MBJLIS – Middlebelt Journal of Library and Information Science, Vol. 23, 2025
ISSN: 1596 - 1595
Journal homepage: https://www.mbjlisonline.org/

USE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND PLAGIARISM TESTING PRACTICES AMONG PH.D. STUDENTS AT THE FACULTY OF ARTS, UNIVERSITY OF IBADAN, NIGERIA

VICTORIA OLUBOLA FADEYI
National Mathematical Centre,
Abuja, Nigeria.
vicfadeyi@gmail.com
ORCID: 0009-0009-6865-0417

Submitted: 23/07/2025 **Accepted:** 12/12/2025 **Published:** 29/12/2025

ABSTRACT

The study investigated use of artificial intelligence (AI) and plagiarism testing practices among Ph.D. students in the Faculty of Arts of the University of Ibadan. Descriptive research design was adopted. The population for this study consists of the Ph.D. students in the Faculty of Arts, University of Ibadan, Nigeria and utilised total enumeration sampling technique. Survey questionnaire was used for data collection. Descriptive statistics such as mean and standard deviation was used to answer research questions, while regression analysis was used to test the hypothesis at 0.05 level of significance. Findings revealed that AI applications such as ChatGPT and Grammarly are frequently used to support a variety of academic tasks. While daily used common available tools such as Turnitin for plagiarism verification, highly advanced AI applications such as Microsoft Azure AI and TensorFlow are seldom utilised. The result (r = -.010, n = 210, df = 209, p = .8830) implies that there is no correlation between the level of use of AI and the prevalence of plagiarism. The study brings to the forefront the growing application of AI in doctoral studies and the need for having guidelines to ensure ethical application. Universities are encouraged to review their plagiarism policies regularly to reflect the realities of AI being integrated into academia.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, AI Tools, ChatGPT, Grammarly, Plagiarism, Turnitin

Introduction

Plagiarism among Nigerian, doctoral students has become a serious academic concern, which undermines academic integrity and quality of scholarship. A number of studies have examined the occurrence, causes and effects of plagiarism at the doctoral level of education, offering a comprehensive picture of the phenomenon. The literature indicates that plagiarism is a significant issue among Ph.D. students. For instance, Ibegbulam and Eze (2015) in their research established that many Nigerian students

were ignorant of plagiarism prior to receiving formal instruction on the subject. This lack of knowledge is a cause of inadvertent plagiarism because the students fail to understand what constitutes academic dishonesty.

Similarly, Babalola (2012) observed that over 60% of students admitted to copying information from the internet without referencing, demonstrating how digital materials can easily be misused. Several factors are responsible for the incidence of plagiarism among Ph.D. students. Access to digital information has enabled students to copy and paste materials without referencing them properly. Ogunsuji and Fagbule (2020) clarify that even though the diffusion of ICTs has facilitated plagiarism, it also offers software like Turnitin to detect and prevent it. However, the effectiveness of such software is undermined by poor anti-plagiarism policy and its poor implementation in the majority of Nigerian universities. The use of AI has increasingly become a double-edged sword in the academic field, particularly in the area of testing the integrity research works generated by Ph.D. students.

While AI provides excellent benefits in enhancing learning, research productivity, and writing support, it also generates new dilemmas of differentiating between rightful assistance and academic dishonesty. On one hand, AI-powered tools such as Grammarly, Turnitin, and citation management tools such as Zotero and Mendeley have immensely enabled students' ability to generate well-structured, grammatically sound and properly referenced scholarly writing. Turnitin and similar sites allow students to check for textual similarities and possible plagiarism, making it easier for institutions to uphold academic standards. These technologies have made it possible for supervisors and examiners to check the originality of theses and dissertations effectively and thus promote a culture of responsibility and ethical scholarship (Viper Plagiarism Checker, 2025). However, conversely, the emergence of generative AI tools like ChatGPT, Jasper AI, and other language models has also brought about new types of plagiarism.

These tools can generate entire essays, literature reviews, and even research proposals that students can present as their own without acknowledging the source. Such AI-assisted ghost writing is ethically problematic in terms of authorship and originality. Ebiringa et al. (2025) write that Nigerian universities are becoming more concerned that some PhD students are utilizing generative AI to produce good and adequate content without contribution to the work being submitted. The advancement of AI-generated content is increasingly becoming difficult to detect. This is further compounded by the absence of clear-cut institutional policies and training on the ethical usage of AI on campus. In Nigerian universities specifically, many institutions have not yet adopted policies that distinguish proper utilisation from improper utilisation, leaving students open to accidental ethical violations. The study concludes by recommending that universities adopt advanced AI-sensitive plagiarism software, establish clear policies, and conduct formal instruction in AI ethics to ensure that AI is utilised to promote, rather than compromise, academic integrity.

Statement of the Problem

Students at the Ph.D. level have greatly increased their efficiency and output, especially through the use of AI tools in generating content, editing grammatical expressions, formatting citations, and even developing literature reviews. Nevertheless, these advantages equally introduce critical ethical concerns, arguably with respect to academic integrity. One of these major concerns includes silent plagiarism: passing off content generated by AI that would appear original, but which is not reflective of the student's intellectual contribution to merit the degree of an independent scholar.

Further compounding this problem is that traditional plagiarism detection software currently being utilised, such as Turnitin and Grammarly's plagiarism checker, is generally incapable of detecting AI-generated text, and as such, verification of students' academic submissions becomes a core challenge for institutions and supervisors. Recent reports and scholarly discussions by UNESCO (2023) have highlighted that the rapid growth in adopting generative AI has created increasing difficulties for universities in distinguishing human-produced work from machine-generated content. Against this background of emerging concerns, this present study explores the use of AI tools and related plagiarism practices among Ph.D. students in the Faculty of Arts, University of Ibadan.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided the study:

1. What are the types of plagiarism practiced among Ph.D. students at the Faculty of Arts, University of Ibadan, Nigeria?
2. What are the reasons for plagiarism among Ph.D. students at the Faculty of Arts, University of Ibadan, Nigeria?
3. What is the frequency of use of AI among Ph.D. students at the Faculty of Arts, University of Ibadan, Nigeria?
4. What is the purpose of use of AI among Ph.D. students at the Faculty of Arts, University of Ibadan, Nigeria?

Hypothesis

A null hypothesis was formulated to guide the study:

There is no relationship between use of AI and plagiarism practices among Ph.D. students at the Faculty of Arts, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.

Review of Related Literature

The use of artificial intelligence tools has become a frequent practice among Ph.D. students, mainly for tasks such as text creation, grammar refinement, literature synthesis, and citation formatting. Large language models, Hussain (2025) and Bingzhi (2025) presently, are used by doctoral researchers to reduce the burden of routine academic activities that have conventionally consumed so much time and cognitive energy. Khalifa, and Albadawy (2025) also relate that AI writing assistants help students improve clarity and coherence, particularly those operating in a multilingual environment. The growing integration of AI in research workflows has therefore enhanced the productivity of students and expanded their scholarly writing toolsets.

However, with the increasing adoption of AI, there has been a growing, grave concern for academic integrity due to what scholars refer to as "silent plagiarism": the unseen usage of AI-generated content, which is perceived to be original but actually does not reflect a student's intellectual effort. Amirzhanov *et al*. (2025) says that silent plagiarism is different from traditional plagiarism in that the content often is newly

generated and not copied from sources that are identifiable; hence, this content is hard to attribute and detect. According to Malik *et al*. (2024), such practice erodes the foundation of independent scholarship that is supposed to underpin doctoral research since AI-generated text dilutes or may trivialise the conceptual reasoning and voice of a student. As lines blur between what human authors and machines write, increasingly, supervisors and institutions are facing challenges defining and policing academic honesty.

A key complication is introduced via the limits inherent in existing plagiarism-detection systems. Traditional similarity-checking systems, like Turnitin and Grammarly, were developed to match work by students against databases of published and previously submitted texts. As Gotoman *et al*. (2025) point out, wholly original AI-generated content cannot be reliably picked up because it is not matched to any existing source. Newer systems have emerged for AI detection; however, their accuracy remains inconsistent. Deep *et al*. (2025) found that AI detectors frequently generate false positives flagged as AI-generated, while actual human writing has gone undetected, and false negatives also occur when texts are lightly edited after initial generation. These technological limitations introduce ambiguity for doctoral supervisors who are required to assess originality in student submissions without the help of dependable tools.

In response to these challenges, universities worldwide have begun updating their academic integrity policies to address AI use explicitly. Kirsanov *et al*. (2025) and Gonsalves (2024) highlight a shift from prohibition to regulated disclosure, with students required to declare if and how AI tools assisted their work. Research by Ochasi *et al*. (2025) indicates that those institutions that clearly articulate guidelines and provide training regarding ethical use report fewer instances of misconduct and closer alignment between students and supervisors in terms of the expectations held. Conversely, where there is ambiguity or contradiction at the policy level, higher rates of covert use tend to occur among students seeking to navigate doubts about acceptable assistance. These institutional dynamics are proof that ethical use of AI in doctoral research is dependent not just on technological safeguards but also supportive educational and policy frameworks. Notwithstanding these continuing policy reforms, several gaps remain in the current plagiarism-testing practices.

Ahmad and Fauzi (2024) argue that the detection tools remain poorly calibrated for discipline-specific writing, which creates variable results across the fields of humanities, social sciences, and STEM subjects. Furthermore, Deep *et al*. (2025) and Mathewson (2023) note that multilingual Ph.D. students who rely frequently on AI-based paraphrasing and translation face greater scrutiny and higher risks of false detection-a concern for equity. Longitudinal research is also needed to understand how writing practices that are dependent on AI evolve during the course of a Ph.D. and change supervisors' strategies for assessment. Combined, these findings indicate that the current systems of monitoring academic integrity remain somewhat in a state of evolution and must be constantly reviewed to keep up with generative AI development.

The advent of AI in higher education has significantly influenced academic practices, particularly in writing, research, and integrity. Scholars have examined AI's dual role both as a tool for enhancing academic productivity and as a potential enabler of unethical practices such as plagiarism (Mpolomoka *et al*. 2025).

While the majority of the students use these tools responsibly to augment academic writing and comprehension, there are concerns that AI has the potential to inadvertently facilitate plagiarism, especially if used without exposure to ethical standards (Bui & Tong, 2025).

As highlighted by Saidu (2024), students abuse generative AI tools by copying text output directly into their coursework without referencing the sources. This, they believe, blurs the boundary between assisted writing and academic dishonesty, particularly where the students lack training on how to cite. According to Werdiningsih and Rusdin (2024), AI-generated content can create false notions of originality, hence undermining the authenticity of student submissions. They concluded that AI based plagiarism is not usually discussed but the result of students' lack of understanding of academic integrity.

There are other researchers who consider that AI can be utilised to reduce plagiarism if properly integrated into the academic process. As stated by Deep *et al*. (2025), if the students are instructed on the ethical use of AI tools like Turnitin and Grammarly, the tools become preventative measures, and students become more conscious of non-original work. The authors advocated for adoption of AI by universities and colleges as partners in achieving excellent academic writing rather than banning its use. More broadly, Sozon et al. (2024) investigated cheating and plagiarism in higher education institutions and attributed plagiarism to other factors such as time pressure, poor academic preparation, and lack of supervisor guidance. This would suggest that plagiarism is more a matter of academic culture and deficiency of skills than AI usage itself. Also, Hidayati et al. (2025) observed that students resort to using AI paraphrasing tools like QuillBot and Spinbot to disguise copied work, thus avoiding plagiarism detection tools. According to them, this form of academic dishonesty is difficult to detect, especially when students manually edit AI-generated work.

Revesai (2025) investigated Generative AI dependency and the emerging academic crisis and its impact on student performance. The research identified that students who experience high academic stress and low writing self-efficacy are more likely to employ AI tools to produce assignments quickly. They found that institutions with lax supervision and ambiguous AI use policies had more incidences of AI based plagiarism. A global comparative study by Parker *et al*. (2025) found that the impact of AI on plagiarism varies by region and institutional policy and reported that UK and Australian, Canada, China universities have begun integrating AI ethics modules in research methodology courses. However, Sangwa *et al*. (2025) observed wide disparities in policy development and readiness. South Africa, Nigeria, and Rwanda are early adopters, aligning institutional policies with national digital strategies. Such measures have supposedly reduced cases of AI-enabled plagiarism and promoted responsible usage.

Methodology

Descriptive survey research design was adopted for this study. The population consisted of all Ph.D. students in the Faculty of Arts, University of Ibadan for 2024/ 2025 session, Nigeria, which includes 14 departments such as English, History, Philosophy, Linguistics, and Theatre Arts. Using a total enumeration

sampling technique, all 216 Ph.D. students in the faculty were included in the study. Data were collected through a structured questionnaire, chosen for its efficiency in gathering comprehensive information from a large group within a short time-frame. Data analysis was subjected to descriptive statistics such as mean and standard deviation were used to answer the research questions, while regression analysis was used to test the hypothesis at a 0.05 level of significance.

Response Rate

A total number of 216 copies of the questionnaire were administered to respondents in fourteen departments in the Faculty of Arts, University of Ibadan. However, 210 copies were returned out of 216 and found useful for analysis giving a response rate of 97%. This was considered very adequate for the study.

Data Analysis and Results

RQ 1: What are the types of plagiarism practiced among Ph.D. students in University of Ibadan?

Table 1: Level of Plagiarism Practiced among the Respondents

S/N	Level of Plagiarism Practiced	High n (%)	Moderate n (%)	Low n (%)	Mean	SD
1	Copying a paper from another student	90 (42.9%)	86 (41.0%)	28 (13.3%)	3.24	.79
2	Copying from the internet	96 (45.7%)	94 (44.8%)	18 (8.6%)	3.35	.68
3	Cutting and pasting from different sources	106 (50.5%)	92 (43.8%)	8 (3.8%)	3.43	.66
4	Quoting without acknowledgement	120 (57.1%)	80 (38.1%)	6 (2.9%)	3.50	.65
5	Copying whole phrases and changing some words	92 (43.8%)	76 (36.2%)	34 (16.2%)	3.20	.85
6	Paraphrasing without attribution	76 (36.2%)	104 (49.5%)	28 (13.3%)	3.21	.70
7	Duplicating work for more than one submission	76 (36.2%)	70 (33.3%)	56 (26.7%)	3.02	.89
8	Writing without references	92 (43.8%)	100 (47.6%)	10 (4.8%)	3.31	.74
9	Failing to put a quotation in quotation marks	52 (24.8%)	90 (42.9%)	50 (23.8%)	2.84	.90
10	Changing words but copying the sentence structure without credit	54 (25.7%)	114 (54.3%)	34 (16.2%)	3.02	.76
11	Copying so many words/ideas that it forms majority of the work	68 (32.4%)	116 (55.2%)	24 (11.4%)	3.19	.67
12	Turning in someone else's work as your own	116 (55.2%)	88 (41.9%)	2 (1.0%)	3.50	.62
13	Using tables/figures not derived from primary data without acknowledgement	70 (33.3%)	124 (59.0%)	10 (4.8%)	3.23	.67
14	Using pictures/videos not captured by you without acknowledgement	62 (29.5%)	118 (56.2%)	20 (9.5%)	3.10	.76

Table 1 shows that plagiarism is a significant issue among the respondents based on self-reported data. The most prevalent forms of plagiarism perpetrated are quoting without referencing (57.1%; $\bar{x}$ = 3.50, SD = 0.650), presenting another's work as one's own (55.2%; $\bar{x}$ = 3.50, SD = 0.621), and cutting and pasting from different sources (50.5%; $\bar{x}$ = 3.43, SD = 0.661).

These recorded the highest mean scores, indicating rampant unethical academic practice. The other common practices include copying from the Internet, writing without referencing, and copying from a peer's work, which all reflect high frequencies of participation. The moderately frequent practices include paraphrasing without quotation and copying sentences with minor changes continue to reflect a disturbing ignorance of proper citation conventions. While, the most infrequent, but still occurring, are failing to use quotation marks and duplicating sentence structure without any attribution.

RQ 2: What are the reasons for plagiarism among Ph.D. students in Faculty of Arts, University of Ibadan?

Table 2: Reasons for Plagiarism among the Respondents

S/N	Reasons	SA	A	D	SD	M	SD
1	Ignorance of acts that constitute plagiarism	72	94	38	6	3.10	.79
2	Desire to get good grades	70	130	10	0	3.29	.55
3	Poor time management	70	132	8	0	3.30	.53
4	Pressure to meet deadlines	80	116	14	0	3.31	.59
5	Fear of failure	76	118	12	4	3.67	.65
6	Complex assignment topics	78	104	28	0	3.24	.67
7	Lack of academic writing skills	46	130	32	2	3.05	.64
8	Lack of time	46	124	40	0	3.03	.64
9	Assignment perceived as unimportant	24	62	112	12	2.47	.77
10	Belief that they will not get caught	26	100	76	8	2.69	.74
11	Lack of language skills	24	124	54	8	2.78	.69
12	Lack of interest in the study/topic	42	108	52	8	2.88	.77
13	Imitating others	38	86	78	8	2.73	.80
14	Improper supervision by project supervisors	42	68	92	8	2.69	.83
15	Absence of university policies on plagiarism	34	62	104	10	2.57	.82
16	Convenience (internet makes “copy and paste” easy)	137	66	8	2	3.60	.63
	Criterion mean = 2.50						

Table 2 shows the factors responsible for plagiarism act among the respondents. The most cited reasons were the fear of failure, for which the highest mean score ($\bar{x}$ = 3.67, SD = 0.653) was given. The other important reasons for plagiarism among the respondents are multiple ranging from the perception that plagiarism helps them catch up and cope with the rest of the class; the convenience of use of internet resources that allow "copy and paste" suggesting that ease of access to technology has made academic dishonesty easy for students. Pressures to meet up with deadlines and inadequate management and the need to earn good grades show that students plagiarize all the time when they are under time pressure or in pursuit of academic success.

Similarly, assignment complexity and lack of knowledge regarding what plagiarism is, were the most important influences indicating that a lack of knowledge and difficulty with academic tasks might be causing the issue. Furthermore, lack of academic writing skills and lack of language proficiency that show students plagiarize due to academic and linguistic deficits were highlighted. On the other hand, low-salience reasons were perceptions such as the work being of minimal significance, having no university policies against plagiarism, and ineffective supervision by project supervisors, and institutional failures, although relevant, were perceived to be less impacting by most students. With a weighted mean of 3.025 (above the criterion mean of 2.50), the overall responses imply that plagiarism among the respondents is largely driven by a mix of psychological, academic, and technological factors.

RQ 3: What is the frequency of use of AI among Ph.D. students at the Faculty of Arts, University of Ibadan?

Table 3: Frequency of Use of Artificial Intelligence Tools among the Respondents

S/N	AI Tool	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Yearly	Never	M	SD
1	Chat GPT	70	108	22	6	4	4.11	.85
2	Grammarless	62	98	44	6	0	4.03	.79
3	Jasper AI	40	120	48	2	0	3.94	.68
4	Google Bard	10	50	84	44	22	2.91	1.03
5	IBM Watson	10	34	86	40	40	2.69	1.10
6	Microsoft Azure AI	34	122	42	6	6	3.86	.84
7	Quill Boot	44	108	44	12	2	3.86	.85
8	Deeply Translator	28	124	42	12	4	3.76	.83
9	Turn tin	30	108	50	18	4	4.05	.82
10	Tensor Flow	42	116	38	14	0	3.89	.80

Table 3 shows that AI applications are prevalent among the respondents, with the majority of them reporting use either daily or weekly. The most frequently used applications include ChatGPT, Grammarly, Turnitin, and Jasper AI, all of which had mean ratings in excess of 4.00, well above the criterion mean of 3.0 and the weighted mean of 3.71. This implies that these tools form students' learning workflow, supporting

tasks like writing, proofreading, and plagiarism checking. Specifically, ChatGPT was used most frequently, whereby most of the students used it weekly or daily, reflecting its usage for text generation and academic support. Grammarly, Jasper AI, and Turnitin also used it most frequently, reflecting their use in improving grammar, citations, and originality of academic work. Other tools like Microsoft Azure AI, QuillBot, DeepL Translator, and TensorFlow were also used very often with mean scores between near or above the weighted mean, indicating frequent usage for content generation, paraphrasing, translation, and data processing. By contrast, Google Bard, IBM Watson, and Microsoft Azure AI to some extent experienced lower frequencies of use, with most students answering monthly, yearly, or none at all.

RQ 4: What is the purpose of use of AI by Ph.D. students of Faculty of Arts in the University of Ibadan?

Table 4: Purpose of Use of Artificial Intelligence Tools

S/N	**Purpose of AI Use**	**SA**	**A**	**D**	**SD**	**M**	**SD**
1	To complete class assignments	150	60	0	0	3.71	.45
2	For research purposes	148	60	2	0	3.69	.48
3	To obtain course-related information/materials	120	82	8	0	3.53	.57
4	Recommended by lecturers	66	86	52	6	3.01	.82
5	For seminar/oral class presentation	76	122	12	0	3.31	.59
6	To update knowledge/keep abreast of developments	72	134	4	0	3.33	.53
7	Entertainment	56	104	46	4	3.01	.75
8	Leisure	56	104	44	6	3.00	.77
9	To read for examinations	108	96	6	0	3.49	.56
	Weighted mean = 3.34						

Table 4 shows that there are numerous academic and non-academic grounds for which the respondents, employ AI tools. These include class assignments and research, which registered the highest mean scores ($\bar{x}$ = 3.71; 3.69), respectively, with extremely low standard deviations. This indicates consensus among respondents that AI technologies are a necessity in assisting them in achieving their academic tasks. Ubiquitous usage of AI in such high-stakes academic ventures testifies to its perceived usefulness in productivity and academic attainment. Use of AI tools to acquire course content and learning resources was also significantly important ($\bar{x}$ = 3.53), reflecting the students' direct use of these tools for preparation and learning. Similarly, use of AI for seminar/oral tasks ($\bar{x}$= 3.31) and staying up-to-date with emerging developments ($\bar{x}$ = 3.33) reflect the significance of AI implementation in formal and informal learning environments.

HO_1: There is no relationship between use of AI and plagiarism practices among Ph.D. students at the Faculty of Arts, University of Ibadan, Nigeria**.**

Table 5: Relationship between the Use of AI and the Incidences of Plagiarism

Variables	**Mean** $\bar{x}$	**Std. Dev.**	**N**			**Df**
Use of AIs	3.71	.607	210			
Prevalence of plagiarism	3.21	.414	210	r = -.010	p = .883	209

Table 5 showed that there is no significant relationship between the use of AI and the incidences/prevalence of plagiarism among the respondents. The result (r = -.010, n = 210, df = 209, p = .8830) implies that there is no correlation between the level of use of AI and the prevalence of plagiarism.

Discussion of the Findings

The findings of the investigation reveal that plagiarism is a common academic integrity issue among University of Ibadan, Faculty of Arts Ph.D. students. The most common forms of academic misconduct are quoting without citing, submitting another person's work as one's own, and copying texts from different sources without citing. These behaviors were all reported at high rates across the board, suggesting a concerning trend of academic dishonesty. To support these observations, Hephyang and Ashiru (2025) argue that plagiarism is still a major issue in Nigerian universities, particularly at the postgraduate level, due to a combination of a lack of training in academic writing and a lack of effective institutional enforcement. The study indicated that most students do not have appropriate citation competencies and will use easily accessed online content without acknowledgement. In the same vein, Sambo *et al*. (2021) equally observed that publication and research pressures within limited time frames, coupled with lack of supervision and mentorship on scholarly ethics, exacerbate academic dishonesty, particularly among postgraduate students.

The findings of the study illustrate that plagiarism among Ph.D. students in the Faculty of Arts at the University of Ibadan is driven by a combination of psychological, academic, and technological factors. A few of the primary motives include fear of failure in academics, perceived utility of plagiarism as a survival mechanism, and the convenience offered by digital technology, particularly the ease of copying and pasting information available on the web. These results are in conformity with a study conducted by Orok *et al*. (2023), in which they made it evident that psychological stressors such as fear of failure and ambition for academic success are significant sources of plagiarism among Nigerian postgraduate university students and that emotional stress, in addition to coursework, has the tendency to lead students towards academic misconduct.

The findings reveal that AI applications are now well entrenched in the scholarly practice of Ph.D. students in the Faculty of Arts, University of Ibadan. A vast majority of the students reported frequent usage of AI tools particularly for writing, proofing, and originality verification of their work. The most utilised tools were ChatGPT, Grammarly, Turnitin, and Jasper AI, which were utilised extensively to generate content,

refine grammar, format citations, and detect plagiarism. The results are in agreement with Owan *et al*. (2025) reports of increased use of AI tools among postgraduate students in Nigerian public universities. Their findings indicated that students were increasingly using tools like ChatGPT and Grammarly to enhance writing clarity and academic productivity.

The findings indicate that Ph.D. students in the Faculty of Arts at the University of Ibadan largely accept AI tools for academic purposes. The reasons for using AI most frequently cited are completing class assignments and supporting research work. This indicates that students largely view AI as being at the core of their academic productivity, particularly in writing, learning, and research assistance tasks. This result aligns with Alade and Daniel (2023), who determined that AI applications are predominantly employed by postgraduate students in Nigerian universities for writing research, processing data, and accessing scholarly literature.

The study concluded that there is no significant correlation between use of AI tools and incidence or prevalence of plagiarism among Ph.D. students in the Faculty of Arts, University of Ibadan. This means that the level or amount of AI use is not a direct factor in whether students plagiarize or not. The result implies that plagiarism can be driven by personal, psychological, academic, or institutional reasons rather than the use of AI tools itself. This finding is also supported by Saidu (2024), who stated that the use of AI writing tools in Nigerian universities does not automatically imply increased plagiarism. The findings pointed out that most students who plagiarised tend to do so due to non-technological factors, such as poor academic preparation or insufficient time.

Conclusion

This study has found that Ph.D. students in the Faculty of Arts, University of Ibadan, are making heavy use of the potential of AI tools in performing academic tasks, like completing assignments, conducting research, and accessing course-related materials, with the most widely used tools being ChatGPT, Grammarly, Jasper AI, and Turnitin. The findings show that while AI greatly enhances efficiency and learning outcomes, the use of AI also brings about ethical challenges, including forms of plagiarism, such as unacknowledged AI-generated content. Poor time management, pressure to meet deadlines, lack of academic writing skills, and limited awareness of plagiarism rules are some of the factors that contribute to such integrity issues. The study further highlights that traditional plagiarism detection systems are largely inadequate in identifying AI-generated content, therefore leaving gaps in maintaining academic honesty. Addressing these challenges will require stronger institutional policies on the use of AI, clearer guidelines on its use, and targeted training on ethical scholarly practices. Assuring responsible use of AI will not only reduce misconduct but also promote genuine scholarship, improve the quality of research, and develop Ph.D. students professionally.

Recommendations

1. University should put in place comprehensive policies that clearly articulate accepted and unacceptable use of AI tools in academic work. Such policies will detail when and how AI assistance in assignments, theses, and research can be acknowledged without breaching academic integrity for Ph.D. students.

2. University of Ibadan should adopt advanced plagiarism detection tools that can trace AI-generated content. Regular audits and monitoring can support supervisors and academic integrity offices to track potential misconduct effectively and make sure the doctoral research is of high quality and genuinely original.
3. Ph.D. students of the University of Ibadan should be provided with training programmes on using AI ethically, citing appropriately, and being aware of plagiarism. Students' responsible research practices will thus be enhanced through workshops and seminars, and they will be prepared for applying AI tools without compromising academic honesty.
4. PhD students' supervisors should provide steady guidance on the writing of research, use of AI, and proper observance of ethical standards. Active mentoring of the students and reviewing work assisted by AI will go a long way in reducing unintentional plagiarism and enforcing responsible scholarship practices.

REFERENCES

Ahmad, H., & Fauzi, M. A. (2024). Plagiarism in academic writing in higher education institutions: A bibliometric analysis. *International Journal on Social and Education Sciences (IJonSES), 6*(1), 64-84. https://doi.org/10.46328/ijonses.623 https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1415002.pdf

Alade, M. O., & Daniel, H. A. (2023). Influence of artificial intelligence (AI) on research among Nigerian postgraduate students. *FUOYE Journal of Communication, 7,* 203-214. https://www.researchgate. net/profile/Henry-Daniel-4/pdf

Amirzhanov, A., Turan, C., & Makhmutova, A. (2025). Plagiarism types and detection methods: A systematic survey of algorithms in text analysis. *Frontiers in Computer Science, 7,* Article 1504725. https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/computer-science/articles/10.3389/fcomp.2025.1504725/full

Babalola, Y. (2012). Awareness and incidence of plagiarism among undergraduates in a Nigerian private university. *African Journal Library Archival & Information Science, 22*(1), 53-60. https://ajlais.com/index.php/ajlais/article/view/35/36

Bingzhi, L. (2025). Study on the long-term cognitive effects of excessive LLM use among students and general users. Journal of Contemporary Educational Research, 9(10), 203-214.

Bui, T., & Tong, T. (2025). The impact of AI writing tools on academic integrity: Unveiling English-Majored students' Perceptions and practical solutions. *AsiaCALL Online Journal, 16*(1), 83-110. 10.54855/acoj.251615.

Deep, P. D., Edgington, W. D., Ghosh, N., & Rahaman, M. S. (2025). Evaluating the effectiveness and ethical implications of AI detection tools in higher education. *Information*, *16*(10), 905. https://www.mdpi.com/2078-2489/16/10/ 905file:///C:/Users/HP/Downloads/information-16-00905.pdf

Ebiringa, E. T., & Ikerionwu, C. O., Erike, A. I., & Asiegbu, B. C. (2025). Generative AI adoption in Nigerian higher education: Benefits, challenges and opportunities. *African Journal of Humanities and Contemporary Education Research, 20*(1). 285-304.

Gonsalves, C. (2024). Addressing student non-compliance in AI use declarations: implications for academic integrity and assessment in higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *50*(4), 592–606. https://doi.org/10.1080/0260 2938.2024.2415654

Gotoman, J. E., Harenz, L. L., & Sangria, J. C., & Cereneo, S. S., & Barbuco, D. D. (2025). Accuracy and reliability of AI-generated text detection Tools: A literature review. *American Journal of IR 4.0 and Beyond, 4*(1), 1-9.

Hephyang, O., & Ashiru, B. (2025). Academic integrity and plagiarism attitudes among postgraduate Students in Southwestern Nigerian universities. *FUDMA International Journal of Library Science and Information Management, 5*(1), 119-136

Hidayati, N., Andriyanti, E., Hidayati, S., & Adiyani, N. (2025). Unlocking student insights: The role of Quillbot in academic writing. *International Journal of Environmental Sciences, 11*(25), 525-534. https://theaspd.com/index.php/ijes/article/view/116 98/8363

Hussain, D. (2025). Applications of large language models in education https://www.hu.ac.ae/knowledge-update/from-different-corners/applications-of-large-language-models-in-education

Ibegbulam, I., & Eze, J. (2015). Knowledge, perception and attitude of Nigerian students to plagiarism: A case study. *IFLA Journal, 4*(2), 120-128.

Khalifa, M., & Albadawy, M. (2024). Using artificial intelligence in academic writing and research: An essential productivity tool. *Computer Methods and programmes in Biomedicine Update, 5*(1), Article 100145.

Kirsanov, O., Kushwah, L., & Selvaretnam, G. (2025). Beyond detection: How students use and Hide AI in online assessments and what authentic tasks can do about it. *Journal of Academic Ethics, 24*(14).

Leong, Wai Yie & Zhang, J. (2025). AI on academic integrity and plagiarism detection. *ASM Science Journal, 20*(1).

Malik, M. A., Amjad, A. I., Aslam, S., & Fakhrou, A. (2024). Global insights: ChatGPT's influence on academic and research writing, creativity, and plagiarism policies. *Frontiers in research metrics and analytics*, *9*. Article 1486832. https://doi.org/10.3389/frma.2024.1486832

Mathewson, T. G. (2023). AI detection tools falsely accuse international students of cheating. https://themarkup.org/machine-learning/2023/08/14/ai-detection-tools-falsely-accuse-international-students-of-cheating#:~:text=Over%20the%20

Mpolomoka, D. L., Luchembe, M., Mushibwe, C., Muvombo, M., Changala, M., Sampa, R. L., & Banda, S. (2025). Artificial intelligence-related plagiarism in education: A systematic review. *European Journal of Education Studies, 12*(5), 325-336.

Ochasi, A., Okunna, N., Obasi, J., Agbagwa, G., & Ogu, H. (2025). An exploratory study of students' knowledge, attitudes, and training in healthcare ethics. *International Journal of Ethics Education* (2025). https://doi.org/10.1007/s40889-025-00219-2

Ogunsuji, O. O., & Fagbule, O. F. (2020). Plagiarism: The curse of internet in African academia? *Annals of Ibadan Postgraduate Medicine*, *18*(2), 98–99.

Orok, E., Adeniyi, F., Williams, T., Dosunmu, O., Ikpe, F., Orakwe, C., & Kukoyi, O. (2023). Causes and mitigation of academic dishonesty among healthcare students in a Nigerian university. *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 19*(13), 1-16

Owan, V. J., Chukwu, C. O., Agama, V. U., Owan, T. J., Ogar, J. O., & Etorti, I. J. (2025). Acceptance and use of artificial intelligence for self-directed research learning among postgraduate students in Nigerian public universities. *Discover Education,* 4, 329 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-025-00770-6

Parker, L., Loper, J., Hayes, J., Karakas, A., White, S., & Hallman, H. (2025). Comparative analysis of artificial intelligence policies in universities across five countries. Discover Computing, 28(267), 1-30.

Revesai, Z. (2025). Generative AI dependency: the emerging academic crisis and its impact on student performance: A case study of a university in Zimbabwe. *Cogent Education*, *12*(1), 23-35. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2025.2549787

Saidu, M. (2024). ChatGPT usage and plagiarism in academic writing: The mediating role of academic integrity among Nigerian universities' students. In P.A. Okebukola (Ed.), *A Handbook on AI and Ethics, Academic Integrity and the Future of Quality Assurance in Higher Education* (pp.86-97).

Sambo, A., Akanbi, M., & Habib, S. (2021). Awareness and perception of plagiarism among postgraduate LIS Students in South. *Communicate Journal of Library and Information Science, 23*(1), 1-14.

Sangwa, S., Ekosse, E., & Placide, M. (2025). AI governance in African higher education: Status, challenges, and a future-proof policy framework. *Artificial Intelligence and Education, 1*(1), 20-34.

Sozon, M., Alkharabsheh, O. H., Fong, P. W., & Chuan, S. B. (2024). Cheating and plagiarism in higher education institutions (HEIs): A literature review. *F1000Research, 13*(788), 1-34. https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.147140.2

Viper Plagiarism Checker (2025). Plagiarism checks and PhD theses: How rigorous is rigorous enough? https://blog.scanmyessay.com/2025/07/14/plagiarism-checks-and-phd-theses-how-rigorous-is-rigorous-enough/

UNESCO (2023). *Guidance for generative AI in education and research*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural organisation

Werdiningsih, I. M., & Rusdin, D. (2024). Balancing AI and authenticity: EFL students' experiences with ChatGPT in academic writing. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, *11*(1), 23-34.https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2024.2392388

AUTHOR'S PROFILE

Victoria Olubola FADEYI works with the National Mathematical Centre, Abuja, Nigeria. She is the immediate past Centre Librarian and holds a Ph.D. in Library and Information Science. Her professional expertise includes ICT application to library services and education. She has published in her discipline and contributes actively to the academic community through research and public engagement.