Naveen Shodh Sansar (An International Refereed / Peer Review Multidisciplinary Research Journal)
RNI No.- MPHIN/2013/60638, ISSN 2320-8767, E- ISSN 2394-3793, Scientific Journal Impact Factor (SJIF)- 8.054,
January to March 2026, E-Journal, Vol. I, Issue LIII (53), ISO 9001:2015 - E2024049304 (QMS)

Copyrightability and Machine-Generated Academic Content

Ameya Sapre* **Vidhyanshi Bhanwar****

***Assistant Professor (Law) NMIMS, Bengaluru (Karnataka) INDIA**
****Assistant Professor (Law) Government Law College, Dhar (M.P.) INDIA**

Introduction - The arrival of Artificial Intelligence (AI) has transformed the process of knowledge generation, dissemination, and assessment, particularly in academia.[1]One of the most interesting developments in this context is OpenAI's ChatGPT, a highly advanced language model that produces linguistically appropriate and contextually sound text, mirroring human pattern of thinking very closely.[2]Launched in November 2022, ChatGPT has quickly gained popularity among researchers, writers, and students alike for its use in drafting, research, and creative thinking tasks.[3]

Traditionally, academic work entailed significant human effort in the search for material, information processing, and articulation of well-organized arguments. There is now a growing trend of outsourcing these tasks to AI-driven tools.[4] This trend of automation raises complex issues of originality, intellectual contribution, and academic authorship.[5] In India, the University Grants Commission (UGC) has addressed some of these issues through its 2018 guidelines, which establish what constitutes plagiarism and set penalties for academic misconduct.[6] These rules do not, however, deal with the effect of AI-generated material that does not amount to direct copying but does not have genuine authorship.

This paper responds to an important question: Can humans reliably distinguish between content written by machines and content written by humans? The response to this question has both epistemological and legal implications. To respond to this question, the research uses an adaptation of the Turing Test, which was first conceived by Alan Turing in 1950 as a measure of a machine's ability to exhibit intelligent behavior indistinguishable from, or equivalent to, human behavior.[7]Empirical findings from our research demonstrate that 75% of participants inaccurately labeled AI-generated content as being human-written, reflecting a blurring of distinctions between artificial and human intelligence.

This event raises fundamental legal questions. As per the doctrines of Indian law, authorship is limited to human creators.[8] In the case of *Emergent Ventures India v. Satyam Venture Engineering Services Pvt. Ltd.*, the Delhi High Court held that only works that convey human skill and judgement are entitled to protection under copyright.[9] Similarly, courts on the global front have dismissed the attribution of AI systems as "inventor" or "author," as in the case of *Thaler v. Comptroller-General of Patents, Designs and Trade Marks* in the United Kingdom.[10]

Furthermore, ethical questions emerge: What is the responsibility of academicians using AI tools? Does reliance on such technology diminish intellectual accountability? The future of academic integrity depends on clear regulation and a nuanced understanding of AI's role in knowledge systems.

Conceptual Framework: Natural V. Artificial Intelligence- Artificial Intelligence has traditionally been defined as the ability of machines to simulate human mental processes, such as reasoning, learning, and decision-making.[11] Natural Intelligence (NI), as the innate human ability for consciousness, experiential learning, and moral reasoning, is the opposite of AI. The boundary between AI and NI, once clearly defined, is being blurred as AI systems are being designed to perform tasks traditionally considered unique human mental processes. This has raised strict legal, philosophical, and ethical questions on issues of identity, responsibility, and authorship.

Traditionally, AI systems have been classified into two categories: Weak AI, designed to perform specific functions such as translation or image recognition, and Strong AI, designed to provide generalized cognitive capability in any domain. Generative AI, like models such as ChatGPT, is a breakthrough in this evolution because they create original content that is extremely human-like in nature.[12] Such models do not rely solely on pre-coded rules; they learn from enormous datasets and create content based on probabilistic relationships, thus creating the illusion of understanding.[13]

The working practices of generative artificial intelligence are much closer to those of past rule-based systems than might be expected, as they have contextual conversations, combine knowledge from several domains,

and possess flexible linguistic abilities. Their critics argue that these systems only produce "statistical echoes" of human speech without actual semantic understanding. The criticism is not a new view; the general standards for measuring AI's equivalence with human ability have their roots in Alan Turing's groundbreaking 1950 paper, in which he introduced the Turing Test—a series of tests to determine whether a machine's response is indistinguishable from that of a human.[14] The test's purpose was not to measure consciousness, but to estimate apparent intelligence in terms of conversational ability.[15]

Modern language models like GPT-4 have passed the bar of passing everyday Turing Tests in ordinary academic and professional settings.[16] This success has led to a phenomenon of cognitive trickery, as the human assessors wrongly believe that AI created content.[17] Researchers claim that such systems are "stochastic parrots"—models that copy without understanding, often hiding deep-seated significant biases. Their linguistic abilities can cover up the absence of intentionality, inviting legal and ethical concerns regarding possession and authenticity of the generated content.[18]

These problems are especially crucial in academia, where originality, authorship, and responsibility are the cornerstones of academic work. If a researcher or a student submits AI-generated work that is indistinguishable from their own work, then how can academic integrity policies be enforced in institutions? This problem is further exacerbated by the fact that prevailing copyright regimes, like the Indian Copyright Act and comparable regimes in other countries, only acknowledge natural persons as authors.[19]

Thus, the theoretical distinction between Natural and Artificial Intelligence has severe practical implications. The distinction is not a philosophical platitude; it is a significant test for legal distribution, moral blame, and academic honesty at a time when content produced by machines is more and more indistinguishable from content produced by humans.

Empirical Findings And Analysis - The empirical component of this study was designed to evaluate whether legal professionals and students could distinguish between texts written by humans and those generated by artificial intelligence models. This approach draws upon the classic framework of the Turing Test, repurposed in an academic setting to interrogate the indistinguishability of AI-generated legal writing from that of human authorship. The findings yield important epistemological insights while simultaneously raising normative questions about authorship, cognitive agency, and intellectual integrity in legal academia.

Methodology And Structure Of The Study- Participants in the study were presented with three anonymized texts discussing the topic *"Computers Incidental to Crimes in India."* Each text was created through a different means:

Text 1 was written by a law student.
Text 2 was generated entirely by ChatGPT using a prompt to compose a short academic note.
Text 3 was generated by another AI model, Perplexity, in response to the same prompt.

All texts were standardized by removing AI-specific formatting features such as bullet points, distinctive punctuation, and digital identifiers (e.g., "As an AI model, I..."). The aim was to ensure that no overt cues revealed the origin of the content, preserving the integrity of the blind evaluation process. Participants were then asked to identify which text appeared most human-like, and to classify the origin of each.

The participant pool primarily comprised individuals from the legal academic community, including students, faculty, and researchers. Crucially, participants varied in their experience with AI tools, allowing for an assessment of whether familiarity with generative AI correlated with greater discriminatory accuracy.

Key Findings- The survey revealed an unexpected pattern: **over 75% of respondents misclassified the ChatGPT-generated text as being authored by a human**, while **50% of participants misclassified the human-written text as AI-generated.** Only **one participant**correctly identified the source of all three texts, and notably, this individual reported using AI tools in over 60% of their academic work, primarily for research assistance.

These results suggest a convergence in perceived linguistic credibility between human and machine-generated texts, especially when the content is factual, structurally coherent, and legally accurate. The empirical evidence demonstrates that even individuals trained in critical legal reasoning can be deceived by AI-generated texts—an outcome that both validates the sophistication of large language models and complicates traditional notions of authorship.

Implications For Academic Integrity And The Turing Test- The findings raise foundational concerns about the Turing Test's utility as a measure of intelligence in legal writing contexts. Although modern AI models like ChatGPT have surpassed the informal threshold of passing the Turing Test in everyday academic tasks, this success is primarily mimetic rather than cognitive. These systems simulate human communication by producing statistically probable text sequences but **lack semantic understanding, contextual awareness, and normative judgment.**

This distinction is crucial in law, where meaning is not merely a matter of grammar or coherence but involves layered interpretations, socio-legal context, and jurisprudential reasoning. AI may convincingly mimic human expression, but it does not possess *mens rea*, critical thinking, or the ability to reflect upon justice—traits foundational to legal authorship.

The Problem Of "Invisible Misconduct" - One of the gravest challenges emerging from this study is the phenomenon of "invisible misconduct"—the submission of

AI-generated academic work that escapes detection because it is both original (in the statistical sense) and indistinguishable from human writing. Unlike traditional plagiarism, which involves textual replication, the ethical dilemma here revolves around *intent and contribution*. The absence of discernible human labor behind a seemingly original submission undermines academic honesty and misrepresents intellectual authorship.

Moreover, current academic policies—such as the UGC's 2018 plagiarism regulations—focus on *source similarity detection*, leaving a regulatory vacuum when it comes to AI-generated but non-plagiarized content. Without a reformulation of institutional definitions of misconduct to include machine-generated ghostwriting, enforcement mechanisms remain outdated and ineffective.

The Correlation Between AI Literacy And Detection Accuracy - The survey findings tentatively suggest a correlation between higher AI literacy and better detection accuracy. The sole participant who correctly identified all three text sources was also the most frequent user of AI tools. This points toward the paradoxical possibility that only those deeply familiar with AI are adequately equipped to identify its output, thereby complicating enforcement strategies that rely on uninformed or novice gatekeepers.

This insight underscores the necessity of integrating AI literacy training into academic curricula—not only to prevent misuse but also to empower students and faculty to engage critically with AI-generated content.

Doctrinal Analysis: Legal And Ethical Implications

A. Legal Concerns: The advent of AI-produced academic content has undermined long-standing copyright traditions, particularly in terms of authorship. Under Indian law, the Copyright Act of 1957 has established a definition for an "author" as a human entity liable for original work and contains no provisions for creators other than human.[20] Likewise, the United States also upholds the belief that copyright protection applies only to works created by human authors.[21] In contrast, the United Kingdom does provide a provision for works produced by computers, with the author being the person liable for making the necessary arrangements.[22] In the academic community, this ambiguity is problematic when students submit work that is fully or partially produced by AI software like ChatGPT. In the absence of meaningful human contribution, it is questionable whether authorship—and the ensuing academic credit—can justly be assigned to the submitting student.

AI-generated content also makes the legal notion of plagiarism more complex. Conventional plagiarism detection software is designed to look for copied content, but ChatGPT creates content algorithmically and tends to produce entirely new outputs that are outside such detection. The UGC of India has released regulations against academic plagiarism, but its 2018 policy considers copying from identifiable human sources.[23] This makes a regulatory loophole where AI-generated content, though not technically plagiarized, is being employed to avoid academic integrity. Scholars have urged revising policy definitions to consider "machine-generated ghostwriting," based on intent not text similarity.[24]

Internationally, regulatory frameworks are beginning to acknowledge this complexity. The European Union's AI Act of 2024 classifies large language models like ChatGPT as high-risk AI systems when deployed in educational environments and places them under compulsory disclosure and transparency.[25] In India, the Information Technology Rules of 2021 focus on the intermediary function but overlook generative AI and the possibility of its misuse in educational environments.[26]This international regulatory gap compels institutions to institute and apply academic standards unevenly, often based on discretionary and unstructured policy.

B. Ethical Concerns: Ethically, using AI tools like ChatGPT without informing is a new form of academic dishonesty. Whereas the older types of misconduct either amount to copying or outsourcing work to someone else, technology allows students to write whole essays or dissertations on their own individually—technically original but ethically dishonest.[27] The core academic principle of intellectual honesty is violated, although there is no traditional plagiarism. Authors argue that ethics of authorship rely not on textual originality but on the good intellectual work that goes into the work.[28]

There is also a more general worry about the integrity of research being eroded. Academic writing is not merely content generation but involves critical thinking, synthesis, and reflection. AI tools, although able to emulate style and structure, possess no epistemic agency—no ability to construct or evaluate arguments as humans do. The more we use AI, particularly early-career researchers, the more we risk knowledge production being superficial and mechanical. The peer review process is also at risk; if journals do not have AI-detection capabilities, they risk unknowingly publishing ghostwritten papers.[29]

Teachers and schools have the moral duty to meet this new reality. Most schools of higher learning have no policies for the application of AI, and this creates confusion and irregularity. According to a 2024 EDUCAUSE survey, less than 25% of Indian schools had instituted guidelines for the application of AI tools for student assignments.[30] The students cannot be held entirely responsible for accidental abuse without formal orientation and sensitization training. Ethical applications of AI should be incorporated into curricula, along with citation training and academic writing.[31]

Teachers also need to rethink test design. Open-ended, reflective tasks that value process rather than product are less susceptible to AI misuse than recall essay questions. The emphasis has to be on the development of meta-cognitive abilities—how learners think about learning and

knowledge and not how they replicate it.[32] The long-term ethical issue is not so much avoiding wrongdoing as creating an academic environment where honesty in human and machine work is valued.

Human-AI Collaboration in Academia: Now, the emergence of generative AI models such as ChatGPT has forced academia to confront the question of whether AI should be prohibited or integrated within academic workflows. While initial responses were reactionary—focusing on bans and detection tools—recent scholarship supports a shift toward ethical and transparent integration.[33]

AI has demonstrated potential to support academic work in numerous ways, from summarizing texts and improving grammar to generating ideas or clarifying arguments. For students from underrepresented backgrounds, particularly those with limited language proficiency or access to academic mentorship, AI may function as a support mechanism to promote equity in education. In this sense, AI joins a lineage of educational technologies that, when properly regulated, can assist without replacing human cognition.[34]

Nevertheless, using AI to generate entire essays or solve assignments without disclosure violates core academic principles such as intellectual honesty and independent effort. Scholars warn that the risk is not the technology itself but the uncritical outsourcing of cognitive labor. Research indicates that such misuse undermines the epistemic goals of education, leading to performative rather than reflective learning. Moreover, because ChatGPT produces novel content rather than copying from existing sources, it may evade traditional plagiarism detection mechanisms, intensifying the threat of "invisible misconduct."[35]

To address this, institutions are beginning to draw clearer lines between permissible and impermissible AI use. Some universities, including Cambridge, Stanford, and NLSIU, have introduced internal policies requiring students to disclose any AI assistance used in assessments.[36] International advisory bodies like the International Center for Academic Integrity (ICAI) recommend integrating AI disclosure statements in student work, modeled after acknowledgments in research publications.[37]

Citation guidelines are also evolving. The APA and MLA both now provide provisional formats for citing generative AI, typically listing the system as a non-human contributor.[38] In parallel, law schools and technical institutes in India have initiated pilot guidelines treating ChatGPT as a research aid that must be documented. These changes underscore the importance of transparency, not prohibition, in academic integrity frameworks.[39]

On the regulatory front, international instruments offer normative guidance. The European Union's Artificial Intelligence Act, 2024 classifies generative AI systems as high-risk tools in educational environments, mandating transparency, documentation, and user disclosures.[40]

Pedagogically, the most effective deterrent to misuse may lie in assignment design.[41]Assessments that rely on open-ended reflection, oral articulation, or creative synthesis are less likely to be completed by AI alone. Educators are encouraged to teach with AI—not just about AI—by embedding critical engagement with AI outputs into their curricula.[42] For instance, students can be asked to critique, fact-check, or improve upon AI-generated drafts, thus turning the tool into a subject of learning.

Ultimately, a ban-only approach is both impractical and counterproductive. Instead, academia must cultivate a culture of *responsible AI use*, grounded in disclosure, institutional guidance, and pedagogical innovation. This requires collaboration among universities, policymakers, students, and developers to establish enforceable and ethically sound norms for human–AI co-authorship.

AI Hallucinations and Academic Misinformation- The integration of generative AI into academic environments has introduced new challenges, one of the most critical being the phenomenon of AI hallucinations—outputs that are grammatically coherent but factually incorrect or entirely fabricated. Large language models (LLMs) like ChatGPT, while remarkably capable at mimicking human syntax and producing structured responses, are prone to generating fictitious citations, non-existent legal cases, and distorted doctrinal interpretations. These hallucinations pose a serious threat to academic credibility and the integrity of legal research.

At the core of this issue is the way LLMs function. Unlike legal scholars, AI models do not understand content in a semantic or epistemic sense; they merely generate text based on statistical correlations learned from vast datasets. When prompted to provide a citation or explain a case, the model is not recalling verified facts but predicting what a plausible legal citation might look like. This predictive mechanism results in what scholars have termed "hallucinations," where the AI produces responses that sound authoritative but lack factual grounding.[43]

The consequences of AI hallucinations have already materialized in legal practice. In *Mata v. Avianca*, a New York attorney submitted a legal brief containing six fabricated cases generated by ChatGPT, all of which were entirely fictitious.[44] The incident attracted global attention and prompted a judicial rebuke emphasizing the dangers of relying uncritically on generative AI in legal processes. If seasoned legal professionals can fall prey to AI hallucinations, the risks are even higher for students and early-career researchers who may lack the doctrinal grounding to cross-check AI-generated content.[45]

In academia, hallucinated content threatens more than just individual assignments—it endangers the scholarly record itself. Papers and dissertations submitted with fictitious case law or imaginary doctrinal principles erode trust in the peer review system. Traditional plagiarism detection tools, such as Turnitin, are ill-equipped to catch

hallucinations because they flag similarity, not factual inaccuracy. This creates a regulatory blind spot where AI-generated errors can pass undetected under the guise of originality.

The problem is further compounded when hallucinated content makes its way into secondary citations. When one paper inadvertently cites AI-fabricated sources, subsequent researchers may build upon that false foundation, leading to a cascade of misinformation. Legal academia—already grappling with the challenges of bias, under-citation of minority scholars, and uneven access to resources—cannot afford this epistemic contamination.

Several studies confirm the pervasiveness of hallucinations across AI tools. One recent paper analysing GPT-4 responses found that nearly 30% of the legal citations produced were fabricated or inaccurate.[46] Another audit found that AI models hallucinate at higher rates when asked to generate domain-specific outputs—especially in law, medicine, and finance.[47] These domains require a high degree of factual precision, making hallucinations not just misleading but potentially dangerous.

Given these risks, institutions must adopt proactive countermeasures. First, AI literacy should become part of legal education curricula, teaching students not only how to use AI responsibly but also how to identify hallucinations. Faculty and supervisors should develop rubrics that require source verification for any AI-assisted work.

Second, academic citation guidelines must evolve to include AI output disclaimers. The APA and MLA have already issued preliminary formats for citing generative AI,[48] but legal citation systems like the Bluebook have yet to catch up comprehensively. A mandatory "AI-used" disclosure clause could alert reviewers to the possibility of hallucinated content.

Third, developers of AI tools must take greater responsibility. OpenAI, Anthropic, and other LLM providers should incorporate citation verification features into their systems. Additionally, watermarking techniques and explainable AI models could help users trace the logic behind specific outputs, offering some degree of transparency.

Finally, academic journals and law reviews must train peer reviewers to identify hallucinated content. Some journals have begun requiring authors to submit a list of verified sources and a declaration of AI use. Such practices could become the norm to preserve academic standards in the age of AI.

In sum, AI hallucinations are not merely a technical glitch—they represent a structural epistemic threat to legal academia. While generative AI offers immense promise for efficiency and accessibility, its integration must be grounded in rigorous factual scrutiny. The burden of responsibility lies with students, educators, institutions, and developers alike to ensure that the legal discipline does not become a victim of algorithmic misinformation.

Way Forward and Recommendation- With academia at the threshold of AI disruption, mere reactive steps will not be enough. The threat that generative AI tools such as ChatGPT pose necessitates multi-stakeholder, proactive steps guided by law, ethics, and pedagogy. In this response, we offer a framework for institutional, regulatory, and educational reform to ethically incorporate AI in the academic ecosystem.

Firstly, schools need to adopt formal policies on the use of AI that make a distinction between authentic help and cheating. The policies need to have measures to reveal AI help, in line with guidelines already embraced by international institutions and advisory bodies. The institutions also need to clarify "unfair means" for the AI era, redefining academic integrity rules like the UGC.

Second, the regulatory bodies need to define the lacuna in the law of authorship, responsibility, and plagiarism in AI-generated work. In India, the Ministry of Education and the UGC need to update current frameworks, such as the 2018 plagiarism guidelines, to specifically address the particular risks of non-human content generation. Statutory definitions of "automated or algorithmically generated scholarly content" can be used to fill this lacuna.

Third, we suggest national AI literacy programs with faculty and student training modules for the proper use of AI. Such programs should not only deter misuse of AI but enable the user to use these resources in a responsible manner. UNESCO and OECD have underlined that AI is required in education to promote digital citizenship and academic responsibility.

Fourth, institutions must integrate AI literacy and disclosure mechanisms into coursework itself. AI-authored work, for instance, may be submitted with student annotation detailing the tool's input. This encourages reflective use over passive reliance. Assignments must be reimagined to emphasize process over product, with more focus on oral testing, critical annotation, and iterative feedback.

Fifth, peer-review groups and academic journals to set AI-authorship disclosure guidelines, asking authors to report whether AI tools were employed in editing, writing, or idea generation. Like for conflict-of-interest statements, this will ensure transparency in publishing research.

Finally, developers of AI tools must assume responsibility for abuse through inclusions such as watermarking, citation reminders, or user warnings about academic policy. OpenAI and other LLM providers are especially well-positioned to facilitate ethical deployment within the education sector.

Collectively, these suggestions strive to strike a balance between intellectual integrity and technological advancements. Institutions should not fight AI integration but rather guide it—constructively, openly, and ethically.

Conclusion - The evolving landscape of generative artificial intelligence, particularly tools like ChatGPT, has

fundamentally disrupted long-held assumptions about academic authorship, epistemic authority, and intellectual labour. This paper began with a simple yet pressing question: Can humans reliably distinguish between content generated by machines and that created by fellow humans? The empirical evidence—demonstrating that over 75% of participants mistook AI-generated legal writing for human work—suggests the answer is increasingly no. More concerning, however, is not merely that humans are being tricked by machines, but that academia is structurally unprepared to deal with this deception.

The doctrinal analysis revealed that current legal frameworks, such as the Indian Copyright Act and UGC's 2018 plagiarism regulations, are ill-equipped to address the complexities of authorship and originality in the age of AI. These instruments were crafted with a human-centred notion of creativity, one that cannot account for machine-generated but technically original content. At the same time, academic integrity policies that rely on similarity-based detection are unable to capture what this paper has termed "invisible misconduct"—submissions that are technically original but lack genuine human intellectual input.

With the inclusion of hallucinated outputs—entirely fabricated citations, doctrines, and precedents that AI tools confidently produce—this problem intensifies. Hallucinations threaten not just academic honesty but the very infrastructure of legal knowledge production. When misinformation is generated convincingly and inserted into the scholarly record, it undermines trust, degrades research quality, and risks the perpetuation of false legal narratives. In law—where authority depends on doctrinal coherence and precedent—such distortions are particularly damaging. Moreover, the paper's findings suggest a paradox: the more familiar users are with AI, the better equipped they are to detect its outputs. This indicates that AI literacy is not a luxury but a necessity. The ability to interrogate, verify, and contextualize AI-generated content must become a core component of academic and legal training.

To preserve the integrity of academic work, institutions must move beyond detection to prevention and pedagogy. This involves not only updating regulatory definitions of plagiarism and authorship but also embedding AI literacy, citation ethics, and source verification into academic curricula. Developers must also take responsibility by embedding citation warnings, hallucination disclosures, and fact-checking modules within LLM interfaces.

Ultimately, this paper does not advocate for the rejection of AI in academia. Rather, it calls for its critical integration—a framework of cautious optimism grounded in transparency, legal reform, and ethical clarity. As generative AI continues to blur the lines between human and machine intelligence, academia must respond not with fear, but with rigorous standards that preserve the value of human intellectual labour in an era of algorithmic co-authorship.

Bibliography - *"AI tools were used in limited capacity during the preparation of this manuscript. Grammarly was used for grammar and proofreading. ChatGPT (OpenAI, GPT-4) was used for summarizing background sources. The final AI similarity index score was under 10%. All AI-generated inputs were reviewed and edited by the authors."*

Books & Reports:-

1. Stuart Russell & Peter Norvig, Artificial Intelligence: A Modern Approach (4th ed. 2021) 1–2.
2. Neil Selwyn, Should Robots Replace Teachers? AI and the Future of Education (2023) Polity Press 167–70.
3. EDUCAUSE, Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education: A 2024 Survey Report (2024).
4. National Law School of India University, AI Usage in Academic Writing: Pilot Guidelines, Academic Council Notes, July 2024.
5. U.S. Copyright Office, Copyright Registration Guidance: Works Containing Material Generated by Artificial Intelligence (Mar. 16, 2023).
6. Rishi Bommasani et al., On the Opportunities and Risks of Foundation Models, Stan. Inst. for Human-Centered AI 10–12.

Journal Articles & Academic Papers:-

1. Yogesh K. Dwivedi et al., 'So What If ChatGPT Wrote It?' (2023) 71 Int'l J. Info. Mgmt. 102642.
2. Luciano Floridi & Massimo Chiriatti, 'GPT-3: Its Nature, Scope, Limits, and Consequences' (2020) 30 Minds & Machines 681.
3. Shubha Ghosh, 'AI, Authorship, and Copyright' (2021) 58 Hous. L. Rev. 809.
4. K. J. Greene, 'The Ethics of Writing with AI' (2023) 98 Chi.-Kent L. Rev. 275.
5. Tracey Bretag, 'Challenges in Addressing Contract Cheating and Academic Integrity' (2020) 15(2) Int'l J. Educ. Integrity 1.
6. Sarah Elaine Eaton, 'Academic Integrity in the Age of Artificial Intelligence' (2021) 12(1) J. Acad. Ethics 1.
7. Jodi Schneider, 'Detecting AI-Generated Text in Peer Review Submissions' (2023) 38 Learned Pub. 121.
8. James H. Moor, 'The Turing Test' (2008) 39 Metaphilosophy 309.
9. Emily Bender et al., 'On the Dangers of Stochastic Parrots' (2021) ACM Conf. on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency 610.
10. Jennifer Cobbe et al., 'Auditing Large Language Models' (2023) ACM Conf. on Artificial Intelligence & Law 45.
11. Anna Mills, 'Designing AI-Resistant Assignments' (2024) 10(2) Teaching & Learning Inquiry 112.
12. Edward Watson & Charles D. Graham, 'Teaching in the Age of AI' (2024) 13 Int'l J. Tech. Educ. Innovation 77.
13. James Zou et al., 'How AI Can Support Marginalized Students' (2023) 3 Nat. Mach. Intell. 568.
14. Anna Jobin et al., 'The Global Landscape of AI Ethics

Guidelines' (2019) 1 Nat. Mach. Intell. 389.
15. Gary Marcus, 'The Next Decade in AI: A Conversation' (2024) 48 AI Mag. 5.
16. Ethan Mollick, 'The Practical Applications of GPT-4 in Higher Education' (2023) Harvard Business Review (March edition).
17. Avi Goldfarb & Daniel Trefler, 'AI and the Future of Work' (2022) 37 Brookings Papers on Econ. Activity 183.

Cases, Statutes & Regulations:-

1. Emergent Ventures India v. Satyam Venture Eng'g Servs. Pvt. Ltd., (2011) SCC OnLine Del 3836.
2. Thaler v. Comptroller-General of Patents, Designs and Trademarks, (2021) EWCA Civ 1374.
3. Mata v. Avianca, Inc., No. 22-cv-1461 (S.D.N.Y. 2023).
4. The Copyright Act, 1957 (14 of 1957) s 2(d).
5. Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, c. 48, s 9(3).
6. University Grants Commission, Promotion of Academic Integrity and Prevention of Plagiarism in Higher Educational Institutions Regulations, 2018.
7. University Grants Commission, Promotion of Academic Integrity Regulations, No. F.1-18/2010 (CPP-II), India (2018).
8. European Commission, Regulation (EU) 2024/867 on Artificial Intelligence (AI Act), 2024 O.J. (L 867) 1.
9. Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021, Gazette of India.

Web Sources & Blogs:-

1. APA Style Team, How to Cite ChatGPT, APA Style Blog (2023), https://apastyle.apa.org/blog/how-to-cite-chatgpt
2. Purdue OWL, How to Cite Generative AI (APA 7), https://owl.purdue.edu
3. International Center for Academic Integrity, AI Use and Disclosure: Policy Brief (2023), https://academicintegrity.org
4. University Grants Commission, 2018 Regulations, https://www.ugc.gov.in/pdfnews/7771545_academic-integrity-Regulations2018.pdf

****