



Vol.9 No.2 (2026)

Journal of Applied Learning & Teaching

ISSN: 2591-801X

Proudly owned and sponsored by Kaplan Business School, Australia

Content Available at: <https://jalt.open-publishing.org/index.php/jalt/index>

Book Review of Kumar, R., & Eaton, S. E. (Eds., 2026). *A Research Agenda for Artificial Intelligence and Academic Integrity*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Ali Mikaeili^A

^AUniversity of Calgary, Canada

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2026.9.2.15>

Introduction

A Research Agenda for Artificial Intelligence and Academic Integrity is a 282-page volume in Edward Elgar's Research Agendas series that sets out what academic integrity research should examine now that generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) has unsettled long-standing assumptions about authorship and assessment (Kumar & Eaton, 2026). The editors, Rahul Kumar of Brock University and Sarah Elaine Eaton of the University of Calgary, bring together 16 chapters by 27 contributors, 16 of whom are based in Canada or Australia, with others in the United Arab Emirates, Egypt, the United Kingdom, and Türkiye. The volume is framed by postplagiarism, the proposition that inherited definitions of plagiarism break down once human and machine contributions can no longer be separated (Eaton & Kumar, 2026a, p. 1). It opens with a question many teachers now face: "*When a student submits work for assessment, can you tell where their thinking ends, and artificial intelligence (AI) begins?*" (Eaton & Kumar, 2026a, p. 1). The editors intend it as "a road map for established and emerging scholars" (Kumar & Eaton, 2026, p. xviii).



Figure 1. The book cover of *A Research Agenda for Artificial Intelligence and Academic Integrity*.

My main argument is that the book offers a valuable map of the field as it stood in 2024 and 2025 and a strong foundation for the evidence-based agenda it proposes. The chapters are clearly written and well-referenced, and the concluding agenda gives researchers a usable set of questions. The volume also invites several next steps: extending its empirical base beyond single institutions and small groups, testing the postplagiarism lens that frames it, and bringing its contributors' differing positions, particularly on detection, into explicit dialogue. As a doctoral researcher working on AI governance and academic integrity, I read the volume as both a resource and an argument. After a brief overview of its organization, I consider the postplagiarism lens, the dialogue between chapters, the evidence base and feasibility of the agenda, opportunities to broaden its geographic and commercial scope, and its relation to earlier work.

Organization and content

The book has four parts, framed by an introduction and a concluding research agenda. The editors organized the introduction around five themes and the conclusion around five research themes divided into twenty subthemes (Eaton & Kumar, 2026a, pp. 1–3; 2026b, pp. 237–247).

Part I, “Foundations,” examines the conceptual and ethical grounds. Drawing on the idea of ontological politics (Mol, 1999), the part's opening chapter argues that integrity policies help constitute what it means to be a student, and that current discourse casts AI tools as “helpers” and “tutors” while portraying students as “potential cheaters” (Nieminen, 2026, pp. 9–11). A survey of 185 faculty at one Canadian university finds that integrity perceptions explain an additional 7.6% of variance in intention to teach with GenAI beyond perceived usefulness, and that they moderate the relationship between usefulness and intention (Barcomb & Foxe, 2026, pp. 28–30). A third chapter organizes ethical guidance for researchers around the five core values of the Committee on Publication Ethics (Khan et al., 2026a, p. 45). The convenience inversion framework then adds convenience as a third dimension to an earlier two-axis model to explain why students adopt GenAI readily, while many faculty do not (Kumar, 2026, pp. 61, 69–70; Lancaster, 2023).

Part II, “Diagnostic and Mapping,” examines institutions and research practice. A comparison of human and GenAI coding of 264 senate minutes from two Canadian universities, spanning 2008 to 2023, finds a subtle shift from punitive toward educative framings and concludes that the two GenAI tools tested were not sensitive enough for stand-alone qualitative analysis (Stoesz & Scholle-Cotton, 2026, pp. 82, 85, 92). Responses from 1,050 students in 29 countries show that students mostly use GenAI for searching, grammar checking, summarizing, and planning, and that they often encounter policy silence (McGray & Kumar, 2026, pp. 98–99, 102). A further chapter sets limits on GenAI in research writing, accepting it for tasks such as brainstorming, literature screening, and language editing while excluding it from methods, results, and discussion sections (Khan et al., 2026b, pp. 111–115).

Part III, “Educational Applications,” addresses pedagogy. A collaborative intelligence framework proposes four principles for human–AI collaboration: meaningful human control, shared responsibility, respect for human judgment, and empowerment through education (Sabbaghan, 2026, p. 124). A criminological framework sorts students into Non-cheaters, the Cheat curious, and Likely cheats, and matches these groups to promotion, prevention, and prosecution respectively (Curtis & Clare, 2026, pp. 141–142). An online co-design workshop attended by around 70 participants produced shared values for AI policy, discussed through the notion of “not-yetness” (Bali et al., 2026, pp. 161, 168–169; Collier, 2015). The remaining chapters examine the barriers facing secondary educators in Ontario (Sharma, 2026, pp. 186–187) and propose macro-competencies linked to six fundamental values of academic integrity (Pellerin, 2026, pp. 196–200).

Part IV, “Research and Institutional Futures,” looks ahead. One chapter distinguishes discursive approaches to restricting AI, such as instructions and traffic-light systems that rely on students' compliance, from structural approaches that change the assessment task itself, and sets out four research questions (Dawson & Corbin, 2026, pp. 215–220). Another reads the GenAI moment through the pandemic turn to remote proctoring, arguing that proctoring entrenched inequity and diverted resources from support for teaching and learning, and that AI detection risks repeating this pattern (Jhangiani & Jhangiani, 2026, pp. 227–231). The editors close with five research themes, four “priorities for immediate action,” and a call to move away from an “arms race” between detection and evasion (Eaton & Kumar, 2026b, pp. 237, 248–249).

Evaluation and directions for future research

The post-plagiarism lens: description, prediction, or program?

Post-plagiarism rests on six tenets: hybrid human–AI writing will become normal; human creativity is enhanced; language barriers disappear; humans can relinquish control but not responsibility; attribution remains important; and historical definitions of plagiarism no longer apply (Eaton, 2023). The tenets are phrased as predictions, and the volume develops them into normative programs. The concluding chapter presents its themes as a paradigm shift and maps each theme onto a tenet (Eaton & Kumar, 2026b, pp. 238, 248).

Read against the chapters, the tenets receive different degrees of support, which usefully indicates where research is most needed. The tenet that humans can relinquish control but not responsibility receives the clearest support, through the emphasis on meaningful human control and accountability (Khan et al., 2026a, p. 45; Sabbaghan, 2026, p. 124). The attribution tenet is reinforced by calls for transparency and traceability in research (Khan et al., 2026b, pp. 108–110). Other tenets are refined by the chapters. The exclusion of GenAI from methods, results, and discussion sections (Khan et al., 2026b, p. 115) suggests that hybrid writing may become normal in some genres and sections while remaining inappropriate in others, a boundary that future work on the hybrid-writing tenet could specify. The language-barriers tenet gains nuance from evidence that AI detectors disproportionately disadvantage students writing in a foreign language (Jhangiani & Jhangiani, 2026, p. 231), which suggests that removing barriers in writing also requires attention to how that writing is assessed. The sorting of students into Non-cheaters and Likely cheats (Curtis & Clare, 2026, pp. 141–142), like the gradual change in senate discourse (Stoesz & Scholle-Cotton, 2026, p. 85), indicates that historical definitions continue to shape institutional practice during this transition. The tenet that human creativity is enhanced is affirmed in the conclusion (Eaton & Kumar, 2026b, p. 248) and remains an open question for empirical study. Six of the fourteen substantive chapters engage postplagiarism explicitly, while the others contribute to its themes without naming it. I therefore read postplagiarism in this volume as a forward-looking normative program expressed in predictive language. Its value lies in setting directions, and the chapters supply the material for testing those directions empirically.

Pluralism as a resource for future dialogue

The chapters also represent a genuine plurality of positions, which is one of the volume's strengths. The case for detection and prosecution for Likely cheats (Curtis & Clare, 2026, pp. 148–149) offers a different emphasis from the critique of portraying students as potential cheaters (Nieminen, 2026, pp. 9–10) and from sustained skepticism of detection tools (Jhangiani & Jhangiani, 2026, pp. 230–231). The editorial chapters present these contributions within a shared move away from detection-based approaches (Eaton & Kumar, 2026a, p. 3; 2026b, pp. 241, 244), a framing that invites future work to examine where these positions converge and diverge.

A second productive contrast lies between the argument that discursive approaches such as traffic-light systems cannot assure learning (Dawson & Corbin, 2026, p. 218) and two other positions in the volume: students' calls for clear guidance (McGray & Kumar, 2026, p. 102) and the emphasis on transparency in co-designed policy principles (Bali et al., 2026, p. 168). These positions can be reconciled, since clear guidance may serve fairness and orientation for students even if it cannot assure learning on its own, and making that reconciliation explicit would be a valuable next step. I read this plurality as being productive. A follow-up agenda could build on this by naming the main points of divergence and identifying which of them empirical research is best placed to resolve, especially on detection, a question of pressing concern for institutions.

Evidence base, currency, and feasibility

The empirical chapters provide valuable early evidence, and their designs also show where the evidence base can grow. The faculty survey comes from one university (Barcomb & Foxe, 2026, p. 25), the governance analysis from two (Stoesz & Scholle-Cotton, 2026, p. 82), and the secondary-school chapter from one province, using secondary sources (Sharma, 2026, pp. 186–187). The co-design chapter draws on around 70 participants at a July

workshop, and its authors helpfully note that attendees were likely already interested in AI or equity (Bali et al., 2026, pp. 161, 170). The student survey is the broadest, with 1,050 respondents in 29 countries, and fuller reporting of its sampling and analysis would strengthen its value as a reference point (McGray & Kumar, 2026, p. 98). Longitudinal and cross-institutional designs, which the editors themselves call for (Eaton & Kumar, 2026b, p. 249), are the natural next step.

The timing of the data collection is also worth noting. The faculty survey was conducted in early 2024 (Barcomb & Foxe, 2026, p. 25) and the co-design workshop took place in July 2024 (Bali et al., 2026, p. 176). The finding that 73.9% of faculty had no experience teaching with GenAI (Barcomb & Foxe, 2026, p. 31) may therefore say as much about when the data were collected as about the urgency of training, and such figures are best read as baselines from an early stage of adoption against which later studies can measure change.

The agenda itself is comprehensive. The concluding chapter proposes five themes and 20 subthemes, and its four priorities for immediate action span four of the five themes (Eaton & Kumar, 2026b, pp. 248–249), so researchers may wish to establish a sequence among them. The most specific and feasible agenda is organized around four explicit research questions, and its authors set out what comparing restriction strategies would require: common metrics, collaborative teams, independence from technology vendors, and sustained study (Dawson & Corbin, 2026, pp. 215–220). The proposal to test the convenience inversion model across higher education contexts is similarly concrete (Kumar, 2026, p. 73). Elsewhere, the recommendations identify promising directions that future studies can translate into specific research questions.

Opportunities to broaden scope: Geographic range and commercial interests

The contributors' stated institutional affiliations span six countries. Eleven of the 27 contributors are based in Canada and five in Australia, and the volume also includes welcome contributions from colleagues in the United Arab Emirates, Egypt, the United Kingdom, and Türkiye; three contributors did not state a location. No contributor lists an affiliation with an institution in East, South, or Southeast Asia. Three chapters that report data or case material draw on Canadian contexts (Barcomb & Foxe, 2026; Sharma, 2026; Stoesz & Scholle-Cotton, 2026). The editors recognize that current approaches reflect Western academic traditions of individual authorship and call for research on other ways of knowing (Eaton & Kumar, 2026a, p. 5). The concluding agenda also calls for comparative governance research, with examples drawn from the European Union, the United States, and Canada (Eaton & Kumar, 2026b, p. 243). For JALT's international and particularly Asia-Pacific readers, the volume offers frameworks developed largely within Canadian and Australian higher education, and testing them in other regulatory and cultural contexts is a promising direction for future research.

Commercial interests form another area in which the volume opens a path for further work. The chapter on pandemic proctoring addresses them most directly, describing the pressure on educational technology companies, including Turnitin, to embed GenAI in their products and arguing that detection tools monetize students' intellectual labor (Jhangiani & Jhangiani, 2026, pp. 228–231). The assessment chapter adds that research comparing restriction strategies should ideally not be funded by technology vendors (Dawson & Corbin, 2026, p. 219), and the concluding agenda includes a subtheme on commercialization and vendor influence (Eaton & Kumar, 2026b, p. 247). The editors note that contributors address commercial pressures largely implicitly (Eaton & Kumar, 2026b, p. 237), which positions this subtheme as an important direction for future research. Future studies could examine the business models of the companies that build GenAI systems and detectors, and how vendor contracts shape institutional policy, a question of growing importance as many institutions procure these tools rather than design them in-house.

Situating the volume

The obvious comparator is the earlier research agenda for academic integrity in the same series (Bretag, 2020). This volume focused on contract cheating, commercial essay mills, quality assurance, and regional perspectives such as Latin America and Eastern Europe, and identified cybersecurity as the next frontier. Curtis and Clare, Dawson, and Eaton all contributed to it, and their chapters across the two volumes show how the field has devel-

-oped over six years. Attention has moved from human-supplied cheating services to machine assistance that is appropriate in some uses and inappropriate in others, and from deterring misconduct to redesigning assessment. The 2020 volume also framed integrity within a commercialized sector and gave regions beyond the Anglosphere their own chapters, two strengths that a future agenda on AI and academic integrity could usefully carry forward.

Journal literature also helps place the book. An early analysis of news coverage found that student voices were poorly represented in public debates about ChatGPT (Sullivan et al., 2023), and the student survey and co-design chapters make a welcome contribution to addressing that gap. An earlier JALT article proposed treating responses to GenAI as provisional, collaborative open educational practice (Mills et al., 2023), an approach the co-design chapter, with one of the same authors, extends to a wider group. The discursive and structural distinction is also set out in a journal article (Corbin et al., 2025), and the chapter extends that argument into a set of research questions.

Conclusion

This is a useful, well-edited, and timely book. Its strongest contributions are the chapters that pair a clear conceptual argument with a researchable agenda, notably the convenience inversion framework (Kumar, 2026), the discursive and structural distinction (Dawson & Corbin, 2026), and the comparison with pandemic proctoring (Jhangiani & Jhangiani, 2026). Its sustained attention to equity and to who is harmed when integrity systems fail is the thread I found most valuable. As an agenda assembled in a fast-moving field, it also points to clear next steps: broadening the evidence base, testing the postplagiarism lens empirically, extending the geographic range beyond Canada and Australia, and bringing the contributors' differing positions into explicit dialogue.

Researchers will find a usable map of open questions, and educators and policymakers will find frameworks worth adapting, particularly when the empirical chapters are read as early snapshots and the frameworks are adapted to the local contexts. I recommend this volume to anyone shaping institutional responses to AI, read alongside the earlier agenda in the series (Bretag, 2020) and recent journal work, to see how far the field has travelled. Its most enduring contribution may be the agenda it invites readers to test, refine, and extend.

AI use disclosure

Claude (Anthropic) Opus 5 was used solely as an editorial support tool for proofreading and revising the draft text. The author actively reviewed, questioned, modified, and selectively incorporated AI-generated suggestions during the writing process. No substantive claims, interpretations, analyses, or conclusions were generated by this AI system. The author takes full responsibility for the manuscript's content and its scholarly integrity.

Competing interests

The reviewer is a doctoral researcher at the Werklund School of Education, University of Calgary. One of the volume's editors, Sarah Elaine Eaton, holds a faculty position at the same institution. The reviewer's supervisor, Soroush Sabbaghan, is a contributor to this volume (Chapter 9). Neither editor nor supervisor had any involvement in the preparation, evaluation, or content of this review, which was written independently. After the review was accepted for publication, Dr Eaton agreed to join the reviewer's research team on a separate project. This collaboration began after acceptance of this review and had no bearing on the review; it is disclosed here for transparency. No other conflicts of interest are declared.

References

- Bali, M., Mostafa, H., & Atef, Y. (2026). Co-creating guiding principles for academic integrity AI policies by exploring equity in pedagogies. In R. Kumar & S. E. Eaton (Eds.), *A research agenda for artificial intelligence and academic integrity* (pp. 156–176). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781035343645.00021>
- Barcomb, M., & Foxe, J. P. (2026). Effects of university faculty's perceptions of academic integrity on their acceptance of GenAI technology. In R. Kumar & S. E. Eaton (Eds.), *A research agenda for artificial intelligence and academic integrity* (pp. 22–38). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781035343645.00011>
- Bretag, T. (Ed.). (2020). *A research agenda for academic integrity*. Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781789903775>
- Collier, A. (2015, April 9). Not-yetness. *Red Pin Cushion*. <https://redpincushion.us/blog/teaching-and-learning/not-yetness/>
- Corbin, T., Dawson, P., & Liu, D. (2025). Talk is cheap: Why structural assessment changes are needed for a time of GenAI. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 50(7), 1087–1097. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2025.2503964>
- Curtis, G. J., & Clare, J. (2026). Promote, prevent, and prosecute: A framework to counteract AI-based cheating in educational assessments. In R. Kumar & S. E. Eaton (Eds.), *A research agenda for artificial intelligence and academic integrity* (pp. 140–155). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781035343645.00020>
- Dawson, P., & Corbin, T. (2026). How does assessment of learning need to change for a world where AI is ubiquitous? A research agenda. In R. Kumar & S. E. Eaton (Eds.), *A research agenda for artificial intelligence and academic integrity* (pp. 212–222). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781035343645.00025>
- Eaton, S. E. (2023). Postplagiarism: Transdisciplinary ethics and integrity in the age of artificial intelligence and neurotechnology. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 19, Article 23. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-023-00144-1>
- Eaton, S. E., & Kumar, R. (2026a). Introduction: Evidence-based academic integrity reimagined through a postplagiarism lens. In R. Kumar & S. E. Eaton (Eds.), *A research agenda for artificial intelligence and academic integrity* (pp. 1–7). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781035343645.00008>
- Eaton, S. E., & Kumar, R. (2026b). The future of research on ethics and integrity in higher education in a postplagiarism era. In R. Kumar & S. E. Eaton (Eds.), *A research agenda for artificial intelligence and academic integrity* (pp. 237–252). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781035343645.00027>
- Jhangiani, R. S., & Jhangiani, S. (2026). On ethically responding to technological change in higher education: From COVID-19 to GenAI. In R. Kumar & S. E. Eaton (Eds.), *A research agenda for artificial intelligence and academic integrity* (pp. 223–236). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781035343645.00026>
- Khan, Z. R., Sivasubramaniam, S., Mukala, P., & Dawood, M. (2026a). Navigating ethical dimensions of GenAI in academic research. In R. Kumar & S. E. Eaton (Eds.), *A research agenda for artificial intelligence and academic integrity* (pp. 39–60). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781035343645.00012>
- Khan, Z. R., Wilkinson, S., Razi, S., & Bhattacharya, P. (2026b). GenAI in academic research: Integration and challenges. In R. Kumar & S. E. Eaton (Eds.), *A research agenda for artificial intelligence and academic integrity* (pp. 106–121). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781035343645.00017>
- Kumar, R. (2026). Research priorities for understanding GenAI adoption: The convenience inversion framework. In R. Kumar & S. E. Eaton (Eds.), *A research agenda for artificial intelligence and academic integrity* (pp. 61–77). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781035343645.00013>

- Kumar, R., & Eaton, S. E. (Eds.). (2026). *A research agenda for artificial intelligence and academic integrity*. Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781035343645>
- Lancaster, T. (2023). *Assessing with integrity for the AI generation: Plenary for Nexus Academic Integrity Day, University of Wales Trinity Saint David* [PowerPoint slides]. SlideShare. <https://www.slideshare.net/slideshow/assessing-with-integrity-for-the-ai-generation-plenary-for-nexus-academic-integrity-day-university-of-wales-trinity-saint-david/257503790>
- McGray, R., & Kumar, R. (2026). The ethics and politics of GenAI policy: A comparative international study of postsecondary student perspectives. In R. Kumar & S. E. Eaton (Eds.), *A research agenda for artificial intelligence and academic integrity* (pp. 97–105). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781035343645.00016>
- Mills, A., Bali, M., & Eaton, L. (2023). How do we respond to generative AI in education? Open educational practices give us a framework for an ongoing process. *Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching*, 6(1), 16–30. <https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2023.6.1.34>
- Mol, A. (1999). Ontological politics: A word and some questions. *The Sociological Review*, 47(1), 74–89. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-954X.1999.tb03483.x>
- Nieminen, J. H. (2026). Humanizing AI, dehumanizing students? The ontological politics of academic integrity in an age of AI. In R. Kumar & S. E. Eaton (Eds.), *A research agenda for artificial intelligence and academic integrity* (pp. 9–21). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781035343645.00010>
- Pellerin, M. (2026). Cultivating macro-competencies and student agency for academic integrity in the age of GenAI. In R. Kumar & S. E. Eaton (Eds.), *A research agenda for artificial intelligence and academic integrity* (pp. 192–210). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781035343645.00023>
- Sabbaghan, S. (2026). Redefining academic integrity: Navigating the emergence of collaborative intelligence in higher education. In R. Kumar & S. E. Eaton (Eds.), *A research agenda for artificial intelligence and academic integrity* (pp. 123–139). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781035343645.00019>
- Sharma, S. (2026). From artificial to amplified: Centering secondary educators in a new era of thinking, integrity, and GenAI. In R. Kumar & S. E. Eaton (Eds.), *A research agenda for artificial intelligence and academic integrity* (pp. 177–191). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781035343645.00022>
- Stoesz, B. M., & Scholle-Cotton, L. (2026). Governance, academic integrity culture, and knowledge access in Canadian higher education: Comparative analysis of human and GenAI methods. In R. Kumar & S. E. Eaton (Eds.), *A research agenda for artificial intelligence and academic integrity* (pp. 79–96). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781035343645.00015>
- Sullivan, M., Kelly, A., & McLaughlan, P. (2023). ChatGPT in higher education: Considerations for academic integrity and student learning. *Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching*, 6(1), 31–40. <https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2023.6.1.17>

Copyright: © 2026. Ali Mikaeili. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.