FUTURITY
Education

DOI: https://doi.org/10.57125/FED.2026.06.05

How to cite: Tran Minh, D. (2026). Academic integrity and assessment design in the era of generative AI: perspectives from Vietnamese universities. *Futurity Education, 6*(2), 73–89. https://doi.org/10.57125/FED.2026.06.05

Academic Integrity and Assessment Design in the Era of Generative AI: Perspectives from Vietnamese Universities

Tran Minh Duc

Thu Dau Mot University, Binh Duong Province, Vietnam, https://orcid.org/0009-0003-9359-3000

***Corresponding author:** ductm@tdmu.edu.vn.*

Received: January 23, 2026 | **Accepted:** April 18, 2026 | **Available online:** May 12, 2026

Abstract: The rapid advancement of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) is beginning to change the way we teach, learn, and assess in higher education. While these technologies present new potential for academic productivity and learning support, they also pose new and serious challenges to academic integrity and the validity of entrenched assessment methods. This study seeks to examine what university lecturers in Vietnam think about the impact of generative AI on academic integrity and how they assess the value of current assessment methods in this new reality. Within a mixed-methods framework, this study employs survey data from 286 lecturers across various academic fields, along with follow-up interviews to deepen the analysis. The primary concerns of lecturers appear to be authorial ambiguity, the misuse of AI in take-home assessments, and the challenges in determining the originality of student work. Traditional essays and writing assessments have also come to be regarded as increasingly vulnerable. Lecturers also overwhelmingly support assessment redesign proposals aimed at incorporating more process-focused assessment, staged submissions, oral defence, in-class assessments, and the reflective disclosure of AI use. Regression analysis also indicates that perceived academic integrity risk, along with institutional support, was the strongest predictor of support for assessment reform. The study concludes that sustainable responses to generative AI involve redesigning assessments rather than relying on AI detection tools. These findings help advance debates on academic integrity and assessment management in the generative AI era, especially in emerging higher education contexts.

Keywords: academic integrity, assessment design, generative AI, higher education, Vietnam.

Introduction

The transformative potential of generative artificial intelligence (AI) in higher education is becoming increasingly evident. AI systems capable of generating text, code, images, and data analyses (e.g., ChatGPT, Copilot, and Gemini) are now widely integrated into academic practices, including writing, research, ideation, feedback, and task completion. As a result, generative AI is no longer a peripheral innovation but is increasingly embedded within pedagogical processes and cognitive practices in universities (Dempere et al., 2023; Kasneci et al., 2023; Michel-Villarreal et al., 2023; Munaye et al., 2025).

The growing use of AI tools has significantly reshaped both student learning and teaching practices. Students commonly rely on AI to brainstorm ideas, organise essays, and summarise readings, while lecturers employ these tools to develop instructional materials and provide feedback. Although these applications enhance productivity, they simultaneously challenge established norms concerning authorship, knowledge construction, and the visibility of student cognition (Kasneci et al., 2023; Michel-Villarreal et al., 2023). Beyond supporting academic work, generative AI is fundamentally transforming how academic outputs are produced and evaluated. In particular, traditional written assignments—long regarded as reliable indicators of learning—are increasingly being called into question.

The rapid advancement of AI-generated text has made it more difficult to distinguish between human-authored and AI-assisted work (Dempere et al., 2023; Munaye et al., 2025). Consequently, concerns about academic misconduct have intensified in both scale and complexity. While academic misconduct has traditionally been associated with plagiarism or collusion, the integration of AI introduces new concerns related to authorship, textual origin, and intellectual ownership (Cotton et al., 2023; Holmes & Miao, 2023). Practices such as AI-assisted ghostwriting, authorial ambiguity, and originality-related plagiarism pose significant risks to the authenticity and educational value of student work (Cotton et al., 2023; Chauncey & McKenna, 2023).

In this evolving context, the role of educators is shifting from merely detecting plagiarism to addressing broader ethical and institutional challenges. At the same time, an exclusive focus on AI's risks may obscure its potential as a valuable learning resource. Scholars increasingly argue for balanced approaches that promote ethical use of AI, transparency, and appropriate citation practices (Holmes & Miao, 2023; Modern Language Association & Conference on College Composition and Communication, 2024).

Institutional responses have often relied on AI detection tools; however, such approaches have proven inadequate. Detection systems frequently produce inconsistent results depending on writing style and language proficiency (Walters, 2023), can be easily circumvented (Perkins et al., 2024a), and may introduce bias, particularly against non-native English writers (Liang et al., 2023). These limitations raise serious concerns regarding reliability, fairness, and unintended discrimination. As a result, growing attention has shifted toward assessment redesign, with an emphasis on process-oriented approaches such as staged assignments, reflective writing, oral defences, and in-class assessments (Lodge et al., 2023; Perkins et al., 2024b). Such strategies aim to foreground student reasoning and engagement, thereby providing more authentic evidence of learning.

These issues are particularly salient in Vietnam, where higher education is undergoing rapid digital transformation. While AI tools are increasingly integrated into teaching and learning, institutional frameworks, policies, and pedagogical practices remain underdeveloped and uneven across disciplines. Despite the urgency of these challenges, empirical research on how Vietnamese lecturers perceive and respond to generative AI remains limited.

Research Problem

Despite the growing global literature on generative AI in higher education, there remains a lack of empirical evidence regarding how university lecturers—particularly in emerging higher education contexts such as Vietnam—perceive AI-related risks to academic integrity and the implications for assessment practices. Existing studies have largely focused on technological capabilities or student use, with insufficient attention to lecturers as key actors in implementing and interpreting institutional policies.

Moreover, current institutional responses, particularly reliance on AI detection tools, have demonstrated significant limitations in terms of reliability, fairness, and pedagogical value. This creates a critical gap between the rapid adoption of AI technologies and the capacity of higher education systems to ensure meaningful and integrity-driven assessment practices.

Research Focus

This study examines the intersection of generative AI, academic integrity, and assessment design in higher education. Specifically, it examines how lecturers perceive the challenges posed by generative AI, how they evaluate the effectiveness of existing assessment methods, and how they conceptualise appropriate strategies for assessment redesign in response to AI-related disruptions.

Research Aim and Research Questions

This study aims to investigate lecturers' perceptions of the impact of generative AI on academic integrity and assessment practices, and to identify preferred strategies for assessment redesign in Vietnamese higher education institutions.

To achieve this aim, the study addresses the following research questions:

1. How do university lecturers in Vietnam perceive the impact of generative AI on academic integrity?
2. How do lecturers evaluate the effectiveness and limitations of current assessment practices in the context of generative AI?
3. What assessment redesign strategies do lecturers prefer in response to AI-related challenges?
4. What factors influence lecturers' support for assessment reform in the era of generative AI?

Literature Review and Theoretical Background

Generative AI and the changing nature of academic work

Research on the impact of artificial intelligence (AI) tools on students' academic workflows has demonstrated their efficacy in supporting writing (Dempere et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2024). Students utilise AI tools to revise drafts, generate answers to AI-posed questions, and assist with brainstorming ideas; they are also employing AI tools to summarise reading assignments. Students are using AI tools to assist with writing, strengthen argument structure, organise ideas, develop frameworks, and provide fully developed answers to questions. This demonstrates that AI tools provide support that enables students to become active participants in creating academic documents. This new use of AI tools challenges the previously held assumption that student assignments are the product of their own cognition. This belief is no longer sustainable. Wang and Tian (2025) posit that AI tools transform the processes of thinking and the sequencing of steps toward academic achievement, and Levine et al. (2024) describe the effects of AI tools across the continuum of thought, from idea generation to revision. As a result, the effort students invest in academic tasks may create a disconnect between students' perceived effort and the actual evidence of their learning. AI tools are also changing how students search for information and how they structure their

arguments. Students no longer interact directly with primary sources. Instead, they rely on sAI-generated synthesised output to reconfigure the knowledge they need.

Although this is a time-saving measure, it could reduce direct contact with primary sources and diminish students' interpretive and evidentiary processes. Dempere et al. (2023) argue that while AI is reshaping productivity, it is also altering the epistemic processes involved in students' construction of arguments and assessment of supporting evidence. Consequently, through new forms of mediation, AI changes the significance of "student work" and "real engagement" by transforming the ways students produce work.

Academic integrity in the era of generative AI

Academic integrity has traditionally been rooted in honesty, trust, fairness, and responsibility. Concerns have typically focused on plagiarism, cheating, and fabrication. New generative AI systems, however, pose more complex problems that go beyond these concerns. Recent research has documented the risks of AI-assisted cheating, hidden co-authorship, undisclosed AI-generated text, false citations, and the embedding of misinformation in seemingly polished text (Cotton et al., 2023; Holmes & Miao, 2023). The major concern is that AI-generated text may show no evidence of the student's own reasoning. The student may have submitted the text; however, the student's reasoning is not reflected in it. Submissions of this nature may violate the spirit, if not always the formal definition, of academic integrity, while still adhering to narrow technical definitions of plagiarism. In terms of authorship ambiguity, AI is blurring the boundaries more than ever. When AI is used in drafting, co-ideation, or revision, questions of ownership and authorship need to be addressed. There is a need for a thorough reconceptualisation of integrity in the submission of co-generated works produced by humans and machines (Chan, 2023; Chauncey & McKenna, 2023). This has brought forward the notion of integrity by design. Instead of relying on detection after the fact, integrity by design depends more on the constructive design of teaching, assessment, and institutional regulatory frameworks that encourage the responsible and constructive use of AI.

Holmes and Miao (2023) suggest that universities ought to create spaces that focus on integrity as a positive construct, rather than treating it only as something that can be violated and monitored through surveillance systems.

Limits of AI detection and the critique of detector-centred responses

During the early stages of grappling with the potential consequences of generative AI, institutions have, in cumbersome fashion, opted to rely on AI text detectors. The existing literature, however, sharply critiques the use of such technologies, outlining issues of reliability and fairness. Inconsistent results and unreliable thresholds for adjudicating academic misconduct have been shown to depend on the type of detection model and the author's writing style (Walters, 2023). The "bypassability" of AI text detection is also well documented (Perkins et al., 2024a). As detection technologies and generative AI continue to evolve, the educational value of employing detection technologies is further undermined. Liang et al. (2023) have shown that the linguistic discrimination of AI text detectors is especially pronounced for non-native English speakers, raising concerns about equity and bias. In short, the unreliability of detectors, their inevitable circumvention, and the linguistic bias and discrimination they exhibit constitute a strong case against detection-based strategies as the central response to the generative AI issue. Furthermore, the centrality of AI detectors in any strategy to address generative AI should be significantly minimised.

Assessment design and authentic evidence of learning

In response to detection deficiencies, attention has increasingly shifted to the design of the assessments themselves. Pellegrino et al. (2001) highlight the importance of assessments providing a fair

representation of students' understanding and capabilities. This principle is particularly important in the context of AI. This is because students may not demonstrate their own understanding when AI generates a response. Poe and Elliot (2019) assert that a fair assessment should consider the "production conditions." As a result, Lodge et al. (2023) suggest that educators move away from take-home assignments and instead design assessments that prioritise process and reasoning. In the same vein, Perkins et al. (2024b) put forward the AIAS framework and suggest that institutions redesign assessments to address AI while still documenting learning. The literature suggests process-oriented assessment, authentic assessment, oral defence, staged writing, in-class assessment, reflection, explanation, and multimodality as forms of evidence. These assessment approaches shift the emphasis away from simply submitting a task and toward how students arrived at their answers. In summary, assessment redesign is a useful strategy for maintaining integrity in academic environments.

Learning theory support for assessment redesign

In the AI era, learning theory justifies the redesign of assessment. Retrieval practice posits that when students recall knowledge and reconstruct it, learning is enhanced (Roediger & Karpicke, 2006; Karpicke & Blunt, 2011). As such, assessment methods that ask students to explain or perform in class may capture a clearer picture of students' understanding and knowledge. It is also important to note that generative learning theory posits that students develop a better grasp of material when they take the initiative to produce, structure, and explain content (Fiorella & Mayer, 2015). With the growing use of AI as a learning tool, it is equally important for assessment to encourage students to demonstrate thinking and engage in critical thought rather than merely present a final product. Research on self-regulated learning and writing-to-learn also elucidates the importance of reflective and process-oriented tasks in helping students think critically about concepts, including through metacognition (Nückles et al., 2020). When students explain their thought processes, or when AI use is disclosed, assessment becomes less open to exploitation. In addition, scaffolding theory demonstrates the necessity of structured support in students' developing learning processes by making learning more visible and accessible to them (Belland, 2013; Van de Pol et al., 2010). Carefully crafted assessments should allow students to explain, reflect, and reason clearly while reducing the risk that AI may misuse them.

Research gap and conceptual focus

While there is an increasing body of scholarship, significant work remains to be done. Much of the literature available to date addresses the relationship between generative AI, academic integrity, and assessment design. However, few studies consider this relationship from the perspective of lecturers, who are the primary implementers of institutional policy. This is particularly true in Vietnam, where higher education is undergoing rapid digitalisation and empirical work on lecturers' understanding of generative AI remains limited. There is a lack of research on how lecturers understand AI, integrity, and assessment-related risks, how they respond to different types of assessment, and how they plan to redesign assessment. Therefore, this research acknowledges that assessment design is a primary strategy for deterring academic misconduct in a pervasive AI context. Unlike much of the literature, which views academic integrity primarily from the perspective of detection, this research places assessment redesign at the centre of the response to the pedagogical and institutional integrity challenges posed by AI, to provide more authentic evidence of student learning.

Literature Review

Existing scholarship has extensively examined the impact of generative artificial intelligence on academic work, academic integrity, and assessment practices. Prior studies have demonstrated that AI tools are increasingly embedded in students' academic workflows, supporting activities such as drafting, revising, summarising, and idea generation (Dempere et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2024). While these tools

enhance efficiency, they simultaneously challenge traditional assumptions regarding authorship, originality, and the visibility of student cognition (Kasneci et al., 2023; Michel-Villarreal et al., 2023).

Within the domain of academic integrity, recent research highlights emerging risks associated with AI-assisted work, including hidden co-authorship, undisclosed AI-generated content, fabricated citations, and epistemic distortions (Cotton et al., 2023; Holmes & Miao, 2023; Chauncey & McKenna, 2023). These developments suggest that academic integrity can no longer be understood solely in terms of plagiarism. However, they must also encompass issues of intellectual ownership, transparency, and the authenticity of student reasoning.

At the institutional level, early responses have largely relied on AI detection tools; however, these approaches have been widely criticised for their inconsistency, susceptibility to circumvention, and potential bias against non-native English writers (Walters, 2023; Perkins et al., 2024a; Liang et al., 2023). Consequently, a growing body of literature advocates for a shift from detection-based approaches toward assessment redesign. Process-oriented and authentic assessment strategies—such as staged writing, oral defence, reflective tasks, and in-class performance—have been proposed as more effective means of capturing genuine student learning (Lodge et al., 2023; Perkins et al., 2024b).

Despite these advances, there remains a lack of empirical research examining how lecturers themselves interpret these challenges and respond to them in practice, particularly in emerging higher education contexts such as Vietnam. This study addresses this gap by focusing on lecturers' perceptions of academic integrity, assessment practices, and assessment redesign in the era of generative AI.

Materials and Methods

This study adopts a mixed-methods approach, combining quantitative survey data with qualitative interview insights. Such an approach is particularly appropriate given the emerging, multifaceted nature of generative AI in higher education, allowing for both measurable patterns and contextualised understanding (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

The quantitative component provides a broad overview of lecturers' perceptions of academic integrity challenges and assessment practices. In contrast, the qualitative component offers deeper insights into how these issues are experienced and interpreted in real teaching contexts. The overall design is primarily quantitative, with qualitative data used to complement and enrich the interpretation of statistical findings. This integration enables a more comprehensive understanding of how lecturers respond to AI-related transformations in higher education.

Sample and Participants

The study focuses on university lecturers across multiple disciplines in Vietnam. Approximately 250–350 lecturers were initially contacted to ensure diversity in demographic characteristics and disciplinary representation. Participants were drawn from major academic fields, including social sciences, education, economics and business, engineering, and information technology.

In addition to the survey, a subset of 8–12 lecturers participated in semi-structured interviews designed to explore their perspectives on academic integrity, assessment challenges, and institutional responses to generative AI. These interview participants were selected from survey respondents who indicated willingness to provide further input. The combination of survey and interview data enabled the study to capture both general trends and in-depth experiential insights from lecturers actively engaged in teaching.

Sampling was conducted using a combination of convenience and snowball techniques, which are commonly employed in educational research where comprehensive sampling frames are difficult to obtain (Etikan et al., 2016). Participants were recruited through academic networks, institutional mailing lists, and professional communities. The survey was distributed via online platforms, and respondents were encouraged to share it with their networks. Although this approach does not yield a fully representative sample, it allows for the collection of diverse perspectives across institutions and disciplines, which is particularly valuable in exploratory studies of emerging technologies.

Instrument and Procedure

Data were collected using an online survey instrument comprising four main sections. The first section gathered demographic information, including gender, age, teaching experience, disciplinary background, institutional affiliation, prior AI training, and the use of generative AI in teaching and learning contexts.

The second section measured lecturers' perceptions of academic integrity challenges associated with generative AI using 10–12 items on a five-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree). Items addressed the risk of dishonest submissions, the difficulty of distinguishing AI-assisted work from student-generated work, and the perceived limitations of existing institutional policies.

The third section examined perceptions of assessment design, including support for process-oriented assessment approaches such as oral examinations, in-class tasks, staged assignments, reflective writing, project-based learning, and AI disclosure practices.

The fourth section focused on institutional responses, evaluating lecturers' perceptions of policy clarity, availability of training, departmental guidance, and confidence in existing academic regulations related to AI.

Following the survey, semi-structured interviews were conducted with selected participants to provide additional qualitative insights into practical challenges and institutional dynamics associated with generative AI.

Data Analysis

Quantitative data were analysed using established statistical procedures. The internal reliability of multi-item scales was assessed באמצעות Cronbach's alpha, and exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted to examine the underlying structure of key constructs. Descriptive statistics were used to summarise lecturers' perceptions. At the same time, relationships among variables—such as perceived integrity risk, attitudes toward generative AI, institutional support, and preferences for assessment redesign—were examined using correlation and multiple regression analyses.

Qualitative interview data were analysed באמצעות thematic coding. This process involved identifying recurring patterns and themes in participants' responses and linking these themes to the quantitative findings. The integration of quantitative and qualitative analyses enabled a more nuanced interpretation of lecturers' perspectives and a richer understanding of the complexities surrounding academic integrity and assessment in the AI era.

Results

Demographic profile of respondents

The quantitative analysis was based on 286 valid survey responses. Furthermore, 10 lecturers conducted short follow-up interviews to provide qualitative insight into aspects of academic integrity and

assessment design. The diversity of disciplines and teaching experience in the survey sample facilitated the examination of different university settings in Vietnam. As depicted in Table 1, the sample included slightly more female than male lecturers. The age group with the largest number of respondents was 31–40, followed by 41–50. This shows that the sample consisted primarily of early- to mid-career lecturers. This was also the case for teaching experience, with the largest number of respondents in the 6–15 years range. Overall, the range of disciplines was satisfactory, with the greatest representation in social sciences and education, followed by economics and business, engineering, and information technology.

Regarding generative AI, most respondents indicated some familiarity with AI tools. The largest group of respondents reported using generative AI modestly, and a significant minority reported using it quite often. Nonetheless, previous formal AI training remained relatively limited.

Over half of the respondents reported not having received formal training on generative AI, suggesting that their current engagement with AI may be self-taught rather than through professional development.

Table 1

Demographic profile of respondents (N = 286)

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	124	43.4
	Female	162	56.6
Age	Under 30	29	10.1
	31–40	111	38.8
	41–50	91	31.8
	Over 50	55	19.2
Teaching experience	Under 5 years	41	14.3
	6–15 years	132	46.2
	16–25 years	78	27.3
	Over 25 years	35	12.2
Discipline	Social sciences and education	101	35.3
	Economics and business	61	21.3
	Engineering	54	18.9
	Information technology	33	11.5
	Other fields	37	12.9
AI usage frequency	Never	16	5.6
	Rarely	58	20.3
	Occasionally	121	42.3
	Frequently	73	25.5
	Very frequently	18	6.3
Prior AI training	None	153	53.5
	Short workshop/training session	89	31.1
	Formal course/certificate	44	15.4

On the whole, the sample indicates that generative AI has begun to permeate the professional setting of Vietnamese university lecturers, although systemic organisational preparedness remains patchy. This

context is important for understanding the subsequent analyses of lecturers' views on academic integrity and assessment frameworks.

Perceived impact of generative AI on academic integrity

The next phase of analysis focused on lecturers' perceptions of the impact of generative AI on academic integrity. Lecturers were asked to respond to several statements measured on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). As noted in Table 2, lecturers believed that academic integrity has been significantly affected by the emergence of generative AI. However, not all risks were perceived as equally concerning. Higher mean values were recorded for concern regarding authorship ambiguity (M = 4.31, SD = 0.67), misuse of generative AI in take-home assignments (M = 4.26, SD = 0.70), and challenges in verifying originality (M = 4.18, SD = 0.73). These values reflect lecturers' concern that a student submission may not reflect the student's authentic work but rather the output of generative AI. In the interviews, some lecturers pointed out that the issues went beyond simple plagiarism to the greater concern of "who, if anyone, actually authored the text." More moderate concerns were shown regarding fictitious citations and inaccurate references (M = 3.82, SD = 0.79) and dependence on AI (M = 3.76, SD = 0.81). These results indicate that lecturers understand some of the epistemological and cognitive risks of AI, particularly the possibility that students will use AI-produced content indiscriminately. The risks related to authorship and the ethics of assessment were still of greater concern than the cognitive and epistemic risks.

In contrast, support for the complete prohibition of AI use in higher education teaching was the lowest (M = 2.41, SD = 0.92). This illustrates that the majority of lecturers are not in favour of an absolute prohibition of generative AI. It also shows that while lecturers expressed concerns about integrity and assessment, they understand that AI is now part of academic life.

Table 2

Perceived impact of generative AI on academic integrity

Item	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Generative AI creates ambiguity about authorship in student work	4.31	0.67	High concern
Generative AI is easily misused in take-home assignments	4.26	0.70	High concern
It is increasingly difficult to verify the originality of student submissions	4.18	0.73	High concern
Generative AI increases the risk of fabricated citations or false references	3.82	0.79	Moderate concern
Students may become overdependent on AI-generated outputs	3.76	0.81	Moderate concern
Universities should completely reject AI use in academic work	2.41	0.92	Low support

Overall, participants viewed AI as a technology but were more concerned with its implications for the ownership, authenticity, and trustworthiness of students' work. Hence, the results show that, with regard to generative AI, academic concern about the integrity of students' work is shifting from mere copying to clandestine co-authorship.

Perceptions of current assessment practices

The third stage of analysis focused on lecturers' views on different forms of assessment within the context of generative AI. The survey asked lecturers to what degree they perceived different forms of assessment as adequate or vulnerable. The views expressed by lecturers indicate that assessments in the form of written assignments or unsupervised take-home tasks are of declining utility in the context of AI

and assessment. Table 3 shows that most respondents were concerned that traditional essays do not fully represent the learning that occurs (M = 4.12, SD = 0.72). An even lower mean score (M = 2.74, SD = 0.88) was recorded for unsupervised writing tasks, which many lecturers perceived as not being representative of students' actual performance. Concerns regarding take-home assignments were also expressed by interview respondents, many of whom stated that take-home written assignments were becoming "difficult to interpret" as evidence of genuine learning. In contrast, lecturers expressed support for assessment methods that explicitly assess students' processes, reasoning, and ownership of ideas.

These methods include oral defence or viva (M = 4.21, SD = 0.69), process writing with multiple stages (M = 4.16, SD = 0.71), in-class tasks (M = 4.08, SD = 0.74), project-based assessment (M = 3.94, SD = 0.77), and reflective AI disclosure (M = 3.88, SD = 0.80). The data above imply that some educators emphasise assessment techniques that focus on process, explanation, and performative understanding, rather than on the final product.

Table 3

Perceptions of current assessment practices in the AI era

Assessment item	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Traditional essays are increasingly vulnerable to AI misuse	4.12	0.72	High agreement
I have confidence in unsupervised take-home writing tasks	2.74	0.88	Low confidence
Oral defense/viva is a useful response to AI-related integrity concerns	4.21	0.69	Strong support
Process writing (drafts, revisions, staged tasks) is more reliable in the AI era	4.16	0.71	Strong support
In-class writing/performance tasks should be used more often	4.08	0.74	Strong support
Project-based assessment can better capture authentic learning	3.94	0.77	Moderate to strong support
Students should provide reflective commentary on how AI was used	3.88	0.80	Moderate to strong support

These results suggest that instructors are not simply cataloguing difficulties; they are articulating a fairly distinct orientation toward different types of assessment. Broadly speaking, they seem to favour assessment designs that make students' thinking more visible, reduce reliance on unsupervised final products, and increase accountability regarding AI.

Preferred assessment redesign strategies

To better understand lecturers' preferred responses, participants were asked to rank a series of assessment redesign proposals. These results are shown in Table 4. The highest-ranked strategy was staged submission (e.g., outline, draft, revision, final submission), followed by oral presentation/viva, reflective commentary on AI, in-class writing, project-based activities, and peer discussion/defence. The high ranking of staged submission indicates that lecturers see process visibility as an especially important feature in the AI era. Instead of relying on a single finished document, staged assessment provides lecturers with the opportunity to see how a student's thinking and writing evolve across successive drafts. The high ranking of oral presentation and viva shows that lecturers value interactive assessment as a way to confirm understanding. Additionally, reflective commentary on AI suggests a growing interest in transparency rather than a prohibition-based approach.

Table 4

Preferred assessment redesign strategies

Rank	Strategy	Mean preference score
1	Staged submission (outline–draft–revision–final)	4.27
2	Oral presentation / viva	4.19
3	Reflective commentary on AI use	4.02
4	In-class writing	3.96
5	Project-based tasks	3.88
6	Peer discussion / defense	3.74

Overall, the ranking results reinforce the argument that lecturers prefer process-oriented and authenticity-enhancing assessment strategies over detector-centred or prohibition-based responses.

Regression and comparative results

To examine predictors of support for assessment reform, a multiple regression analysis was performed, with support for assessment reform as the outcome variable. Other predictors included perceived integrity risk, frequency of AI use, AI-related attitudes, organisational confidence, and previous AI training. The regression model was significant and accounted for a considerable portion of the variation in support for assessment reform (Adjusted $R^2 = 0.42$, $p < .001$). Table 5 shows that perceived integrity risk was the strongest predictor ($\beta = 0.38$, $p < .001$). This means that the greater the concern about authorship, misuse, and integrity issues related to originality, the greater the support for assessment reform. Institutional support was the second strongest predictor ($\beta = 0.24$, $p < .001$). This means that the greater the expectations for institutional policies, training, and guidance, the greater the support for redesign. Prior AI training also positively influenced support for assessment reform. However, to a lesser extent ($\beta = 0.15$, $p < .05$). Therefore, it can be argued that, in general, training educators in relation to AI appears to increase support for assessment reform.

The significance of attitudes toward AI ($\beta = 0.18$, $p < .01$) indicates that lecturers who hold neutral or more positive attitudes toward AI are more likely to advocate redesign rather than simple rejection. In contrast, the frequency of AI use did not show a strong linear effect ($\beta = 0.07$, $p = 0.118$), indicating that, in isolation, frequent AI use does not necessarily lead to greater support for assessment reform.

Table 5

Multiple regression predicting support for assessment redesign

Predictor	Standardized Beta (β)	t	Sig.
Perceived integrity risk	0.38	6.91	.000
Institutional support	0.24	4.47	.000
Attitudes toward AI	0.18	3.22	.001
Prior AI training	0.15	2.54	.012
AI use frequency	0.07	1.57	.118

The findings imply that while general acceptance of AI may play some role, support for redesign is more strongly influenced by perceived academic integrity risk, institutional readiness to respond, and pedagogical preparedness. This is significant because it shows that support for redesign does not arise

simply from support for AI; rather, it reflects advocacy for redesign as a response to perceived threats to academic integrity and a belief that an institutional response is necessary. Overall, the findings indicate a growing understanding among university lecturers in Vietnam of the threats posed by generative AI to academic integrity and to the trustworthiness of some traditional assessment methods. University lecturers in Vietnam also demonstrate strong support for redesigning the assessment process to require students to engage in processing, explaining, and presenting authentic evidence of learning.

Discussion

Academic integrity is no longer only about plagiarism.

The evolving technological landscape necessitates an evolving understanding of the challenges posed to academic integrity. The findings illustrate an expanding spectrum of issues posed by artificial intelligence (AI). The identified concerns go beyond issues of plagiarism and authorship. Lecturers express concerns regarding the potential misuse of AI tools to generate components of original work. This exemplifies the challenges of determining authorship. These findings illustrate that the character of integrity issues stemming from the use of AI tools has evolved. While AI poses a challenge for identifying misconduct, the lack of attribution, coupled with the potential use of generative AI tools to obscure authorial control, exemplifies misconduct in the form of hidden co-production and the obfuscation of authorship. The implications of this conceptual shift are significant. In order to assess the academic integrity of an assignment, identifying plagiarism in the conventional sense is no longer adequate. The stakes of academic integrity are high, and assessing the use of AI tools must consider the extent to which the work reflects the student's individual cognitive processes and analytical contributions.

The present findings support recent studies suggesting that universities are redefining what constitutes honest work in the age of generative AI. Such a framework must include, in addition to textual originality, intellectual ownership, clarity regarding AI use, and the degree to which the submitted work reflects genuine student engagement.

Assessment, not detection, should be the centre of response.

The study's primary argument is that responses to generative AI should focus on assessment rather than detection. From the study, we see that lecturers have low confidence in unsupervised writing tasks, yet show strong confidence in process-based, oral, and staged assessments. This is significant because it means many lecturers no longer see AI detection as a means of protecting the integrity of the academic process. This aligns with the reviewed literature. AI detectors have been critiqued for inaccuracy, susceptibility to circumvention, and linguistic discrimination. These findings reinforce the critiques of AI detectors—lecturers trust assessment redesign more than they trust surveillance. This is of utmost importance for the governance of higher education. If detectors cannot provide a stable and equitable framework for decision-making, then a "find AI" approach must be abandoned in favour of assessments that serve educational purposes. Assessment redesign is more sustainable because it addresses the educational problem directly.

Instead of questioning the extent to which AI may contaminate a final product, the redesigned assessment focuses on whether students can articulate, justify, and demonstrate understanding through a variety of evidence and explanation formats. In this sense, the response to generative AI is more pedagogical than forensic.

Why do lecturers prefer process-based and authentic assessment?

Lecturers' support for staged submissions, oral presentations or vivas, reflective commentaries, and in-class writing is supported both pedagogically and theoretically. In fact, these approaches share a

common feature—they make thinking visible. Process-based assessments illustrate the development, revision, and justification of ideas over time, rather than only the final polished product. This reduces the likelihood that AI-generated text will substitute for authentic learning. In the same way, an oral defence allows a lecturer to verify the ideas presented. While a student may submit a well-crafted piece, the ability to articulate an argument, respond to questions, and elaborate on particular points in real time is compelling evidence of understanding. This is the context in which oral or performance-based elements have become increasingly important in the current era. Staged assessments and tasks also reduce the chances of AI substitution by distributing the assessment across a series of checkpoints. With the submission of outlines, drafts, revisions, and final copies, the lecturer gains a fuller picture of the learning process. In addition, reflective logs or AI disclosure statements increase accountability by requiring students to explain how AI contributed to the work and the cognitive effort they invested.

Overall, these approaches do not remove AI from learning but rather place it within clearer, more responsible pedagogical frameworks.

Institutional ambiguity remains a major obstacle.

Another key insight is that many lecturers appear to understand the dangers posed by generative AI. However, they still try to work within conditions of institutional ambiguity. The regression results demonstrate that institutional support is a strongly positive predictor of support for assessment redesign, showing that individual awareness alone is insufficient. Lecturers appreciate the need for change. However, they continue to experience institutional uncertainty regarding what is officially promoted, permitted, or achievable in response to AI. This phenomenon is typical in contexts where training is limited and where institutional policy clarity remains weak. It is especially evident in universities that have yet to provide specific frameworks regarding the use, disclosure, or evaluation of AI. As a result, lecturers improvise their responses. This encourages fragmentation, as practice becomes more idiosyncratic within departmental or course boundaries. The consequence of this pattern is the erosion of institutional coherence, often to the detriment of the student experience. Given this, the evidence suggests that the challenges posed by generative AI are more organisational than individual or purely technological in nature. In the absence of clear policy, systemically actionable guidance, or directed professional training, lecturers' responses will remain reactive and uneven.

Vietnamese universities are in a transitional moment.

The above findings are particularly noteworthy in the context of higher education in Vietnam. Most Vietnamese universities are undergoing digital transformation, and the implementation of generative AI tools is occurring at a stage when many institutional systems are still in flux. There is a clear tendency toward technological modernisation, alongside the emerging need for AI governance in teaching and assessment. These overlapping dynamics place Vietnamese universities in a unique transitional moment. Most lecturers understand that traditional assessment formats are vulnerable, and many are willing to adopt different approaches. However, the institutional development needed to support robust and sustained reform remains incomplete, particularly in policy development, lecturer training, and the redesign of assessment systems. This study suggests that the main challenges are not only technological but also institutional, and that the systems on which effective governance is expected to develop remain nascent. The challenge, therefore, is to convert heightened awareness into coherent reform at the level of pedagogy and institutional framework.

Conclusions

This study examined Vietnamese university lecturers' perceptions of academic integrity and assessment design in the context of generative AI. The findings indicate that the emergence of AI is

fundamentally reshaping how academic integrity is conceptualised. Concerns extend beyond traditional notions of plagiarism to include issues of authorship, contributory ambiguity, and the diminishing reliability of written submissions as indicators of student learning.

The results further demonstrate that conventional assessment formats—particularly unsupervised take-home assignments and essay-based tasks—are increasingly perceived as vulnerable in the AI era. In response, lecturers show strong support for alternative approaches, including staged submissions, oral defence, in-class assessments, and reflective commentary. These approaches emphasise process, reasoning, and the visibility of student thinking rather than reliance on final outputs alone.

Importantly, the findings suggest that heavy reliance on AI detection tools is neither sufficient nor sustainable. Instead, assessment redesign emerges as a more viable and pedagogically grounded response. The study also highlights the critical role of institutional support, as clearer policies, training, and guidance significantly influence lecturers' willingness to adopt new assessment practices. Overall, responses to generative AI require a multifaceted approach that integrates pedagogical innovation with institutional and policy development.

This study contributes to ongoing debates on academic integrity and assessment governance in the AI era, particularly within developing higher education contexts such as Vietnam. It underscores the need to move beyond detection-based approaches toward more systemic, design-oriented strategies that preserve fairness, transparency, and meaningful evidence of learning.

Practical implications

The findings offer several practical implications for universities, lecturers, and policymakers. At the institutional level, there is a clear need to develop comprehensive AI-integrity policies that define acceptable and unacceptable uses of AI, establish expectations for transparency and disclosure, and provide guidance for assessment in AI-integrated learning environments. Such policies can help reduce ambiguity and promote consistency across institutions.

In addition, universities should reconsider assessment practices by reducing reliance on vulnerable take-home writing tasks and adopting more authentic, process-oriented approaches. Emphasis should be placed on assessment designs that require students to articulate their reasoning, demonstrate understanding, and engage actively in the learning process. This shift also implies a reduced reliance on AI detection tools, which are unreliable and raise concerns about fairness and bias.

Professional development and training are equally important. Institutions should invest in building lecturers' capacity to design and implement authentic assessment strategies, including staged writing, oral defence, and reflective practices. At the classroom level, lecturers can integrate AI disclosure statements, redesign assignments into multiple stages, and combine written tasks with in-class or oral components to strengthen evidence of student learning.

More broadly, there is a need to incorporate responsible AI use into students' academic literacy, ensuring that AI is used in a transparent and pedagogically meaningful manner. At the policy level, the absence of clear national or sectoral guidance highlights the importance of coordinated efforts by higher education authorities to support system-wide assessment reform and the integration of AI ethics into higher education pedagogy.

Limitations

Several limitations of this study should be acknowledged. First, the use of convenience and snowball sampling may limit the generalizability of the findings. Second, the study relies primarily on self-reported

perceptions, which may not fully reflect actual assessment practices in classroom settings. Third, the cross-sectional design does not capture changes over time, particularly in a rapidly evolving context where AI-related policies and practices continue to develop.

Suggestions for future research

Future research can build on this study in several directions. Comparative studies across different types of institutions, such as public and private universities, may provide deeper insights into institutional variation in AI adoption and assessment practices. Similarly, cross-disciplinary analyses could identify whether certain academic fields are more affected by AI-related challenges.

Further research should also incorporate classroom-based or observational data to understand better how assessment practices are implemented in real teaching contexts. Longitudinal studies would be particularly valuable in examining how institutional policies, lecturer practices, and student behaviours evolve in response to generative AI. Such research would contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of assessment governance and academic integrity in the AI era.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank all participating lecturers for their valuable contributions to this study.

Conflict of Interest

The author declares that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

Funding

This research received no external funding.

References

Belland, B. R. (2013). Scaffolding: Definition, current debates, and future directions. In M. J. Spector, M. D. Merrill, J. Elen, & M. J. Bishop (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational communications and technology* (pp. 505–518). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-3185-5_39

Chan, C. K. Y. (2023). A comprehensive AI policy education framework for university teaching and learning. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 20*, Article 38. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00408-3

Chauncey, S. A., & McKenna, H. P. (2023). A framework and exemplars for ethical and responsible use of AI chatbot technology to support teaching and learning. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 5*, Article 100182. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2023.100182

Cotton, D. R. E., Cotton, P. A., & Shipway, J. R. (2023). Chatting and cheating: Ensuring academic integrity in the era of ChatGPT. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 61*(2), 228–239. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2023.2190148

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Dempere, J., Modugu, K., Hesham, A., & Ramasamy, L. K. (2023). The impact of ChatGPT on higher education. *Frontiers in Education, 8*, 1206936. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2023.1206936

Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics, 5*, 1–4. https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11

Fiorella, L., & Mayer, R. E. (2015). *Learning as a generative activity: Eight learning strategies that promote understanding*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107707085

Holmes, W., & Miao, F. (2023). *Guidance for generative AI in education and research*. UNESCO Publishing. https://doi.org/10.54675/EWZM9535

Karpicke, J. D., & Blunt, J. R. (2011). Retrieval practice produces more learning than elaborate studying with concept mapping. *Science, 331*(6018), 772–775. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1199327

Kasneci, E., Sessler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., Gasser, U., Groh, G., Günnemann, S., Hüllermeier, E., Krusche, S., Kutyniok, G., Michaeli, T., Nerdel, C., Pfeffer, J., Poquet, O., Sailer, M., Schmidt, A., Seidel, T., ... Kasneci, G. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. *Learning and Individual Differences, 103*, Article 102274. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274

Levine, S., Beck, S. W., Mah, C., Phalen, L., & Pittman, J. (2024). How do students use ChatGPT as a writing support? *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1002/jaal.1373

Liang, W., Yuksekgonul, M., Mao, Y., Wu, E., & Zou, J. (2023). GPT detectors are biased against non-native English writers. *Patterns, 4*(7), 100779. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.patter.2023.100779

Lodge, J. M., Howard, S., Bearman, M., Dawson, P., & Associates. (2023). *Assessment reform for the age of artificial intelligence*. Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency. https://www.teqsa.gov.au/sites/default/files/2023-09/assessment-reform-age-artificial-intelligence-discussion-paper.pdf

Michel-Villarreal, R., Vilalta-Perdomo, E., Salinas-Navarro, D., Thierry-Aguilera, R., & Gerardou, F. (2023). Challenges and opportunities of generative AI for higher education as explained by ChatGPT. *Education Sciences, 13*(856), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13090856

Modern Language Association & Conference on College Composition & Communication. (2024). *Generative AI and policy development: Guidance from the MLA-CCCC task force*. https://cccc.ncte.org/mla-cccc-joint-task-force-on-writing-and-ai

Munaye, Y. Y., Admass, W., Belayneh, Y., Molla, A., & Asmare, M. (2025). ChatGPT in education: A systematic review on opportunities, challenges, and future directions. *Algorithms, 18*(6), 352. https://doi.org/10.3390/a18060352

Nückles, M., Hübner, S., & Renkl, A. (2020). The self-regulation view in writing-to-learn: Using journal writing to optimize cognitive load in self-regulated learning. *Educational Psychology Review, 32*(3), 753–778. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-020-09528-1

Pellegrino, J. W., Chudowsky, N., & Glaser, R. (Eds.). (2001). *Knowing what students know: The science and design of educational assessment*. National Academy Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/10019

Perkins, M., Furze, L., Roe, J., & MacVaugh, J. (2024b). The Artificial Intelligence Assessment Scale (AIAS): A framework for ethical integration of generative AI in educational assessment. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice, 21*(6), Article 06. https://doi.org/10.53761/jutlp.2024.21.6.06

Perkins, M., Roe, J., Vu, B. H., Postma, D., Hickerson, D., McGaughran, J., & Khuat, H. Q. (2024a). Simple techniques to bypass GenAI text detectors: Implications for inclusive education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 21*(1), 53. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00584-w

Poe, M., & Elliot, N. (2019). Evidence of fairness: Twenty-five years of research in *Assessing Writing*. *Assessing Writing, 42*, 100418. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2019.100418

Roediger, H. L., III, & Karpicke, J. D. (2006). Test-enhanced learning: Taking memory tests improves long-term retention. *Psychological Science, 17*(3), 249–255. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2006.01693.x

Van de Pol, J., Volman, M., & Beishuizen, J. (2010). Scaffolding in teacher–student interaction: A decade of research. *Educational Psychology Review, 22*(3), 271–296. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-010-9127-6

Walters, W. H. (2023). The effectiveness of software designed to detect AI-generated writing: A comparison of 16 AI text detectors. *Open Information Science, 7*(1), 20220158. https://doi.org/10.1515/opis-2022-0158

Wang, C., & Tian, Z. (2025). *Rethinking writing education in the age of generative AI*. Taylor & Francis. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003426936

Wang, C. Z., Aguilar, S. J., Bankard, J. S., Bui, E., & Nye, B. (2024). Writing with AI: What college students learned from utilizing ChatGPT for a writing assignment. *Education Sciences, 14*(9), Article 976. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14090976