-value, the null hypothesis failed to reject. This implies that there is no significant difference between the mean ratings of lecturers and administrators on the extent administrative supervisory strategies regulate the use of artificial intelligence to promote academic integrity in state-owned universities in Rivers State

H_{03}: There is no significant difference between the mean responses of administrators and lecturers on the extent capacity building for academic staff regulate the use of artificial intelligence to promote academic integrity in state-owned universities in Rivers State.

Table 6: z-test Analysis on Extent Capacity Building for Academic Staff Regulate the Use of Artificial Intelligence to Promote Academic Integrity

Respondents	N	Mean	S.D.	df	α	z-cal	z-crit	Remark
Lecturers	325	2.87	0.93					
				399	0.05	0.00	±1.96	Failed to Reject
Administrators	76	2.87	0.95					

Source: Research Data, 2026

The data in Table 6 show the z-test comparison of the responses of lecturers and administrators on the extent capacity building for academic staff regulate the use of artificial intelligence to promote academic integrity in state-owned universities in Rivers State. Using a 0.05 significance level and 399 degrees of freedom, a critical z-value of 1.96 was obtained. The calculated z-value of 0.00 was found to be lower than the critical value. Consequently, the null hypothesis failed to reject, indicating that lecturers and administrators do not differ significantly in their perceptions of the extent capacity building for academic staff regulate the use of artificial intelligence to promote academic integrity in state-owned universities in Rivers State.

Discussion of Findings

Administrative Policy Strategies and the Regulation of Artificial Intelligence to Promote Academic Integrity

The first finding of the study as presented in table 1 revealed that AI use policies would, to a high extent, regulate the use of artificial intelligence to promote academic integrity in state-owned universities in Rivers State. This implies that respondents perceived the formulation of explicit institutional policies on artificial intelligence, including guidelines on permissible and impermissible use, disclosure requirements, and consequences for misuse, as a strong instrument for safeguarding academic integrity. This finding aligns with the position of Azevedo, Temper, and Wu (2025), who argued that institutional policies on artificial intelligence serve as a dynamic guide that is flexible enough to evolve alongside the technology while remaining robust enough to centre ethical and pedagogical integrity, and that institutions which align such policies with academic freedom, equity, and transparency are better positioned to manage the risks associated with generative artificial intelligence. The finding also corroborates the submission of Read (2025), who observed that higher education institutions, particularly mission-driven colleges, must develop clear policy frameworks that balance innovation with institutional values, since the absence of well-articulated policy guidance leaves academic integrity vulnerable to the unregulated proliferation of artificial intelligence tools.

The result of the hypothesis tested showed no significant difference between the mean responses of administrators and lecturers on the extent to which administrative policy strategies regulate the use of artificial intelligence to promote academic integrity in state-owned universities in Rivers State. This outcome suggests that both categories of respondents share a common understanding of the regulatory value of institutional policy, regardless of their differing administrative and instructional roles. This convergence is consistent with the findings of Okonkwo, Briggs, and Adeyemi (2024), who reported that administrators and academic staff in Nigerian public universities tend to converge in their assessment of policy-based interventions because both groups are equally exposed to, and affected by, the consequences of unregulated technology use in academic settings. The absence of a significant difference further suggests that policy strategies are perceived as an institution-wide concern rather than a role-specific issue, which strengthens the case for a unified, centrally coordinated artificial intelligence policy rather than fragmented, departmental approaches, as recommended by the AI Policy and Guidance Template for Higher Education (2026), which emphasises a standing governance structure adaptable to an institution's mission, risk posture, and shared-governance culture.

Administrative Supervisory Strategies and the Regulation of Artificial Intelligence to Promote Academic Integrity

Secondly, the findings obtained from research question two as presented in table 2 indicated that administrative supervisory strategies would regulate the use of artificial intelligence to promote academic integrity in state-owned universities to a high extent. This finding suggests that the direct oversight of teaching, learning, and assessment processes, through classroom monitoring, invigilation, and the supervision of student submissions, is considered an effective mechanism for curbing the inappropriate use of artificial intelligence. This is consistent with the assertion of Drisko, et al., (2023), who noted that academic behaviour involving artificial intelligence is difficult to detect in modern learning environments, making active supervisory engagement, such as invigilated assessments and faculty-level critical reading, a necessary complement to technological detection tools. The finding also supports the position of Balalle, Pannilage, and Herath (2025), who emphasised that controlled assessment environments and direct invigilation allow supervisors to monitor student behaviour in real time, thereby reducing opportunities for unauthorized reliance on generative artificial intelligence during examinations and continuous assessment. Furthermore, Sullivan, Verhoef, and Davodi (2023) found that supervisory practices such as frequent drafting requirements, interactive assessments, and oral defense of submitted work compel students to demonstrate authentic understanding, which in turn strengthens institutional capacity to detect and deter artificial intelligence-enabled academic misconduct.

The tested null hypothesis revealed no significant difference between the mean responses of administrators and lecturers on the extent to which administrative supervisory strategies regulate the use of artificial intelligence to promote academic integrity in state-owned universities in Rivers State. This finding implies that lecturers, who supervise students most directly, and administrators, who design and enforce supervisory frameworks, hold similar views on the importance of supervision as a regulatory strategy. This agreement reflects the conclusion of Eze, Nwankwo, and Okorie (2023), who found that despite differences in organizational hierarchy, academic and administrative staff in Nigerian universities often share comparable perceptions of supervisory effectiveness because supervision directly affects the credibility of certification that both groups are responsible for upholding. The non-significant difference further implies that supervisory strategies enjoy broad institutional legitimacy, which provides a strong foundation for universities to strengthen invigilation protocols and continuous assessment monitoring without resistance from either administrative or academic staff cadres.

Capacity Building of Academic Staff and the Regulation of Artificial Intelligence to Promote Academic Integrity

Furthermore, findings from research questions 3 showed that administrative capacity development strategies important to regulating the use of artificial intelligence to promote academic integrity at a high extent. This finding underscores the importance of training, workshops, seminars, and continuous professional development in equipping administrators and lecturers with the requisite skills and literacy to identify, manage, and respond appropriately to artificial intelligence use in academic work. This finding is in agreement with the recommendation of the European Network for Academic Integrity, as

cited by Hasanein, Sweidan, and Al-Emran (2024), that training both students and teachers on the ethical use of artificial intelligence tools and their inherent limitations, including bias and accuracy concerns, is essential for promoting awareness of academic misconduct and strengthening institutional response capacity. The finding also resonates with the work of Tatum, Chen, and Marsh (2025), who maintained that faculty must be supported with professional learning opportunities to reinvent assessment practices and pedagogical approaches in response to the rapid evolution of generative artificial intelligence tools, since institutions that under-invest in staff capacity development are more likely to experience inconsistent and reactive responses to integrity breaches. In addition, the ASCCC Educational Policies Committee, as discussed by Marquez, Tran, and Whitfield (2024), identified professional learning, training, and education as one of the five essential pillars of an effective institutional artificial intelligence policy, alongside ethical considerations, legal compliance, transparency, and accountability.

The result of the hypothesis tested showed no significant difference between the mean responses of administrators and lecturers on the extent to which administrative capacity development strategies regulate the use of artificial intelligence to promote academic integrity in state-owned universities in Rivers State. This finding suggests that both administrators and lecturers similarly recognize the value of structured training and capacity building in addressing artificial intelligence-related integrity challenges, regardless of their differing job functions. This is supported by the findings of Adebayo, Chukwu, and Ogundele (2023), who observed that staff development needs in Nigerian tertiary institutions are typically perceived uniformly across administrative and academic cadres because both groups recognize their shared deficiency in digital and artificial intelligence literacy. The lack of significant difference further implies that any institutional intervention aimed at capacity building should be designed as a comprehensive, cross-cadre programme rather than one targeted narrowly at either administrators or lecturers alone, since both groups appear equally convinced of its necessity.

Conclusion

Based on the findings of the study, it was concluded that students' over-reliance on artificial intelligence for academic activities can be effectively regulated through the adoption of comprehensive administrative strategies in universities. The study revealed that policy development, supervisory strategies, capacity building of academic staff can regulate the use of artificial intelligence to a high extent, thereby promoting academic integrity among students.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, it recommended that:

1. University management should formulate and disseminate a comprehensive, institution-wide artificial intelligence policy that clearly defines acceptable and unacceptable use of artificial intelligence tools in teaching, learning, and assessment, rather than allowing individual faculties or departments to develop fragmented and inconsistent guidelines.
2. Heads of department and academic supervisors should strengthen direct oversight of teaching, learning, and assessment processes through regular classroom monitoring, strict invigilation during examinations, and close supervision of project and thesis writing, so as to complement technological detection measures with human judgement in identifying inappropriate use of artificial intelligence.

University management should institute regular training programmes, workshops, and seminars for both administrators and lecturers on artificial intelligence literacy, ethical use, and detection techniques, to ensure that staff are continuously equipped with the competence required to manage the fast-evolving challenges that artificial intelligence poses to academic integrity.

References

1. Abdelhalim, S. M. (2024). Using chatgpt to promote research competency: English as a foreign language undergraduates' perceptions and practices across varied metacognitive awareness levels. Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 40(3), 1261–1275. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12948.
2. Alonso-de-Castro, M. G., & García-Peñalvo, F. J. (2022). Reflections on the ethics, potential, and challenges of artificial intelligence in the framework of quality education (SDG4). Inclusión y Desarrollo, 9(2), 782–791. https://doi.org/10.3916/C74-2023-03.

3. Balalle, H. & Pannilage, S. (2025) Reassessing academic integrity in the age of AI: A systematic literature review on AI and academic integrity. Social Science and Humanities Open, 11, 101299.

4. Bennett, R., Castillo, M., & Osei, K. (2025). Due process and academic honor policy enforcement in the age of artificial intelligence. Journal of Academic Ethics, 23(1), 45–61.

5. Drisko, J. W., Coren, A., & Whitley, S. (2025). Addressing student use of generative AI in schools and universities through academic integrity reporting. Frontiers in Education, 10, Article 1610836.

6. Ergen, Ö. (2019). What is artificial intelligence? Anatolian Journal of Cardiology, 22(Suppl 2), 5–7.

7. Eze, C. U., Nwankwo, I. F., & Okorie, B. (2023). Supervisory practices and academic staff perception in Nigerian public universities. Nigerian Journal of Educational Administration and Planning, 23(1), 77–94.

8. Hui, M. (2020). Artificial intelligence in strategic marketing and research frameworks. Journal of Marketing and AI Research, 14(3), 112–126.

9. Njoku, C. & Wey- Amaewhule, B. (2025) Integration of Artificial Intelligence (A1) Driven assessment tools on the academic performance of students in public universities in Rivers State. (2025). International Journal of Educational Management, Rivers State University, 1(1), 1-16.

10. Nwile, C. B., Amaewhule, E. C., & Ezeugo, C. R. (2025). Utilization of Artificial Intelligence Tools for Improving Educational Outcomes of Students in Public Universities in Rivers State, Nigeria. African Journal of Humanities and Contemporary Education Research, 19(1), 195-209.

11. Nwosu, F. C., Yakubu, A., & Effiong, M. (2022). Disciplinary enforcement and institutional reputation in Nigerian public universities. Journal of Education and Practice in Africa, 14(3), 201–215.

12. Sullivan, M., Verhoef, A., & Davodi, A. (2023). Authentic assessment design as a deterrent to generative AI misuse. Assessment Practices in Higher Education, 11(2), 154–170.

13. Ventura, A. M. C., & Lopez, L. S. (2024). Unlocking the future of learning: Assessing students' awareness and usage of AI tools. International Journal of Information and Education Technology, 14(8), 1136–1144. https://doi.org/10.18178/ijiet.2024.14.8.2142.

14. Wey-Amaewhule, B. & Mohammed, N. M (2026). Integrating artificial intelligence and cybersecurity tools into strategic management of private secondary schools in Rivers State. International Journal of Educational Management, Rivers State University, 2 (1), 482-493.

15. Wey-Amaewhule, B. & Ogbonnaya E. (2024). Principals' ethical leadership behaviour on administration of public secondary schools for goals attainment in Rivers State. International Journal of Innovative Social Sciences & Humanities Research 12(1), 86-98.