

Exploring the Personal and Environmental Factors Promoting Academic Dishonesty among University Students: The Contribution of AI Tools

Maryam Tasneem ^a, Shaista Khalid ^b and Ahmad Bilal Cheema ^c

^{a-b-c} Institute of Education, University of Sargodha, Pakistan

Keywords: Academic Dishonesty, Personal Factors, Environmental Factors, AI Tools, University students

Article Information			
Received	5 th Jan 2026	Accepted	15 th Mar 2026
Published	30 th Mar 2026		

Abstract

Academic dishonesty refers to students' attempts to present others' academic work as their own. The main purpose of the current study was to explore the personal and environmental factors that promote academic dishonesty among university students and the contribution of AI tools. Quantitative research design was used. The target population comprises all undergraduate and graduate students studying at the University of Sargodha. A stratified random sampling was employed to gather data from 371 students using a closed-ended questionnaire. Data were analyzed through frequencies, percentages, mean score, and standard deviation, independent sample t-test and ANOVA. The major findings of the study revealed that most of the university students disagreed that personal and environmental factors lead them towards academic dishonesty. The findings also revealed that most of the university students agreed that they use AI tools in learning and use AI tools for dishonest academic practices. Research study recommended that universities and departments should arrange training workshops and sessions for students because most of the university students even do not think so that the usage of AI tools in academic settings could be unethical.

Introduction

Over the last few decades, academic dishonesty has continued to be a major concern. Academic dishonesty (AD), which is defined as academic behavior that violates established assessment requirements and other institutional policies, occurs when students act in ways intended to obtain an unfair advantage in connection with their assessment (Guthrie, 2009). AD is a global problem that impacts both developed and developing countries (Bayaa et al., 2016). The most prevalent forms of academic dishonesty include: unapproved collaboration on assignments, work completed by another person, copying or searching during in-class exams and various forms of plagiarism (Riad, 2023). According to previous research (Starovoytova & Namango, 2016; Abiodun, 2011), the main reasons behind academic dishonesty were "time pressure, difficult course, laziness, competition with others, stress management, difficult exams, low probability of detection, light punishment, better grades, peer pressure, fear of failure, everyone does it, meaningless course, parental pressure, taking a chance, indifferent lecturer, low instructor vigilance, high course load, and not understanding the questions, among others".

A study by Asgher et al. (2023) investigated the underlying reasons for the occurrence of academic dishonesty among university students at the University of Agriculture Faisalabad, Pakistan. The study found that "lack of learning ability, fear of failure, lack of interest in learning, poor retention, inability to write and speak

English, fear of teachers, and language barrier” were some of the factors that led to learning challenges, and consequently, academic dishonesty.

Artificial Intelligence (AI) refers to the intelligence shown by machines rather than human minds. This term Artificial Intelligence (AI) was first used by John Mc Carthy in year 1955. He defined it “making a machine behave in ways that would be called intelligence if a human were so behaving” AI Tools are defined as digital programs or software systems that rely on artificial intelligence techniques to perform activities that would normally require human intellect. ChatGPT, Grammarly, QuillBot, and other AI-powered systems that produce text, answer questions, or provide academic assistance are some examples of AI tools.

Review of the Literature

Academic dishonesty is as old as examination is (Bushway and Nash, 1977). During the ancient Chinese civil service exams such as the one in example, cheating was so widespread that the government had to resort to measures of deterrence to curb it such as the search of individual before the test, placing of test takers in solitary cubes and threats of execution to those who cheated (Brickman, 1961). Although current applications of research still reveal that scholarly dishonesty is widespread, cheating in tertiary level is not a recent issue (King et al., 2009; Jones, 2011; Chiang et al., 2022).

Academic dishonesty has numerous forms among them being unauthorized collaboration where students complete their assignments in two or more groups and only to be expected to complete them without collaboration and cheating where the student will assign someone to do his homework, written assignments, or tests (Davis et al., 2009). There are also resistant memorizers who can cheat during in-class tests by using an electronic gadget to get answers, copying a portion of the work to another test, or by having an answer to refer to in one way or the other. The most prevalent cheating in higher education in the undergraduate and graduate levels is plagiarism (Lang, 2013). The act of copying some content without mentioning a source properly is called plagiarism, and it may take the forms of sham and illegal paraphrasing, verbatim copying, recycling, purloining, and ghostwriting (Denisova-Schmidt, 2017; Riad, 2023).

Academic dishonesty is a global ethical issue. Ninety-seven percent of students at one European medical school acknowledged engaging in academic dishonesty (Taradi et al., 2012). According to one study, 57% of students in the US had cheated in the preceding six months (Hensley et al., 2013). A study conducted on a famous American university revealed that around fifty percent of a group of 250 students cheated on an exam (Murphy, 2013). This type of statistics indicates that academic dishonesty is a menace in the west. However, academic dishonesty is also a vice in Asia.

Academic dishonesty has been prevalent among students in the contemporary world at the disadvantage of social norms and moral values, (Colnerud & Rosander, 2009). This conduct results in improper behavior that is detrimental to upholding a respectful learning environment. Because academic dishonesty affects both students' academic performance and societal norms, it is crucial to address and eradicate this habit. The study will look into the causes of rude behavior and academic dishonesty, which directly affects students' academic performance both during and after their schooling (Asgher, 2022).

Factors/ Reasons for Academic Dishonesty

According to previous research (Starovoytova & Namango, 2016; Abiodun, 2011), the main reasons behind academic dishonesty were “time pressure, difficult course, laziness, competition with others, stress management, difficult exams, low probability of detection, light punishment, better grades, peer pressure, fear of failure, everyone does it, meaningless course, parental pressure, taking a chance, indifferent lecturer,

low instructor vigilance, high course load, and not understanding the questions, among others". They are a dishonest society (Harold & Max, 2001), "poor teaching, a poor learning environment, lack of facilities" (Korbs, 2009), "a performance-driven education system, poor time management" (Macdonald & Carrol, 2006), "lack of productive study habits (Chinamase et al., 2011), and technology" (Carpenter, 2006).

Personal Factors/ Internal factors

Students are forced to plagiarize their work because they encounter certain internal or personal factors during their studies that are very difficult to control. Academic aptitude, peer, family, and financial pressure, and pride are typical internal and personal factors (Šprajc et al., 2017; Amin et al., 2012). Asgher et al. (2023) investigated how students perceived the personal elements that lead to academic dishonesty. This study identifies the following as the primary personal factors: poor time management, money problems, daydreaming, laziness, low work morale, low family motivation, and parental pressure.

Asgher et al. (2023) investigates the respondents' opinions about what motivates them to commit academic dishonesty in relation to learning challenges. Fear of failing, poor retention, lack of interest in studies, difficulty writing in English, and fear of teachers are the main causes of learning difficulties. Orok et al. (2023) reported similar results where the fear of failing drove about 77% of students to engage in academic dishonesty.

According to Asgher et al. (2023) the respondents' behavioral or psychological factors that lead to academic dishonesty included: deviating from goals, having a habit of sadness, acting carelessly, unethical anger, exhausting anger, abuse and addiction, and feeling burdened by work or study.

External factors/ Environmental Factors

Academic challenges require that students apply their skills in academic undertakings to complete course work and tests and attain their degrees as part of their core academic obligations. However, most students plagiarize to some extent as a result of external factors in a bid to satisfy these demands. In the course of education, students are affected by external factors to commit some levels of academic dishonesty. The factors such as teaching, control, the Web, and information and communication technology (ICT) are directly related to academic dishonesty among students. The accessibility to ICT and the Web (Abbas and Faiz, 2013; Fatima et al., 2017) and search engines allows students to quickly find the relevant material in the digital library of the university. It is difficult to manage student plagiarism because there are numerous sites on the internet that provide services or solutions that can be used to eradicate or reduce plagiarism in written research work (Culwin and Lancaster, 2001). Since coursework assignments (essays and literature review reports) are the foundation of a university course, students usually plagiarize coursework assignments and not their examinations (Hayes and Introna, 2005). Therefore, skills in teaching are essential among the students, the manner in which the teachers teach, the subjects taught in the course, and published studies (Jereb et al., 2018; Gholipour et al., 2011; Fatima et al., 2019).

Teaching and Organizational Factors

Some of the teaching and organizational factors that can cause academic dishonesty include irrelevant instructions, the absence of teaching abilities, communication barrier, inadequate classroom facilities, the inability to establish an effective environment, inadequate mastery of the subject, overcrowded classes, and lack of cooperation between students and teachers (Asgher et al., 2023).

Social Factors

A previous research discovered that negative perceptions towards competition, social rejection, social justice, illiteracy, social insecurity, inferiority complex and low self-esteem in the society are social causes of academic

dishonesty. The contribution of parental expectations, conformity, taking classes due to outside pressure such as parents, and extreme competition in grades all play a significant role in contributing to academic dishonesty among students (Anitha and Sundaram, 2021; Randy et al., 1995).

Artificial Intelligence

Technology has become a part of time; it has changed the way we live, how we communicate, how we work, and how we learn. New innovations of every kind are being developed to make our work and activities more productive. A more recent technological development, artificial intelligence, or AI (artificial intelligence), is now being used in education and is a tool that enables people to learn. The educational sector should keep up with technology, especially information and communication technology, to make the quality of education better.

Whether we realize it or not, artificial intelligence is used in daily life. Artificial intelligence has been incorporated into numerous applications as a benefit. When we talk about artificial intelligence technology, we're talking about machines that have human-like thinking, decision-making, and action-weighting abilities.

Education ranks among the numerous aspects that have been interfered with by the extensive application of generative AI equipment. It has several opportunities and threats when it comes to the ability of educators or students to produce literary or scientific content, drawings, or images in several seconds and without using costly software, advanced computers, or coding knowledge (Sağın et al., 2024).

It is agreeable that it can replace human beings in the daily functions. It plays a role in learning and educating people in a new manner. Artificial intelligence in teaching and learning is very useful in all levels of education. Artificial intelligence also offers modern solutions in teaching and learning, medical diagnosis, and automatic answers to several problems in teaching and learning in the university level.

AI Tools

AI tools are programs that use artificial intelligence to automate tasks, analyze data, and improve human abilities. Examples include chatbots (ChatGPT, Copilot), writing assistants (Grammarly), image generators (Midjourney), and data analysis platforms (Tableau), which assist with research, customer service, content creation, and more.

Both academics and students in higher education institutions use AI language models like ChatGPT to support their academic success (Barber et al., 2021) and to develop assessments that highlight student ability (Atlas, 2023). Postgraduate students in Indian higher education use AI tools to improve reading skills, which leads to academic success (e.g., meeting specific research deadlines), and to improve academic writing and editing before submission (Mohammed et al., 2023; Baena-Rojas et al., 2023; Ogurlu & Mossholder, 2023; Nguyen, 2023; Khabib, 2022).

With a generative pre-trained transformer (GPT) model, a writer is able to complete a writing task within seconds, providing an opportunity to achieve new directions in completing writing tasks (Biermann, 2022). The generated content is fully machine generated, and human intervention is typically confined to the development of prompts, so the language model cannot comprehend, reason or have in any personal insight as to what the author would desire to create. The content produced might not mirror the thoughts of the author, which concerns the question of the academic honesty (Liu et al., 2023; Balalle and Pannilage, 2025). Moreover, in the case of AI in academic misconduct, the qualifications that academic institutions grant might

not correspond to the desired standards, and the overall performance of students will decline in the real-life conditions (Currie et al., 2023).

Nevertheless, AI tools can enhance the quality and academic integrity of any educational setting, provided they are used in the right manner. As an example, software such as Grammarly, Wordtune, and QuillBot can assist students with language-related problems and also assist institutional action in maintaining academic integrity (Yeo, 2023; Balalle and Pannilage, 2025).

System of Pakistan Higher Education and Academic dishonesty

In Pakistan's higher education system, academic dishonesty has become a recurring problem, especially in public and private universities where student enrollment has grown significantly over the previous 20 years. Unethical academic practices like exam cheating, plagiarism, data fabrication, unauthorized collaboration, and the improper use of technology to obtain an unfair academic advantage are all considered forms of academic dishonesty (Saeed et al., 2024). These practices are frequently ingrained in larger structural, cultural, and institutional realities in Pakistan, such as examination-oriented learning, intense academic pressure, and lax enforcement of academic integrity regulations.

According to empirical research done in Pakistani universities, academic dishonesty is a complex phenomenon influenced by environmental factors and personal vulnerabilities rather than a singular, isolated act (Asgher et al., 2023). The nature of academic dishonesty has changed further with the advent of artificial intelligence (AI) tools, posing grave questions about authorship, originality, and moral teaching methods in higher education.

In the context of globalization, the scope and demand for higher education are growing quickly, and only high-quality education can satisfy this demand. Globally, universities are ranked according to the caliber of education they provide to their graduates. This high-quality education encompasses the caliber of academic services, the productivity of research, the productivity's market value, and the institution's global perspective. The fourth Sustainable Development Goal, "ensuring inclusive and equitable quality education and promoting lifelong learning opportunities for all individuals," places a strong emphasis on education. Developing a culture of academic integrity is essential to reaching and upholding this standard, and it greatly advances high-quality education (Mahmood et al., 2023; Asif et al., 2024).

Literature declared that the idea of academic dishonesty is not new, but due to technological advancements, academic dishonesty is a serious problem in higher education. Thus, the current study is designed to address this issue with the intention that the findings could assist in establishing instructional approaches to reduce academic dishonesty among students. The study aimed to explore the personal and environmental factors that promote academic dishonesty among university students and the contribution of AI tools in promoting dishonest academic practices.

Research Questions

- What are the personal factors that promote academic dishonesty among university students?
- What are the environmental factors that promote academic dishonesty among university students?
- What is the students' perspective regarding the usage of AI tools in learning and its contribution towards academic dishonesty at the university level?
- Is there any gender-based difference in personal factors, environmental factors, and usage of AI tools with respect to academic dishonesty?
- Is there any academic program-based difference in personal factors, environmental factors, and usage of AI tools with respect to academic dishonesty?

- Is there any faculty-based difference in personal factors, environmental factors, and usage of AI tools with respect to academic dishonesty?

Methodology

❖ Research Design

In this study, a quantitative research design was used. A survey design was used to collect quantitative data. Data was collected through closed-ended questionnaire.

❖ Population of the study

All undergraduate and graduate students studying at the University of Sargodha and the population of the study.

❖ Sample and Sampling Technique of the study

Sample

The sample of this study consisted of 371 undergraduate and graduate students of three faculties of the University of Sargodha, including the Faculty of Sciences, Faculty of Social Sciences, and Faculty of Arts and Humanities.

Sampling Technique

Stratified random sampling technique was used in this study to gather quantitative data from different strata.

❖ Research Instrument

A close-ended questionnaire and structured interviews were used as a research instrument in this study to collect information from the sample. The questionnaire used for data collection of this study contains 41 items that consist of different indicators. The major three indicators of research instrument include personal factors, environmental factors and perception and contribution of AI tools in academic misconduct. The questionnaire of this study was developed after extensively reading many articles regarding this topic, specifically from the study of Akbulut et al. (2008), Yan et al. (2025), Alotaibi et al. (2024), Aktay et al. (2024), Moura et al. (2022), and Lund et al. (2025). A 6-point Likert scale was used to add options to the questionnaire comprising strongly agree, agree, slightly agree, slightly disagree, disagree and strongly disagree.

❖ Data Analysis

To achieve different objectives of the study, quantitative data was analyzed using descriptive statistics, including frequencies, percentages, mean and standard deviation, as well as inferential statistics, included independent sample t-test, ANOVA.

Results

The findings from the analysis offer empirical evidence to address the research questions and enable meaningful interpretation of the results.

Table 1: Analysis of Demographic Information

Variable		Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	144	38.8%

	Female	227	61.2%
	Total	371	100.0%
Faculty	Sciences	140	37.7%
	Social Sciences	149	40.2%
	Arts and Humanities	82	22.1%
	Total	371	100.0%
Academic Program	Undergraduate	316	85.2%
	Graduate	55	14.8%
	Total	371	100.0%

Table 1 showed frequencies and percentages of different demographic factors including gender, faculty and academic program. According to this table there were 144 male (38.8%) and 227 (61.2%) female students who contributed in this study. Likewise, there were 140 (37.7%) students of faculty of sciences, 149 (40.2%) students of social sciences and the remaining 82 (46.0%) students of faculty of arts and humanities. Similarly, 316 (85.2%) undergraduate and 55 (14.8%) graduate students contributed in this study. So, the total number of participants who contributed in this study were 371 students. This table was concluded that mostly students who participated in this study were female and belongs to social sciences. Similarly, most of the students were undergraduates.

Variable wise Descriptive Analysis of Items

In factor wise descriptive analysis of the dataset, frequencies, percentages, mean and standard deviation of the main indicators of study such as personal factors, environmental factors and perception and contribution of AI tools towards academic misconduct were calculated.

Personal Factors

In personal factors of academic dishonesty, two further factors were explored in this study which includes personal learning difficulties and personal psychological factors.

Table 2: Personal Learning Difficulties

Sr.	Statements	SD	D	SLD	SD+D+SLD	SLA	A	SA	SA+A+SLA	Mean	S.D
1	I cheat in exams because my course material is difficult for me	188 (50.7%)	98 (26.4%)	25 (6.7%)	311 (83.8%)	28 (7.5%)	24 (6.5%)	8 (2.2%)	60 (16.2%)	1.99	1.34463
2	My weak memory and recall difficulties push me toward dishonesty.	172 (46.4%)	117 (31.5%)	32 (8.6%)	321 (86.5%)	16 (4.3%)	26 (7%)	8 (2.2%)	50 (13.5%)	2.01	1.30487
3	Limited knowledge of the English language makes me dependent on copying material.	118 (31.8%)	97 (26.1%)	47 (12.7%)	262 (70.6%)	56 (15.1%)	40 (10.8%)	13 (3.5%)	109 (29.4%)	2.69	2.37632
4	I cheat because I do not prepare well before exams	170 (45.8%)	92 (24.8%)	36 (9.7%)	298 (80.3%)	44 (11.9%)	24 (6.5%)	5 (1.3%)	73 (19.7%)	2.12	1.34797
5	I do not know the right way to study, which pushes me toward academic dishonesty	171 (46.1%)	85 (22.9%)	44 (11.9%)	300 (80.9%)	34 (9.2%)	23 (6.2%)	14 (3.8%)	71 (19.1%)	2.18	1.44284
	Total				1492 (80.4%)				363 (19.6%)	2.20	

The table gives the respondents' views regarding factors that promote them to involve in academic dishonesty related to learning difficulties. The first prominent factor in learning difficulties is the limited knowledge of the English language that promote academic dishonesty which obtained a mean value of 2.69 on the scale used. Do not know the right way to study was ranked second, with a mean value of 2.18. The third factor, do not prepare well before exams, ranked with a mean value of 2.12. Weak memory and recall difficulties ranked

fourth, with a mean value of 2.01. Course material is difficult ranked fifth, with a mean value of 1.99 which promote academic dishonesty.

Overall, the table gives insights most prominent factors among learning difficulties includes limited knowledge of the English language, and do not know the right way to study that promote academic dishonesty.

Table 3: Personal Psychological Factors

Sr	Statements	SD	D	SLD	SD+D+SLD	SLA	A	SA	SA+A+SLA	Mean	S.D
6	I feel pressured to cheat when teachers do not appreciate the quality of personal work	137 (36.9%)	98 (26.4%)	38 (10.2%)	273 (73.6%)	35 (9.4%)	43 (11.6%)	20 (5.4%)	98 (26.4%)	2.49	1.58938
7	Assignments seem irrelevant to my future, so I do not put much effort in it	100 (27%)	88 (23.7%)	59 (15.9%)	247 (66.6%)	47 (12.7%)	52 (14%)	25 (6.7%)	124 (33.4%)	2.83	1.60879
8	I cheat because I used to cheat in my previous academic career	190 (51.2%)	107 (28.8%)	34 (9.2%)	331 (89.2%)	25 (6.7%)	10 (2.7%)	5 (1.3%)	40 (10.8%)	1.85	1.14555
9	I engage in dishonest practices because I am not interested in studies	186 (50.1%)	97 (26.1%)	37 (10%)	320 (86.3%)	27 (7.3%)	11 (3%)	13 (3.5%)	51 (13.7%)	1.97	1.31286
10	I do not pay attention in class, knowing that I can eventually cheat on the exams	198 (53.4%)	95 (25.6%)	33 (8.9%)	326 (87.9%)	23 (6.2%)	15 (4%)	7 (1.9%)	45 (12.1%)	1.88	1.23496
11	Fear of failing a semester leads me to cheat	166 (44.7%)	88 (23.7%)	44 (11.9%)	298 (80.3%)	28 (7.5%)	30 (8.1%)	15 (4%)	73 (19.7%)	2.23	1.48231
12	Lack of confidence in my academic abilities pushes me towards academic dishonesty	161 (43.4%)	86 (23.2%)	44 (11.9%)	291 (78.4%)	35 (9.4%)	35 (9.4%)	10 (2.7%)	80 (21.6%)	2.26	1.46501
13	My desire for high grades drives me to dishonest academic practices	159 (42.9%)	87 (23.5%)	51 (13.7%)	297 (80.1%)	37 (10%)	20 (5.4%)	17 (4.6%)	74 (19.9%)	2.25	1.45768
14	The desire to please the family with success and superiority leads me to cheat	198 (53.4%)	92 (24.8%)	34 (9.2%)	324 (87.3%)	22 (5.9%)	13 (3.5%)	12 (3.2%)	47 (12.7%)	1.91	1.30079
15	I do not cheat because I pride myself on being a good and trustworthy person.	99 (26.7%)	65 (17.5%)	43 (11.6%)	207 (55.8%)	42 (11.3%)	44 (11.9%)	78 (21%)	164 (44.2%)	3.27	1.91262
	Total				2914 (78.5%)				796 (21.5%)	2.29	

The table gives the students views regarding factors that promote them to involve in academic dishonesty related to psychological factors. The first prominent factor in psychological factors is the Assignments seem irrelevant to my future that promote academic dishonesty which obtained a mean value of 2.83 on the scale used. teachers do not appreciate the quality of personal work was ranked second, with a mean value of 2.49. Lack of confidence in my academic abilities was ranked third, with a mean value of 2.26. The fourth factor, desire for high grades drives me to dishonest academic practices, ranked with a mean value of 2.25. Fear of failing a semester leads me to cheat ranked fifth, with a mean value of 2.23. Not interested in studies ranked

sixth, with a mean value of 1.97 which promote academic dishonesty, desire to please the family with success and superiority leads me to cheat ranked seventh, with a mean value of 1.91, do not pay attention in class, knowing that I can eventually cheat on the exams ranked eight, with a mean value of 1.88, used to cheat in my previous academic career encourage me to cheat ranked ninth, with a mean value of 1.85.

Overall, the table revealed that most selected factors among psychological factors were assignments seem irrelevant to my future, teachers do not appreciate the quality of personal work and lack of confidence in my academic abilities that encourage academic dishonesty.

Environmental Factors

In environmental factors of academic dishonesty further three factors explored in this study which includes teaching factors, organizational factors and social factors.

Table 4: Teaching Factors

Sr.	Statements	SD	D	SLD	SD+D+SLD	SLA	A	SA	SA+A+SLA	Mean	S.D
16	The teacher's lack of competence in explaining the subject material	105 (28.3%)	133 (35.8%)	55 (14.8%)	293 (79%)	40 (10.8%)	28 (7.5%)	10 (2.7%)	78 (21%)	2.4	1.34373
17	Teachers' ignore academic misconduct done by the student	108 (29.1%)	104 (28%)	54 (14.6%)	266 (71.7%)	56 (15.1%)	35 (9.4%)	14 (3.8%)	105 (28.3%)	2.59	1.46650
18	Teachers tend to give a lot of assignments	85 (22.9%)	95 (25.6%)	48 (12.9%)	228 (61.5%)	53 (14.3%)	62 (16.7%)	28 (7.5%)	143 (38.5%)	2.99	1.63406
19	Lack of vigilance by certain teachers while monitoring exams	94 (25.3%)	103 (27.8%)	54 (14.6%)	251 (67.7%)	47 (12.7%)	52 (14%)	21 (5.7%)	120 (32.3%)	2.79	1.56570
20	Teachers are not available for academic support and guidance during consultation time.	109 (29.4%)	93 (25.1%)	60 (16.2%)	262 (70.6%)	40 (10.8%)	45 (12.1%)	24 (6.5%)	109 (29.4%)	2.71	1.58794
21	Teachers rarely check plagiarism in assignments.	82 (22.1%)	83 (22.4%)	56 (15.1%)	221 (59.6%)	48 (12.9%)	61 (16.4%)	41 (11.1%)	150 (40.4%)	3.12	1.69761
	Total				1521 (68.3%)				705 (31.7%)	2.77	

The table gives the student's views regarding factors that promote them to involve in academic dishonesty related to teaching factors. The first prominent factor in teaching factors was the teachers rarely check plagiarism in assignments that promote academic dishonesty which obtained a mean value of 3.12 on the scale used. Teachers tend to give a lot of assignments was ranked second, with a mean value of 2.99. Lack of vigilance by certain teachers while monitoring exams was ranked third, with a mean value of 2.79. The fourth factor, teachers are not available for academic support and guidance, ranked with a mean value of 2.71. Teachers' ignore academic misconduct done by the student ranked fifth, with a mean value of 2.59. Teacher's lack of competence in explaining the subject material ranked sixth, with a mean value of 2.4 which promote academic dishonesty.

So, it was interpreted from the results that teachers rarely check plagiarism in assignments, teachers tend to give a lot of assignments and lack of vigilance by certain teachers was the prominent teaching factors that supports academic dishonesty.

Table 5: Organizational Factors

Sr.	Statements	SD	D	SLD	SD+D+SLD	SLA	A	SA	SA+A+SLA	Mean	S.D
22	The pressure of managing many subjects at the same time leads me to academic dishonesty	149 (40.2%)	100 (27%)	40 (10.8%)	289 (77.9%)	44 (11.9%)	26 (7%)	12 (3.2%)	82 (22.1%)	2.28	1.43441
23	Congested seating in the examination hall helps me to cheat	129 (34.8%)	116 (31.3%)	64 (17.3%)	309 (83.3%)	31 (8.4%)	26 (7%)	5 (1.3%)	62 (16.7%)	2.26	1.28049
24	Lack of strict penalties encourages me to engage in academic fraud	137 (36.9%)	106 (28.6%)	56 (15.1%)	299 (80.6%)	33 (8.9%)	28 (7.5%)	11 (3%)	72 (19.4%)	2.30	1.39360
25	Easy access to the internet and online resources on campus pushes me towards dishonest academic practices.	155 (41.8%)	90 (24.3%)	57 (15.4%)	302 (81.4%)	31 (8.4%)	22 (5.9%)	16 (4.3%)	69 (18.6%)	2.25	1.43902
	Total				1199 (80.8%)				285 (19.2%)	2.27	

The table gives the participant's views regarding factors that promote them to involve in academic dishonesty related to organizational factors. The first prominent factor in organizational factors was the lack of strict penalties promote academic dishonesty which obtained a mean value of 2.30 on the scale used. Pressure of managing many subjects at the same time was ranked second, with a mean value of 2.28. Congested seating in the examination hall was ranked third, with a mean value of 2.26. The fourth factor, easy access to the internet and online resources on campus, ranked with a mean value of 2.25 which promote academic dishonesty.

So, it was interpreted from the results that lack of strict penalties and pressure of managing many subjects at the same time was the prominent organizational factors that supports academic dishonesty.

Table 6: Social Factors

Sr.	Statements	SD	D	SLD	SD+D+SLD	SLA	A	SA	SA+A+SLA	Mean	S.D
26	High pressures and expectations from family lead me to engage in unethical academic practices	166 (44.7%)	100 (27%)	60 (16.2%)	326 (87.9%)	15 (4%)	17 (4.6%)	13 (3.5%)	45 (12.1%)	2.07	1.32036
27	I copy assignments because my classmates often do it without	117 (31.5%)	103 (27.8%)	40 (10.8%)	260 (70.1%)	58 (15.6%)	34 (9.2%)	19 (5.1%)	111 (29.9%)	2.58	1.53524

	facing consequences.										
28	I cheat in exams because my friends encourage me to do so	153 (41.2%)	104 (28%)	55 (14.8%)	312 (84.1%)	25 (6.7%)	20 (5.4%)	14 (3.8%)	59 (15.9%)	2.18	1.37501
29	I use AI tools unethically because I observe my teachers doing the same.	127 (34.2%)	97 (26.1%)	49 (13.2%)	273 (73.6%)	41 (11.1%)	35 (9.4%)	22 (5.9%)	98 (26.4%)	2.53	1.56170
30	Fear of bullying and negative criticism from family and friends involves me in academic misconduct	139 (37.5%)	114 (30.7%)	51 (13.7%)	304 (81.9%)	33 (8.9%)	22 (5.9%)	12 (3.2%)	67 (18.1%)	2.25	1.36479
31	I do not cheat because it is not morally and socially acceptable among students	74 (19.9%)	61 (16.4%)	44 (11.9%)	179 (48.2%)	45 (12.1%)	69 (18.6%)	77 (20.8%)	192 (51.8%)	3.61	2.10183
	Total				1654 (74.3%)				572 (25.7%)	2.54	

The table gives the student's views regarding factors that promote them to involve in academic dishonesty related to social factors. The first prominent factor in social factors is the copy assignments because my classmates often do it without facing consequences that promote academic dishonesty which obtained a mean value of 2.58 on the scale used. use AI tools unethically because they observed their teachers doing the same was ranked second, with a mean value of 2.53. Fear of bullying and negative criticism from family and friends was ranked third, with a mean value of 2.25. The fourth factor, cheat in exams because their friends encourage them to do so, ranked with a mean value of 2.18. High pressures and expectations from family ranked fifth, with a mean value of 2.07 which promote academic dishonesty.

So, it was interpreted from the results that plagiarized assignments because their classmates often do it without facing consequences, the use AI tools unethically because students observe their teachers doing the same, fear of bullying and negative criticism from family and friends was the prominent social factors that supports academic dishonesty.

Table 7: Students' Perceptions and Contribution of AI-Related Academic Misconduct

Sr .	Statements	SD	D	SLD	SD+D+SLD	SLA	A	SA	SA+A+SLA	Mea n	S.D
32	I rely on AI tools instead of using my own critical thinking skills.	95 (25.6%)	78 (21%)	47 (12.7%)	220 (59.3%)	70 (18.9%)	53 (14.3%)	28 (7.5%)	151 (40.7%)	2.98	1.63726
33	I use AI tools to copy or rephrase content instead of writing it myself.	55 (14.8%)	84 (22.6%)	67 (18.1%)	206 (55.5%)	71 (19.1%)	64 (17.3%)	30 (8.1%)	165 (44.5%)	3.26	1.53928
34	I use AI tools to summarize content	48 (12.9%)	50 (13.5%)	41 (11.1%)	139 (37.5%)	67 (18.1%)	126 (34%)	39 (10.5%)	232 (62.5%)	3.78	1.59163
35	I prefer AI tools to do my assignments because they save time and effort.	39 (10.5%)	62 (16.7%)	47 (12.7%)	148 (39.9%)	70 (18.9%)	117 (31.5%)	36 (9.7%)	223 (60.1%)	3.73	1.54271
36	I believe that text generated through AI tools is superior to my own	55 (14.8%)	68 (18.3%)	69 (18.6%)	192 (51.8%)	56 (15.1%)	81 (21.8%)	42 (11.3%)	179 (48.2%)	3.45	1.62058
37	I believe using AI in learning	43 (11.6%)	49 (13.2%)	51 (13.7%)	143 (38.5%)	67 (18.1%)	99 (26.7%)	62 (16.7%)	228 (61.5%)	3.85	1.62152

Exploring the Personal and Environmental Factors Promoting Academic Dishonesty among University Students: The Contribution of AI Tools

	may lead to over-reliance on technology										
38	I believe AI tools are convenient and easy to use, which makes me rely on them.	45 (12.1%)	63 (17%)	56 (15.1%)	164 (44.2%)	69 (18.6%)	101 (27.2%)	37 (10%)	207 (55.8%)	3.62	1.56624
39	I think the integration of AI tools in education increases the risk of academic fraud.	36 (9.7%)	66 (17.8%)	61 (16.4%)	163 (43.9%)	60 (16.2%)	96 (25.9%)	52 (14%)	208 (56.1%)	3.73	1.58157
40	I use AI tools to generate answers for exams, quizzes, or tests.	53 (14.3%)	75 (20.2%)	60 (16.2%)	188 (50.7%)	65 (17.5%)	78 (21%)	40 (10.8%)	183 (49.3%)	3.43	1.60657
41	I involve in academic dishonesty because AI tools make it easier.	89 (24%)	87 (23.5%)	58 (15.6%)	234 (63.1%)	48 (12.9%)	51 (13.7%)	38 (10.2%)	137 (36.9%)	3.00	1.67413
	Total				1797 (48.4%)				1913 (51.6%)	3.48	

Table presents students' views and self-reported contribution of AI-related academic misconduct. Overall, the grand mean value ($M = 3.48$) suggests a moderate to high level of agreement among students regarding the use of AI tools and their potential contribution to academic misconduct. This indicates that AI tools are perceived as playing a noticeable role in shaping students' academic behaviors. Higher mean values were observed for statements emphasizing functional and attitudinal reliance on AI. For instance, "I use AI tools to summarize content" ($M = 3.78$) and "I prefer AI tools to do my assignments because they save time and effort" ($M = 3.73$) indicate that students largely view AI as a convenient and efficiency-enhancing tool. The highest mean score was recorded for the statement "Using AI in learning may lead to over-reliance on technology" ($M = 3.85$), followed by "AI tools increase the risk of academic fraud" ($M = 3.73$). These results demonstrate a strong awareness among students of the potential negative academic consequences of AI integration.

Overall, the table gives insights as most of the university students were agreed that they use AI tools in learning and use AI tools for dishonest academic practices at the university level such as for making assignments, exam assistance, and summarizing content, which promote them towards, easiness, less efforts to do work, laziness, over-reliance on technology, academic fraud and lack of critical thinking analysis reveals that while students actively use AI tools for academic support and efficiency, they also acknowledge the risks of over-reliance and academic misconduct. This dual perception highlights the need for clear institutional guidelines, ethical training, and responsible AI usage policies in higher education.

Table 8: Weighted Mean of personal and environmental factors

	Personal Factors		Environmental Factors		
	Personal Learning Difficulty	Personal Psychological Factor	Teaching Factors	Organizational Factors	Social Factors
N	371	371	371	371	371
Mean	10.9892	22.9434	16.6173	9.0970	15.2264

Table 2 shows the average mean of all sub factors of personal (personal learning difficulties and personal psychological factors) and environmental factors (teaching, organizational and social factors) that promote

academic dishonesty. The results revealed that weighted mean score of personal psychological factors (22.9434) is greater than all other factors of academic dishonesty. It means that personal psychological factors push the students more towards academic dishonesty as compared to other factors.

Group Differences with respect to Gender and academic program wise

The t-test was used to calculate the difference between groups of gender and academic program. The t-test is typically used to calculate that whether the mean scores of two groups are substantially different from one another or not. The determined results of Independent t-test are given below.

Gender based difference of Personal Factors

Table 9: Gender wise Differences on the aspect of Personal Learning Difficulty

Indicator	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-value	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Personal Learning Difficulty	Male	144	12.0486	5.42118	3.108	369	.002
	Female	227	10.3172	5.10386			

It can be checked from table that the results of personal learning difficulties depicted that male students had more mean score (M= 12.0486, S.D 5.421) than the mean score of female students (M= 10.3172, S.D= 5.10386), with df (369) $t = 3.108$, $p = .002$ which indicates that male students involves more in academic dishonesty due to personal leaning difficulties as comparison to female student.

Table 10: Gender wise Differences on the aspect of Personal Psychological Factors

Indicator	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-value	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Personal Psychological Factors	Male	144	25.4792	8.78330	4.749	369	.000
	Female	227	21.3348	7.79396			

It can be checked from table that the results of personal psychological factors depicted that male students had greater mean score (M= 25.4792, S.D = 8.783) than the mean score of female students (M= 21.3348, S.D= 7.793), with df (369) $t = 4.749$, $p = .000$ which indicates that male students involves more in academic dishonesty due to personal psychological factors as comparison to female student.

Gender Wise difference of Environmental Factors

Table 11: Gender wise Differences on the aspect of Teaching Factors

Indicator	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-value	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Teaching Factors	Male	144	17.2500	7.04481	1.422	369	.156
	Female	227	16.2159	6.68058			

It can be checked from table that the results of teaching factors depicted that male students had more mean score (M= 17.2500, S.D = 7.04481) than the mean score of female students (M= 16.2159, S.D= 6.68058), with df (369) $t = 1.422$, $p = .156$ but the mean difference between both groups is minimum and the significance value is .156 which is greater than p-value 0.05. It was concluded that there was no significant difference between the scores of males and females of teaching factors.

Table 12: Gender wise Differences on the aspect of Organizational Factors

Indicator	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-value	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Organizational Factors	Male	144	10.0556	4.38653	3.524	369	.000
	Female	227	8.4890	4.03125			

It can be checked from table that the results of organizational factors depicted that male students had greater mean score (M= 10.0556, S.D = 4.386) than the mean score of female students (M= 8.4890, S.D= 4.03125), with df (369) t = 3.524, p = .000 which indicates that male students involves more in academic dishonesty due to organizational factors as comparison to female student.

Table 13: Gender wise Differences on the aspect of Social Factors

Indicator	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-value	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Social Factors	Male	144	16.7361	5.81171	4.348	369	.000
	Female	227	14.2687	4.99584			

It can be checked from table that the results of social factors depicted that male students had greater mean score (M= 16.7361, S.D = 5.8117) than the mean score of female students (M= 14.2687, S.D= 4.9958), with df (369) t = 4.348, p = .000 which indicates that male students involves more in academic dishonesty due to social factors as comparison to female student.

Gender Wise differences in Perceptions and contributions about AI Academic Misconduct

Table 14: Gender wise Differences on the Aspect of Perceptions and contribution about AI Academic Misconduct

Indicator	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-value	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Perceptions about AI Academic Misconduct	Male	144	34.8194	10.36984	-.004	369	.997
	Female	227	34.8238	10.61660			

It can be checked from table that the results of perceptions about the AI related misconduct depicted that male students had almost equal mean score (M= 34.8194, S.D = 10.369) like the mean score of female students (M= 34.8238, S.D= 10.616), with df (369) t = -.004, p = .997 but the mean difference between two groups is very low and the significance value is .997 which is greater than p-value 0.05. It was concluded that there was no significant difference between the scores of males and females of perceptions about the AI related misconduct.

Academic Program-wise Difference of Personal Factors

Table 15: Academic Program wise Differences on the aspect of Personal learning difficulties

Indicator	Academic Program	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-value	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Personal Learning Difficulties	Undergraduate	316	11.2880	5.34546	2.628	369	.009
	Graduate	55	9.2727	4.64062			

It was checked from table that the results of personal learning difficulties depicted that undergraduate students had more mean score ($M = 11.2880$, $S.D = 5.345$) than the mean score of graduate students ($M = 9.2727$, $S.D = 4.640$), with $df (369)$ $t = 2.628$, $p = .009$ which indicates that undergraduate students involves more in academic dishonesty due to personal leaning difficulties as comparison to graduate student.

Table 16: Academic Program wise Differences on the aspect of Personal psychological factors

Indicator	Academic Program	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-value	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Personal Psychological Factors	Undergraduate	316	23.5854	8.22823	3.573	369	.000
	Graduate	55	19.2545	8.67994			

It can be checked from table that the results of personal psychological factors depicted that undergraduate students had more mean score ($M = 23.5854$, $S.D = 8.228$) than the mean score of graduate students ($M = 19.254$, $S.D = 8.679$), with $df (369)$ $t = 3.573$, $p = .000$ which indicates that undergraduate students involves more in academic dishonesty due to personal psychological factors as comparison to graduate student.

Academic Program wise Differences of Environmental Factors

Table 17: Academic Program wise Differences on the aspect of Teaching factors

Indicator	Academic Program	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-value	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Teaching Factors	Undergraduate	316	16.4747	6.65780	-.963	369	.336
	Graduate	55	17.4364	7.78356			

It can be checked from table that the results of teaching factors depicted that graduate students had more mean score ($M = 17.436$, $S.D = 7.783$) than the mean score of undergraduate students ($M = 16.474$, $S.D = 6.657$), with $df (369)$ $t = -.963$, $p = .336$ but the mean difference between two groups is minimum and the significance value is .336 which is greater than p-value 0.05. It was concluded that there was no significant difference between the undergraduate and graduate students' scores of teaching factors with respect to academic dishonesty.

Table 18: Academic Program wise Differences on the aspect of Organizational factors

Indicator	Academic Program	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-value	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Organizational Factors	Undergraduate	316	9.0570	4.05790	-.436	369	.663
	Graduate	55	9.3273	5.18207			

It can be checked from table that the results of organizational factors depicted that graduate students had more mean score ($M = 9.3273$, $S.D = 5.182$) than the mean score of undergraduate students ($M = 9.0570$, $S.D = 4.057$), with $df (369)$ $t = -.436$, $p = .663$ but the mean difference between two groups is very low and the significance value is .663 which is greater than p-value 0.05. It was concluded that there was no significant difference between the undergraduate and graduate students' scores of organizational factors with respect to academic dishonesty.

Table 19: Academic Program wise Differences on the aspect of Social factors

Indicator	Academic Program	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-value	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Social Factors	Undergraduate	316	15.3639	5.43976	1.165	369	.245
	Graduate	55	14.4364	5.52021			

The results of table showed that of social factors depicted that undergraduate students had more mean score ($M = 15.3639$, $S.D = 5.439$) than the mean score of graduate students ($M = 14.4364$, $S.D = 5.520$), with $df (369)$ $t = 1.165$, $p = .245$ but the mean difference between two groups is very low and the significance value is .245 which is greater than p -value 0.05. It was concluded that there was no significant difference between the undergraduate and graduate students' scores of social factors with respect to academic dishonesty.

Academic Program-wise Differences in Perceptions and Contributions about AI Academic Misconduct

Table 20: Academic Program wise Differences on the aspect of Perceptions about AI Academic Misconduct

Indicator	Academic Program	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-value	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Perceptions about AI Academic Misconduct	Undergraduate	316	34.8038	10.44074	-.080	369	.936
	Graduate	55	34.9273	10.98122			

It can be checked from table that the results of perceptions about the AI related misconduct depicted that undergraduate students had almost equal mean score ($M = 34.8038$, $S.D = 10.440$) like the mean score of female students ($M = 34.9273$, $S.D = 10.981$), with $df (369)$ $t = -.080$, $p = .936$ but the mean difference between two groups is too small and the significance value is .936 which is greater than p -value 0.05. It was concluded that there was no significant difference between the scores of undergraduate and graduate students of perceptions about the AI related misconduct.

Group Differences with respect to Faculty

The ANOVA was applied to calculate the difference between groups with respect to faculty. The ANOVA is basically used to investigate whether the mean score of more than two groups is significantly different from each other or not. The calculated results of ANOVA are given below.

Faculty Wise difference of Personal Factors

Table 21: ANOVA results in respect to Faculty wise of sub variables of Personal Factors

Indicator	Groups	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Personal Learning Difficulty	Between Groups	226.688	2	113.344	4.119	.017
	Within Groups	10127.269	368	27.520		
	Total	10353.957	370			
Personal Psychological Factor	Between Groups	1236.969	2	618.485	9.091	.000
	Within Groups	25036.842	368	68.035		
	Total	26273.811	370			

This table revealed that the personal learning difficulties had a significant impact on academic dishonesty with respect to faculty, $F(2, 368) = 4.119$, $p = .017$. The significance value is lower than significant level = 0.05 which revealed that these three groups of faculties are significantly differ from each other. The table also revealed that the personal psychological factors had a significant impact on academic dishonesty with respect to faculty, $F(2, 368) = 9.091$, $p = .000$. The significance value is lower than significant level = 0.05 which revealed that these three groups of faculties are significantly differ from each other.

Table 22: Multiple comparison of sub variable of Personal Factors in Respect to Faculty Wise

Variable	(I) Faculty of respondents	(J) Faculty of respondents	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Personal Learning Difficulty	Sciences	Social Sciences	-1.75666*	.013
		Arts and Humanities	-1.15436	.255
	Social Sciences	Sciences	1.75666*	.013
		Arts and Humanities	.60231	.682
	Arts and Humanities	Sciences	1.15436	.255
		Social Sciences	-.60231	.682
Personal Psychological Factor	Sciences	Social Sciences	-3.83624*	.000
		Arts and Humanities	-3.63171*	.005
	Social Sciences	Sciences	3.83624*	.000
		Arts and Humanities	.20453	.982
	Arts and Humanities	Sciences	3.63171*	.005
		Social Sciences	-.20453	.982

This table indicated that the difference between and within group mean score. The results revealed that there was a significant difference between the mean scores of sciences and social sciences with respect to personal learning difficulties while the other groups were not significantly different. This table also revealed that there was a significant mean difference between the scores of sciences and social sciences and scores of sciences and arts and humanities of personal psychological factors while the other groups were not significantly different.

Faculty Wise difference of Environmental Factors

Table 23: ANOVA results in respect to Faculty wise of sub variables of Environmental Factors

Indicator	Groups	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Teaching Factors	Between Groups	157.660	2	78.830	1.694	.185
	Within Groups	17119.990	368	46.522		
	Total	17277.650	370			
Organizational Factors	Between Groups	94.949	2	47.475	2.669	.071

	Within Groups	6545.557	368	17.787		
	Total	6640.507	370			
Social Factors	Between Groups	342.950	2	171.475	5.917	.003
	Within Groups	10664.031	368	28.978		
	Total	11006.981	370			

This table revealed that the teaching factors and organizational factors of academic dishonesty had no significant difference among three faculties; faculty of sciences, social sciences and arts and humanities. This table also shows that the social factors of academic dishonesty had a significant difference with respect to faculty, $F(2, 368) = 5.917$, $p = .003$. The significance value ($p = .003$) is lower than significant level = 0.05 which revealed that the three groups of faculties are significantly differ from each other.

Table 24: Multiple comparison of sub variable of Environmental Factors in Respect to Faculty Wise

Variable	(I) Faculty of respondents	(J) Faculty of respondents	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Teaching Factors	Sciences	Social Sciences	-1.44640	.170
		Arts and Humanities	-.42300	.896
	Social Sciences	Sciences	1.44640	.170
		Arts and Humanities	1.02341	.520
	Arts and Humanities	Sciences	.42300	.896
		Social Sciences	-1.02341	.520
Organizational Factors	Sciences	Social Sciences	-1.11942	.064
		Arts and Humanities	-.31167	.856
	Social Sciences	Sciences	1.11942	.064
		Arts and Humanities	.80774	.346
	Arts and Humanities	Sciences	.31167	.856
		Social Sciences	-.80774	.346
Social Factors	Sciences	Social Sciences	-2.11994*	.003
		Arts and Humanities	-1.63206	.076
	Social Sciences	Sciences	2.11994*	.003
		Arts and Humanities	.48789	.787
	Arts and Humanities	Sciences	1.63206	.076
		Social Sciences	-.48789	.787

This table indicated that the difference between and within group mean score. The results revealed that there was no significant difference among the teaching and organizational factors of academic dishonesty with respect to faculty. Moreover, the results also revealed that there was a significant difference between the mean scores of sciences and social sciences of social factors with respect to academic dishonesty.

Faculty Wise difference regarding the Perceptions and contribution of AI related Academic Misconduct

Table 25: ANOVA results with respect to Faculty-wise variable Perceptions and contributions about AI-related Academic Misconduct

Indicator	Groups	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
AI Academic Misconduct	Between Groups	302.126	2	151.063	1.371	.255
	Within Groups	40548.133	368	110.185		
	Total	40850.259	370			

This table revealed that the perceptions and contributions about AI-related academic misconduct had no significant difference among the three faculties: the faculty of sciences, social sciences, and arts and humanities.

Discussion

The primary objective of the given research was to investigate individual and situational predictors of academic dishonesty among student learners in universities and the role of AI tools. Following the comprehensive literature audit of the journals it was purged of the earlier research that, with new research interests, the volume of research on cheating has increased notably over the last 20 years (Marques et al., 2019). A different study carried out by Riad, (2023) observes that the concept of academic dishonesty is not new. Nevertheless, due to the new developments that have been established due to the internet and online learning, it continues to pose a challenge in higher education. The findings of this study revealed that prominent personal learning difficulties that contribute to academic dishonesty were limited knowledge of the English language, do not know the right way to study, do not prepare well before exams, weak memory and recall difficulties, and difficult course material, that promote academic dishonesty. Prominent psychological factors were assignments seem irrelevant to my future, teachers do not appreciate the quality of personal work, lack of confidence in my academic abilities, desire for high grades, fear of failing a semester, not interested in studies, desire to please the family with success and superiority, do not pay attention in class, knowing that we can eventually cheat on the exams and used to cheat in my previous academic stages, that promote academic dishonesty. These findings of personal factors aligns with previous studies by Starovoytova and Namango (2016) and Abiodun, (2011) mentioned the primary causes of academic dishonesty, time constraints; challenging courses; laziness; competition with others; stress management; challenging exams; little chance of being caught; light punishment; improving one's grades; peer pressure; fear of failing; "everyone does it"; the course was pointless; parental pressure; taking a chance; lecturer indifference; low instructor vigilance; high course load; and not understanding questions, among others. The results of this study were also matched with another study by Asgher et al. (2023). Orok et al. (2023) reported similar results where the fear of failing drove about 77% of students to engage in academic dishonesty. Studies of Jatmika et al. (2022) and Yang et al. (2013) also supported the results of this study. They found that students' lack of interest in their studies is a major contributing factor to academic dishonesty. Some students have

little time or interest in their studies. Another factor that encourages academic dishonesty in students is language barriers and difficulty speaking English. Other researchers like Hensley et al. (2013) and Klocko, (2014) also supported that language barriers have been shown to have detrimental effects on students.

The results of this study also revealed the environmental factors that contribute to academic dishonesty. The prominent teaching factors were teachers rarely check plagiarism in assignments, teachers tend to give a lot of assignments, lack of vigilance by certain teachers while monitoring exams was, teachers are not available for academic support and guidance, teachers ignore academic misconduct done by the student, teacher's lack of competence in explaining the subject material, that promote academic dishonesty. Further, in organizational factors prominent factors were lack of strict penalties, pressure of managing many subjects at the same time, congested seating in the examination hall, and easy access to the internet and online resources on campus promote academic dishonesty. Furthermore, among social factors the prominent factors were the plagiarized assignments because their classmates often do it without facing consequences, use AI tools unethically because students observe their teachers doing the same, fear of bullying and negative criticism from family and friends, cheating in exams because their friends encourage them to do so, and high pressure and expectations from family that promote academic dishonesty among university students. These results were aligned with the study of Asgher et al. (2023) in which academic dishonesty was caused by using irrelevant teaching methods, lack of teaching expertise, communication difficulties, overburdening students with material, a sense of rivalry, social rejection, and social injustice were among the teaching and social factors that had an impact. Another study by Razek (2014) found that peer pressure, performance pressure, and a lack of faculty enforcement were factors that contributed to student misconduct and the prevalence of academic dishonesty among students. Results of the study also matched with the findings of Anitha and Sundaram (2021). They found that parental expectations, conformity, class-taking due to outside influences like parental decisions and social pressure, and fierce competition for grades are important factors that lead students to academic dishonesty.

This study also found that most of the university students were agreed that they use AI tools in learning and use AI tools for dishonest academic practices at the university level such as for making assignments, exam assistance, and summarizing content, which promote them towards, easiness, less efforts to do work, laziness, over-reliance on technology, academic fraud and lack of critical thinking analysis reveals that while students actively use AI tools for academic support and efficiency, they also acknowledge the risks of over-reliance and academic misconduct. This dual perception highlights the need for clear institutional guidelines, ethical training, and responsible AI usage policies in higher education. The current study's findings corroborated to Elom et al.'s (2025) study. The findings showed a positive correlation with academic misconduct and a significant inverse relationship between exposure to AI and ethical behavior.

The obtained results of this study of the Independent sample t-test of the personal factors and environmental factors showed calculated results that showed that there was a significant difference in mean scores between males and females. Thus, it was represented based on the average result score that male students had the higher average result score compared to female students which explains that male students were more engaged in academic dishonesty because of personal and environmental factors of academic dishonesty. The findings of this research were in line with those of the study of Baird, (1980) and Mc Ternan, (2014). In their study, men are prone to the dishonest activities in academics than women.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to explore the personal and environmental factors that promote academic dishonesty among university students and contribution of AI tools in promoting dishonest academic

behaviors and also investigate the teacher's perspectives and role regarding academic dishonesty and usage of AI tools. It was concluded from the results of personal factors that among learning difficulties, limited knowledge of the English language, and do not know the right way to study was the prominent factors and among psychological factors, assignments seem irrelevant to my future, teachers do not appreciate the quality of personal work and lack of confidence in my academic abilities were the main factors that promote academic dishonesty. It was also concluded from the results of environmental factors that among teaching factors, teachers rarely check plagiarism in assignments, teachers tend to give a lot of assignments and lack of vigilance by certain teachers was the prominent factors that promote academic dishonesty and among organizational factors, the most selected factors were the lack of strict penalties and pressure of managing many subjects at the same time and from social factors the most contributing factors were the plagiarized assignments because their classmates often do it without facing consequences, the use AI tools unethically because students observe their teachers doing the same, fear of bullying and negative criticism from family and friends were the major factors of academic dishonesty. The quantitative findings of the study also revealed that most of the university students disagreed that personal and environmental factors lead them towards academic dishonesty, but males, undergraduates and students of social sciences and arts and humanities were more involved in academic dishonesty compared to females, graduates and students of sciences, respectively. The findings also revealed that most of the university students agreed that they use AI tools in learning and use AI tools for dishonest academic practices at the university level.

Recommendations of the Study

In light of the findings and conclusions that were drawn from the analysis of this study, some recommendations were proposed that may help students to improve their academic performance and academic integrity by ethical use of AI tools in an academic setting.

- It is recommended that universities should establish precise and uniform AI use guidelines that include specific instances of permissible use and the proper method of declaring them would be beneficial for institutions (Perkins and Roe 2024).
- It is recommended that universities and teachers should develop their own guidelines and policies about AI regulations to place more emphasis on ethical responsibility and academic innovation than just compliance, which may also have a positive impact on students' opinions.
- Moreover, it is also recommended that educational institutions must establish a transparent and encouraging atmosphere where students feel assured that truthful AI statements will be evaluated equitably. (Carless, 2012; Tan et al., 2024).
- It is also recommended that instead of depending on general frameworks, institutions must customize AI policies to their particular contexts in order to meet the particular needs of their student bodies.
- It is also recommended that universities and departments should arrange training workshops and sessions for students because most of the university students even do not think so that the usage of AI tools in academic settings could be unethical.
- It is also recommended that we should not stop students from using AI, but rather we need to embed it in education, because this transformation is global, and we stand globally at the same pace as developed countries. Therefore, we need to learn new skills and technologies. However, to ensure the ethical usage of AI and preserve academic integrity, it is necessary to establish committees to monitor AI trends and promote interdisciplinary dialogue.

Suggestions for Future Research

Some suggestions that may be helpful for future researchers regarding the factors of academic dishonesty and role or contribution of AI tools in learning and academic institutions:

- For this study, the data were collected only from the 371 students of University of Sargodha as a sample but it is recommended that future study may be conducted with a larger number of sample and may also include other universities of Pakistan. It would allow clearer and broader understanding of phenomena. It would increase the generalizability of the study's findings.
- Furthermore, this study was limited to one public university but it is suggested for future study may also include the students from other public and private sectors and compare the findings of both sectors. It will provide more comprehensive understanding of personal and environmental factors that promote academic dishonesty and role of AI tool in both public and private sectors.
- The present research study was cross-sectional in nature. But it is recommended that future researchers should be used longitudinal approach for their study. It would provide a more in-depth understanding of the factors that promote academic dishonesty and the role of AI tools in promoting such behaviors.
- Finally, it is also recommended that future studies should examine how well certain interventions, like AI ethics classes or legislative changes, promote moral behavior. Future research can offer more profound insights into minimizing the moral dilemmas presented by AI in education while optimizing its potential advantages by tackling these constraints.

References

- Abbas, A., & Faiz, A. (2013). Usefulness of digital and traditional libraries in higher education. *International Journal of Services Technology and Management*, 19(1-3), 149-161. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJSTM.2013.054203>
- Abiodun, G., Gbadebo, O., & Tola, O. (2011). Forms of academic cheating during examination among students with hearing impairment in Nigeria: Implication for counseling practice. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 26(2), 276.
- Akbulut, Y., Şendağ, S., Birinci, G., Kılıçer, K., Şahin, M. C., & Odabaşı, H. F. (2008). Exploring the types and reasons of internet-triggered academic dishonesty among Turkish undergraduate students: Development of Internet Triggered Academic Dishonesty Scale (ITADS). *Computers & Education*, 51(1), 463-473.
- Aktay, S., Gok, S., & Yildirim, A. (2024). Artificial intelligence attitude scale. *International Technology and Education Journal*, 8(2), 14-24.
- Alotaibi, J. S., Alotaibi, A. O., Manzar, M. D., Almansour, A. M., Alasiry, S., Alrasheadi, B. A., & Kashoo, F. Z. (2024). Development and validation of a questionnaire about reasons for academic cheating by nursing students: A cross-sectional study. *Medicine*, 103(23), e38243.
- Amin, L., Zainal, S. Z., Hassan, Z., & Ibrahim, M. H. (2012). Factors contributing to research misconducts. *The Social Sciences*, 7(2), 283-288. <https://doi.org/10.3923/sscience.2012.283.288>
- Anitha, P., & Sundaram, S. (2021). Prevalence, types and reasons for academic dishonesty among college students. *Journal of Studies in Social Sciences and Humanities*, 7(1), 1-14.
- Asgher, S. (2022). Social factors behind academic dishonesty as perceived by the postgraduate students. *International Journal of Social Studies*, 2(2), 49-53.
- Asgher, S., Khan, F. U., Murtaza, G., Abid, S., Shabbir, M., Ashraf, S., & Munawar, B. (2023). Factors leading students to academic dishonesty on the university level in Pakistan. *Journal of Education and Social Studies*, 4(3), 836-843. <https://doi.org/10.52223/jess.2023.4344>
- Asif, R., Abbas, N., & Gilani, T. (2024). Academic integrity among prospective teachers: Challenges and way forward. *Archives of Educational Studies (ARES)*, 4(2), 187-200.
- Atlas, S. (2023). ChatGPT for higher education and professional development: A guide to conversational AI. https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1547&context=cba_facpubs
- Baena-Rojas, J. J., Castillo-Martínez, I. M., Mendez-Garduño, J. I., Suárez-Brito, P., & López Caudana, E. O. (2023). Information communication technologies, artificial intelligence, and social robotics: A complex-thinking vector in higher education? *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, 14(2), 21-50.
- Baird, J. (1980). Current trends in college cheating. *Psychology in the Schools*, 17, 515-522.
- Balalle, H., & Pannilage, S. (2025). Reassessing academic integrity in the age of AI: A systematic literature review on AI and academic integrity. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 11, 101299.
- Barber, M., Bird, L., Fleming, J., Titterington-Giles, E., Edwards, E., & Leyland, C. (2021). Gravity assist: Propelling higher education towards a brighter future. Office for Students.
- Bayaa Martin Saana, S. B., Ablordeppey, E., Mensah, N. J., & Karikari, T. K. (2016). Academic dishonesty in higher education: Students' perceptions and involvement in an African institution. *BMC Research Notes*, 9(1), 234.
- Biermann, O. C. (2022). Writers want AI collaborators to respect their personal values and writing strategies: A human-centered perspective on AI co-writing. <https://doi.org/10.14288/1.0420422>
- Brickman, W. W. (1961). Ethics, examinations, and education. *School and Society*, 89, 412-415.
- Bushway, A., & Nash, W. (1977). School cheating behavior. *Review of Educational Research*, 47(4), 623-632.

- Carless, D. (2012). Trust and its role in facilitating dialogic feedback. In *Feedback in higher and professional education* (pp. 90-103). Routledge.
- Carpenter, D. D., Harding, T. S., Finelli, C. J., Montgomery, S. M., & Passow, H. J. (2006). Engineering students' perceptions of and attitudes towards cheating. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 95(3), 181-194.
- Chiang, F. K., Zhu, D., & Yu, W. (2022). A systematic review of academic dishonesty in online learning environments. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 38, 907-928. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12656>
- Chinamasa, E., Mavuru, L., Maphosa, C., & Tarambawamwe, P. (2011). Examinations cheating: Exploring strategies and contributing factors in five universities in Zimbabwe. *Journal of Innovative Research in Education*, 1(1), 86-101.
- Colnerud, G., & Rosander, M. (2009). Academic dishonesty, ethical norms and learning. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 34(5), 505-517.
- Culwin, F., & Lancaster, T. (2001). Plagiarism issues for higher education. *VINE*, 31(2), 36-41. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03055720010804005>
- Currie, G., Singh, C., Nelson, T., Nabasenja, C., Al-Hayek, Y., & Spuur, K. (2023). ChatGPT in medical imaging higher education. *Radiography*, 29(4), 792-799. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.radi.2023.05.011>
- Davis, S. F., Drinan, P. F., & Gallant, T. (2009). *Cheating in school: What we know and what we can do*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Denisova-Schmidt, E. (2017). *The challenges of academic integrity in higher education: Current trends and prospects*. Boston College.
- Elom, C. O., Ayanwale, M. A., Ukeje, I. O., Offiah, G. A., Umoke, C. C., & Ogbonnaya, C. E. (2025). Does AI knowledge encourage cheating? Investigating student perceptions, ethical engagement, and academic integrity in the digital age. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 24(4), 708-729.
- Fatima, A., Abbas, A., Ming, W., Hosseini, S., & Zhu, D. (2019). Internal and external factors of plagiarism: Evidence from Chinese public sector universities. *Accountability in Research*, 26(1), 1-16.
- Fatima, A., Ming, W., & Abbas, A. (2018). Chinese students' perception on plagiarism: A case of Anhui, China. *The New Educational Review*, 53(3), 95-101. <https://doi.org/10.15804/tner.2018.53.3.08>
- Guthrie, C. L. (2009). *Plagiarism and cheating: A mixed methods study of student academic dishonesty* (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Waikato).
- Harold, J., & Max, A. (2001). *Fraud and education: The norm in the Apple*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Hayes, N., & Introna, L. D. (2005). Cultural values, plagiarism, and fairness: When plagiarism gets in the way of learning. *Ethics & Behavior*, 15(3), 213-231. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327019eb1503_2
- Hensley, L., Kirkpatrick, K., & Burgoon, J. (2013). Relation of gender, course enrollment, and grades to distinct forms of academic dishonesty. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 18, 895-907. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2013.827641>
- Hensley, L., Kirkpatrick, K., & Burgoon, J. (2013). Relation of gender, course enrollment, and grades to distinct forms of academic dishonesty. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 18, 895-907. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2013.827641>
- Jatmika, S., Suwandi, J., Santoso, J., Oktaviana, F., & Karima, M. (2022). Academic dishonesty on online learning among vocational high school students. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.viii4.22507>
- Jereb, E., Perc, M., Lämmlein, B., Jerebic, J., Urh, M., Podbregar, I., & Šprajc, P. (2018). Factors influencing plagiarism in higher education: A comparison of German and Slovene students. *PLOS ONE*, 13(8), e0202252. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0202252>
- Jones, D. R. L. (2011). Academic dishonesty: Are more students cheating? *Business Communication Quarterly*, 74, 141-150.
- Khabib, S. (2022). Introducing artificial intelligence (AI)-based digital writing assistants for teachers in writing scientific articles. *Teaching English as a Foreign Language Journal*, 1(2), 114-124. <https://doi.org/10.12928/tefl.vii2.249>

- King, C. G., Guyette, R. W., & Piotrowski, C. (2009). Online exams and cheating: An empirical analysis of business students' views. *Journal of Educators Online*, 6.
- Klocko, M. (2014). Academic dishonesty in schools of nursing: A literature review. *The Journal of Nursing Education*, 53(3), 121–125. <https://doi.org/10.3928/01484834-20140205-01>
- Korb, K. (2009). Mental health and exam malpractice: Theory of test design is prediction, not deception. *The Nigerian Educational Psychologist*, 7, 96–104.
- Liu, H., Azam, M., Bin Naeem, S., & Faiola, A. (2023). An overview of the capabilities of ChatGPT for medical writing and its implications for academic integrity. *Health Information and Libraries Journal*, 40(4), 440–446. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hir.12509>
- Lund, B. D., Lee, T. H., Mannuru, N. R., & Arutla, N. (2025). AI and academic integrity: Exploring student perceptions and implications for higher education. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 1–21.
- Macdonald, R., & Carroll, J. (2006). Plagiarism – a complex issue requiring a holistic institutional approach. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 31(2), 233–245.
- Mahmood, U., Khan, I. A., & Mahmood, S. (2023). The sociological dynamics of academic integrity in the universities of Punjab, Pakistan. *Pakistan Social Sciences Review*, 7(3), 958–965. [https://doi.org/10.35484/psr.2023\(7-III\)78](https://doi.org/10.35484/psr.2023(7-III)78)
- Marques, T., Reis, N., & Gomes, J. J. (2019). A bibliometric study on academic dishonesty research. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 17(2), 169–191.
- McTernan, M., Love, P., & Rettinger, D. (2014). The influence of personality on the decision to cheat. *Ethics & Behavior*, 24(1), 53–72.
- Mohammed, A., Al-Ghazali, A., & Alqohfa, K. (2023). Exploring ChatGPT uses in higher studies: A case study of Arab postgraduates in India. *Journal of English Studies in Arabia Felix*, 2(2), 8–15. <https://doi.org/10.56540/Jesaf.v2i2.55>
- Moura, H. M. D., Gouveia, R. S. V., Grangeiro, A. S. D. M., Figueiredo, C. V. D., & Gouveia, V. V. (2022). Cheating motivation scale: Evidence of validity and reliability. *Psico-USF*, 27, 425–436.
- Murphy, B. (2013, February 1). Harvard cheating scandal ends in dozens of forced withdrawals. *Huff Post College*. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/02/01/harvard-cheating-scandal-_n_2600366.html
- Nguyen, M. (2023). Academic writing and AI: Day-1 experiment. *OSF Preprints*. <https://osf.io/xgqu5/download>
- Ogurlu, U., & Mossholder, J. (2023). The perception of ChatGPT among educators: Preliminary findings. *Research in Social Sciences and Technology*, 8(4), 196–215. <https://doi.org/10.46303/ressat.2023.39>
- 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>
- Randy, M., & DeTommaso, L. (1995). Are college cheating and plagiarism related to academic dishonesty? *Psychological Reports*, 77, 691–698.
- Riad, J. (2023). Academic dishonesty in higher education: What we know and what we can do. *Journal of Research Initiatives*, 7(2), 11.
- Saeed, G., Abbasi, Y. H., & Hussain, W. (2024). Understanding academic dishonesty in higher education: Determinants and mitigation strategies. *Pakistan Journal of Society, Education and Language*, 10(2), 39–56.
- Sağın, F. G., Özkaya, A. B., Tengiz, F., Geyik, Ö. G., & Geyik, C. (2024). Current evaluation and recommendations for the use of artificial intelligence tools in education. *Turkish Journal of Biochemistry*, 48(6), 620–625.
- Šprajc, P., Urh, M., Jerebic, J., Trivan, D., & Jereb, E. (2017). Reasons for plagiarism in higher education. *Organizacija*, 50(1), 33–45. <https://doi.org/10.1515/orga-2017-0002>
- Starovoytova, D., & Cherotich, S. (2016). Female underrepresentation in undergraduate education: Case study in School of Engineering. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, 6(14).
- Tan, C., Alhammad, M. M., & Stelmaszak, M. (2024, April). Teachers' Perceptions of Students' Use of Generative AI in Summative Assessments at Higher Education Institutions: An Exploratory Study. *UK Academy for Information Systems*.

Taradi, S., Taradi, M., & Dogas, Z. (2012). Croatian medical students see academic dishonesty as an acceptable behaviour: A cross-sectional multicampus study. *Journal of Medical Ethics*, 38, 376–379. <https://doi.org/10.1136/medethics-2011-100015>

Yan, Y., Wu, B., Pi, J., & Zhang, X. (2025). Perceptions of AI in higher education: Insights from students at a top-tier Chinese university. *Education Sciences*, 15(6), 735.

Yang, S., Huang, C., & Chen, A. (2013). An investigation of college students' perceptions of academic dishonesty, reasons for dishonesty, achievement goals, and willingness to report dishonest behavior. *Ethics & Behavior*, 23, 501–522. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10508422.2013.802651>

Yeo, M. A. (2023). Academic integrity in the age of artificial intelligence (AI) authoring apps. *TESOL Journal*, 14(3), e716. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.716>

Declarations
Authors' Contribution:
▪ All AuthorsConceptualization, and intellectual revisions, Data collection, interpretation, and drafting of manuscript ▪ The authors agree to take responsibility for every facet of the work, making sure that any concerns about its integrity or veracity are thoroughly examined and addressed ▪ No Research Data available outside the submitted manuscript file
Conflict of Interest: NIL
Funding Sources: NIL
Correspondence:
Maryam Tasneem
maryamtasneem410@gmail.com
How to Cite: Exploring the Personal and Environmental Factors Promoting Academic Dishonesty among University Students: The Contribution of AI Tools. (2026). Wah Academia Journal of Global Religions, 2(1), 106-131. https://doi.org/10.63954/bq15ko8o Open Access: Publication is Open Access Licensing: Creative Commons Attribution License - CC BY- 4.0 Copyrights: The author retains unrestricted copyrights and publishing rights