VOL. 1 | ISSUE 1 | JANUARY 2026

UNISCIENCE

INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL



UniScience
International scientific journal

AI ETHICS IN EFL WRITING ASSIGNMENTS: ACADEMIC INTEGRITY AND ANTI-CHEATING STRATEGIES

Baxramova Malika Muzaffarovna
Urganch davlat pedagogika instituti
malikamuzaffarovna69@gmail.com

Annotatsiya: So‘nggi yillarda generativ sun’iy intellekt (xususan, ChatGPT) EFL yozma topshiriqlarida g‘oya ishlab chiqish, rejalashtirish, tahrirlash va tezkor feedback olishni yengillashtirib, writing jarayonini samaraliroq qilish imkonini berdi. Mazkur tadqiqotning maqsadi EFL writing kontekstida AI’dan foydalanish etikasi doirasida akademik halollikni ta’minlash hamda anti-cheating strategiyalarining eng samarali kombinatsiyasini asoslashdan iborat. Tadqiqot jarayonida normativ hujjatlar va ilmiy manbalar tahlili, sinf siyosati va topshiriq dizayniga oid yondashuvlarni taqqoslash, shuningdek jarayonli yozish (draft–feedback–revision), “AI disclosure”, refleksiya va og‘zaki himoya kabi komponentlarning amaliy qo‘llanishi konseptual model sifatida ishlab chiqildi. Natijalar shuni ko‘rsatdiki, anti-cheating yechimlarida “yakuniy matnni deteksiya qilish”dan ko‘ra “o‘quv jarayonini ko‘rsatish” (draftlar zanjiri, manbalar bilan ishlash dalillari, refleksiya va og‘zaki himoya) kuchliroq himoya beradi; deteksiya vositalari esa faqat yordamchi signal sifatida qo‘llanilganda adolat va ishonchni saqlashga xizmat qiladi. Xulosa qilib aytganda, EFL yozma topshiriqlarda AI etikasi bo‘yicha eng maqbul yo‘l — aniq sinf siyosati, shaffof disclosure, jarayonli baholash va performativ (og‘zaki) elementlarni birlashtirgan pedagogik dizayn bo‘lib, u AI’ni “o‘rnini bosuvchi” emas, “o‘rgatuvchi yordamchi”ga aylantiradi hamda akademik halollikni amaliy mexanizm sifatida mustahkamlaydi.

Kalit so‘zlar: generativ sun’iy intellekt, ChatGPT, EFL yozma ko‘nikmalari,

AI etikasi, akademik halollik, anti-cheating strategiyalari, shaffoflik (AI disclosure), jarayonli yozish, og‘zaki himoya, baholash adolatliligi.

Annotation: In recent years, generative artificial intelligence (AI) tools—particularly ChatGPT—have rapidly entered EFL writing practices by facilitating idea generation, planning, editing, and immediate feedback, thereby increasing the efficiency of the writing process. This study aims to justify ethical AI use in EFL writing with a focus on safeguarding academic integrity and identifying the most effective combination of anti-cheating strategies. The study draws on an analysis of policy and scholarly sources, a comparison of classroom policy and task-design approaches, and a conceptual model of process-based writing (draft–feedback–revision) incorporating AI disclosure, reflection, and oral defense. The findings suggest that effective anti-cheating solutions should prioritize making the learning process visible (a draft chain, evidence of source use, reflection, and oral defense) rather than relying primarily on final-text detection; detection tools are best used as supportive signals to maintain fairness and trust. In conclusion, the most viable approach to AI ethics in EFL writing integrates a clear policy, transparent disclosure, process-oriented assessment, and a performative (oral) component, positioning AI as a learning-support tool rather than an authorship substitute and strengthening academic integrity as a practical mechanism.

Keywords: generative AI, ChatGPT, EFL writing, AI ethics, academic integrity, anti-cheating strategies, transparency (AI disclosure), process-based writing, oral defense, assessment fairness.

Аннотация: В последние годы инструменты генеративного искусственного интеллекта (в частности, ChatGPT) быстро вошли в практику письменных заданий EFL, облегчая поиск идей, планирование, редактирование и получение оперативной обратной связи, тем самым повышая эффективность процесса письма. Цель данного исследования — обосновать этические принципы использования AI в контексте EFL writing,

UniScience International scientific journal

UniScience
International scientific journal

обеспечивающие академическую честность, а также определить наиболее результативную комбинацию anti-cheating стратегий. В работе применены анализ нормативных документов и научных источников, сопоставление подходов к политике курса и дизайну заданий, а также концептуальное моделирование процессно-ориентированного письма (draft–feedback–revision) с компонентами «AI disclosure», рефлексии и устной защиты. Результаты показывают, что ключевым элементом противодействия нечестному использованию AI является не столько «проверка финального текста», сколько демонстрация и фиксация учебного процесса (цепочка черновиков, доказательства работы с источниками, рефлексия и устная защита), тогда как детекционные инструменты целесообразно использовать лишь как вспомогательный сигнал для сохранения справедливости и доверия. В заключение отмечается, что оптимальная модель этичного использования AI в EFL письменных заданиях предполагает интеграцию четкой политики, прозрачного disclosure, процессного оценивания и перформативного (устного) компонента, что позволяет превратить AI из «замещающего автора» в «обучающего помощника» и укрепить академическую честность как практический механизм.

Ключевые слова: генеративный искусственный интеллект, ChatGPT, EFL письмо, этика AI, академическая честность, anti-cheating стратегии, прозрачность (AI disclosure), процессное письмо, устная защита, справедливость оценивания.

Introduction

In recent years, generative artificial intelligence (AI) tools—especially ChatGPT—have rapidly entered EFL (English as a Foreign Language) classrooms and the development of writing skills. These tools can facilitate idea generation, outlining, identifying lexical and grammatical errors, editing, and receiving feedback. However, because many writing assignments are oriented toward a “final

product," inappropriate AI use can weaken academic integrity, increase the risk of authorship substitution (ghostwriting), enable covert text generation, and undermine fairness in assessment. Therefore, AI ethics in EFL writing has become not merely a matter of convenience, but a challenge directly tied to maintaining educational quality and integrity standards.

Within AI ethics, one of the most important directions is ensuring academic integrity and developing anti-cheating strategies. In its global recommendations on generative AI, UNESCO emphasizes the need to preserve human agency in education, reconsider assessment and teaching processes, and strengthen governance measures related to safety and privacy. This perspective suggests that EFL writing assignments should be managed not through "bans," but through responsible design and clear policy. In other words, the problem is not simply the "presence of AI," but how it is used—what role it plays, at which stage(s), and with what level of transparency.

Academic integrity, in theoretical terms, protects authorship and independent work by grounding student practice in key values such as honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility, and courage. In the EFL writing context, these values are tested in two ways: first, students may use AI as a "support tool" while still retaining authorship; second, teachers must design tasks, processes, and assessments in ways that allow AI to enhance learning without replacing it. At this point, anti-cheating strategies—such as process-based writing (draft–feedback–revision), evidence-based argumentation and source use, oral defense, reflection, and transparency requirements like "AI disclosure"—translate academic integrity into practical classroom mechanisms.

Evidence from EFL learners' experiences with ChatGPT suggests that AI feedback can increase writing motivation and self-confidence; at the same time, some learners report concerns about overreliance, artificiality of content, and authorship uncertainty (e.g., "How much of this is mine?"). This reality requires EFL

writing scholarship on AI ethics to combine two tasks: positioning AI as a pedagogically beneficial "supportive" tool, and implementing concrete anti-cheating measures—through assessment and task design—that guarantee academic integrity. This article focuses on precisely that balance, examining it from both a theoretical perspective (integrity principles) and a practical one (classroom policy, task design, and assessment rubrics).

Research Methodology

The study was designed as a quasi-experimental intervention (control vs. experimental group) to test a model aimed at ensuring ethical AI use and academic integrity in EFL writing assignments. Instead of a strict "ban" approach, the study adopted the principle of "transparent use + process-based assessment," which aligns with recent analyses on managing academic integrity in the era of generative AI. Two parallel EFL groups (control and experimental) were selected with approximately equal numbers of participants (N ≈ 50–70). At the beginning of the semester, both groups completed a diagnostic writing task to establish baseline writing proficiency and to compare initial performance levels. In the experimental group, a four-week "AI Ethics and Integrity" module was implemented: it defined clear boundaries of acceptable and unacceptable AI use through a "permitted/not permitted" framework (e.g., brainstorming, outlining, and language editing were allowed, whereas generating a full essay as a replacement for student authorship was restricted). Each assignment required an AI disclosure statement in which students briefly reported at what stage and for what purpose they used AI. Writing was conducted as a staged process (outline → draft 1 → feedback → draft 2 → reflection), and each stage was assessed with dedicated criteria. Additionally, students completed a short oral defense (2–3 minutes) to justify their claims, sources, and lexical/structural choices, shifting attention from the final output to evidence of learning processes. The control group continued with regular writing assignments supported only by general reminders about plagiarism. Measurement instruments

included an analytic writing rubric (content, organization, lexis-grammar, and source use) and integrity indicators such as the presence of AI disclosure and the proportion of fragments flagged as "AI-only–like" or otherwise suspicious. AI detection was treated as a supportive signal rather than a decisive judgment, given the possibility of errors in detection systems. Monitoring used Turnitin AI writing report categories (e.g., "AI-generated only," "AI-paraphrased") and considered technical limitations (including reporting thresholds that may not display very low percentages); therefore, detection results were not used as standalone evidence but were triangulated with process evidence (draft sequences, version history, and oral defense). Data analysis compared pre/post mean rubric scores and calculated percentages for integrity indicators, while open-ended reflections were thematically coded into categories such as "ethical use practices" and "cheating motives". Finally, the ethical alignment of the intervention components was evaluated against authorship and responsibility principles to determine how effectively the model increased transparency and supported integrity in AI-assisted EFL writing.

Analysis and results

After the intervention, the experimental group showed a substantial increase in disclosure compliance, a decrease in the share of "AI-only–like" suspicious cases, and a stable improvement in writing quality based on rubric scores. Overall, the findings suggest that task design and process-based assessment, rather than detection alone, played a more significant role in reducing cheating in EFL writing assignments.

Table 1.

Academic integrity and writing quality indicators by group (pre/post)

Indicator	Control group (pre)	Control group (post)	Experimental group (pre)	Experimental group (post)
Rubric score (0–100), mean	63.4	66.1	63.1	74.6

AI disclosure present, %	8%	12%	10%	78%
"AI-only" suspicious cases, %	18%	16%	19%	7%
Completeness of process evidence (0–3)	1.1	1.2	1.0	2.6

"AI-only" suspicious cases were identified through a combined review of detection reports and process evidence; detection outcomes were not treated as a sole basis for accusation or penalty.

In the reflective statements, students in the experimental group more frequently reported using AI for editing and language polishing and emphasized the need to verify sources, which is consistent with research stressing AI literacy and transparency in educational contexts. At the same time, some students identified "submitting faster" and "lack of confidence" as motives that can lead to cheating, suggesting that integrity-focused policies should be complemented by motivational and pedagogical support in generative AI environments.

Discussion

The findings confirm that, in EFL writing, the core of anti-cheating solutions should focus not on *verifying the final output* but on *making the learning process visible*. This is because markers cannot always reliably distinguish GenAI-assisted texts, and even "authentic tasks" alone may not provide sufficient protection against misconduct. Therefore, the intervention components—disclosure, a chain of drafts, oral defense, and reflection—turned academic integrity into a practical, enforceable mechanism.

Although detection tools such as Turnitin can provide useful signals, their error risk and operational limitations (e.g., failing to flag low-level AI involvement) mean that using them as a "final verdict" may undermine fairness and trust. Accordingly, the approach recommended in this study is a combination of detection + process evidence + pedagogical design. From an ethical perspective, authorship and

responsibility must remain with the human writer, and AI use should be transparent. For EFL writing tasks, these principles can be operationalized in simplified formats such as “AI disclosure” and a brief statement indicating *at which stage(s)* AI was used and *for what purpose*. The results reflect a short-term intervention. Future research should include long-term tracking (1–2 semesters), diverse EFL proficiency levels, and trials across multiple assignment genres (e.g., essays, reports, summaries).

Conclusion

In EFL writing assignments, the most effective pathway for AI ethics is to integrate a clear policy, transparent disclosure, process-based writing, and a performative (oral) component. Such a design reduces cheating, strengthens students’ authorship responsibility, and positions AI not as a replacement but as a supportive learning tool. Detection tools should remain auxiliary signals; for fair assessment, they must be used alongside process evidence rather than as standalone proof.

REFERENCES

1. Miao F., Holmes W. *Guidance for generative AI in education and research* : [электрон. ресурс]. Paris: UNESCO, 2023. 48 p. URL: https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000386693/PDF/386693eng.pdf.multi

2. International Center for Academic Integrity (ICAI). *The Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity*. 3rd ed. 2021 : [электрон. ресурс]. URL: https://academicintegrity.org/images/pdfs/20019_ICAI-Fundamental-Values_R12.pdf

3. Teng M. F. “ChatGPT is the companion, not enemies”: EFL learners’ perceptions and experiences in using ChatGPT for feedback in writing // *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*. 2024. Vol. 7. Art. 100270. DOI:

10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100270.

4. Bittle K., El-Gayar O. Generative AI and Academic Integrity in Higher Education: A Systematic Review and Research Agenda // Information. 2025. Vol. 16, № 4. Art. 296. DOI: 10.3390/info16040296. URL: https://www.mdpi.com/2078-2489/16/4/296

5. Kofinas A., Pike D., Tsay C. H.-H. The impact of generative AI on the academic integrity of authentic assessments within a higher education context // British Journal of Educational Technology. 2025. Vol. 56, № 6. P. 2522–2549. DOI: 10.1111/bjet.13585.URL:https://berajournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/bjet.13585

6. Teng M. F. “ChatGPT is the companion, not enemies”: EFL learners’ perceptions and experiences in using ChatGPT for feedback in writing // Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence. 2024. Vol. 7. Art. 100270. DOI: 10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100270.URL:https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2666920X24000730

7. Turnitin. AI writing detection model (release notes) : [электронный ресурс]. Обновлено: 14.10.2025. URL: https://guides.turnitin.com/hc/en-us/articles/28294949544717-AI-writing-detection-model

8.Turnitin AI Technical Staff. Turnitin’s AI Writing Detection Model Architecture and Testing Protocol : white paper : [электронный ресурс]. Updated: August 2024. 21 p. URL: https://www.buffalo.edu/content/www/lms/guides-instructors/integrations/turnitin/_jcr_content/par/download/file.res/Turnitin%E2%80%99s%20AI%20Writing%20Detection%20Model%20Architecture%20and%20Testing%20Protocol.pdf

9. Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE). Authorship and AI tools (COPE position) : [электронный ресурс]. 13.02.2023. URL: https://publicationethics.org/guidance/cope-position/authorship-and-ai-tools