Högskolepedagogiska texter, Enheten för pedagogisk utveckling och interaktivt lärande (PIL), Göteborgs universitet November 2026, www.pil.gu.se/publicerat/texter

Teaching with Wikipedia in the age of generative AI

Netha Hussain

Abstract

The Wikipedia Education Program integrates open-knowledge production with higher education pedagogy, asking university students to create or improve Wikipedia articles instead of writing traditional assignments. While this approach has been valued as an authentic assessment, the rapid rise of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) has disrupted the conditions under which it operates. No guidelines currently address the specific intersection of GenAI and Wikipedia Education Programs. This conceptual paper, therefore, asks: What guidelines can responsibly govern the use of GenAI within Wikipedia Education Programs so that both students' learning outcomes and the integrity of Wikipedia are preserved? Drawing on educational research, informal consultations with educators and members of the Wikimedia community, Wikipedia community policies, programmatic reports from Wiki Education, and the author's experience as a long-standing Wikipedia editor, the author synthesizes these sources into a conceptual paper in from which a set of practical recommendations is derived in four interconnected themes: transparency and disclosure, responsible use boundaries, AI literacy development, and quality assurance mechanisms. It aims to support educators, institutions, students, and the Wikipedia community in navigating GenAI in ways that protect both learning and open knowledge.

Introduction

The Wikipedia Education Program, established in 2010, is an initiative that integrates open knowledge production with higher education pedagogy (1). Through this program, university instructors assign their students to create or improve Wikipedia articles on course-related topics, thereby replacing traditional assignments with contributions to Wikipedia (2). The program operates through partnerships among educators, universities, and Wikimedia entities such as the Wiki Education Foundation, Wikimedia chapters worldwide, and the broader community of volunteer Wikipedia editors (1).

A typical Wikipedia assignment spans several weeks and is often done as part of STEM and humanities courses at higher education institutions. Students first complete short training modules on Wikipedia's policies. They then select a topic, usually an underdeveloped article within the course theme, and compile a bibliography of reliable sources. Next, they draft their contribution in a personal "sandbox" page, receive feedback from peers, the instructor, and sometimes experienced Wikipedia editors, and iteratively revise their draft. Finally, they move their work into the live Wikipedia article space, where it becomes visible to millions of readers and subject to continued community editing. Assessment typically combines reviews

of the student's revisions, their engagement with feedback, and the quality of the final published article against Wikipedia's content standards (3). Since its inception, more than 152,000 students have participated in Wikipedia Programs globally, contributing over 125 million words to Wikipedia across multiple languages (2).

Pedagogically, these assignments serve as authentic assessments, a higher education concept that describes tasks that mirror the real-world application of students' knowledge, skills, and attitudes (3). The underlying pedagogical model is constructivist, in which students build knowledge by actively participating in an existing community of practice rather than producing documents solely for grading. It is also collaborative and sociocultural, as students become active participants in community knowledge-building. Participants in Wikipedia Education Programs are known to develop skills in research, writing, critical analysis, and information literacy (4). The public-facing nature of their work motivates deeper engagement with sources and encourages attention to neutrality and verifiability (including proper citation practices), all of which are values central to higher education (3). Moreover, the collaborative editing environment of Wikipedia fosters collaborative learning by introducing students to open peer-review processes from actors around the world, in ways that traditional coursework cannot replicate (5-7). Participants in Wikipedia Education Programs have also rated these assignments as engaging, inspiring, community-oriented, and positive learning experiences (8).

However, the emergence of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI), particularly large language models (LLMs), has fundamentally altered the landscape in which Wikipedia Education Programs operate. These tools can produce fluent, coherent, and convincing text on virtually any subject, and AI-generated content on Wikipedia has been rising as a result (9). Yet these tools also raise questions about authorship, originality, accuracy, and integrity, concerns that apply to any academic work, including the encyclopedic content created as part of Wikipedia Education Programs. This challenge is particularly unique, given that Wikipedia Education Programs must operate in an environment where participants' content is subject to both their university's academic integrity policies and Wikipedia's community-developed content policies and guidelines.

This is a conceptual paper that includes a literature review and a summary of exploratory conversations about generative AI in Wikipedia Education Programs to derive recommendations for course leaders and the Wikipedia community on how to approach GenAI when designing their educational programs. The novelty of this study is its bidirectionality: it explores the use of GenAI in Wikipedia Education Programs in two directions: towards students' own learning and towards the public knowledge on Wikipedia. This paper addresses the educational and encyclopedic aspects of the Wikipedia Education Program simultaneously, through the lens of GenAI.

Research Design

To address this aim, the paper combines two complementary sources of information. The first is a review of the literature on generative AI in Wikipedia Education Programs, together with programmatic reports from Wiki Education. The second is a series of information-gathering

conversations with practitioners in higher education and the Wikimedia community, aimed at understanding the current landscape from their perspectives and identifying what they find lacking in terms of resources.

First, relevant literature was found using combinations of search terms such as ‘generative AI’, ‘Wikipedia Education Program’, ‘Wikipedia in the classroom’, ‘large language models. Second, Wikipedia community policies regarding the use of generative AI on the English Wikipedia were examined (10-13). Third, programmatic reports from Wiki Education, including data on AI detection & student behaviour, were also referred (14).

The author, as a volunteer editor on Wikipedia for the last 16 years, a reviewer for past Education Programs, and familiar with various Education Programs and their course leaders, also drew on this perspective to synthesize the findings, primarily regarding Wikipedia’s policies and practices concerning Gen AI. These included conversations with an educator at the University of Gothenburg who designs and leads an educational program; participation at WikiCredCon 2026 (a conference for brainstorming ways to increase the credibility of Wikipedia, with sessions dedicated to GenAI in Wikipedia Education Programs); informal exchanges at the same conference; two monthly meetings of Wikipedia volunteers where GenAI was discussed; and online, one-to-one discussions with one Wikipedian and one course leader. These one-to-one consultations were exploratory and collegial rather than structured research interviews; no conversations were recorded, and no individuals were identified in the meeting notes. Their purpose was to test the relevance of themes that emerged from the literature review, to surface practical concerns in the field, and to triangulate the author’s experiences with those of similar practitioners.

Review of existing literature

Because GenAI became widely used only around 2022, the literature search yielded very little existing literature in this area, aside from material published by the Wiki Education Foundation. Wiki Education, the organization that supports Wikipedia Education Programs, has reported a 5% increase in AI-generated text among student contributions since the launch of ChatGPT (15). A 2026 study showed that the rate of increase in adoption of generative AI is 3.8% per academic term, with adoption rates as high as 20% in the spring term of 2025 (16). This trend mirrors broader patterns in higher education, where studies indicate that 88% of students now use AI tools in some capacity (17), and institutions worldwide are developing policies to address GenAI integration by emphasizing academic integrity and adapting teaching and learning practices to accommodate it (18). Despite these developments, no guidelines specifically addressing the use of generative AI within Wikipedia Education Programs have yet been proposed to the best of the author’s knowledge.

The Wiki Education Foundation has offered some broad suggestions, such as equipping course leaders to flag suspicious AI-generated drafts with poor-quality content, providing training modules to offer clearer guidance to students, and prompting new Wikipedians to start with a list of sources rather than relying on GenAI to create content(15). Apart from these, existing research on GenAI in higher education tends to focus on classroom assessments (18, 19) or on AI literacy more broadly (20), while research on Wikipedia

education has concentrated on learning outcomes (4, 8) or on the social and pedagogical dimensions of Wikipedia Education Programs without concerning itself with GenAI (3). The existing literature thus offers little direct guidance on the questions this paper takes up.

The English Wikipedia community, comprising volunteer editors from all over the world, has responded to the rise of generative AI through a series of community-driven policy developments. As of the time of writing, Wikipedia has adopted guidelines allowing the speedy deletion of articles written with LLMs without human review (21). Editors who incorporate LLM output are expected to disclose this in their edit summaries, identifying the specific tool and where possible, its version (11). The WikiProject AI Cleanup, a Wikipedia community-driven initiative formed in 2023, has emerged as a dedicated project to identify and remediate poor-quality AI-generated content (22).

At the programmatic level, the author drew on the Wiki Education Foundation's programmatic reports. A central measure described there is the implementation of the Pangram detection tool, which offers a useful starting point for identifying poorly written AI-generated content. The tool has been proven accurate by human review, with relatively few false positives on Wikipedia text, and has flagged 178 articles out of the 3,078 created since 2022 as containing AI-generated text (15). The organisation has also introduced automated email alerts to participants whose contributions are detected as likely poor-quality AI-generated text, generating 1,406 such alerts in the second half of 2025 (15). Importantly, the majority of detections (78%) occurred in sandboxes (spaces where students write draft articles) during early exercises, rather than in published articles, suggesting that students use AI-generated drafts in early stages and probably rewrite them as they progress through the article-writing process.

Synthesis of practitioner perspectives

This section turns to the second source of information: the practitioners. In the data collected from educators and Wikipedia editors, there was broad consensus among practitioners that not all uses of generative AI should be regarded as problematic within the Wikipedia Education Program, a view echoed in the higher-education literature. As the literature emphasizes, the fundamental question regarding responsible use is not whether students use GenAI, but whether the intended learning outcomes of the assessment are preserved and whether the Wikipedia Education Program avoids introducing low-quality AI-generated content into Wikipedia articles. (23-25).

The concerns raised in the conversations with the practitioners were grouped into four issues, each of which informed one of the recommendation themes given in the next section. The most frequently raised issue by practitioners was visibility. Course leaders and Wikimedians alike described considerable uncertainty about whether, and to what extent, their students had drawn on generative AI. This concern pointed toward the first issue of the conceptual paper: transparency and disclosure.

A second issue was the absence of a shared understanding of which uses of GenAI are acceptable within a Wikipedia Education Program. Practitioners noted that they lacked

specific guidance, from either Wikipedia or their institutions, for navigating this ambiguity. This consideration gave rise to the second theme, responsible use boundaries.

A third issue concerned the judicious use of AI rather than its outright prohibition. There was broad agreement that banning AI is neither realistic nor educationally productive, and that students should instead be equipped to evaluate AI-generated output critically and to deploy these tools judiciously in their work. This led to the theme of AI literacy.

Finally, practitioners and Wikimedians raised the issue about quality. They highlighted the need to prevent AI-assisted contributions from degrading the encyclopedic content that students publish, as well as the value of detection tools and staged review. This led to the final theme, quality assurance mechanisms.

Additional themes, such as privacy and intellectual property, were considered but not included as separate themes because they are relevant to all four themes and were treated as horizontal concerns that spanned the existing themes.

Pedagogical recommendations

Based on the literature review and the conversations with practitioners, four major themes emerged for recommendations to course leaders and Wikipedians: transparency and disclosure, responsible use boundaries, AI literacy, and quality assurance mechanisms. These four selected themes are not independent either. Transparency makes the boundaries for responsible use enforceable by giving instructors and the Wikipedia community visibility into how AI was used. AI literacy equips students to make transparent and responsible choices in the first place. Quality assurance can only be ensured when the other three themes are taken into consideration. Weakness in any one dimension undermines the others: without transparency, AI use boundaries cannot be safeguarded; without AI literacy, disclosure becomes mechanical rather than meaningful; without quality assurance, well-intentioned policies fail.

Transparency and Disclosure

This paper proposes transparency as the most important attribute for sustainably assessing pedagogy in the context of the Wikipedia Education Program, central to both academic integrity and Wikipedia's community norms. The transparency principle should operate at multiple levels.

At the individual edit level, students must disclose any use of generative AI in their Wikipedia edit summaries, consistent with community expectations. As noted in the literature review, Wikipedia's existing guidelines recommend that every edit incorporating LLM output be marked as LLM-assisted in the edit summary, identifying the specific tool and, where possible, its version (11). This requirement should be explicitly incorporated into Wikipedia Education Program assignment designs and communicated to students from the start of the course.

At the assignment level, students should document their use of AI tools by providing a brief description of how GenAI content was incorporated into their work. This documentation serves both pedagogical and accountability functions, encouraging students to reflect on their own thinking process while providing instructors with evidence for authentic work. The documentation can be structured as a small checklist, a questionnaire, or a reflective essay, and submitted iteratively at different stages of the assignment. This method also draws on Kolb's experiential learning cycle, which includes reflective observation as one of its stages (26).

At the course level, instructors should include an AI use policy statement in their syllabus, specifying permitted and prohibited uses of generative AI, along with disclosure obligations. This statement should align with both the institution's academic integrity policy and Wikipedia's community guidelines. Frameworks such as the Artificial Intelligence Assessment Scale (27) could be readily adapted for Wikipedia Education Program contexts to provide the clarity that both students and instructors need.

Research on AI use declarations suggests that non-compliance is widespread, driven by fear of academic repercussions, ambiguous guidelines, inconsistent enforcement, and peer influence (28). The Wikipedia Education Program context may partially mitigate these barriers, as Wikipedia's culture of openness, where all edits are publicly logged and attribution is a fundamental norm, provides a natural framework for disclosure. Nevertheless, the author advocates that universities must ensure that students are provided with a safe and supportive environment for disclosure, one in which honesty does not invite punitive consequences. When course leaders are transparent and committed to creating a safe space for honest engagement, students are more likely to embrace transparency themselves, creating a virtuous cycle of disclosure and trust that benefits both the educational and encyclopedic dimensions of the Wikipedia Education Program.

Responsible Use Boundaries

Drawing on this principle, the author recommends that course leaders and Wikimedians should distinguish between permissible, conditional, and prohibited uses to preserve intended learning outcomes.

Permissible uses of GenAI should include those that support the writing process without replacing the student's authentic intellectual engagement. GenAI may be appropriately used for brainstorming article topics and identifying content gaps, generating initial search terms for literature discovery, checking grammar and syntax, and learning about unfamiliar concepts during the research phase (15). In Wiki Education's survey of students using AI in these supported ways, 87% reported finding the tools helpful (15).

Conditional uses, those permitted under specific circumstances with appropriate disclosure, might include using AI to summarize source materials as an aid to comprehension (with the student subsequently verifying the summary against the original), using AI to suggest structural improvements to draft text, and using AI for translation assistance when working with non-English sources.

Prohibited uses should include all applications where AI replaces the core intellectual work and undermines the intended learning outcomes that the assignment is designed to develop. This includes using AI to generate article text presented as the student's original writing, fabricating citations, generating peer-review feedback without insight, and submitting AI-generated drafts directly to Wikipedia without substantial human revision or verification. It also includes uses that create the final assignment by bypassing the learning process, such as relying completely on AI-generated summaries instead of genuinely understanding the sources and delegating the selection and evaluation of sources completely to AI. These prohibitions align directly with Wikipedia's existing policies that prohibit adding AI-generated text without human review (11).

Institutional policies can differ across institutions and, within institutions, within faculties. There are substantial disparities in the knowledge, usage intentions, and engagement with GenAI among University students (19). Hence, the author proposes that each institution/faculty develop its own policies on permissible, conditional, and prohibited uses of Wikipedia Education Programs, based on the broader use-case policies on Wikipedia. The author suspects that, in the long term, as the potential of gen AI tools stabilizes, institutional policies are likely to converge, as happened with plagiarism-related policies.

AI Literacy Development

AI literacy, broadly regarded as the ability to understand and critically evaluate AI tools, is being increasingly recognized in higher education as an essential skill (20). The author believes that Wikipedia Education Programs are uniquely positioned to develop AI literacy, as their emphasis on verifiability, reliable sourcing, and a neutral point of view provides a natural set of evaluative criteria against which AI-generated content can be assessed, and the recommendations that follow aim to leverage these criteria.

AI literacy within the Wikipedia Education Program context should encompass several dimensions. First, students should develop a foundational understanding of GenAI, including that even when these tools cite sources or appear to look things up, their synthesis is generated rather than verified, and the reasoning behind it is not openly auditable in the way Wikipedia's edit histories and talk pages are. Second, students should learn to identify the characteristic markers of poorly written AI-generated text, including hallucinated citations, information-dense but vague prose, overuse of specific transitional phrases, and formatting inconsistencies. Wikipedia's "Signs of AI writing" guide, developed in 2025 and continuously expanded since, provides a practical resource for this training (29). Third, wherever feasible, students should engage in structured exercises that directly compare AI-generated content with properly researched, human-written Wikipedia text. The author acknowledges that designing such exercises presents challenges, given the rapidly evolving capabilities and proliferating variety of AI tools. Nevertheless, providing students with opportunities to evaluate AI output against Wikipedia's content standards critically remains imperative for Wikipedia Education Programs.

Furthermore, students should develop an awareness of the broader societal implications of AI-generated content on open knowledge platforms. Brooks et al. found that approximately

5% of new Wikipedia articles contained AI-generated content (9), and the Wikimedia Foundation's reporting of declining human readership of Wikipedia (30) indicates the urgency of incorporating these discussions into the curriculum of Wikipedia Education Programs. Students should be encouraged to recognize that the societal impacts of generative AI on open knowledge are still unfolding and to engage critically with these developments beyond the duration of their course. Wikipedia offers a distinctive advantage in this regard: its publicly available tools for tracking edit histories and content quality metrics enable students to observe the real-world impact of their own contributions and the evolution of any of Wikipedia's AI-related policies over time. By introducing students to these tools, the Wikipedia Education Program can likely engage them in conversations about GenAI that extend beyond the formal program period.

Quality Assurance Mechanisms

This section recommends the practical mechanisms needed to ensure that the use of generative AI does not degrade the quality of student contributions to Wikipedia. The author argues that quality assurance in this context must operate at both the programmatic and the individual contribution levels.

At the individual contribution level, the guidelines should require students to verify every factual claim and citation in their Wikipedia contributions. Wikipedia's existing standards for verifiability and reliable sourcing provide the necessary benchmarks for such an exercise. Students should be trained to cross-reference all cited sources against the actual source material, verify facts against high-quality sources, and ensure that the article's narrative accurately represents the balance of views in the source literature. These verification practices should be treated as non-negotiable elements of the assignment, forming a core assessment criterion for content quality.

Instructors should also consider implementing staged review processes, in which student drafts are reviewed by peers, the instructor, or a teaching assistant, and/or experienced Wikipedia editors before publication. This multi-layered review system serves as both a quality assurance mechanism and a pedagogical tool, ensuring that students receive diverse perspectives about their work while minimizing the chances of inadvertent errors.

Discussion

The same features that make Wikipedia assignments pedagogically valuable also make them uniquely vulnerable to GenAI. When students delegate text to GenAI, they simultaneously undermine two things: the learning process the assignment is designed for, and the integrity of a public knowledge resource, Wikipedia. This dual consequence differs from traditional assignments, where the damage from AI misuse is confined to the individual student's assessment.

The boundary between permissible (example: brainstorming article topics) and prohibitive (example: generating draft article text) uses of GenAI can often be blurry. This paper addresses this ambiguity through transparency: by requiring students to document how they

used AI and the assessment, resulting in a more nuanced, qualitative assessment of the student's contribution, rather than just AI/no AI.

Pangram, as good a detection tool as it is, should only be embedded within a supportive pedagogical framework, treating it as an assistive tool rather than a surveillance tool. This paper attempts to position detection of poorly written AI content as one element within the broader system, alongside transparency norms, AI literacy development, and quality assurance. It is, however, unclear if this is a long-term viable solution, because as large language models improve rapidly, the distinguishability between AI-generated and human-written text may close or even vanish altogether.

This conceptual paper acknowledges that the appropriate boundaries for GenAI use differ across disciplines and does not prescribe specific boundaries for specific fields. A prescriptory approach to specific boundaries is not possible. Still, it should be left to individual instructors to interpret the recommendations in light of their disciplinary norms, the students' prior knowledge, the course's specific learning outcomes, and institutional policies. Future work could develop discipline-specific recommendations for GenAI integration, but the author believes it is too early, given the rapid pace of GenAI development.

A potential gap exists between Wikipedia's community policies on GenAI and students' comprehension of the rationale behind those policies. The English Wikipedia community has adopted a cautious stance toward AI-generated content, driven primarily by concerns that such content undermines the encyclopedia's standards of verifiability and reliable sourcing and by unresolved questions regarding the intellectual ownership and attribution of GenAI-produced text. Students are more likely to comply with Wikipedia's norms that they perceive as legitimate and well-reasoned than with rules experienced as arbitrary or externally imposed. Wikipedia Education Programs should therefore invest not only in communicating the rules governing GenAI use but in helping students understand the evidentiary foundations of Wikipedia's stance.

Finally, Wikipedia is experiencing declining pageviews since the advent of GenAI (30). If fewer human readers read Wikipedia, fewer volunteers may be available to detect and remediate problematic content, creating a feedback loop in which declining engagement enables declining quality. Wikipedia Education Programs, by introducing thousands of new editors each year and equipping them with verification skills and AI literacy, may be one of the best scalable interventions to counteract this trend. Conceptual papers such as the one proposed here, and their continued expansion and adaptation as generative AI evolves, are therefore important both for ensuring that students derive the full educational benefit of their participation in Wikipedia Education Programs and for safeguarding the integrity of the world's largest open knowledge resource.

Limitations

This study is not without limitations. First, the rapid pace of change in generative AI technology means that the evidence base may evolve significantly in a matter of a few

months. Second, the programmatic data for the studies included in this paper from Wiki Education primarily reflect U.S. and Canadian contexts, which may limit the generalizability of findings to other program settings, particularly educational environments in the Global South and those using non-English languages. Excluding non-English literature will also omit several perspectives. Third, this is a small study with a limited timeframe; therefore, not all data sources can be analysed in depth, and only the main publications will be examined.

Ethical considerations

The paper cites aggregated programmatic data from Wiki Education. However, no individual students, editors, or instructors were identified. No ethics approval was required as this is a conceptual paper drawing on published literature and publicly available policy documents, with no primary data collection from human participants.

Generative AI disclosure

The author used Claude (Anthropic, Claude Opus 4.6) as an assistive tool during the preparation of this manuscript. Specifically, the tool was used to refine academic language and phrasing, as well as to generate bibliographic records in RIS format. All substantive arguments, analyses, and conclusions are the author's own. All AI-generated text was reviewed, edited, and verified by the author before inclusion. The author assumes full responsibility for the accuracy and integrity of the published work.

References

1. Wikipedia Education Program: Wiki Edu Foundation; 2024 [Available from: https://meta.wikimedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia_Education_Program.
2. Impact of Wikipedia Education Program: Wiki Education; 2026 [Available from: https://wikiedu.org/impact/.
3. Davis LL, Sigalov SE, Maljković F, Peschanski JA. The Wikipedia Education Program as Open Educational Practice: Global Stories. In: Olivier J, Rambow A, editors. Open Educational Resources in Higher Education: A Global Perspective. Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore; 2023. p. 251-78.
4. Vetter MA, McDowell ZJ, Stewart M. From Opportunities to Outcomes: The Wikipedia-Based Writing Assignment. Computers and Composition. 2019;52:53-64.
5. Suggestions and guidelines for creating Wikipedia assignments: University of Pennsylvania; 2024 [Available from: https://guides.library.upenn.edu/wikipedia-assignments.
6. Alcazar C, Bucio J, Ferrante L. Wikipedia Education Program in higher education settings: Actions and lessons learned from four specific cases in Mexico and Argentina. Páginas de Educación. 2018;11:23-36.
7. Schlesner Alves E, Stephenson D, Terán JE. Enhancing Learning Through Open-Access Contributions: Evaluating the Educational Value of Wikipedia-Based Assignments. Journal for STEM Education Research. 2025.
8. Evenstein Sigalov S, Cohen A, Nachmias R. Transforming higher education: a decade of integrating wikipedia and wikidata for literacy enhancement and social impact. Journal of Computers in Education. 2025;12(3):953-95.

9. Brooks C, Eggert S, Peskoff D. The rise of AI-generated content in Wikipedia. arXiv preprint arXiv:241008044. 2024.
10. Wikipedia. Artificial intelligence in Wikimedia projects 2025 [Available from: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Artificial_intelligence_in_Wikimedia_projects.
11. Wikipedia. Wikipedia:Large language models 2025 [Available from: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Large_language_models.
12. Wikipedia. Wikipedia:Writing articles with large language models 2025 [Available from: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Writing_articles_with_large_language_models.
13. Wikipedia. Wikipedia:Artificial intelligence 2025 [Available from: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Artificial_intelligence.
14. Programs & Events Dashboard: Wiki Education / Wikimedia Cloud Services; 2016 [Available from: https://outreachdashboard.wmflabs.org/explore.
15. Davis L. Wiki Education. 2026 2026/01/29/. Available from: https://wikiedu.org/blog/2026/01/29/generative-ai-and-wikipedia-editing-what-we-learned-in-2025/.
16. Salvi F, Ross S, Cummings RE, Horta Ribeiro M. The Impact of LLM Adoption on Student Writing: Lessons from Wikipedia Assignments. Wiki Workshop 2026 (13th edition); March 25-26, 20262026.
17. Freeman J. Student Generative AI Survey 2025. Oxford: Higher Education Policy Institute (HEPI); 2025 2025/02/26/. Contract No.: Policy Note 61.
18. Jin Y, Yan L, Echeverria V, Gašević D, Martinez-Maldonado R. Generative AI in higher education: A global perspective of institutional adoption policies and guidelines. Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence. 2025;8:100348.
19. Qu Y, Tan MXY, Wang J. Disciplinary differences in undergraduate students' engagement with generative artificial intelligence. Smart Learning Environments. 2024;11(1):51.
20. Yang Y, Zhang Y, Sun D, He W, Wei Y. Navigating the landscape of AI literacy education: insights from a decade of research (2014–2024). Humanities and Social Sciences Communications. 2025;12(1):374.
21. Wikipedia:Speedy deletion - G15. LLM-generated pages without human review: Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia; 2025 [Available from: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Speedy_deletion#G15._LLM-generated_pages_without_human_review.
22. Wikipedia:WikiProject AI Cleanup: Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia; 2025 [Available from: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:WikiProject_AI_Cleanup.
23. Salinas-Navarro DE, Vilalta-Perdomo E, Michel-Villarreal R, Montesinos L. Using Generative Artificial Intelligence Tools to Explain and Enhance Experiential Learning for Authentic Assessment. Education Sciences [Internet]. 2024; 14(1):[83 p.].
24. Temper M, Tjoa S, David L. Higher Education Act for AI (HEAT-AI): A framework to regulate the usage of AI in higher education institutions. Frontiers in Education. 2025;10:1505370.
25. Bhattacharya A. The volunteer Wikipedia army protecting against AI slop. Rest of World. 2026 February 5, 2026.
26. Kolb AY, Kolb DA. Learning Styles and Learning Spaces: Enhancing Experiential Learning in Higher Education. Academy of Management Learning & Education. 2005;4(2):193-212.

27. Perkins M, Furze L, Roe J, MacVaugh J. The Artificial Intelligence Assessment Scale (AIAS): A framework for ethical integration of generative AI in educational assessment. Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice. 2024;21(6).
28. Gonsalves C. Addressing student non-compliance in AI use declarations: implications for academic integrity and assessment in higher education. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education. 2024;50(4):592-606.
29. Wikipedia:Signs of AI writing: Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia; 2025 [updated 2025. Available from: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Signs_of_AI_writing.
30. Wikipedia Reports Traffic Decline as A.I. Changes How Users Seek Information. 2025 2025/10/20/.