



Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) Utilisation and Academic Integrity among Master's Students in Lagos State University, Nigeria

MALIK, Muhammad Sidique¹; SHITTU, Taofeek Olawale PhD² & MALIK, Rukayat Towobola³

¹Department of Accounting, University of Lagos, Nigeria

^{1,2,3}Department of Education Management, Lagos State University, Nigeria

Received: 25.07.2026 | Accepted: 16.09.2026 | Published: 20.09.2026

*Corresponding Author: SHITTU, Taofeek Olawale PhD

DOI: [10.5281/zenodo.22856412](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22856412)

Abstract

Original Research Article

This study examined Generative Artificial Intelligence utilisation and academic integrity among master's students in Lagos State University, Nigeria. The AI literacy and competence, institutional regulation, and academic ethics awareness as determinants of academic integrity among master's students at Lagos State university, Nigeria. Anchored on Technology Acceptance Model (TAM). The population of the study comprised of 231 master's students with sample size of 170 determined by Taro Yamane formula and selected through the simple random sampling techniques. The study employed a quantitative, cross-sectional, explanatory (correlational) survey design. Data were collected using a six-section, structured questionnaire on a 5-point Likert scale. Construct validity was established through exploratory factor analysis (KMO = 0.861; Bartlett's test was significant), and reliability was confirmed with Cronbach's alpha coefficients ranging from 0.818 to 0.846. Multiple linear regression results revealed that institutional regulation on AI usage was the strongest positive predictor of academic integrity ($\beta = 0.335$, $t = 5.061$, $p < 0.001$), followed by academic ethics awareness ($\beta = 0.247$, $t = 3.747$, $p < 0.001$) and AI literacy and competence ($\beta = 0.191$, $t = 2.934$, $p = 0.004$). Generative AI utilisation emerged as the only inverse predictor ($\beta = -0.249$, $t = -3.977$, $p < 0.001$). The four predictors jointly explained 38.5% of the variance in academic integrity ($R = 0.621$; adjusted $R^2 = 0.370$), $F(4, 165) = 25.846$, $p < 0.001$. The study concludes that undisclosed AI use, rather than AI itself and erodes integrity. It is therefore recommended that Lagos State University management should develop clear GenAI guidelines by specifying acceptable and unacceptable uses of Generative AI in assignments, examinations, seminars, projects, and dissertations.

Keywords: Academic Integrity, Generative Artificial Intelligence, Master's Student and Utilization.

Copyright © 2026 The Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0)

Introduction

Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) has emerged as a transformative technology in higher education, offering students opportunities to generate ideas, summarise information, improve

writing, and support academic research. Among Masters students, its use can enhance learning and research productivity when applied responsibly. Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) refers to advanced artificial intelligence systems capable of producing human-like content such as text, images,



computer code, summaries, and research ideas in response to users' instructions. The rapid development of tools such as ChatGPT has created new possibilities for teaching, learning, research, and academic writing in higher education. For Masters students, GenAI can serve as a useful academic support tool by helping them brainstorm ideas, clarify difficult concepts, summarise scholarly materials, improve grammar, and organise written work. When used appropriately, these capabilities can improve students' learning experiences and research productivity. However, increasing reliance on GenAI has raised concerns about academic integrity, particularly regarding plagiarism, inappropriate authorship, fabrication of information, and submitting AI-generated work as students' original contributions. At Lagos State University, where postgraduate students engage extensively in research and scholarly writing, understanding how GenAI is utilised and its implications for academic integrity is important. This study therefore examines Generative AI utilisation and academic integrity among Masters students in Lagos State University, Nigeria. However, the release of ChatGPT in November 2022 marked a watershed in the application of generative artificial intelligence to higher education; for the first time, students gained access to systems capable of producing fluent, well-referenced, and largely undetectable academic content on demand (Kofinas et al., 2025). According to Mohammed, Shittu, Abudu, Mohammed and Dairo (2025), the emergence of Artificial Intelligence (AI), especially generative AI, has significantly impacted the ecosystem of higher education institutions across the world. Generative AI can be described as systems with intelligence to create original content such as text, summaries, learning notes, or analysis based on a large volume of information. Examples of such tools used in learning institutions include ChatGPT, Grammarly, Gemini, and Turnitin.

Problem of the Study

The growing use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) among university students has created new opportunities for learning, research, and academic

writing. However, its increasing adoption also raises concerns about academic integrity. Master's students at Lagos State University are expected to demonstrate originality, critical thinking, proper citation, and independent research skills. Yet, some students may rely heavily on GenAI to generate assignments, research ideas, literature reviews, and other academic outputs without adequately verifying or acknowledging its use. Such practices may encourage plagiarism, inaccurate information, misrepresentation of authorship, and reduced development of students' independent intellectual abilities. Despite these concerns, there is limited empirical evidence on how Masters students utilise GenAI and whether such utilisation influences their commitment to academic integrity at Lagos State University. This study therefore investigates GenAI utilisation and academic integrity among Masters students in Lagos State University, Nigeria.

Objectives of the Study

The study seeks to enhance academic integrity among master's students in Lagos State University, Nigeria. The following specific objectives were to:

- i. examine the effect of generative AI utilisation on academic integrity.
- ii. determine the effect of AI literacy and competence on academic integrity.
- iii. assess the effect of institutional regulation on AI usage on academic integrity.
- iv. investigate the effect of academic ethics awareness on academic integrity among master's students in Lagos State universities.

Research Hypotheses

In line with the objectives stated above, the following null hypotheses are tested at the 5% level of significance:

Ho1: Generative AI utilisation has no significant effect on academic integrity among master's students in Lagos State universities.

Ho2: literacy and competence have no significant effect on academic integrity among master's students in Lagos State universities.

Ho3: Institutional regulation of AI use has no significant effect on academic integrity among master's students in Lagos State universities.

Ho4: Academic ethics awareness has no significant effect on academic integrity among master's students in Lagos State universities.

Literature Review

The Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), developed by Davis (1989), provides a relevant theoretical foundation for this study. TAM explains users' acceptance and utilisation of technology through two major beliefs: perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use. Perceived usefulness refers to the extent to which an individual believes that using a technology will improve performance, while perceived ease of use concerns the extent to which the technology is perceived as easy to learn and operate. The theory is relevant because Masters students are more likely to utilise GenAI when they perceive it as useful for improving academic writing, research, learning, and productivity. Similarly, the simplicity and accessibility of GenAI platforms may encourage frequent utilisation. However, TAM primarily explains technology adoption rather than ethical behaviour. Therefore, in this study, the model can be extended conceptually by examining whether the nature and extent of GenAI utilisation are associated with students' adherence to academic integrity. The theory thus provides a useful lens for understanding why Masters students adopt GenAI and how its utilisation may create both academic benefits and integrity-related concerns.

Today, Artificial Intelligence (AI) is increasingly transforming university administration by changing how institutions collect information, allocate resources, monitor performance and make strategic decisions. Artificial intelligence (AI) is defined as the simulation of human intelligence in computers designed to understand, learn, and solve problems in the same way as people do. These high-profile AI applications include advanced web search engines

like Google Search, recommendation systems such as YouTube, Amazon, and Netflix; autonomous speech such as Waymo; generative and creative tools such as ChatGPT, Gamma PPT; Ask AI, Google Translate, Gemini, AI Chatbot, Orai, Suno and AI art; superhuman play and analysis in strategy games such as chess, Go; and interacting via human speech such as Google Assistant, Siri and Alexa (Shittu, Temisanren, Dairo & Ola, 2026). Artificial Intelligence (AI) can complement, rather than replace human judgement by providing intelligent tools for recognising emotional patterns, supporting self-awareness, facilitating personalised professional development, monitoring workplace stress indicators, and strengthening communication between university management and academic staff. According to Shittu, Yekinni and Adedapo (2022), academic staff stress can be said to be normal if there is a regular balance in the time used to carry out numerous organizational goals and duties in such a way that the mental and physical state of the person doing the work is not affected. When calculating normal workload, three important variables should be considered. These are Task, Time, and Frequency of labour. Artificial Intelligence (AI) has particular relevance to university administration because contemporary institutions generate large amounts of information. These include staff performance records, workload information, survey responses, student feedback, attendance patterns, research outputs, and administrative communication. According to Shittu, Idowu and Lawal (2020) online teaching is an application of electronic devices to impart knowledge and acquire skills through the internet, intranet/extranet, audio or video tape, satellite TV and CD-ROM, Web-based learning, computer-based learning, virtual classroom and digital collaboration. According to Shittu, Ola and Adedapo (2021), LMS has been introduced in many higher education institutions to connect lecturers and students online through internet facilities without the confines of physical traditional classroom. It is an academic online portal that uses digital software to connect classroom lecturers and students in order to achieve educational goals and objectives. During the COVID-19 pandemic, many Nigerian universities faced the reality of limited preparedness for online teaching. The LMS offers online dealing with

assignments, course content management, chats, forums, lesson plans, quizzes, tests, assignments, surveys, file sharing and resources, not all of these features will work for an institution (Shittu, Temisanren, Dairo and Mohammed, 2025).

Moreso, emergence of Artificial Intelligence (AI), especially generative AI, has significantly impacted the ecosystem of higher education institutions across the world. Generative AI can be described as systems with intelligence to create original content such as text, summaries, learning notes, or analysis based on a large volume of information. Examples of such tools used in learning institutions include ChatGPT, Grammarly, Gemini, and Turnitin. The framework integrates AI-enabled emotional assessment, emotional self-regulation, empathy development, relationship management, institutional support, and lecturers' well-being. It further identifies ethical considerations, including privacy, informed consent, algorithmic bias, data security, and the need to preserve human agency in emotionally sensitive decisions (Mohammed, Shittu, Abudu, Mohammed & Dairo, 2025). Perhaps, the use of technology among academic staff in Nigerian public universities seems to be become worrisome and crucial due to technostress management. Technostress is characterized by the "inability to cope with new technologies," To manage technostress in public universities, lecturers can take the following steps: encouraging open communication and support; implementing technology-related policies and training; taking regular breaks and practicing self-care; setting boundaries for technological use; and fostering a healthy work-life balance. Therefore, this study seeks to address this critical gap in knowledge by conducting comprehensive research on the relationship between technostress and academic staff productivity in public universities in Lagos State, Nigeria (Shittu, Ola & Oladipo, 2024).

However, the increasing use of GenAI in universities has also generated concerns about academic integrity. Academic integrity involves honesty, responsibility, fairness, trust, respect, and accountability in academic activities. Students are expected to present their own intellectual contributions, acknowledge sources appropriately, and avoid practices such as plagiarism, fabrication,

cheating, and misrepresentation. The availability of GenAI makes these expectations more complex because students can produce well-written academic content within seconds, sometimes without fully understanding or verifying the information generated. Among Masters students, the issue is particularly important because postgraduate education places considerable emphasis on independent research, critical thinking, scholarly communication, and originality. Excessive dependence on GenAI may reduce students' willingness to engage deeply with academic literature and develop their own arguments. There is also a possibility that students may submit AI-generated content as their original work without disclosure. Furthermore, GenAI systems can produce inaccurate information, invented references, or biased explanations. Consequently, students who use such information without verification may unintentionally compromise the quality and credibility of their academic work. GenAI utilisation is not, however, inherently inconsistent with academic integrity. Its impact largely depends on how and why students use it. Responsible utilisation may include using AI to generate preliminary ideas, improve language, identify possible research questions, or obtain explanations of difficult concepts, followed by independent verification and proper acknowledgement where required. Irresponsible utilisation occurs when students allow AI to complete substantial academic tasks, submit generated work without review, fabricate information, or use the technology to circumvent assessment requirements. This distinction suggests that digital literacy, ethical awareness, institutional policies, and students' understanding of responsible AI use may influence the relationship between GenAI utilisation and academic integrity. In the Nigerian university context, the growing adoption of GenAI presents both opportunities and challenges.

Master's students in Lagos State University operate within an environment where postgraduate research, seminar presentations, assignments, and dissertations require substantial independent intellectual engagement. The ease with which GenAI can generate academic-looking content may therefore create difficulties for lecturers in

distinguishing students' original contributions from machine-generated material. At the same time, banning GenAI completely may prevent students from developing the skills needed to use emerging technologies responsibly. The central concern is consequently not simply whether students use GenAI, but whether they use it ethically, transparently, critically, and in ways that support rather than replace genuine learning. However, academic integrity is conventionally defined as a commitment to six fundamental values: honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility and courage, or, more plainly, as being honest in academic work and taking responsibility (Smit et al., 2025). According to Dairo, Shittu, Beyioku and Odekunle (2025), Artificial Intelligence (AI) has evolved from a theoretical concept into a transformative force that now underpins almost every aspect of global life from communication and commerce to healthcare and education.

Methodology

The population of the study comprised all 231 master's students enrolled in the Education Management and Business Education classes of Lagos State University during the 2024/2025 academic session, a finite, fully enumerated population whose records served as the sampling frame. Taro Yamane's formula ($n = N \div [1 + N(e)^2]$, $e = 0.05$) was adopted to determine the sample of 170 selected through simple random sampling techniques

and yielding a usable response rate of 73.6%, comfortably exceeded this threshold and satisfied the requirements for multiple regression. Data were collected using a six-section structured questionnaire on a 5-point Likert scale, measuring demographics, generative AI utilisation, AI literacy and competence, institutional regulation, academic ethics awareness, and academic integrity. Each construct was scored as the composite mean of five items adapted from validated instruments. Face and content validity were established by three experts, and construct validity was assessed through exploratory factor analysis in SPSS, which yielded a Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin value of 0.861, a significant Bartlett's test ($\chi^2 = 1717.479$, $df = 300$, $p = 0.000$), and five components accounting for 61.208% of total variance. Reliability was confirmed with Cronbach's alpha coefficients of 0.818 to 0.846 across all subscales. Data were analysed in SPSS using descriptive statistics and Ordinary Least Squares multiple linear regression at the 0.05 level, after verifying the assumptions of normality, linearity, multicollinearity, and homoscedasticity.

Results and Discussion

Results

This section presents findings on generative AI utilisation and academic integrity among 170 master's students, analysed using descriptive statistics and multiple regression at the 5% significance level.

Table 1: Demographic Profile of Respondents

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	86	50.6
	Female	84	49.4
	Total	170	100.0
Age (years)	21–25	11	6.5
	26–30	70	41.2

	31–35	46	27.1
	36–40	29	17.1
	Above 40	14	8.2
	Total	170	100.0
Programme of Study	Education Management	93	54.7
	Business Education	77	45.3
	Total	170	100.0
Internet-Enabled Device	Yes	166	97.6
	No	4	2.4
	Total	170	100.0

Respondents were almost evenly split by gender (50.6% male, 49.4% female), mainly aged 26–30 (41.2%), mostly in Education Management (54.7%), and 97.6% owned internet-enabled devices.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics of Study Constructs

Construct	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Decision
Generative AI Utilisation	170	1.00	5.00	3.011	0.973	Moderate
AI Literacy and Competence	170	1.00	5.00	2.920	0.969	Moderate
Institutional Regulation on AI Usage	170	1.00	4.80	2.933	0.949	Moderate
Academic Ethics Awareness	170	1.00	5.00	3.004	0.948	Moderate
Academic Integrity	170	1.00	4.80	2.958	1.003	Moderate

All constructs recorded moderate means, with generative AI utilisation highest ($M = 3.011$) and academic integrity showing the greatest dispersion ($M = 2.958$, $SD = 1.003$).

Table 3: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	0.621	0.385	0.370	0.796	1.999

Source: Researchers, 2026.

The four predictors together explained 38.5% of the variance in academic integrity (adjusted $R^2 = 0.370$).

Table 4: ANOVA of the Regression Model

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	65.522	4	16.380	25.846	0.000
Residual	104.573	165	0.634		
Total	170.095	169			

The model was statistically significant, $F(4, 165) = 25.846, p < 0.001$.

Table 5: Summary of Regression Assumptions

Assumption	Diagnostic Test	Result	Decision
Independence of residuals	Durbin-Watson statistic	1.999 (Close to ideal value of 2)	Met
No multicollinearity	Collinearity diagnostics (condition index)	Condition indices ranged from 1.000 to 13.398, all below the critical threshold of 30	Met
Normality of residuals	Normal P-P plot of regression standardised residuals	Points clustered along the diagonal	Met
Linearity and homoscedasticity	Scatterplot of standardised residuals against standardised predicted values	Random, even spread with no systematic pattern	Met
No outliers	Standardised residual range	-2.286 to 2.166, within the acceptable ± 3 limits	Met

All key regression assumptions were met, confirming that the multiple linear regression results are statistically valid. The Durbin-Watson value of 1.999 indicated independent residuals; condition indices well below the critical value of 30 ruled out multicollinearity; and the Normal P-P plot and

residual scatterplot confirmed normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity. With standardised residuals within the ± 3 limits, no case was flagged as an outlier; the model was therefore suitable for interpretation and hypothesis testing.

Table 6: Regression Coefficients of the Predictors of Academic Integrity

Predictor	B	Std. Error	β	t	Sig.	95% CI for B
	1.330	0.331		4.017	0.000	0.676, 1.984
AI Literacy and Competence	0.197	0.067	0.191	2.934	0.004	0.065, 0.330
Institutional Regulation on AI Usage	0.354	0.070	0.335	5.061	0.000	0.216, 0.493
Academic Ethics Awareness	0.261	0.070	0.247	3.747	0.000	0.124, 0.399
Generative AI Utilisation	-0.257	0.065	-0.249	-3.977	0.000	-0.384, -0.129

Institutional regulation was the strongest positive predictor ($\beta = 0.335$, $t = 5.061$, $p < 0.001$), followed by academic ethics awareness ($\beta = 0.247$, $t = 3.747$, $p < 0.001$) and AI literacy ($\beta = 0.191$, $t = 2.934$, $p = 0.004$). Generative AI utilisation was the sole negative predictor ($\beta = -0.249$, $t = -3.977$, $p < 0.001$).

Table 7: Summary of Hypotheses Testing

Hypothesis	β	t	p-value	Decision	Conclusion
H ₀₁ : Generative AI utilisation has no significant effect on academic integrity	-0.249	-3.977	0.000	Rejected	Significant negative effect
H ₀₂ : AI literacy and competence has no significant effect on academic integrity	0.191	2.934	0.004	Rejected	Significant positive effect
H ₀₃ : Institutional regulation on AI usage has no significant effect on academic integrity	0.335	5.061	0.000	Rejected	Significant positive effect
H ₀₄ : Academic ethics awareness has no significant effect on academic integrity	0.247	3.747	0.000	Rejected	Significant positive effect

All four null hypotheses were rejected, indicating that institutional regulation (positive), AI literacy and ethics awareness (positive), and generative AI utilisation (negative) significantly influence academic integrity.

Discussion

The regression model was significant, $F(4,165) = 25.846$, $p < 0.001$, with the four predictors jointly explaining 38.5% of the variance in academic integrity (adjusted $R^2 = 0.370$). Generative AI utilisation was the only inverse predictor ($\beta =$

-0.249 , $t = -3.977$, $p < 0.001$), indicating that master's students who deploy chatbots more frequently are more likely to compromise integrity norms, consistent with evidence that students use chatbots for assessments without necessarily perceiving such use as a breach (Gruenhagen et al.,

2024). Institutional regulation of AI use was the strongest positive predictor ($\beta = 0.335$, $t = 5.061$, $p < 0.001$), reinforcing the argument that ambiguous institutional rules create moral hazards that nudge students towards risky AI behaviour (Smit et al., 2025). Academic ethics awareness was the second strongest predictor ($\beta = 0.247$, $t = 3.747$, $p < 0.001$), aligning with findings that students' perceptions of ethical boundaries shape integrity-related risk-taking (Ogbaga et al., 2026). AI literacy and competence also contributed positively ($\beta = 0.191$, $t = 2.934$, $p = 0.004$), supporting AI-literacy frameworks that position capability as a safeguard against misuse (Ng et al., 2021). Put together, the results indicate that institutional guidance and ethics- and literacy-oriented interventions are complementary levers for safeguarding academic integrity in the generative AI era.

Conclusion

Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) is increasingly becoming an important part of higher education, providing Masters students with opportunities to improve learning, research, academic writing, and productivity. However, its growing use also presents important concerns regarding academic integrity, particularly plagiarism, misrepresentation of authorship, inaccurate information, and excessive dependence on AI-generated content. The central issue is therefore not the use of GenAI itself, but how responsibly and ethically students employ it in their academic activities. At Lagos State University, promoting responsible GenAI utilisation requires students to develop digital literacy, critical thinking, research skills, and a clear understanding of academic integrity. Lecturers and university authorities should also provide appropriate guidance and policies on acceptable AI use. Ultimately, responsible utilisation of GenAI can complement students' academic development without undermining originality, honesty, and scholarly responsibility.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations are made:

1. Lagos State University management should develop clear GenAI guidelines by specifying acceptable and unacceptable uses of Generative AI in assignments, examinations, seminars, projects, and dissertations.
2. Lagos State University Masters students should receive AI literacy training on responsible GenAI use, including fact-checking, proper citation, originality, ethical use, and the limitations of AI-generated information.
3. University lecturers should guide students on using GenAI as a learning and research-support tool rather than allowing it to replace independent thinking, critical analysis, and scholarly judgement.
4. The university should strengthened academic integrity by intensify orientation programmes on plagiarism, academic honesty, authorship, research ethics, and the consequences of submitting AI-generated work as original work.
5. Departments should adopt assessment methods that encourage master's students to demonstrate personal understanding, critical reasoning, and originality through presentations, oral defense, reflective tasks, and research-based activities.

References

- Dairo, T. S., Shittu, T. O., Beyioku, J. B., & Odekunle, Q. B. (2025). Transforming university education through usage of artificial intelligence (AI) in Lagos State owned universities: Panacea for data-driven approach to curb menace of cyber security. *ISA Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2(6), 29-36.

- Kofinas, A., Tsay, C., & Pike, D. (2025). The impact of generative AI on academic integrity of authentic assessments within a higher education context. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 56(6), 2522-2549. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13585>
- Mohammed, M. O., Shittu, T. O., Abudu, A. M., Mohammed, A. O., & Dairo, T. S. (2025). Ethical use of generative AI and development guidelines among business education lecturers in public tertiary institutions in Lagos State, Nigeria. *LASU Journal of Multidisciplinary Nigerian Studies (LASUJMNS)*, 1(1), 142-150.
- Ng, D. T. K., Leung, J. K. L., Chu, S. K. W., & Qiao, S. (2021). Conceptualizing AI literacy: An exploratory review. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 2, 100041. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2021.100041>
- Ogbaga, I., Onwudebelu, U., Akwuma, N., & Igwe, K. (2026). Academic Integrity in the Era of Generative AI: Students' perceptions, ethical boundaries, and risk-taking behavior in Nigerian universities. *System and Computing*, 2(2), 95-125. <https://doi.org/10.64409/sycom.v2.i2.44>.
- Shittu, T. O., Idowu, O. K., & Lawal, S. I. (2020). Implementation of online teaching in Nigerian Universities: The pros and cons. *Journal of Research in Educational Management and Business Studies*, 5(1), 46-56.
- Shittu, T. O., Ola, B. A., & Adedapo, O. O. (2021). Implementation of learning management system in Nigerian public higher education in the new normal. *Journal of Sociology and Education in Africa*, 18, 25-30.
- Shittu, T. O., Ola, B. A., & Oladipo, O. B. (2024). Technostress management strategies and lecturers' productivity in public universities in Lagos State, Nigeria. *West African Journal of Educational Administration and Planning (WAJEAP)*, 2, 54-61.
- Shittu, T. O., Temisanren, O. E., Dairo, T. S., & Mohammed, M. O. (2025). Integration of learning management system as evolutionary option for tackling physical classroom congestion in Nigerian public universities today and tomorrow. *ISA Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2(6), 50-55.
- Shittu, T. O., Temisanren, E. O., Dairo, T. S., & Ola, B. A. (2026). Ethical usage of Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools and lecturers' research productivity in Lagos State-owned universities, Nigeria. *GEN Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 2(1), 203-209.
- Shittu, T. O., Yekinni, N. L., & Adedapo, O. O. (2022). Academic stress management and lecturers' productivity in public universities in Lagos state, Nigeria. *Uneswa Journal of Education (UJOE)*, 5(1), 33-41.
- Smit, M., Wagner, R., & Bond-Barnard, T. (2025). Ambiguous regulations for dealing with AI in higher education can lead to moral hazards among students. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.plas.2025.100187>