



TRACKING ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE VIOLATIONS AMONG LECTURERS FOR SUSTAINABLE UNIVERSITY EDUCATION IN RIVERS STATE



¹**Dr. C. C. Ukala**

kateukala@gmail.com

Department of Educational Management,
Faculty of Education,
University of Port Harcourt,
Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria

&

²**Dr. Precious C. Aderiye**

aderiyevaluable31@gmail.com

Department of Educational Management,
Faculty of Education,
University of Port Harcourt,
Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria

Abstract

The study focused on tracking artificial intelligence violations among lecturers for sustainable university education in Rivers State. Four research questions and corresponding hypotheses guided the study. Descriptive survey design was adopted for the study and the population of the study was all the 3,624 academic staff of the three public Universities in Rivers State while 360 staff were sampled for the study using stratified random sampling technique. The instrument employed for data collection was a 20 item questionnaire named "Tracking Artificial Intelligence Violations among Lecturers for Sustainable University Education Questionnaire" (TAIVLSUEQ). The instrument was face and content validated by three Educational Management lecturers at Rivers State University while the reliability was estimated as 0.81 using Cronbach alpha statistics. Out of the 360 copies of questionnaire administered, 347 copies which represented 96.4% retrieval rate was used for analysis. The research questions were answered using mean and standard deviation while the hypotheses were tested using z-test at 0.05 level of significance. The findings of the study showed that common misuse of AI was to prepare lecture notes and write research papers. It was shown that this misuse limits critical thinking and also reduces the quality of teaching. The respondents identified that there is a unit in the University responsible for handling AI related issues while the proposed solution to AI misuse included setting up ethical committees. The study recommended the provision of relevant tools for lecturers to use this technology properly without any violation that can affect sustainable University education.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Lecturers, Technology, University Education

Introduction

The transformative role of Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) in education has been widely acknowledged, especially in the context of university systems. As technology becomes more entrenched in the fabric of higher education, universities are undergoing a paradigm shift. ICTs is defined as technological tools and resources used for communication, information storage, dissemination, and management (Bizi&Shittu, 2014), which now serves as the backbone for administrative and pedagogical processes. From the first industrial revolution to the ongoing Fourth Industrial Revolution (4IR), technological evolution has continued to disrupt traditional educational systems. Today, the rise of Artificial Intelligence (AI) represents one of the most consequential developments in this trajectory.



AI, as conceptualized by Emiri et al. (2024), involves computational systems capable of emulating and improving human cognitive and decision-making functions. Its integration into education has been significant, with scholars such as Olayinka et al. (2020) highlighting its potential to reshape university education. This technological revolution offers an opportunity for sustainable university education by enhancing efficiency, inclusivity, and quality service delivery. Today, University lecturers are burdened with an array of responsibilities including teaching, research, mentorship, and community service. Balancing these roles effectively requires innovation and support, and AI tools are gradually filling this gap. As Emiri et al. (2024) explain, many routine academic tasks such as grading, scheduling, administrative logistics, and even aspects of research synthesis are now being increasingly automated by AI systems.

This automation allows educators to focus on more strategic and human-centered activities like curriculum innovation, academic advising, and personalized student support. Ofor-Douglas (2025) argued that the integration of AI does not aim to replace traditional teaching but to complement it, thereby offering a hybrid educational model that combines the strengths of conventional pedagogy with technological efficiency. In this way, AI supports a more effective, less stressful teaching process that benefits both students and academic staff.

Despite the transformative potential of AI in higher education, several challenges undermine its effective and sustainable deployment. Chief among these is the issue of digital and AI literacy among university lecturers. Kasinidou et al. (2025) found that while many lecturers possess intermediate levels of digital literacy, they lack the advanced AI competencies required to leverage these tools to their full potential. This skills gap often leads to misuse or underutilization of AI tools, undermining the very benefits they are intended to provide. Similarly, unprofessional use of AI in academia has ethical implications. Without proper understanding and guidance, AI can be used in ways that breach academic integrity, data privacy, and the core values of scholarship. The growing concerns about AI misuse underscore the urgent need for a regulatory and capacity development framework that can guide its integration in university settings.

For AI to contribute meaningfully to sustainable university education, its integration must be done responsibly and strategically. As Nikolopoulou (2025) observed, AI can foster sustainability by improving pedagogical outcomes and streamlining resource use, but only when used ethically and proficiently. Therefore, the human interface, particularly the knowledge and attitudes of university staff is crucial to the success of AI in education. Okafor et al. (2022) emphasize the importance of training programs, apprenticeships, and continuous professional development in equipping staff with both the technical and soft skills necessary for effective AI adoption. These capacity-building efforts should be complemented by clear institutional policies and ethical guidelines that define the boundaries of AI use in the academic space. However, policy development often lags behind technology adoption. This discrepancy has created regulatory vacuums that exacerbate the risks associated with AI deployment in education.

Therefore, there is an urgent need for universities and policy institutions to bridge this gap by formulating adaptive policies that promote innovation while safeguarding against misuse. These policies must be iterative, inclusive, and informed by global best practices. Stakeholder engagement which includes university management, academic unions, students, and technology developers will be vital in creating a shared vision for responsible AI integration. Artificial Intelligence presents a remarkable opportunity to reimagine university education in a more sustainable, inclusive, and efficient manner. While the benefits of AI are profound which ranges from easing administrative burdens to improving learning outcomes as well as its professional usage remains a critical concern. The gap between AI's potential and its responsible deployment in university education highlights the importance of digital literacy, ethical awareness, and supportive institutional frameworks. For AI to become a true enabler of sustainable university education, capacity development and regulatory preparedness must go hand in hand with technological innovation. Universities must not only embrace AI but also invest in the human capital and policy infrastructure needed to make its integration purposeful, ethical, and sustainable



Some studies have been conducted to understand the usage of artificial intelligence among lecturers and how this affects University operations. One of such studies was conducted by Barango-Tariah et al., (2025) on artificial intelligence and quality service delivery in Rivers State owned universities for sustainable national development. The study used a correlational survey design. The study's responders were the faculty members of the two universities owned by Rivers State. Respondents for the study were chosen through census sampling. Data was gathered using a tool called the "Artificial Intelligence and Quality Service Delivery Questionnaire" (AIQSDQ). The instrument's three clusters each had a reliability coefficient of 0.78, 0.81, and 0.79. The z-ratio was employed to test the hypotheses at the 0.05 level of significance, and the mean and standard deviation were utilized to evaluate the data in order to answer the research questions. The study's findings demonstrated a strong correlation between service delivery and artificial intelligence.

On the other hand, Eairheartand Azimzadeh (2025) investigated the impact of artificial intelligence on college students' education and social behavior. Using electronic search techniques across many academic databases, data were extracted from 20 scholarly peer-reviewed journal papers, which were selected from 47 related articles. According to the evaluated publications, public health students' academic performance, learning attitude, self-efficacy, and motivation all increased when an AI-based chatbot was used for after-class review. Similarly, a number of additional research demonstrate that AI-powered educational assistance enhances and speeds up students' learning. However, some other research highlighted the drawbacks of AI, including concerns about data privacy, employment loss, student academic cheating chances, and the possibility of human obsolescence.

In a related manner, Emiri et al.,(2024) investigateddigital literacy among lecturers in the age of artificial intelligence. Using Yamane's method, the research selected a sample of 231 professors from a population of 545 lecturers, and the study used a descriptive survey approach. Descriptive statistics (weighted means, percentages, and frequencies) were used to examine the data, which were gathered using a structured questionnaire that was verified and shown to be reliable ($r = 0.84$). The results show that professors' actual use of AI tools is still low, despite their digital literacy on AI being somewhat above moderate. Research and writing, plagiarism detection, data analysis, presentations, content production, and idea generating are examples of common applications. Inadequate internet services, a lack of management support, challenges incorporating AI into conventional pedagogy, time constraints, and expensive software were the study's main utilization hurdles.

Furthermore, Thomaset al.,(2024) conducted an assessment of lecturers' awareness of artificial intelligence for education in a Nigerian university. A proportionate stratified random selection technique was used to choose a sample of 271 teachers. Two research questions and hypotheses served as the study's compass. Four experts validated the structured questionnaire that was used to collect the data. Following a pilot test of the questionnaire, the results were statistically analyzed using the Cronbach alpha correlation method, yielding a reliability coefficient of 0.87. The research issues were addressed using descriptive statistics such as mean and standard deviation. With a grand mean of 2.57, the study's findings showed that lecturers are aware of AI. There was no discernible difference between the mean response of male and female university lecturers about their awareness of artificial intelligence for education, according to the results of the independent samples t-test analysis.

Ahmad et al., (2023) carried out another study on the impact of artificial intelligence on human loss in decision making, laziness and safety in education. The study's approach was qualitative, and PLS-Smart was used to analyze the data. 285 students from various Chinese and Pakistani universities provided primary data for the study. The sample was selected from the population using the purposive sampling technique. The results of the data study demonstrate how AI greatly affects human decision-making and laziness. It affects privacy and security as well. The results indicate that the effects of artificial intelligence on Chinese and Pakistani society account for 27.7% of the loss of decision-making, 68.9% of human laziness, and 68.6% of personal privacy and security concerns. It has been noted that the area most impacted by AI is human laziness.

Similarly, Spivakovsky, et al.,(2023) focused their study oninstitutional policies on artificial intelligence inUniversity learning, teaching and research focusing on the experience of Kherson State

University. According to the study, the goal of these institutional regulations was to establish a framework for the use of artificial intelligence in teaching, learning, and research for all students while also fostering an inclusive atmosphere with contemporary digital tools for lecturers of non-professional specialties. Okafor et al., (2025) carried out another study on the impact of artificial intelligence on University education in Nigeria and the findings of the study suggested that AI offered significant potential that transforms teaching and learning. There were barriers to implementation such as infrastructural limitations, inadequate training and there was need to introduce proactive measures for proper usage. So far, it can be deduced that the use of AI comes with variation of challenges that need to be properly contextualized for the productive use of this technology for sustainable University education.

Objectives of the Study

The main objective of the study was to investigate how to track lecturers' violation of artificial intelligence for sustainable University education in Rivers State. The specific objectives of the study were to:

1. determine the common misuse of artificial intelligence which affects sustainable University education in Rivers State
2. examine the impact of artificial intelligence violation on sustainable University education in Rivers State
3. ascertain the ethical guidelines existing for tracking artificial intelligence violations for sustainable University education in Rivers State
4. find out the solutions for tracking lecturers' artificial intelligence violation for sustainable University education in Rivers State

Research Questions

The following research questions were formulated to guide the study:

1. What are the common misuse of artificial intelligence which affects sustainable University education in Rivers State?
2. What is the impact of artificial intelligence violation on sustainable University education in Rivers State?
3. What are the ethical guidelines existing for tracking artificial intelligence violations for sustainable University education in Rivers State?
4. What are the solutions for tracking lecturers' artificial intelligence violation for sustainable University education in Rivers State?

Research Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were tested at 0.05 significance level:

1. There is no significant difference between the mean ratings of male and female academic staff on the common misuse of artificial intelligence which affects sustainable University education in Rivers State
2. There is no significant difference between the mean ratings of male and female academic staff on the impact of artificial intelligence violation on sustainable University education in Rivers State
3. There is no significant difference between the mean ratings of male and female academic staff on the ethical guidelines existing for tracking artificial intelligence violations for sustainable University education in Rivers State
4. There is no significant difference between the mean ratings of male and female academic staff on the solutions for tracking lecturers' artificial intelligence violation for sustainable University education in Rivers State

Methodology

The study engaged a descriptive survey design which investigated the current situation of the phenomenon being interrogated. The population of the study was all the 3,624 academic staff of the three public Universities in Rivers State. There were 360 staff who was sampled for the study, consisting of 198 males and 162 females. The sample size was determined using the Taro Yamane minimum sample size determination formula while the respondents were drawn using stratified random sampling technique. The instrument used for the collection of data was a 20 item questionnaire titled "Tracking Artificial Intelligence Violations among Lecturers for Sustainable University Education Questionnaire" (TAIVLSUEQ). The instrument was structured in the form of a four point modified Likert scale of Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D) and Strongly Disagree (SD) with weighted values of 4, 3, 2 and 1 with an average value of 2.50 which was the criterion mean score used for decision making. The questionnaire was face and content validated by three Educational Management lecturers at Rivers State University while the reliability was estimated as 0.81 using Cronbach alpha statistics. Out of the 360 copies of questionnaire administered, 347 copies (190 males and 157 females) which represented 96.4% retrieval rate was used for analysis. The research questions were answered using mean and standard deviation while the hypotheses were tested using z-test at 0.05 level of significance.

Results

Answer to Research Questions

RQ₁: What are the common misuse of artificial intelligence which affects sustainable University education in Rivers State?

Table 1: Mean and standard deviation scores on the common misuse of artificial intelligence which affects sustainable University education in Rivers State

S/No	Items	Male Respondents n=190			Female Respondents n=157			Mean Set	
		Mean	$\bar{X}_1$	SD	Mean	$\bar{X}_2$	SD	$\bar{X}$	Rank
1	AI is used to manipulate research data among lecturers	2.72		0.32	2.61		0.29	2.67	3 rd
2	Lecturers use AI to prepare their lecture notes	2.81		0.28	2.74		0.27	2.78	1 st
3	Examination questions are often generated using AI	2.63		0.21	2.62		0.20	2.63	4 th
4	Some lecturers use AI to write their research papers	2.85		0.27	2.65		0.32	2.75	2 nd
5	AI is used by lecturers to grade students performance with no human input	2.43		0.31	2.37		0.21	2.40	5 th
	Average	2.69		0.28	2.56		0.26	2.64	Agree

Table 1 indicated that among the items listed, item 5 which stated that AI is used by lecturers for grading students was disagreed with a mean value of 2.43 while the other items were agreed since they were above the criterion mean value of 2.50 used for decision making. Item 2 with mean value of 2.78 ranked 1st indicating that lecturers' use of AI to prepare lecture note was the commonest misuse of artificial intelligence which affects sustainable University education in Rivers State.

RQ₂: What is the impact of artificial intelligence violation on sustainable University education in Rivers State?

Table 2: Mean and standard deviation scores on the impact of artificial intelligence violation on sustainable University education in Rivers State

S/No	Items	Male Respondents n=190			Female Respondents n=157			Mean Set	
		Mean	$\bar{X}_1$	SD	Mean	$\bar{X}_2$	SD	X $\bar{X}$	Rank
6	Reduced trust on academic credentials	2.79		0.31	2.60		0.31	2.70	4 th
7	Reduced critical thinking	2.88		0.28	2.98		0.28	2.93	1 st
8	Negative reputation of the University	2.45		0.22	2.72		0.20	2.59	5 th
9	Degradation of academic integrity	2.62		0.27	2.87		0.25	2.75	3 rd
10	Erosion of quality of teaching and research	2.70		0.21	2.93		0.21	2.82	2 nd
	Average	2.69		0.26	2.82		0.25	2.75	Agree

Table 2 showed that all the items were agreed as the impact of artificial intelligence violation on sustainable University education in Rivers State as the items had mean values that were above the criterion mean score, except for item 8 which was disagreed by the male respondents but agreed by the female respondents with mean scores of 2.45 and 2.72 respectively. Item 7 ranked 1st with average mean score of 2.93, indicating that reduced critical thinking was the major impact of artificial intelligence violation on sustainable University education in Rivers State

RQ₃: What are the ethical guidelines existing for tracking artificial intelligence violations for sustainable University education in Rivers State?

Table 3: Mean and standard deviation scores on the ethical guidelines existing for tracking artificial intelligence violations for sustainable University education in Rivers State

S/No	Items	Male Respondents n=190			Female Respondents n=157			Mean Set	
		Mean	$\bar{X}_1$	SD	Mean	$\bar{X}_2$	SD	X $\bar{X}$	Rank
11	Existence of ethical guideline for AI use in the University	2.56		0.30	2.57		0.31	2.57	4 th
12	There are procedures for investigating alleged AI violations	2.64		0.27	2.59		0.29	2.62	2 nd
13	The University has a unit that oversees AI detection activities	2.70		0.24	2.67		0.22	2.69	1 st
14	There is an AI use policy that currently exists in the University	2.60		0.26	2.56		0.28	2.58	3 rd
15	There are byelaws which states how lecturers should responsibly use AI	2.55		0.31	2.51		0.23	2.53	5 th
	Average	2.61		0.28	2.58		0.27	2.60	Agree

Table 3 revealed that items 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15 all had mean scores that were above the criterion mean score of 2.50 and as such, were all agreed. However, the mean set score showed that item 13 ranked 1st indicating that there is a unit that oversees AI detection activities while item 15 ranked 5th with mean value of 2.53 indicating that there are bye laws that states how Universities should use AI responsibly which were all part of the ethical guidelines existing for tracking artificial intelligence violations for sustainable University education in Rivers State.

RQ4: What are the solutions for tracking lecturers' artificial intelligence violation for sustainable University education in Rivers State?

Table 4: Mean and standard deviation scores on the solutions for tracking lecturers' artificial intelligence violation for sustainable University education in Rivers State

S/No	Items	Male Respondents n=190		Female Respondents n=157		Mean Set	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	X̄	Rank
16	AI detection tools are available for tracking violations	2.67	0.21	2.68	0.29	2.68	2 nd
17	Lecturers are trained on how to use AI responsibly	2.62	0.29	2.58	0.27	2.60	4 th
18	Lecturers have incentives for the professional use of AI	2.48	0.32	2.43	0.24	2.46	5 th
19	Ethical committees exists to grant approval for AI usage	2.71	0.22	2.75	0.32	2.73	1 st
20	Policies are implemented to guide the use of AI	2.69	0.21	2.65	0.31	2.67	3 rd
	Average	2.63	0.25	2.62	0.29	2.63	Agree

Table 4 showed that items 16, 17, 19 and 20 with mean scores that were above the criterion mean score of 2.50 used for decision making were among the solutions for tracking lecturers' artificial intelligence violation for sustainable University education in Rivers State. However, item 18 with mean value of 2.48 from the male respondents and 2.43 from the female respondents as well as an average mean set score of 2.46 which ranked 5th indicated that incentives for the professional use of AI was not among the solutions for tracking lecturers' artificial intelligence violation for sustainable University education in Rivers State.

Test of Hypotheses

HO₁: There is no significant difference between the mean ratings of male and female academic staff on the common misuse of artificial intelligence which affects sustainable University education in Rivers State

Table 5: z-test analysis of no significant difference between the mean ratings of no significant difference between the mean ratings of male and female academic staff on the common misuse of artificial intelligence which affects sustainable University education in Rivers State

Variable	n	Mean	SD	df	z-cal.	z-crit.	Level of Significance	Decision
Male Respondents	190	2.69	0.28	345	4.48	1.96	0.05	Rejected
Female Respondents	157	2.50	0.26					

Table 5 revealed that at 5% significance level and 345 degrees, of freedom, the value of z-crit. of 1.96 was less than the value of z-cal. of 4.48 and as such, the null hypothesis was rejected, implying that there was a significant difference between the mean ratings of male and female academic staff on the common misuse of artificial intelligence which affects sustainable University education in Rivers State.

HO₂: There is no significant difference between the mean ratings of male and female academic staff on the impact of artificial intelligence violation on sustainable University education in Rivers State

Table 6: z-test analysis of no significant difference between the mean ratings of no significant difference between the mean ratings of male and female academic staff on the impact of artificial intelligence violation on sustainable University education in Rivers State

Variable	n	Mean	SD	df	z-cal.	z-crit.	Level of Significance	Decision
Male Respondents	190	2.69	0.26	345	4.73	1.96	0.05	Rejected
Female Respondents	157	2.82	0.28					

Table 6 revealed that at 5% significance level and 345 degrees, of freedom, the value of z-crit. of 1.96 was less than the value of z-cal. of 4.73 and as such, the null hypothesis was rejected, implying that there was a significant difference between the mean ratings of male and female academic staff on the impact of artificial intelligence violation on sustainable University education in Rivers State.

HO₃: There is no significant difference between the mean ratings of male and female academic staff on the ethical guidelines existing for tracking artificial intelligence violations for sustainable University education in Rivers State

Table 7: z-test analysis of no significant difference between the mean ratings of no significant difference between the mean ratings of male and female academic staff on the ethical guidelines existing for tracking artificial intelligence violations for sustainable University education in Rivers State

Variable	n	Mean	SD	df	z-cal.	z-crit.	Level of Significance	Decision
Male Respondents	190	2.61	0.28	345	1.01	1.96	0.05	Not Rejected
Female Respondents	157	2.58	0.27					

Table 7 revealed that at 5% significance level and 345 degrees, of freedom, the value of z-crit. of 1.96 was more than the value of z-cal. of 1.01 and as such, the null hypothesis was rejected, implying that there was no significant difference between the mean ratings of male and female academic staff on the ethical guidelines existing for tracking artificial intelligence violations for sustainable University education in Rivers State.

HO₄: There is no significant difference between the mean ratings of male and female academic staff on the solutions for tracking lecturers' artificial intelligence violation for sustainable University education in Rivers State

Table 8: z-test analysis of no significant difference between the mean ratings of no significant difference between the mean ratings of male and female academic staff on the solutions for tracking lecturers' artificial intelligence violation for sustainable University education in Rivers State

Variable	n	Mean	SD	df	z-cal.	z-crit.	Level of Significance	Decision
Male Respondents	190	2.63	0.25	345	0.34	1.96	0.05	Not Rejected
Female Respondents	157	2.62	0.29					

Table 8 revealed that at 5% significance level and 345 degrees, of freedom, the value of z-crit. of 1.96 was less than the value of z-cal. of 0.34 and as such, the null hypothesis was rejected, implying that there was no significant difference between the mean ratings of male and female academic staff on the solutions for tracking lecturers' artificial intelligence violation for sustainable University education in Rivers State.

Discussion of Findings

The result of the study revealed a critical trend of AI misuse in the academic practices of university lecturers and the most commonly reported misuse was the use of AI for preparing lecture notes. This means that there is a growing reliance on AI-generated content rather than lecturers engaging in original preparation and knowledge curation. There is no doubt that AI can be a supportive tool in enhancing teaching materials, but over-reliance on it without contextualization may dilute educational quality and reduce the authenticity of pedagogical engagement, which is critical for sustainability in university education (Barango-Tariah et al., 2025; Okafor et al., 2025). This is an issue that Universities must give proper attention to.

Similarly, it was shown that there was the use of AI in writing research papers and manipulating research data is a gross misconduct, which has eventually become practicable with the advent of AI (Emiri et al., 2024). These practices compromise academic integrity and the credibility of scholarly outputs. Given the role of universities as research base, such malpractices threaten the foundational values of University education (Spivakovsky et al., 2023). The generation of examination questions using AI was also identified and this further raises ethical and quality assurance concerns, especially in disciplines requiring critical thinking and contextual application.

Interestingly, the only item below the decision threshold was the use of AI for grading students without human oversight. This suggests that while automation is being adopted in academic functions, there is a relatively lower acceptance or actual implementation of fully automated grading systems, possibly due to quality control, fairness concerns, or institutional limitations which is known to the lecturers (Thomas et al., 2024). This must however be compared with extant grading policies in order for the Universities to adopt best practices that will not violate enhanced University educational outcomes.

The result of the study further highlighted the far-reaching consequences of AI misuse on the sustainability of university education in Rivers State. The most significant impact, as reported by both male and female lecturers, was the reduction in critical thinking among students. This finding aligns with global concerns that AI tools such as ChatGPT and automated essay writers may lead students to bypass mental rigor, undermining their analytical and creative abilities (Ahmad et al., 2023). The erosion of teaching and research quality and degradation of academic integrity were also strongly acknowledged impacts according to the response of the lecturers. These outcomes suggest a scenario where universities may appear productive on paper but are hollowing out the very processes that sustain academic excellence. Reduced trust in academic credentials further reflects a growing skepticism from stakeholders such as employers, accrediting bodies, and the public about the validity of university qualifications.

In the same manner, although the negative reputation of universities was not strongly agreed upon by male respondents, the female lecturers considered it a more significant issue. This gender variance in perception may be tied to differing degrees of concern about external validation and institutional image, particularly across the sampled institutions. Similarly, the respondents generally agree that there are existing ethical frameworks and monitoring structures aimed at controlling AI-related violations in universities. The most agreed-upon was the presence of a unit overseeing AI detection activities, suggesting a level of institutional awareness and administrative structuring to manage AI integration (Spivakovsky et al., 2023). Additionally, the availability of investigative procedures, existence of AI-use policies and ethical guidelines point to a foundational commitment toward responsible AI adoption (Okafor et al., 2025). However, the relatively low mean for the existence of byelaws shows that formal legislative instruments guiding AI use may still be underdeveloped or poorly enforced.

Based on the responses of the lecturers, it was indicated that the establishment of ethical committees that grant approval for AI usage was highly rated as a solution for this violation. This underscores the importance of oversight mechanisms to vet and approve AI applications, promoting accountability and compliance (Barango-Tariah et al., 2025). Availability of AI detection tools and policy implementation were also highly rated. These tools and frameworks provide both technical and administrative levers for managing AI behavior within academic settings. Training lecturers on responsible AI use was another critical solution that the lecturers identified which reflects a recognition that knowledge and digital literacy are essential in curbing misuse (Emiri et al., 2024; Fairheart & Azimzadeh, 2025). Unfortunately, the lecturers revealed that incentives for professional AI use was not considered an effective solution which either suggests skepticism about its efficacy or lack of precedent within the system. The absence of meaningful incentive structures may also point to broader systemic issues in how innovation and ethics are rewarded within Nigerian universities. Therefore, it can be said that the use of AI among lecturers still requires some legislative, administrative and technical support in order to promote its proper usage for sustainable University education.

Conclusion

The study concludes that there are artificial intelligence violations that are perpetrated by lecturers in public Universities in the State and majority of these violations are as a result of lack of tracking mechanisms that are needed to promote responsible use of these technologies. The male and female respondents did not differ in their opinion on these issues and they alluded to the fact that these violations can be corrected with the right policies and regulations in place in the Universities.

Recommendations

The following recommendations emanated from the findings of the study:

1. Universities should enact rules and regulations that will guide the adoption and use of artificial intelligence by lecturers as this will guide the regulation of academic output from these institutions.
2. Ethical guidelines for the use of artificial intelligence should be institutionalized by establishing units that will be responsible for the monitoring of the use of these technologies in order to ensure academic integrity across the Universities.
3. Lecturers should be provided relevant tools and resources which will aid the use of artificial intelligence such as professional training and broadband support in order to avoid any form of academic violation.

References

- Ahmad, S. F., Han, H., Alam, M. M., Rehmat, M. K., Irshad, M., Arrano-Munoz, M. & Ariza-Montes, A. (2023). Impact of artificial intelligence on human loss in decision making, laziness and safety in education. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 10, 311



- Barango-Tariah, I. H., Ibekwe, I. T. &Wokoma, M. (2025). Artificial intelligence and quality service delivery in Rivers State owned Universities for sustainable national development: *International Journal of Educational Management, Rivers State University*, 1(2), 422-435
- Bizi, A. M. &Shittu, F. (2014). Information and Communication Technology (ICT) and education: *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 4(7), 88-91
- Eairheart, G. &Azimzadeh, R. (2025). The impact of artificial intelligence on college students' education and social behavior: *Open Access Library Journal*, 12, e12961
- Emiri, O. T., Ijiekhuamhen, O. P. &Nwankwo, W. (2024). Digital literacy among lecturers in the age of artificial intelligence: A case study. *Delta Journal of Computing, Communications & Media Technologies*, 1, 76-90
- Kasinidou, M., Kleanthoys, S. &Otterbacher, J. (2025). Cypriot teachers' digital skills and attitudes towards AI: *Discover Education*, 4(1), 1-22
- Nikolopoulou, K. (2025). Generative artificial intelligence and sustainable higher education: Mapping the potential. *Journal of Digital Educational Technology*, 5(1), ep2506
- Ofor-Douglas, S. (2025). Artificial intelligence and the sustainability of the teaching profession in Rivers State Universities. *BW Academic Journal*, 2, 14-26
- Okafor, B. N., Ogboh, V. C., Obiora-Okeke, C. A. &Ogboke, H. N. (2025). The impact of artificial intelligence in University education in Nigeria: Towards a built and sustainable environment. *Iconic Research and Engineering Journals*, 8(11), 747-756
- Okafor, B. N., Ogboke, H. N., Aniagboso, A. O. &Nwoye, N. A. (2022). Skills development and labour output in construction: Towards reducing poverty in the society. *Iconic Research and Engineering Journals*, 5(7), 528-530
- Olayinka, A. S., Nwankwo, W. &Olayinka, T. C. (2020). Model based machine learning approach to predict thermoelectric figure of merit: *Archive of Science and Technology*, 1(1), 55-57
- Spivakovsky, O., Omelchuk, S., Kobets, V., Valko, N. &Malchykova, D. (2023). Institutional policies on artificial intelligence in University learning, teaching and research: *Information Technologies and Learning Tools*, 97(5), 181-202
- Thomas, G., Gambari, A. I., Yusuf, H. T., Abanikannda, M. O. &Daramola, F. O. (2024). Assessment of lecturers' awareness of artificial intelligence for education in a Nigerian university: *Educational Technology Quarterly*, 4, 378-389