



CALL FOR PAPERS - DINAMICA

Originality, Automated Writing and the Use of AI Detection in Academia: A Multidisciplinary and Comparative Approach

Submission Deadline **31 JANUARY 2026**

TOPICS (BUT NOT EXHAUSTIVE)

- ✓ Intellectual Property, Ethics, Privacy
- ✓ Transparency and Regulation
- ✓ Anti-Discrimination issues
- ✓ Communication Science issues
- ✓ Statistics and Data Science issues
- ✓ Computer Science and Information Engineering
- ✓ Machine Learning/Deep Learning
- ✓ IL and RAG
- ✓ Computational Linguistics
- ✓ Analysis of linguistic characteristics of AI-generated texts.
- ✓ Style and idiolect analysis
- ✓ Stylometry models

IMPORTANT DATES

1. 31 JANUARY 2026
Abstract Submission
2. 31 MARCH 2026
Paper approval announcement
3. 30 JUNE 2026
Full paper deadline
4. 8/9 OCTOBER 2026
Hybrid Workshop at Carlo Cattaneo-LIUC University, Italy

Info: [Link](#)
Submission: efalletti@liuc.it

NO REGISTRATION FEES
HYBRID WORKSHOP

AFTER PEER REVIEW,
ARTICLES PUBLISHED.



CALL FOR PAPERS

DINAMICA

Originality, Automated Writing and the Use of AI Detection IN Academia: A Multidisciplinary and Comparative Approach

HYBRID WORKSHOP
CARLO CATTANEO UNIVERSITY – LIUC
Castellanza (Italy)

8/9 October 2026

The widespread adoption of generative AI (GenAI) writing tools, such as ChatGPT, Claude, Copilot, Gemini, Perplexity and so on, has had a significant impact across academic sectors. These tools, based on large language models (LLMs), are probabilistic models trained on vast text datasets to predict sequences of words with high accuracy. The more extensive training data improves the model's capacity to generate responses accurately by identifying patterns based on conditional probability rather than logical reasoning. LLMs choose the most probable next word in a sequence based on the preceding words, enabling them to produce coherent and contextually relevant text.

This issue had already arisen with anti-plagiarism software, which had search parameters on imitation of the source unrelated to machine learning technologies. Thus, source verification, even if automated, could be considered a satisfactory system of intercepting copied text. The intervention of GenAI has changed the scene of the production of intellectual materials because the combined use of machine learning and neural networks involves not “simple” plagiarism, but mirror imitation of combined of different contents and thus, metaphorically speaking, the authors (humans or machinery) find oneself in the situation of the house pets who cannot distinguish themselves from their projected image in the mirror.

The ability of these AI systems to interact with users through written and spoken text creates an illusion of human-like interaction, fostering a sense of trust. This interaction is notable in professional and academic fields where AI-generated text is more and more common.

Within academia, both students and faculty members could use GenAI tools for a wide range of tasks, i.e. from crafting presentations and articles to producing assignments, research papers, and even dissertations or full books. However, this reliance on AI raises concerns, as AI-generated content can sometimes produce errors which may lead to inaccuracies that users might accept as genuine.

To address the risks associated with AI-generated text, tools such as watermarking and AI detection software have been developed. However, watermarking does not confirm the originality or the source of ideas, while AI detection tools, often used alongside plagiarism checks, have proven ineffective in identifying AI-generated text. Studies indicate that these tools can result in false positives, leading to legal, social, and ethical challenges. False positives may occur, flagging genuine work as AI-generated by mistake and leading to unfair accusations and disciplinary actions, damaging authors' reputation.

These issues could be more worrying for learners since it could result in a loss of creativity, as students might avoid originality out of fear their work could be misidentified, favoring standard styles instead expressed by imagination and creativity. Cultural diversity in writing, including varied dialects and expressions, might be misinterpreted, disadvantaging students from diverse backgrounds. An overreliance on technology can lead educators to neglect teaching critical writing skills, placing too much emphasis on detection over development. The tools could also foster a punitive rather than a supportive culture, emphasizing fear over learning. Equity and access concerns arise as students with fewer resources or weaker writing skills may face stricter scrutiny. Privacy issues emerge if students' work is not stored or analyzed in a clear and transparent way. Last, but not least, such tools may undermine trust between students and faculty, creating suspicion rather than support and growth. This may create a climate of distrust between students and educators, potentially undermining a collaborative learning environment. Furthermore, students from under-resourced backgrounds might be disproportionately scrutinized, exacerbating existing inequalities.

Despite these challenges, GenAI tools can offer clear benefits for individuals with cognitive or linguistic challenges, by assisting with complex language expressions, grammatical accuracy, and idiomatic phrasing. This can be advantageous for non-native language speakers needing support in translation and precision. Moreover, automated writing tools can inspire and support the design and innovative development of ideas, and in this regard it is necessary to define how their use should be managed so as to leave room for the originality of human authorship. Equally important is the regulation and clear indication of how such tools rely on primary sources, as well as the ability of detection systems to intervene and exercise control on this matter.

This call for papers aims to analyze the AI detection systems used in academia. As it is well known, the introduction of the GenAI shows both opportunities and challenges. The former regards the improvement in various areas such as teaching, source searching, collecting information, and writing improvement; the latter concerns checking automated writing misuse in producing mistakes and false contents/statements.

Through its transdisciplinary and comparative approach, this research project could play an innovative role in shaping ethical standards, policies, and teaching methodologies to integrate AI technologies within academia better.

A comparative approach will help to understand how different institutions handle AI detection systems in the production of different academic outputs (articles, papers, books, dissertations, assignments).

One of this research's most significant potential areas of interest is the development of an ethical framework for AI detection in academic settings. AI detection tools face criticism for false positives, which can unjustly accuse authors (students and faculty members) of misconduct and harm their academic careers and reputations.

This call for papers aims to explore potential strategies and/or initiatives that can be adopted to strengthen confidence in scientific writing, both on the part of students and teachers, according to their respective roles and responsibilities. GenAI and LLMs programmes have the potential to impact academia by advancing knowledge on ethical AI use, fostering fairness, and encouraging supportive policies that integrate AI tools into education in a responsible manner.

To this end, the Call invites scholars to present their research on the following, but non exhaustive, list of topics:

Law:

Intellectual property

Regulations on transparency in the use of AI tools

Ethics

Privacy

Anti-discrimination law

Communication Science

Human and artificial language production from a cognitive perspective.

Analysis of human perception of AI-generated texts and bias in evaluation.

Models of comprehension and narrative coherence.

Statistics and Data Science

Statistical analysis of linguistic distributions in texts

Creation of reliability metrics and false positive/negative rates in detection systems.

Scientific validation of predictive models.

Computer Science and Information Engineering

Natural language processing (NLP)

Machine learning and deep learning

Information retrieval (IR)

Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG)

Computer forensics

Computational Linguistics

Analysis of the typical linguistic characteristics of AI-generated texts.

Style and idiolect analysis to verify consistency with the author's human writing.

Stylometry models for author attribution and authentication.

Abstracts (in English), of no more than 700 words, should have a title and a short final bibliography; they should also indicate qualification and institution of the Author(s), as well as an e-mail address for communications.

Abstracts must be submitted, by 31 January 2026, as .pdf files, to the email address: efalletti@liuc.it.

Proposals will be selected by a scientific committee through a peer review process. The outcome of the selection process will be notified by 31 March 2026. Selected Authors will be asked to send by 30 June, 2026 a first version of the paper that will be discussed during the workshop, organized at the LIUC University and virtually on 8/9 October, 2026. The paper, in PDF format, should not exceed 65,000 characters, including notes and spaces (excluding bibliography). The organizing committee will edit a peer reviewed publication collecting the selected papers during the workshop. There is no registration fee. Travel and accommodation expenses will remain the responsibility of the participants.

References

- Alier, M., García-Peñalvo, F., & Camba, J. D. (2024). *Generative Artificial Intelligence in Education: From Deceptive to Disruptive*.
- Bianchini, Filippo, Marco Calamo, Matteo Marinacci, Jacopo Rossi, and Massimo Mecella. "Automating Industrial Quality Control: A Multimodal LLM and RAG Framework for Anomaly Detection." In *IFIP International Conference on Artificial Intelligence Applications and Innovations*, pp. 253-266. Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland, 2025.
- Bisztray, Tamas, Bilel Cherif, Richard A. Dubniczky, Nils Gruschka, Bertalan Borsos, Mohamed Amine Ferrag, Attila Kovacs, Vasileios Mavroeidis, and Norbert Tihanyi. "I Know Which LLM Wrote Your Code Last Summer: LLM generated Code Stylometry for Authorship Attribution." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.17323* (2025).
- Bozkurt, Aras. "GenAI et al. Cocreation, authorship, ownership, academic ethics and integrity in a time of generative AI." *Open Praxis* 16, no. 1 (2024): 1-10.
- Campino, João. "Unleashing the Transformers: NLP Models Detect AI Writing in Education." *Journal of Computers in Education* 12, no. 2 (2025): 645-673.
- Dathathri, Sumanth, Abigail See, Sumedh Ghaisas, Po-Sen Huang, Rob McAdam, Johannes Welbl, Vandana Bachani et al. "Scalable watermarking for identifying large language model outputs." *Nature* 634, no. 8035 (2024): 818-823;
- DUANE, AIDAN. "A Study TO MEASURE THE POTENTIAL IMPACT OF GENERATIVE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE ON ACADEMIC INTEGRITY." *37th Bled eConference Resilience Through Digital Innovation: Enabling the Twin Transition* (2024): 1.
- EU Guidelines for the Responsible Use of Artificial Intelligence for Research, European Union Institute, 2024;
- Fariello, Serena, Giuseppe Fenza, Flavia Forte, Mariacristina Gallo, and Martina Marotta. "Distinguishing Human From Machine: A Review of Advances and Challenges in AI-Generated Text Detection." *International Journal of Interactive Multimedia & Artificial Intelligence* 9, no. 3 (2025).
- Ferrag, Mohamed Amine, Ammar Battah, Norbert Tihanyi, Ridhi Jain, Diana Maimuț, Fatima Alwahedi, Thierry Lestable et al. "Securefalcon: Are we there yet in automated software vulnerability detection with llms?." *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* (2025).
- Guest, O., et al. (2025). *Against the uncritical adoption of "AI" technologies in academia*. Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17065099>
- Gurioli, Andrea, Maurizio Gabbrielli, and Stefano Zacchiroli. "Is This You, LLM? Recognizing AI-Written Programs with Multilingual Code Stylometry." In *2025 IEEE International Conference on Software Analysis, Evolution and Reengineering (SANER)*, 394-405. Piscataway, NJ: IEEE, March 2025.
- Hamerman, Eric J., Anubhav Aggarwal, and Chrissy Martins. "An investigation of generative AI in the classroom and its implications for university policy." *Quality Assurance in Education* (2024)
- Jabarian, Brian, and Alex Imas. "Artificial Writing and Automated Detection." Available at SSRN (2025).
- Kalmani, Vijay H., Amol C. Adamuthe, Arati Premnath Gondil, Vaishnavi Prashant Patil, Riya Amar Kore, and Vaishnavi Mahadev Metkari. "AI vs. Human Writing: Developing a Novel Method for Text Authenticity Detection in Education." (2025).
- Kohen-Vacs, Dan, Maya Usher, and Marc Jansen. "Integrating Generative AI into Programming Education: Student Perceptions and the Challenge of Correcting AI Errors." *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education* (2025): 1-19.
- Kumar, Rahul, and Michael Mindzak. "Who wrote this? Detecting artificial intelligence-generated text from human-written text." *Canadian Perspectives on Academic Integrity* 7, no. 1 (2024).
- Li, Lingyao, Lizhou Fan, Shubham Atreja, and Libby Hemphill. "'HOT' ChatGPT: The promise of ChatGPT in detecting and discriminating hateful, offensive, and toxic comments on social media." *ACM Transactions on the Web* 18, no. 2 (2024): 1-36.
- Luo, Jiahui. "A critical review of GenAI policies in higher education assessment: A call to reconsider the 'originality' of students' work." *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* (2024): 1-14.
- Malik, M. A., & Amjad, A. I. (2025). AI vs AI: How effective are Turnitin, ZeroGPT, GPTZero, and Writer AI in detecting text generated by ChatGPT, Perplexity, and Gemini?. *Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching*, 8(1), 91-101.
- McGrath, Cormac, Alexandra Farazouli, and Teresa Cerratto-Pargman. "Generative AI chatbots in higher education: A review of an emerging research area." *Higher Education* 89, no. 6 (2025): 1533-1549.

- McGrath, Cormac, Alexandra Farazouli, and Teresa Cerratto-Pargman. "Generative AI chatbots in higher education: A review of an emerging research area." *Higher Education* 89, no. 6 (2025): 1533-1549.
- Park, Shinwoo, Hyundong Jin, Jeong-won Cha, and Yo-Sub Han. "Detection of llm-paraphrased code and identification of the responsible llm using coding style features." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.17749* (2025).
- Perkins, M., Roe, J., Postma, D., McGaughran, J., & Hickerson, D. (2024). Detection of GPT-4 generated text in higher education: Combining academic judgement and software to identify generative AI tool misuse. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 22(1), 89-113;
- Perkins, Mike, and Jasper Roe. "Generative AI Tools in Academic Research: Applications and Implications for Qualitative and Quantitative Research Methodologies." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.06872* (2024).
- Perkins, Mike, Jasper Roe, Binh H. Vu, Darius Postma, Don Hickerson, James McGaughran, and Huy Q. Khuat. "Simple techniques to bypass GenAI text detectors: implications for inclusive education." *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education* 21, no. 1 (2023):53;
- Raieli, Salvatore, and Gabriele Iuculano. *Building AI Agents with LLMs, RAG, and Knowledge Graphs: A practical guide to autonomous and modern AI agents*. Packt Publishing Ltd, 2025.
- Rios, Shannon, Yu Zhang, and Eduardo Oliveira. "Authorship Verification in software engineering education: Forget ChatGPT and focus on students' academic writing profiles." *ASCILITE Publications* (2023): 195-204.
- Roberts, Laura Weiss. "Addressing the Novel Implications of Generative AI for Academic Publishing, Education, and Research." *Academic Medicine* 99, no. 5 (2024): 471-473.
- Russell, Joe, Malgorzata Karpinska, and Mohit Iyyer. "People Who Frequently Use ChatGPT for Writing Tasks Are Accurate and Robust Detectors of AI-Generated Text." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.15654* (2025). <https://arxiv.org/abs/2501.15654>.
- Sadasivan, Vinu Sankar, Aounon Kumar, Sriram Balasubramanian, Wenxiao Wang, and Soheil Feizi. "Can AI-generated text be reliably detected? stress testing AI text detectors under various attacks." *Transactions on Machine Learning Research* (2025).
- Silva, Julio CMC, Rafael P. Gouveia, Kallil MC Zielinski, Maria Cristina F. Oliveira, Diego R. Amancio, Odemir M. Bruno, and Osvaldo N. Oliveira Jr. "AI-Assisted Tools for Scientific Review Writing: Opportunities and Cautions." *ACS Applied Materials & Interfaces* (2025).
- Uzun, Levent. "ChatGPT and academic integrity concerns: Detecting artificial intelligence generated content." *Language Education and Technology* 3, no. 1 (2023).
- Van Wyk, Micheal M. "Is ChatGPT an opportunity or a threat? Preventive strategies employed by academics related to a GenAI-based LLM at a faculty of education." *Journal of applied learning and teaching* 7, no. 1 (2024).
- Walters, William H. "The effectiveness of software designed to detect AI-generated writing: A comparison of 16 AI text detectors." *Open Information Science* 7, no. 1 (2023): 20220158.
- Weber-Wulff, Debora, Alla Anohina-Naumeca, Sonja Bjelobaba, Tomáš Foltýnek, Jean Guerrero-Dib, Olumide Popoola, Petr Šigut, and Lorna Waddington. "Testing of detection tools for AI-generated text." *International Journal for Educational Integrity* 19, no. 1 (2023): 26.
- Wu J, Yang S, Zhan R, Yuan Y, Chao LS, Wong DF. A survey on llm-generated text detection: Necessity, methods, and future directions. *Computational Linguistics*. 2025 Mar 15;51(1):275-338.
- Xu, Xiaodan, Chao Ni, Xinrong Guo, Shaoxuan Liu, Xiaoya Wang, Kui Liu, and Xiaohu Yang. "Distinguishing llm-generated from human-written code by contrastive learning." *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology* 34, no. 4 (2025): 1-31.
- Yusuf, Abdullahi, Nasrin Pervin, and Marcos Román-González. "Generative AI and the future of higher education: a threat to academic integrity or reformation? Evidence from multicultural perspectives." *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education* 21, no. 1 (2024): 21