




Generative AI-Assisted Academic Transgressions: A Theoretical “Reflegration” on Student and Faculty Cheating

Shalaleh. Meraji Oskuie^{1*} 

¹ Department of Media Management, Faculty of Management and Economics, Tehran Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran.

* Corresponding author email address: shalaleh.oskuie@yahoo.com

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Luis Felipe Reynoso-Sánchez  Department of Social Sciences and Humanities, Autonomous University of Occident, Los Mochis, Sinaloa, Mexico felipe.reynoso@uadeo.mx	Reviewer 1: Seyed Mohammad Hosseini  Assistant Professor, Department of Health and Rehabilitation in Sports, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran. Email: moh_hosseini@sbu.ac.ir Reviewer 2: Masoud Mirmoezi  Department of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, Islamic Azad University, Central Tehran Branch, Tehran, Iran. Email: massoudmirmoezi@live.com

1. Round 1

1.1 Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The introduction begins with dialogue—"I've designed your assignment...". While this personal anecdote is engaging, it risks appearing informal for an academic paper. Consider reframing this anecdote within a more formal narrative or integrating it later in the text to maintain scholarly tone.

In the paragraph that begins "Higher education institutions have long been facing various forms...", the term "as one type of transgression" is repeated in close succession. Consider revising for conciseness and clarity.

The paragraph citing Siaputra & Santosa (2016) conflates ghostwriting with plagiarism. While related, these are distinct categories of academic dishonesty. Consider clarifying the difference to maintain conceptual rigor.

In the paragraph beginning "When discussing students' goals for attending university...", the generalizations about male students using education to delay military service lack empirical backing. Consider citing relevant sociological studies or national statistics to support this assertion.

While reflective writing is part of the article's methodological approach, phrases such as "I felt a mix of frustration and amusement..." and "I wondered how he thought I wouldn't realize..." risk overpersonalization. Academic tone can be preserved by rephrasing these in a more neutral, analytical manner.

Figures 1 and 2 are presented twice in identical format and content (pages with repeated "Figure 1" and "Figure 2" captions). This repetition may confuse readers. Consider consolidating these or ensuring proper figure numbering and unique content.

In the “Student Cheating” section, the term “GAI’s Language Neutrality” in the conceptual map is formatted inconsistently compared to surrounding terms (e.g., title case vs. sentence case). Standardize all entries for visual coherence.

In “Faculty Cheating”, the statement “submissions fully written with GAI tools” is alarming but unsupported. Consider providing anonymized examples or citing evidence from peer-reviewed studies or editorial reports.

Author revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

1.2 Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

In the introduction, the article claims to use “Theoretical ‘Reflegration’” by combining the fraud diamond and self-control theory, yet it is not until much later that “Reflegration” is defined. Consider introducing this term earlier, within the methodology or end of the introduction, with a concise operational definition.

The term “academic transgression” is alternately used to refer to both student and faculty behavior. In the sentence starting “Cheating emerges from an interaction of motivational, cognitive...”, it is unclear whether this refers to students, faculty, or both. Greater specificity would improve analytical precision.

The sentence “the reviewer compromised my original submission by uploading it entirely into a GAI application...” (Faculty Cheating section) is highly anecdotal. Consider either reframing this as a hypothetical scenario or providing further details with ethical considerations in mind.

In “Faculty Cheating”, the discussion on tenure’s double-edged nature is conceptually rich. However, the sentence “tenure protects the incompetent” could be viewed as sweeping or pejorative. Consider tempering the language or referencing academic literature on tenure and accountability.

The methodology states the use of “natural reflective learning,” “side-by-side theoretical integration,” and “critical reflective writing.” The blending of these approaches is innovative, but the manuscript should more explicitly explain how these were operationalized to ensure methodological transparency.

Author revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.