SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS' PERSPECTIVES ON AUTHORSHIP ANALYSIS IN THE CONTEXT OF AI-PLAGIARISM ON STUDENTS' WORKS IN ENGLISH LESSONS

Fauziyyah Mufida Suni[1], Rizka Maulidya[2], Anisa Wahyu Dwi Putri[3]*

1, 2, 3 Language Education, Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia,

fauziyyahmufida.2024@student.uny.ac.id

OPEN ACCESS
ISSN 2503 3492 (online)

**Correspondence:*

Fauziyyah Mufida Suni

Rizka Maulidya

Anisa Wahyu Dwi Putri

Citation:
Suni et al. (2025).Secondary School Teachers' Percepectives on Authorship Anlaysis in the Context of AI-Plagiarism on Students' Works in English Lessons.
IJILS Vol. 3 Issue 2

ABSTRACT

The rapid integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into educational environments has created new challenges for maintaining academic integrity, particularly concerning AI-assisted student work. As traditional plagiarism-detection tools prove insufficient against sophisticated AI-generated content, there is a growing need to explore teacher-driven detection strategies. This descriptive qualitative study addresses this gap by investigating teachers' views on using authorship analysis as a method to identify AI-generated content in student assignments. The research utilised semi-structured interviews with ten secondary school teachers specialising in the English language. Data were analysed using thematic analysis. The findings revealed three primary themes: (1) The ELT Vulnerability to AI, highlighting an increasing concern about AI-assisted plagiarism in English language teaching; (2) The Resource Gap, where teachers express a lack of sufficient training and institutional resources to address the challenge effectively; and (3) The suggestion to combine AI detection tools, manual authorship analysis, and conversations with students as a strategy. The study highlights how institutional policies and the specific local educational context influence teachers' attitudes toward AI and academic integrity. There is a need to establish clear AI policies and promote AI literacy to students.

Keywords: **artificial intelligence; authorship analysis; plagiarism; students' works; teachers' perspectives**

INTRODUCTION

The rise of Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) in education changes the classroom dynamic, how teachers teach, and how students learn. Since its introduction and spread in many sectors, Generative AI has become something common. The use of AI in academics brings both opportunities and challenges (Fowler, 2023; Fui-Hoon Nah et al., 2023). Yeo (2023) stated that AI creates opportunities to enhance learning and support personalized learning for students. It also helps teachers automate grading and much more. AI can help both the student and the teacher to maximize the teaching and learning process.

On the other hand, AI accessibility becomes a double-edged sword (AlAfnan et al., 2023; Alexander et al., 2023; Hutson, 2024). Artificial Intelligence tools in education, such as QuillBot and Grammarly, can help students improve their writing. However, that also means students could easily generate essays, reports, and other academic work without actually doing the work. Khatri & Karki (2023) mentioned how AI accessibility raised concerns about academic integrity. This phenomenon raises questions about the authenticity, originality, and validity of current systems (Elkhatat, 2023).

The rise of AI-generated content and plagiarism necessitates a transformation in our education system (Song, 2024; Wiredu et al., 2024). The dependency on AI referred to "AI-giarism" phenomenon (Chan, 2025). AI-giarism happens when students modify AI-generated text through paraphrasing, translating, or blending it with their writing (Chaka, 2023, 2024; Chan & Hu, 2023). Students became tempted to turn in AI-generated work instead of their own (Perkins & Roe, 2024; Perkirns, 2023). Teachers express concern that students may use these resources to avoid learning. This may cause students to fail to develop essential skills such as critical thinking and writing skills (Mugambiwa, 2024). The consequences could be severe if this problem is not escalated and addressed promptly (Grassini, 2023; Tan et al., 2024; Zhai et al., 2024).

AI should function as a supporting tool for learning. It should scaffold students' learning and foster their critical thinking development (Abbas et al., 2023; Khalil & Er, 2023). However, the current education system is still

struggling to implement clear policies and detection systems to regulate this phenomenon. Students should be able to use AI ethically and as a shortcut to cheat the learning systems. It requires a re-evaluation of how to assess authenticity and authorship in the classroom (Song, 2024). To maintain academic integrity, there is a urgent need for a new detection strategy (Nakazawa et al., 2022; Yusuf et al., 2024).

Furthermore, to address these issues, teachers utilise the AI detection tools. However, these methods became increasingly insufficient (Khalil & Er, 2023; Kumar et al., 2024). Effective and accurate AI detection tools are needed. This has become increasingly crucial as the content itself gets trickier to identify (Ganguly & Pandey, 2024; Jafari & Keykha, 2024). With the rapid advances in AI generation, many current detection tools are struggling to keep up. The students have become cleverer in utilizing AI that can bypass the AI detection system. They find a way to paraphrase, translate, or substitute words so that the detection system could not detect them (Uygun, 2024). Traditional plagiarism detection tools often miss AI-generated text altogether. These points highlight a significant gap in existing resources. This situation highlights the urgent need for new strategies to tackle the issue. The challenges posed by AI are prompting educators to actively seek out more reliable methods for detecting plagiarism and maintaining academic integrity (Qadhi et al., 2024; Yeo, 2023). The inconsistency in existing plagiarism-detection resources and the demand to detect AI-generated content in students' work emphasize the need for alternative detection systems (Chan & Hu, 2023; McLennan et al., 2022).

This challenge underscores the importance of exploring alternative methods to maintain academic integrity. With the limitations of AI detection tools, this research explores authorship analysis as an alternative. Authorship analysis originating from forensic linguistics that involves examining a text's stylistic features to determine its origin (Ding et al., 2019). It offers a promising way to spot AI in students' work. It involves examining writing style, vocabulary, syntax, semantic coherence, stylistic structures, and patterns to confirm authenticity (Puspitasari et al., 2024). This method has emerged as a viable solution for detecting AI-generated content. With authorship analysis, educators can pinpoint inconsistencies between a student's writing and AI-generated writing.

This study takes a deep dive into Indonesian English teachers' perspectives on authorship analysis to detect AI-generated writing. The study aims to provide an insight into how integrating human judgement (authorship analysis) can uphold academic integrity. This research seeks to answer the following research questions:

1. Is teacher knowledge of authorship analysis sufficient to identify Generative AI in students' works?
2. Can authorship analysis be effectively applied in the classroom?

There are shifts in students' and teachers' perceptions in understanding the ethical use of AI in academic writing (Carobene et al., 2023; Lin, 2024). Students consider AI a valid tool to help them with writing tasks. However, teachers argue for stricter guidelines to limit misuse and ensure educational integrity (Hutson, 2024; Kharis et al., 2024). This difference of opinion underscores the importance of clear policy regarding the ethical use of AI in education (Dergaa et al., 2023; Doskaliuk et al., 2025). Previous studies agree that there is a need for clear rules or policies about AI use in the classroom (Liu et al., 2024; Tang et al., 2024). The educational institution must prepare tools, training for teachers, and policies to equip teachers with the needed knowledge and skills to tackle AI in the classroom (Abubakar et al., 2024; Ganguly & Pandey, 2024).

While AI tools evolve and spread rapidly, institutions and teachers cannot keep pace (Aghaziarati et al., 2023; Azoulay et al., 2023). Professional development programs for teachers are also needed. Teachers need to equip themselves with the necessary knowledge and skills as the integration of AI has become more common. Teacher training, workshops, and courses should focus on understanding the ethical implications of AI use and developing effective strategies to detect AI-generated works (Amzat & Adewojo, 2023; Krueger et al., 2025). Meaningful discussions about authorship analysis and academic integrity need to be continued. Professional development programs should foster an educational atmosphere that embraces innovation and upholds academic standards (Amzat & Adewojo, 2023; Mugambiwa, 2024).

Teacher professional development is essential for maintaining academic integrity and ensure the ethical use of AI in the classroom (Halaweh, 2023). Incorporating AI in education needs a thorough evaluation of existing teaching practices and careful reconsideration of the ethical implications of this technology (Doskaliuk et al., 2025; Kumar et al., 2024). Understanding teachers' viewpoints is crucial for gaining insights into how to effectively incorporate authorship analysis in education to address the challenges posed by AI (Abbas et al., 2023; Khalil & Er, 2023).

Previous research mainly focuses on technical aspects and not the human experience in implementation. Despite its potential, little is known about the application of authorship analysis in classroom settings, particularly from teachers' perspectives. This study addresses this gap by investigating teachers' perspectives on the applicability of authorship analysis and identifying the

specific challenges they face in its implementation. There is a clear need for innovative methods to assess and evaluate academic assignments. This also highlights the necessity for a comprehensive framework to tackle the various challenges posed by AI (Khatri & Karki, 2023; Perkins & Roe, 2024).

METHOD

Research design

For this study, the researchers employed a qualitative approach using a descriptive qualitative design. This design is appropriate because the study aims to explore teachers' perspectives on authorship analysis in identifying AI-generated content in student work, an emerging issue that requires detailed and context-specific understanding. Descriptive qualitative research enables the researcher to remain close to participants' actual expressions and experiences, allowing for rich, straightforward descriptions of the phenomenon without imposing a complex theoretical interpretation (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). Through this approach, the study can capture teachers' nuanced insights into AI-assisted plagiarism and the practical challenges they encounter in evaluating student authorship. This makes the method particularly effective for documenting the depth, variation, and contextual factors that shape teachers' views within the educational setting.

Research site and Participant

The research site was selected because English teachers in this context have recently encountered an increase in AI-generated student assignments, making it a relevant environment for investigating teachers' perspectives on authorship analysis and academic integrity.

Purposive sampling was used to recruit ten Indonesian English language teachers from the selected institution(s). These teachers were chosen based on their direct involvement in evaluating students' written work and their prior exposure to issues related to AI-generated plagiarism. To ensure the relevance and depth of the data, participants were required to meet the following criteria:

1. At least two years of English teaching experience.
2. Direct experience identifying or suspecting AI-generated content in students' assignments.
3. Familiarity with AI detection methods or strategies.
4. Awareness of the AI tools commonly used by students to produce schoolwork.

The combination of this institutional context and purposeful participant selection ensured that the study captured authentic, informed, and contextually grounded insights into teachers' experiences with AI-assisted plagiarism.

Recruitment occurred via online educational forums and mailing lists. It was done through school networks and the affiliated teacher community. This was done to ensure representation across all institutions. The inclusion of multiple institution types allowed the researchers to gather perspectives from teachers working in different administrative, technological, and pedagogical environments. Although qualitative research does not aim for statistical representativeness, representativeness was evaluated in terms of experiential relevance that is, teachers were selected because they had first-hand experience with AI-assisted plagiarism and authorship verification. This ensured that the sample adequately reflected those most directly involved with the phenomenon under investigation. Informed consent was obtained, emphasizing confidentiality and voluntary participation. Ten teachers who fully addressed the criteria were involved. The targeted participants also experienced AI-generated content in students' assignments that breached institutional policies and academic integrity. Teachers meeting this study's criteria may depict whether authorship analysis was significant and applicable to investigate AI-generated content in students' works.

Data collection and analysis

Empirical data were gathered through semi-structured interviews. The questions were adapted from Thomas (2018) study on teachers' perceptions of plagiarism and were modified to address the emerging issue of AI-generated student work. The interview guide contains open-ended and semi-structured prompts designed to explore teachers' experiences, perceptions, and sttateges holistically and comprehensively. The guide was validated through expert review and pilot testing. For accessibility, the interviews were conducted online or offline. It allows participants (teachers) from diverse educational contexts to participate conveniently. Ethical considerations, including informed consent and confidentiality, were strictly followed throughout the data collection process. Participants were fully informed about the study's purpose, their right to withdraw at any time, and how their data would be protected. The interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim. The researchers documented assumptions about AI plagiarism before interviews to minimize bias and prioritized participants' insights.

The interview data were analyzed using thematic analysis following the six-phase framework of Braun and Clarke (2006). All interview recordings were transcribed verbatim. The primary researcher read each transcript several times while listening to the audio to check transcription accuracy and to note initial

impressions and recurring ideas. Memos were written during this stage to capture early analytic thoughts and potential patterns. Initial coding was conducted manually and systematically across the entire dataset. Each meaningful text segment was assigned a concise code that described its semantic content (e.g., "sudden language sophistication," "inconsistent drafting process," "tool awareness"). Codes were recorded in a central codebook with the following fields: code label, definition, inclusion/exclusion criteria, example quote(s), and source transcript ID. The codebook was iteratively refined as new codes emerged. Codes were collated into candidate themes by grouping related codes together (for example, codes about detection strategies and codes about tool limitations were grouped under a candidate theme such as "practical detection strategies"). Visual displays (tables and thematic maps) and a spreadsheet were used to arrange codes and candidate themes to see how they fitted together across participants and institutions. Candidate themes were reviewed in two stages: (a) checking coherence within each theme by re-reading all data excerpts assigned to that theme and (b) checking the relation of themes to the entire data set to ensure they captured the dataset's important patterns. During this process some candidate themes were split, merged, or discarded. Discrepancies in thematic boundaries were resolved through researcher discussion until consensus was reached.

To ensure the study's trustworthiness, the researcher employed multiple strategies. The researcher established credibility by conducting member checks with five participants. These participants reviewed and confirmed the accuracy of the transcripts and findings. The researcher provided detailed descriptions of the research context and participant experiences to support transferability. It allows the readers to evaluate how applicable the findings might be in similar educational settings. The researcher addressed dependability by keeping thorough coding documentation and using a code review procedure. This strategy involves revisiting and re-coding the data to ensure consistency.

Additionally, the researchers maintained a reflexive journal to recognize and reduce personal biases. This supports confirmability and ensures the results genuinely reflect the participants' perspectives. This study acknowledges that the findings are specific to the context and cannot be generalized broadly. As a qualitative study, it offers a detailed and transparent analysis to enhance our understanding of teachers' perspectives on AI plagiarism and authorship analysis in similar classroom contexts.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Results

This qualitative study investigated the views of ten teachers regarding authorship analysis to identify AI-generated content in students' work. The data collected shows that teachers are struggling with increasing cases of AI generated content in students' work with limited support. The study was conducted through semi-structured online and in-person interviews with teachers from diverse backgrounds. The results offer a clear insight into how teachers recognize, detect, and tackle AI-generated content in their students' works.

1. **How Common and Serious AI-Related Plagiarism In Schools**

Most participants agreed that the problem is significant. One teacher pointed out that AI-assisted plagiarism significantly threatens academic integrity. Nine out of ten teachers expressed that AI-assisted plagiarism is an increasing concern and a noticeable problem in their classrooms. This is particularly evident in subjects that demand extensive writing, like the English language. The participants identified the problem as a "noticeable problem" and described the severity of the problem as "serious," "urgent," and "quite significant". This problem heavily impacts subjects that require writing and critical thinking. One participant noted that the issue is growing rapidly.

"It has become a serious and growing issue in ELT since ELT is heavily reliant on writing, analysis, and critical thinking. Students may be tempted to use ChatGPT to generate essays, summaries, or even journals." (P1)

Students became more dependent on AI and only learned on the surface. Teachers observed that students increasingly rely on AI tools to complete assignments, leading to superficial learning patterns (Pan, 2024). This dependency was characterized by students' inability to understand or explain their submitted work, raising fundamental questions about authentic learning outcomes.

"This can make students dependent on using AI, not understanding what is written, not understanding why the assignment was given, and not understanding the importance of the assignment." (P3)

The teachers observed that students were prioritizing the completion of the tasks over the learning process. They viewed AI as a shortcut to good grades.

2. Teacher Professional Development Crisis

Despite the severity of the problems, this data collected there are gaps in teacher preparedness. The policymakers and stakeholders also only made little effort to address this problem. The data collected revealed that:

a. Lack of Training : There is limited formal training and workshops provided for teachers. Only three out of ten teachers had received formal training or workshops on detecting AI-generated content.
b. Inadequate Content : The limited training sessions that exist were described as superficial. Primarily conducted online and only revolve around awareness rather than practical skills.

"*It focused on recognizing patterns typical of AI writing, such as overly formal tone or lack of personal context." (P8)*

c. The Gap in Teacher Confidence : Teachers need more workshops and training to tackle these apparent issues. Educational institutions still fail to provide adequate teacher training. Teachers, who are the main key to this detection system, still have a divide in confidence. Precisely 5 out of 10 teachers expressed confidence in their ability to detect AI-generated work, while the remaining reported that they were lacking confidence and strongly desired formal training.

Teachers' confidence attributed their abilities to accumulated teaching experience and pattern recognition developed through encountering multiple cases.

"I started to feel more competent with my teaching experience. When I observe, compare drafts, and oversee students' work, it helped me to develop a sense for AI-generated language." (P1)

In contrast, the other half expressed that they felt unsure. The participants reported that they never felt confident in identifying AI in texts or students' work. This emphasized the need for structured or formal training, workshops, or even courses for teachers. It shows how that current detection is a self-taught skill that learnt from trial and error in the classroom. It is not a skill developed from teacher professional development.

3. Authorship Analysis by The Teacher's 'Eye'

The data collected shows teachers are already performing authorship analysis informally. These teachers mention several key features that can help identify AI-generated content and students' original work. These key identifying features help them differentiate and flag suspicious works. It is often done through stylistic awareness and comparison with past work. Teachers consistently identified several characteristics that flagged potentially AI-generated content.

Table 1 / Themes Identified from Interview

Themes	Description from Data Collected	Reason for Suspicion
Lack of Personal Voice	Absence of personal reflection, unique experiences, or local context.	AI struggles to replicate the specific, lived experience of the student.
Skill Inconsistency	Mismatch between the student's oral proficiency and written output.	A student who struggles to speak typically cannot write complex, error-free text.
Historical Inconsistency	Mismatch when compared to previous handwritten or assignments.	Jumps in quality are suspicious.
'Too Perfect'	Grammar is flawless, but critical analysis is superficial. The tone is robotic.	"Perfect grammar, but no critical analysis... and a general idea, but no local reference" (P1).
Unusual	Use of advanced vocabulary	Indicates external

Vocabulary	or sentence structures inappropriate for the student's level.	assistance (AI or translation tool).

One teacher summarized how teachers applied this multi-modal detection approach.

"The combination of human judgment with AI. Because teacher intuition still has a significant role here." (P1)

4. The Uncertainty Around Translation Tools

The existing tools might help with the detection system, but it is not foolproof. The detection system can generate false positives. It has become a common concern, especially when it comes to translation tools. When translation was included in this discussion, teachers had divided perspectives:

a. Mostly the teachers believed that translation tools complicate the detection process. Because there might be a student that writes in native language and then translates it. Creating a 'too perfect' results with unnatural English. Or students tried to translate the AI-generated content back-and-forth to force humanize the result. The forced error created, making it harder for AI detecting machines to flag it.
b. Two out of ten teachers felt the translation machine made detection easier. There are several complication factors when students utilize translation tools and AI to generate their work.

Teachers described how translation tools create problematic scenarios. So, these teachers search for detection clues in their students' work. Some teachers noted that translation tools occasionally provided detection clues through awkward vocabulary choices or grammatically correct but contextually inappropriate phrases.

5. The Lack of Clear Policies and Punishment

A significant finding revealed the absence of clear institutional policies regarding AI use in most educational settings. Teachers frequently reported creating their own rules and guidelines, leading to inconsistencies across classrooms.

"Personally, in my school's current policy, there are no rules about AI itself. There is none of it, so I do not know what to comment." (P2)

Teachers relied primarily on grade-related consequences as reinforcement strategies. GPA-related penalties are perceived as effective deterrents due to students' strong focus on academic achievement. One teacher noted that:

"Grades affect students' futures. A GPA penalty is serious enough to discourage dishonesty." (P6)

The research findings show how important the teacher's role is in addressing the issues that emerge due to AI. The teacher could not rely only on existing detection tools, as they became increasingly insufficient. School institutions, policy makers, and all stakeholders must be aware of these issues and make precise regulations and policies surrounding AI ethics in education.

Discussion

The findings strongly align with contemporary academic discourse on AI-related plagiarism. The fact that 9 out of 10 of the teachers agreed that the problem is widespread shows that this is a system-level issue that affects academic integrity at its core. Teachers' intuitive ability to identify AI-generated content through stylistic analysis demonstrates an informal application of authorship analysis principles (Pan, 2024). Their recognition of "overly polished," "too perfect," or "overly general" language patterns and inconsistencies in writing style reflects established authorship analysis techniques used in the classroom.

This shows how teacher's knowledge is important in detecting AI in students work that software cannot replace. Teachers can judge with explanation unlike a detection machine (Chan, 2025). A teacher can judge their students' coherence, voice, style, and argument development personally. Teachers have knowledge of their students' skills so they can compare with these students' previous works. Teachers have the ability to highlight unusual word choices that the student has never used before to support their judgment.

Despite the teacher's skills, a formal training or workshop is still necessary. A professional teacher development crisis is apparent, as many teachers lack a structured program to support them. With AI technology advancing rapidly, teacher training has become more important. The finding that 7 out of 10 teachers

lack adequate training represents a critical gap in professional development (Song, 2024). This deficiency severely impacts educators' confidence and effectiveness in addressing AI-assisted plagiarism, highlighting an urgent need for systematic professional development programs (Khalil & Er, 2023).

Teachers often rely on accumulated experience to develop detection skills. While it shows their adaptability, it reveals the limitations of current institutional support systems (Kotsis, 2024). Teacher training programs need teachers with the specific forensic skills of authorship analysis. Furthermore, teacher development must address the ethical dimensions of AI. Though the informal detection approach is valuable it lacks the precision and consistency that formal training could provide (Fowler, 2023).

The researchers identified that teachers have two crucial roles in detecting AI-generated content in students' work: detectors and ethics guides for students. Even though the teacher has already applied authorship analysis intuitively, the absence of proper training and workshops hinders the process of applying authorship analysis in the classroom. It limits teacher effectiveness and fairness in detecting AI-generated content in students' work. The teachers also have various confidence levels that emphasize the need for proper professional development.

This study supports the human-centered approach that combines multiple detection strategies. It emphasizes the importance of teachers' role in detecting AI-generated content. Their nuanced assessments allow them to consider and examine contextual characteristics that AI often overlooks. (Yeo, 2023) supported these findings, arguing that authorship analysis is most effectively implemented in classrooms. They emphasize that skilled educators can analyze coherence, voice, style, and argument development, particularly in a second-language learning classroom.

The need for manual review due to false positives in AI detection tools directly challenges claims about the current detection technologies (Ganguly & Pandey, 2024). Unlike studies suggesting high accuracy rates for AI detection tools, our participants consistently reported instances where legitimate student work was incorrectly flagged, necessitating human oversight. The divided perspective on translation tools (80% saying it complicates the detection vs. 20% saying it is helpful) presents an interesting contradiction to research suggesting uniform impacts of translation technologies on writing assessment. To sum up, this division may reflect varying levels of teacher expertise, different student conditions, or contextual factors not adequately addressed in previous literature (Dempere et al., 2023).

In addition to using AI detection tools, the teacher observed students' reliance on AI tools. The students also became too reliant on AI tools as a reaction to systemic pressure. The underlying reasons for students using AI can vary. The students were given high academic standards, limited English skills, and were focused only on the result. These highlight the need to redesign learning holistically. These students need new tasks, ethical AI education, student-centered learning, and deep learning, not just punitive approaches alone. While several studies promote technological solutions to AI detection strategy, this study presents how teacher and authorship analysis can address these problems. The teacher can assess the student's engagement and skill directly. They can also contextualize assessments that an AI detection system cannot do (Yeo, 2023). These reasons reveal systemic issues within educational environments. This finding justifies a more comprehensive approach to addressing AI plagiarism that extends beyond detection to address root causes (Elkhatat, 2023).

The detection system must be paired with education. The emphasis on transforming detection moments into "teachable moments" represents a sophisticated pedagogical approach that addresses intent and fosters ethical literacy. These finding challenges punitive approaches and supports educational interventions that build understanding rather than deterring behavior (Yunus & Hur Mustafa, 2020). This study reveals that the teachers' role in authorship analysis in the classroom is essential, especially when reliable tools and policies are absent. Their experience in teaching and assessing equipped them with the intuition. They can recognize AI-generated writing based on their experiences and knowledge. However, training, clear policy, and teacher support are still needed. AI-generated plagiarism is not only a technical issue but also a pedagogical and ethical issue. An AI detection system should not be separated from the learning process since every case can be a "teachable moment" for the students. The teacher needed the training, workshops, courses, policy, and guidance to be able to transfer this knowledge to students. In brief, this process can allow students to learn ethics on using AI actively, not punitively.

However, the absence of institutional policy became a huge barrier. The absence of institutional policies forces individual teachers to create ad hoc solutions, leading to inconsistency and potential unfairness. This finding has significant implications for educational institutions, highlighting the need for comprehensive AI usage policies that balance innovation with academic integrity. There are also cultural and contextual factors in this discourse. The variation in teacher responses suggests that cultural and institutional contexts significantly influence attitudes toward AI-generated content. This finding

indicates that one-size-fits-all approaches to AI policy may be insufficient, requiring culturally responsive and context-specific solutions (Dempere et al., 2023).

Authorship analysis is doable in the classroom, as it has already been practiced in the classroom. However, the teacher did it informally as there was no adequate support. This results in unclear and uneven implementation. Due to the circumstances, these teachers were forced to act independently, which worsened the detection inconsistency. Each class in each school has different policies and consequences for handling AI-generated content in students' work. To summarize, this emphasizes the urgent need for policy and teacher training or courses.

Even though this study gathered valuable insight from ten experienced teachers, it may not represent all teachers' experiences or educational contexts (Halaweh, 2023; Yusuf et al., 2024). Future research should include larger, more diverse samples across academic levels and regions (Abbas et al., 2023). Rapid evolution of AI technologies means the existing detection tools can become ineffective or outdated (Song, 2024). This limitation suggests the need for alternative and adaptive strategies to AI detection in educational settings (Fowler, 2023). Future studies should investigate how teacher attitudes and detection abilities evolve as AI technologies advance and institutional policies develop (Elkhatat, 2023). This study solely focused on teacher perspectives, so investigating students' motivations, awareness, and experiences with AI tools in academic contexts can be done in the future. A more diverse context enables comparative studies across different cultural and educational systems, providing valuable insights into AI-assisted plagiarism in the classroom.

CONCLUSION

The English teachers are facing a serious and urgent problem regarding AI-generated plagiarism. The study shows that the educational system is currently in transition. Teachers act as the main defense in the classroom because they know their students' ability well. They can detect a 'too' perfect AI-generated text instinctively. However, the teachers are struggling because there is a lack of formal support. The schools do not have sufficient policies or training to handle this new technology. Most of the current measures are just punitive and made on the spot. Without clear rules and professional development, the system becomes fragile. The teachers are trying their best, but they do not have sufficient recourse. They need to combine their human judgment with the technology to handle this issue effectively.

Students are increasingly using AI as a shortcut to get a grade rather than learning. They present work that is perfect but synthetic, losing their own developing human voice. To fix this, the focus needs to shift from policing the students to teaching them proper AI-ethics. The goal is to create an environment where students value their own imperfect writing over the AI's output. This research was suggested to establish a collaborative approach involving teachers, students, and policymakers. It aims to support authorship analysis and create supportive policies in detecting AI in students' work. This approach will be useful for upholding academic integrity and ensuring that AI is used as a tool. AI should be used to support learning, not a replacement for learning. It ensures that the transformative power of education is preserved in the digital age.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The researchers would like to thank all those involved in this research. Special thanks to the lecturers and reviewers who provided guidance and feedback to improve the quality of this research. Appreciation is given to all participants who share their time and experiences for this research.

REFERENCES

Abbas, N., Ali, L., Manzoor, R., Hussain, T., & Hussaini, M. H. A. (2023). Role of artificial intelligence tools in enhancing students' educational performance at higher levels. Journal of Artificial Intelligence, Machine Learning and Neural Network, 3(05), 36–49.

Abubakar, U., Falade, A. A., & Ibrahim, H. A. (2024). Redefining student assessment in Nigerian tertiary institutions: The impact of AI technologies on academic performance and developing countermeasures. Advances in Mobile Learning Educational Research, 4(2), 1149–1159. https://doi.org/10.25082/AMLER.2024.02.009

Aghaziarati, A., Nejatifar, S., & Abedi, A. (2023). Artificial Intelligence in Education: Investigating Teacher Attitudes. AI and Tech in Behavioral and Social Sciences, 1(1), 35–42. https://doi.org/10.61838/kman.aitech.1.1.6

AlAfnan, M. A., Samira Dishari, Marina Jovic, & Koba Lomidze. (2023). ChatGPT as an Educational Tool: Opportunities, Challenges, and Recommendations for Communication, Business Writing, and Composition Courses. Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Technology. https://doi.org/10.37965/jait.2023.0184

Alexander, K., Savvidou, C., & Alexander, C. (2023). Who wrote this essay? Detecting ai-generated writing in second language education in higher education. Teaching English With Technology, 2023(2). https://doi.org/10.56297/BUKA4060/XHLD5365

Amzat, O. B., & Adewojo, A. A. (2023). Metaverse-infused academic libraries: a glimpse into the future. Library Hi Tech News, 40(10), 17–19. https://doi.org/10.1108/LHTN-10-2023-0187

Azoulay, R., Hirst, T., & Reches, S. (2023). Let's Do It Ourselves: Ensuring Academic Integrity in the Age of ChatGPT and Beyond. https://doi.org/10.36227/techrxiv.24194874.v1

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Carobene, A., Cabitza, F., Bernardini, S., Gopalan, R., Lennerz, J. K., Weir, C., & Cadamuro, J. (2023). Where is laboratory medicine headed in the next decade? Partnership model for efficient integration and adoption of artificial intelligence into medical laboratories. Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine (CCLM), 61(4), 535–543. https://doi.org/10.1515/cclm-2022-1030

Chaka, C. (2023). Detecting AI content in responses generated by ChatGPT, YouChat, and Chatsonic: The case of five AI content detection tools. Journal of Applied Learning & Teaching, 6(2), 94–104. https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2023.6.2.12

Chaka, C. (2024). Reviewing the performance of AI detection tools in differentiating between AI-generated and human-written texts: A literature and integrative hybrid review. Journal of Applied Learning & Teaching, 7(1). https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2024.7.1.14

Chan, C. K. Y. (2025). Students' perceptions of 'AI-giarism': investigating changes in understandings of academic misconduct. Education and Information Technologies, 30(6), 8087–8108. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-13151-7

Chan, C. K. Y., & Hu, W. (2023). Students' voices on generative AI: perceptions, benefits, and challenges in higher education. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 20(1), 43. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00411-8

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches (5th ed.). SAGE Publications. https://books.google.co.id/books?id=335ZDwAAQBAJ

Dempere, J., Modugu, K., Hesham, A., & Ramasamy, L. K. (2023). The impact of ChatGPT on higher education. Frontiers in Education, 8. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2023.1206936

Dergaa, I., Chamari, K., Zmijewski, P., & Ben Saad, H. (2023). From human writing to artificial intelligence generated text: examining the prospects and potential threats of ChatGPT in academic writing. Biology of Sport, 40(2), 615–622. https://doi.org/10.5114/biolsport.2023.125623

Ding, S. H. H., Fung, B. C. M., Iqbal, F., & Cheung, W. K. (2019). Learning Stylometric Representations for Authorship Analysis. IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics, 49(1), 107–121. https://doi.org/10.1109/TCYB.2017.2766189

Doskaliuk, B., Zimba, O., Yessirkepov, M., Klishch, I., & Yatsyshyn, R. (2025). Artificial Intelligence in Peer Review: Enhancing Efficiency While Preserving Integrity. Journal of Korean Medical Science, 40(7). https://doi.org/10.3346/jkms.2025.40.e92

Elkhatat, A. M. (2023). Evaluating the authenticity of ChatGPT responses: a study on text-matching capabilities. International Journal for Educational Integrity, 19(1), 15. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-023-00137-0

Fowler, D. S. (2023). AI in Higher Education. Journal of Ethics in Higher Education, 3, 127–143. https://doi.org/10.26034/fr.jehe.2023.4657

Fui-Hoon Nah, F., Zheng, R., Cai, J., Siau, K., & Chen, L. (2023). Generative AI and ChatGPT: Applications, challenges, and AI-human collaboration. Journal of Information Technology Case and Application Research, 25(3), 277–304. https://doi.org/10.1080/15228053.2023.2233814

Ganguly, S., & Pandey, N. (2024). Deployment of AI Tools and Technologies on Academic Integrity and Research. Bangladesh Journal of Bioethics, 15(2), 28–32. https://doi.org/10.62865/bjbio.v15i2.122

Grassini, S. (2023). Shaping the Future of Education: Exploring the Potential and Consequences of AI and ChatGPT in Educational Settings. Education Sciences, 13(7), 692. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13070692

Halaweh, M. (2023). ChatGPT in education: Strategies for responsible implementation. Contemporary Educational Technology, 15(2), ep421. https://doi.org/10.30935/cedtech/13036

Hutson, J. (2024). Rethinking Plagiarism in the Era of Generative AI. Journal of Intelligent Communication, 4(1). https://doi.org/10.54963/jic.v4i1.220

Jafari, F., & Keykha, A. (2024). Identifying the opportunities and challenges of artificial intelligence in higher education: a qualitative study. Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education, 16(4), 1228–1245. https://doi.org/10.1108/JARHE-09-2023-0426

Khalil, M., & Er, E. (2023). Will ChatGPT Get You Caught? Rethinking of Plagiarism Detection. Learning and Collaboration Technologies, 475–487. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-34411-4_32

Kharis, M., Ediyanto, E., Wijaya, D. N., Yafie, E., Waluyo, B., & Resultay, R. G. (2024). The Impact of AI Usage on Transforming Student Learning Culture in Indonesia in Alignment with SDG 4. Journal of Ecohumanism, 3(8). https://doi.org/10.62754/joe.v3i8.4845

Khatri, B. B., & Karki, P. D. (2023). Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Higher Education: Growing Academic Integrity and Ethical Concerns. Nepalese Journal of Development and Rural Studies, 20(01), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.3126/njdrs.v20i01.64134

Kotsis, K. T. (2024). Artificial Intelligence Creates Plagiarism or Academic Research? European Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences, 1(6), 169–179. https://doi.org/10.59324/ejahss.2024.1(6).18

Krueger, L., Clemenson, S., Johnson, E., & Schwarz, L. (2025). ChatGPT in Higher Education: Practical Ideas for Addressing Artificial Intelligence in Nursing Education. Journal of Nursing Education, 64(5), 323–326. https://doi.org/10.3928/01484834-20240424-02

Kumar, A., Kumar, A., Bhoyar, S., & Mishra, A. K. (2024). Does ChatGPT foster academic misconduct in the future? Public Administration and Policy, 27(2), 140–153. https://doi.org/10.1108/PAP-05-2023-0061

Lin, Z. (2024). Techniques for supercharging academic writing with generative AI. Nature Biomedical Engineering, 9(4), 426–431. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41551-024-01185-8

Liu, Y., Sullivan, P., & Sinnamon, L. (2024). <scp>AI</scp> Transparency in Academic Search Systems: An Initial Exploration. Proceedings of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 61(1), 1002–1004. https://doi.org/10.1002/pra2.1167

McLennan, S., Fiske, A., Tigard, D., Müller, R., Haddadin, S., & Buyx, A. (2022). Embedded ethics: a proposal for integrating ethics into the development of medical AI. BMC Medical Ethics, 23(1), 6. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12910-022-00746-3

Mugambiwa, S. (2024). Reaping the rewards with minimal toil: Evaluating the polemics of artificial intelligence in academia and the future of academic writing. Edelweiss Applied Science and Technology, 8(6), 3535–3541.

Nakazawa, E., Udagawa, M., & Akabayashi, A. (2022). Does the Use of AI to Create Academic Research Papers Undermine Researcher Originality? AI, 3(3), 702–706. https://doi.org/10.3390/ai3030040

Pan, J. (2024). AI-driven English Language Learning Program and Academic Writing Integrity in the Era of Intelligent Interface. English Language Teaching and Linguistics Studies, 6(4), p120. https://doi.org/10.22158/eltls.v6n4p120

Perkins, M., & Roe, J. (2024). Decoding Academic Integrity Policies: A Corpus Linguistics Investigation of AI and Other Technological Threats. Higher Education Policy, 37(3), 633–653. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41307-023-00323-2

Perkirns, 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, 43(9), 159–161.

Puspitasari, D. A., Fakhrurroja, H., & Sutrisno, A. (2024). AUTHORSHIP ANALYSIS IN ELECTRONIC TEXTS USING SIMILARITY COMPARISON METHOD. Linguistik Indonesia, 42(1), 91–112. https://doi.org/10.26499/li.v42i1.544

Qadhi, S. M., Alduais, A., Chaaban, Y., & Khraisheh, M. (2024). Generative AI, Research Ethics, and Higher Education Research: Insights from a Scientometric Analysis. Information, 15(6), 325. https://doi.org/10.3390/info15060325

Song, N. (2024). Higher education crisis: Academic misconduct with generative AI. Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management, 32(1). https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5973.12532

Tan, S., Rudolph, J., & Tan, S. (2024). Riding the Generative AI Tsunami: Addressing the Teaching and Learning Crisis in Higher Education. In The Palgrave Handbook of Crisis Leadership in Higher Education (pp. 135–154). Springer Nature Switzerland. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-54509-2_8

Tang, A., Li, K., Kwok, K. O., Cao, L., Luong, S., & Tam, W. (2024). The importance of transparency: Declaring the use of generative artificial intelligence (<scp>AI</scp>) in academic writing. Journal of Nursing Scholarship, 56(2), 314–318. https://doi.org/10.1111/jnu.12938

Thomas, K. M. (2018). Teachers' perceptions of plagiarism in international high schools and divisions in China's first-tier cities. Cerdaville Unviersity.

Uygun, D. (2024). Teachers' perspectives on artificial intelligence in education. Advances in Mobile Learning Educational Research, 4(1), 931–939. https://doi.org/10.25082/AMLER.2024.01.005

Wiredu, J. K., Abuba, N. S., & Zakaria, H. (2024). Impact of Generative AI in Academic Integrity and Learning Outcomes: A Case Study in the Upper East Region. Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science, 17(8), 70–88. https://doi.org/10.9734/ajrcos/2024/v17i7491

Yeo, M. A. (2023). Academic integrity in the age of Artificial Intelligence (AI) authoring apps. TESOL Journal, 14(3). https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.716

Yunus, Y., & Hur Mustafa, Y. (2020). Learner Autonomy: A Central Theme in Language Learning. International Journal of Social Sciences & Educational Studies, 7(3). https://doi.org/10.23918/ijsses.v7i3p208

Yusuf, A., Pervin, N., & Román-González, M. (2024). Generative AI and the future of higher education: a threat to academic integrity or reformation? Evidence from multicultural perspectives. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 21(1), 21. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00453-6

Zhai, C., Wibowo, S., & Li, L. D. (2024). The effects of over-reliance on AI dialogue systems on students' cognitive abilities: a systematic review. Smart Learning Environments, 11(1), 28. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-024-00316-7