

## **SPECIAL ISSUE – CALL FOR PAPERS**

### **Postplagiarism and Generativism: Human-AI Hybrid Approaches to Ethical Teaching, Learning, and Assessment**

For publication into the [Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice](#).

#### **Guest editors**

- Professor Sarah Elaine Eaton, University of Calgary, Canada
- Dr. Rahul Kumar, Brock University, Canada
- Dr. Beatriz Moya, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Chile
- Dr. Dimitar Angelov, Coventry University, UK

#### **Background**

Every new technology brings with it societal and moral panic (Orben, 2020). When the Internet first became popularized, concerns about plagiarism increased. Even though there was no empirical evidence that the Internet was actually responsible for increases in rates of plagiarism, the perception that new technology resulted in more academic cheating persisted (Panning Davies & Howard, 2016).

Some plagiarism scholars have been emphatic that the majority of student plagiarism cases are not an intent to deceive, but rather a lack of academic literacy and poor academic practice, and have even advocated for disposing of plagiarism in academic misconduct policies in favour of increased student support (Howard, 1992; Jamieson & Howard, 2021). The idea that plagiarism could be decoupled from academic misconduct seems somewhat unlikely, but by the turn of the decade it was obvious to some that generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) would have an impact on writing, and by extension, on plagiarism (Mindzak & Eaton, 2021).

In response to these technological shifts, various frameworks have emerged to conceptualize academic integrity in the GenAI era. The postplagiarism framework, first introduced by Eaton (2021, 2023) and since discussed by scholars worldwide (Bali, 2023; Bagenal, 2024; Kenny, 2024), offers one approach. Other perspectives, such as Generativism (Pratschke, 2023), AI Literacy frameworks (Ng et al., 2021; Pretorius & Cahusac de Caux, 2024), and UNESCO's Guidance for Generative AI in Education (2023), provide complementary or alternative viewpoints on similar phenomena.

Postplagiarism is based on six tenets (Eaton, 2023): (1) human-AI hybrid writing will become the norm; (2) creativity can be enhanced by AI; (3) AI can help to overcome language barriers; (4) we can outsource control of our writing to AI, but we do not outsource responsibility for what is written; (5) attribution remains important; and (6) historical definitions of plagiarism may require rethinking.

Empirical testing of these and related frameworks has shown differing levels of acceptance and application across educational contexts (Kumar, 2025).

#### **Equity, Diversity, Inclusion, and Accessibility in a Postplagiarism Age**

As higher education institutions aim to promote social justice through equity, diversity, and inclusion (EDI), GenAI holds the potential to either break down or reinforce barriers related to linguistic, cultural, socioeconomic, and ability differences requires critical examination.

Assessment practices should be designed proactively to enable all students to demonstrate their learning without being unfairly disadvantaged by their personal characteristics or circumstances (Tai et al., 2022). Similarly, McDermott (2024) highlights the importance of considering accessibility, equity, and inclusion in assessment and academic integrity.

GenAI offers opportunities to enhance equity by providing personalized support, overcoming language barriers, and assisting learners with diverse needs. However, without careful implementation, it may exacerbate existing inequities through unequal access to technology, algorithmic biases, or assessment designs that privilege certain ways of knowing and communicating.

In this special edition, we propose to examine the broader question: **"How are pedagogies, learning, and teaching approaches evolving in response to GenAI, and what frameworks best support ethical academic practice in a postplagiarism landscape?"**

We invite researchers and practitioners to submit their original research papers exploring the transformation of teaching, learning, and assessment in a GenAI age. We welcome both theoretical and empirical contributions, including positions that may present contrasting viewpoints. Potential topics of interest include, but are not limited to:

- New developments in postplagiarism, generativism, and other emerging frameworks for understanding academic integrity in the GenAI era
- Empirical studies testing these frameworks in different contexts and disciplines
- The use of these frameworks to design or reform academic misconduct policies and procedures
- The relationship between GenAI, academic literacies, and related competencies (e.g., digital literacy, information literacy)
- Pedagogical approaches that embrace GenAI while maintaining academic integrity
- Case studies of successful integration of GenAI into teaching, learning, and assessment
- Critical perspectives on the limitations or challenges of current approaches to GenAI in education
- Position papers presenting new or alternative frameworks for understanding GenAI in teaching and learning

We particularly encourage submissions that engage in dialogue with existing frameworks, offering either supportive evidence or critical alternatives. Our goal is to foster a robust debate about the future of teaching and learning in a GenAI (and even a post-GenAI) world.

We welcome submissions from both established researchers and early-career scholars from a multiplicity of academic and cultural backgrounds. All submissions will be peer-reviewed by an international panel of experts. Accepted papers will be published in a special issue of the *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice*.

### **Types of publications accepted into this Special Issue**

The types of publications that are eligible for acceptance into this Special Issue include:

- Research papers
- Review articles (e.g., systematic review or meta-analysis)
- Case studies and evidence-based good practice examples

### **Developing a high-quality proposal**

We recommend the creation of a single document (Word document preferably) that contains the following:

- Proposed article title
- Proposed authors names and affiliations
- A clear evidence-based rationale for the line of inquiry proposed
- Research question(s)
- Proposed method (for both theoretical and empirical manuscripts)
- Practice-based implications of the proposed research

The word limit for the proposal is 250 words (not including references) and is designed to give the Editorial Team a sense of the rigour of the manuscript proposed and the possible implications of such research. The Editorial Team may return with an invitation to combine similar manuscripts. Acceptance of proposals does not guarantee acceptance of final manuscripts.

### **Timeline**

- Proposals due – May 20, 2026
- Proposal acceptance notifications: June 12, 2026
- Full articles due: September 30, 2026

Submit your abstract via this online form: <https://forms.gle/6sKjc2jkKGWctGgw7>

For further information, or to submit an abstract, please contact [Professor Sarah Elaine Eaton, University of Calgary](#).

### **References**

Bali, M. (2023, March 3). Are We Approaching a Postplagiarism Era? <https://blog.mahabali.me/educational-technology-2/are-we-approaching-a-postplagiarism-era/>

Bagenal, J. (2024). Generative artificial intelligence and scientific publishing: Urgent questions, difficult answers. *The Lancet*, 403(10432), 1118–1120. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(24\)00416-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(24)00416-1)

Eaton, S. E. (2021). *Plagiarism in Higher Education: Tackling Tough Topics in Academic Integrity*. Bloomsbury.

Eaton, S. E. (2023). Postplagiarism: Transdisciplinary ethics and integrity in the age of artificial intelligence and neurotechnology. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 19(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-023-00144-1>

Orben, A. (2020). The Sisyphean cycle of technology panics. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 15(5), 1143–1157. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691620919372>

Howard, R. M. (1992). A plagiarism penitence. *Journal of Teaching Writing*, 11(2), 233–245.