"International organizations in promoting academic integrity in a globalized world: Ukrainian view"

AUTHORS	Artem Artyukhov (iD)
	R
	Dmytro Chumachenko (iD)

NUMBER OF REFERENCES	NUMBER OF FIGURES	NUMBER OF TABLES
6	1	2

© Artem Artyukhov, Dmytro
Chumachenko, 2025

Artem Artyukhov, D.Sc, Research
Institute of Trade and Sustainable
Business, Faculty of Commerce,
Bratislava University of Economics
and Business, Slovakia; Department
of Marketing, Academic and Research
Institute of Business, Economics and
Management, Sumy State University,
Ukraine. (Corresponding author)

Dmytro Chumachenko, Ph.D.,
Computer Science and Artificial
Intelligence Lab, Massachusetts
Institute of Technology, USA;
Mathematical Modelling and Artificial
Intelligence Department, National
Aerospace University "Kharkiv Aviation
Institute", Ukraine.

Artem Artyukhov (Slovakia, Ukraine), **Dmytro Chumachenko** (USA, Ukraine)

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS IN PROMOTING ACADEMIC INTEGRITY IN A GLOBALIZED WORLD: UKRAINIAN VIEW

Abstract

This study aims to examine the role of international organizations in promoting academic integrity, analyzing how diverse cultural interpretations of scholarly ethics create challenges for standard consistency across borders and the mechanisms through which international bodies facilitate the coordination and standardization of integrity practices. A comparative approach examines academic integrity across different jurisdictions and cultural contexts, a multi-level analytical framework understands the organizational structure of academic integrity governance, and illustrative case studies demonstrate practical applications. The analysis identifies five interconnected components of academic integrity: educational, research, managerial, professional association, and publishing integrity. This study reveals a sophisticated five-level hierarchical system of academic integrity governance spanning from international organizations to individual practitioners. International organizations function as collaborative facilitators rather than rigid rule-makers, developing flexible frameworks that can be adapted to diverse cultural contexts while maintaining universal ethical principles. Significant variations exist between national approaches, with some countries implementing comprehensive legislative frameworks while others relying on cultural principles and institutional traditions. International organizations facilitate dialogue and consensus-building that transcends national boundaries while respecting institutional autonomy. The hierarchical governance system demonstrates that academic integrity assurance requires top-down coordination to establish consistent standards and bottom-up commitment to implement those standards. The strength of this system lies in its ability to maintain the universality of core ethical principles while allowing for cultural adaptation in implementation methods, ultimately ensuring that the fundamental commitment to honesty, originality, and fairness in scholarship remains constant regardless of cultural context or geographical location.

Keywords	academic integrity governance, global academic standards, multi-level governance systems, integrity assurance mechanisms
JEL Classification	I23, O31, O38

INTRODUCTION

Imagine a Ukrainian Ph.D. student studying engineering in Germany, collaborating on a research project with peers from Japan and Nigeria, while drawing on sources published by scholars from every continent. This scenario, once the stuff of science fiction, is now an everyday reality in our interconnected world of higher education. Nowadays, the contemporary academic world is characterized by an intricate web of interconnections that both enrich and complicate the pursuit of scholarly excellence. This interconnectedness has created what might be termed a "global academic commons" where knowledge production and dissemination operate according to shared principles while navigating diverse cultural interpretations of concepts such as originality, attribution, and collaborative scholarship.

On the other hand, consider the complexity that Ph.D. students and researchers face. In some cultures, closely paraphrasing a respected text without extensive citation shows proper reverence for established knowledge. This same practice would be labeled plagiarism in another landscape and could end a student's academic career.

The globalization of higher education and science has fundamentally transformed the landscape of academic integrity, creating unprecedented opportunities for knowledge sharing and complex challenges for maintaining scholarly standards across diverse cultural and institutional contexts. As universities expand their international reach through cross-border collaborations, student mobility programs, online education platforms, and transnational research partnerships, the need for coherent, universally applicable frameworks for academic integrity has become increasingly apparent. Within this evolving environment, international organizations have emerged as critical actors in establishing norms, facilitating dialogue, and promoting best practices that transcend national boundaries and institutional silos.

1. BACKGROUND

Let us return to the case of Ukraine. In Ukrainian legislation, academic integrity issues are currently regulated by Article 42 of the Law of Ukraine On Education (Legislation of Ukraine, 2017). This article provides a list of violations of academic integrity:

1) Academic plagiarism – the publication (partially or entirely) of scientific (creative) results obtained by other persons as the results of one's own research (creativity) and/or the reproduction of published texts (published works of art) by other authors without indicating authorship.

2) Self-plagiarism – the publication (partially or entirely) of one's own previously published scientific results as new scientific results.

3) Fabrication – inventing data or facts used in the educational process or scientific research.

4) Falsification – intentional alteration or modification of existing data related to the educational process or scientific research.

5) Cheating – performing written assignments using external sources of information other than those permitted, particularly during learning outcomes assessment.

6) Deception – providing knowingly false information regarding one's own educational (scientific, creative) activity or the organization of the educational process; forms of deception include, but are not limited to, academic plagiarism, self-plagiarism, fabrication, falsification, and cheating (copying).

7) Bribery – providing (receiving) by a participant in the educational process or an offer to provide (receive) money, property, services, benefits, or any other material or non-material goods to gain an undue advantage in the educational process.

8) Biased assessment/Subjective grading – intentionally inflating or deflating the assessment of students' learning outcomes.

This list is exhaustive. Thus, everything not prohibited by this law is permitted in the Ukrainian educational and scientific landscape.

Now, let us examine the European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity from ALLEA (ALLEA, 2023). This code, in addition to the traditional approach to violations of academic integrity (research misconduct is traditionally defined as fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism (the so-called FFP categorization)), also describes other unacceptable practices, such as:

1) Manipulating authorship or denigrating the role of other researchers in publications.

2) Establishing, supporting, or deliberately using journals, publishers, events, or services that undermine the quality of research ("predatory" journals or conferences and paper mills).

3) Participating in cartels of reviewers and authors colluding to review each other's publications.

4) Accusing a researcher of misconduct or other violations in a malicious way.

5) Ignoring putative violations of research integrity by others or covering up inappropriate responses to misconduct or other institutional violations.

Thus, this simple example can show the distinctions between documents of different levels in terms of formalism and the level of recommendations' "internationality."

Other case is the National Code of Research Integrity in Peru (Gob.pe, 2024), among other things, which defines such unacceptable practice: Authorship buying: this is research misconduct that involves purchasing the position of author or co-author of a scientific article by someone who was not involved in the research reported in the article. This violation is also absent from Ukrainian legislation.

In the context of cultural differences in the perception of the principles of academic integrity, one example that is described in the work (Wang et al., 2021) should be given.

Guanxi, a deeply ingrained cultural concept in Chinese society, plays a significant role in influencing academic dishonesty, particularly collaborative cheating. More complex than a simple relationship, *Guanxi* represents a personal connection involving exchange and resources, often emphasizing group-oriented goals and cooperation over individual competition. This collectivistic value can lead to academic problems, such as collaborative cheating, where individuals or groups deliberately assist each other in academic practices that are formally required to be completed individually. Younger generations in China reportedly emphasize *Guanxi*, which can lead to unethical academic issues, as students leverage friendships to gain higher scores or demonstrate loyalty by helping friends cheat, often justifying their actions and neutralizing feelings of shame or guilt.

What should a teacher, a scientist, or a student do when local law or culture allows them to "cross" boundaries? After all, they may not be aware that other rules are common to everyone, regardless of their country.

This is where international organizations step in, not as rigid rule-makers, but as bridges connecting educators and researchers across continents in a shared commitment to academic excellence.

At the foundational level, national and institutional bodies are responsible for setting and enforcing academic integrity standards within their specific contexts. These include university integrity offices, national research ethics committees, and governmental agencies overseeing research funding and conduct. Their primary role is to establish codes of conduct, provide education and training for students and researchers, investigate alleged integrity breaches, and implement disciplinary actions. They operate at the direct interface with individual researchers and academic units, forming the first line of defense for maintaining ethical scholarly practices. Their policies and guidelines are often tailored to their respective countries or institutions' specific legal, cultural, and educational frameworks.

Building upon this foundation are regional and specialized professional organizations that aim to harmonize standards and promote best practices across a broader geographical area or within specific disciplines. These bodies often develop more detailed codes of conduct, offer workshops and conferences, and facilitate networking among integrity practitioners. They synthesize lessons from national and institutional experiences, fostering a shared understanding of integrity challenges and solutions within their purview. Their work complements the national efforts by providing a platform for collaboration, mutual learning, and the development of consensus on issues that transcend individual institutional boundaries, ensuring a more consistent approach to academic integrity within their region or field (Foltynek et al., 2023; Fishman, 2024).

At the apex are global platforms and intergovernmental organizations that work to establish overarching principles and facilitate internation-

al cooperation on academic integrity. These entities typically convene stakeholders worldwide, including policymakers, funding agencies, research institutions, and academic associations, to discuss universal challenges, formulate global statements, and encourage the adoption of common ethical frameworks. Their influence stems from their ability to foster dialogue, build consensus on fundamental principles, and disseminate widely recognized guidelines that regional and national bodies can adapt. They serve as crucial catalysts for a unified global approach to academic integrity, recognizing that research is increasingly international and requires shared values to ensure its trustworthiness and credibility across borders.

The "beauty" of international organizations lies in their unique position as facilitators rather than enforcers. Unlike government agencies that create binding laws, these organizations serve as trusted advisors, offering carefully researched recommendations while respecting each institution's autonomy to implement them. Think of them as experienced guides who share maps and wisdom with fellow travelers, but let each person choose their own path up the mountain.

This collaborative approach makes perfect sense when considering the diverse landscape of academic integrity worldwide. Some countries have detailed national legislation governing academic misconduct, with specific penalties and procedures. Others operate with minimal formal regulations, relying instead on deeply ingrained cultural principles and institutional traditions.

Surprisingly, many countries function effectively without extensive legislative frameworks for academic integrity. What matters more than laws on paper is a genuine understanding of why academic honesty matters. Formal regulations become secondary when educators and students embrace zero tolerance for dishonesty (not because they fear punishment, but because they value truth and fairness). International organizations recognize this reality, focusing on building understanding rather than pushing for uniform legal structures.

The value of international recommendations lies in their flexibility. These organizations research what works across different educational systems,

cultural contexts, and institutional settings, then distill their findings into practical guidance. They might recommend specific strategies for preventing plagiarism, suggest approaches for handling misconduct cases, or provide frameworks for teaching academic integrity to students. However, the crucial point is that responsibility for implementation remains squarely with individual teachers and researchers.

This distribution of responsibility reflects a fundamental truth about academic integrity: it cannot be imposed from above but must be embraced from within. International organizations can provide roadmaps, but educators must decide how to navigate their classroom terrain.

Most importantly, international organizations champion the principle that academic integrity should transcend cultural boundaries. While teaching methods and institutional procedures may vary, the fundamental commitment to honesty, originality, and fairness remains constant. Plagiarism is plagiarism, regardless of whether it occurs where collaboration is traditionally valued or individual achievement is emphasized.

This universality does not mean ignoring cultural diversity, quite the opposite. International organizations strive to determine which aspects of academic integrity are universally applicable versus those that necessitate cultural adaptation in their implementation.

1.1. Academic integrity: Types and promotion network

The classification of academic integrity into distinct types (Figure 1) provides a comprehensive and structured understanding of a complex ethical landscape. This classification identifies specific challenges and responsibilities within each domain, enabling institutions and individuals to uphold ethical standards proactively. Moreover, this classification is useful for further establishing a network of organizations that ensures the promotion (and partly controls) of academic integrity at various levels (international, national, and local).

Integrity in education primarily refers to upholding ethical standards in teaching, learning, and

Figure 1. Academic integrity: Main components

assessment processes, ensuring fairness, preventing cheating, and promoting original thought among students and educators. Research integrity focuses on the ethical conduct of scientific and scholarly research, encompassing honest data collection and reporting, proper attribution, and avoiding plagiarism or fabrication. Managerial integrity pertains to ethical leadership and administration within academic institutions, ensuring fair practices in governance, resource allocation, and personnel management. Professional integrity in associations emphasizes the ethical behavior and accountability of individuals and organizations within broader academic or professional bodies, upholding standards of conduct, collegiality, and public trust. Integrity in the publishing process refers to upholding ethical principles and standards throughout every stage of scholarly communication, from submission and peer review to editing, production, and dissemination, ensuring fairness, transparency, and the trustworthiness of published research.

These five blocks are interconnected and mutually reinforcing. A strong foundation of managerial integrity creates an environment conducive to fostering integrity in education and research by establishing clear policies, promoting ethical values, and ensuring fair enforcement of these values. Similarly, ethical conduct in education and research contributes to the overall reputation and

trustworthiness of academic institutions, thereby strengthening professional integrity within these associations. Breaches in one area, such as research misconduct, can damage the integrity of an educational institution and undermine public trust in the entire academic profession, highlighting the holistic nature of academic integrity. They collectively form a comprehensive framework for ethical conduct across all dimensions of academic and professional life.

1.2. Hierarchy of academic integrity types: Organizations and levels

Academic integrity assurance operates through a multi-level hierarchical system from international organizations to local institutions. This hierarchy ensures consistent standards, coordinated enforcement, and comprehensive coverage of academic integrity principles across the global research ecosystem. Appendices A and B show the links to the websites of the organizations and projects listed below.

Level 1 comprises international organizations (global governance). Primary actors (examples) include: United Nations (UN), United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), World Bank, International Association

of Universities (IAU), Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE), World Association of Medical Editors (WAME), European Association of Science Editors (EASE), Council of Science Editors (CSE), Open Access Scholarly Publishing Association (OASPA), Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ), World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO).

Functions and responsibilities are:

1. Standard setting: Develop global frameworks for academic integrity, establish universal principles and ethical guidelines, create international declarations and conventions, and harmonize integrity standards across countries.

2. Policy coordination: Facilitate international cooperation on research ethics, coordinate cross-border integrity initiatives, develop model policies for adoption by member states, and promote best practices sharing.

3. Monitoring and assessment: Conduct global surveys on academic integrity, monitor compliance with international standards, publish comparative reports on integrity practices, and assess the effectiveness of national implementations.

4. Capacity building: Provide technical assistance to developing countries, fund integrity enhancement programs, support international training initiatives, facilitate knowledge exchange networks.

Level 2 encompasses regional organizations (regional coordination). Primary actors (examples) are European Network for Academic Integrity (ENAI), International Center for Academic Integrity (ICAI), European Network of Research Integrity Offices (ENRIO), European Network for Research Ethics and Integrity (ENERI), Amsterdam Center of Expertise for Research Integrity and Open Science (RIOS), Global Academic Integrity Network (GAIN), Council of Europe Platform on Ethics, Transparency and Integrity in Education (ETINED), European Federation of Academies of Sciences and Humanities (ALLEA), European Association for

Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA), Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA), European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD).

Functions and responsibilities include:

1. Regional harmonization: Align regional standards with international frameworks, develop region-specific integrity guidelines, coordinate cross-border academic collaboration, and establish regional quality assurance mechanisms.

2. Resource sharing: Create regional integrity databases and resources, develop joint training programs, share technological solutions and tools, and coordinate regional research on integrity issues.

3. Policy coordination: Facilitate policy dialogue among member countries, develop regional action plans, coordinate responses to regional integrity challenges, and promote regional mobility and recognition agreements.

4. Enforcement cooperation: Share information on integrity violations, coordinate sanctions and penalties, develop mutual recognition of disciplinary actions, and establish regional appeal mechanisms.

Level 3 comprises the national level (policy framework). Primary actors (examples) are government ministries (education, science, research), national research councils, higher education regulatory bodies, national academies of science, and professional licensing boards. Examples in Ukraine include the National Agency for Higher Education Quality Assurance (NAQA), the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine (MESU), and the National Research Foundation of Ukraine (NRFU).

Functions and responsibilities include:

1. Legislative framework: Enact national laws on academic integrity, establish legal penalties for research misconduct, create national oversight bodies, and define institutional responsibilities and liabilities.

2. Policy development: Develop national integrity policies and strategies, set mandatory standards for institutions, establish funding requirements linked to integrity, and create national codes of conduct.

3. Regulatory oversight: License and accredit educational institutions, monitor institutional compliance, conduct national integrity assessments, and enforce sanctions and penalties.

4. Resource allocation: Fund integrity infrastructure development, support national training programs, invest in detection and prevention technologies, and provide financial incentives for compliance.

5. Key mechanisms: National research integrity offices, mandatory institutional integrity policies, government funding requirements, legal frameworks for misconduct prosecution, and national databases of integrity violations.

Level 4 is for the institutional level (implementation). As for 4A: Universities and Higher Education Institutions, the governance structure includes university boards/trustees (strategic oversight), academic senate/council (policy development), research integrity offices (operational implementation), ethics committees (case-by-case review), and student conduct offices (student-focused enforcement). Functions include developing institutional integrity policies, providing mandatory training programs, investigating alleged violations, imposing disciplinary measures, and maintaining integrity databases.

As for 4B: Professional organizations, examples include the American Psychological Association (APA), the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE), the American Medical Association (AMA), and the International Federation of Accountants (IFAC). Functions comprise establishing professional codes of ethics, providing continuing education on integrity, investigating professional misconduct, revoking professional licenses and memberships, and maintaining professional standards.

Concerning 4C: Publishers and journals, examples include Elsevier, Springer Nature, Wiley, SAGE, university presses, society publishers, and open-access platform operators. Functions include implementing peer review standards, utilizing plagiarism detection software, establishing editorial policies, retracting problematic publications, and maintaining publication integrity databases.

As for 4D: Funding organizations, examples comprise the National Science Foundation (NSF) and the National Institutes of Health (NIH). European Research Council (ERC), private foundations, and corporate funders. Functions include setting integrity requirements for funding, monitoring compliance during projects, investigating allegations of misconduct, imposing funding sanctions, and maintaining databases of sanctioned researchers.

Level 5 includes the individual level (direct implementation). Primary actors are faculty members and researchers, students (undergraduate, graduate, doctoral), research staff and support personnel, editorial board members, and peer reviewers. Responsibilities include adhering to integrity principles in daily practice, reporting suspected violations, participating in training and education, serving on integrity committees, and mentoring others in ethical conduct.

The academic integrity assurance system operates as a comprehensive, multi-level, hierarchical framework demonstrating the interconnected nature of maintaining research and educational standards across the global academic ecosystem. This system illustrates how integrity governance is applied through broad international principles to individual daily practices, creating a cascade of responsibility and accountability that ensures the consistent implementation of ethical standards worldwide.

At its foundation, the system recognizes that academic integrity cannot be effectively maintained through isolated efforts but requires co-ordinated action across multiple organizational levels. International organizations establish the overarching frameworks and universal principles, while regional bodies adapt these standards to specific geographic and cultural contexts. National governments then translate these frameworks into

legislative and policy structures that create legally binding requirements and enforcement mechanisms within their jurisdictions.

The institutional level represents the critical implementation layer where abstract policies become concrete practices. Universities, professional organizations, publishers, and funding bodies play distinct but complementary roles in operationalizing integrity standards. This distributed approach ensures that integrity considerations are embedded throughout the research and publication lifecycle, from initial funding decisions through peer review, publication, and professional recognition.

The individual level completes the hierarchy by placing ultimate responsibility on the researchers, students, and academic professionals who conduct the daily work of scholarship. This personal accountability creates the foundation upon which all higher-level structures depend, as even the most sophisticated institutional systems cannot function without individuals committed to ethical conduct.

The hierarchical structure also facilitates effective enforcement through multiple overlapping mechanisms. When violations occur, they can be addressed through institutional disciplinary processes, professional sanctions, publication retractions, funding restrictions, and legal penalties, depending on the severity and nature of the misconduct. This multi-layered approach ensures that consequences are proportionate and that repeat offenders cannot simply move between institutions or jurisdictions to avoid accountability.

The system's strength lies in its recognition that academic integrity requires both top-down coordination (international standards → regional adaptation → national legislation → institutional policies → individual practice) to establish consistent standards and bottom-up commitment (individual experiences → institutional learning → national policy review → regional coordination → international standard updates) to implement those standards in daily practice. These ways create a robust framework that can adapt to evolving challenges while maintaining core ethical principles across diverse academic contexts and cultural settings.

1.3. Invented (or maybe real? Who knows…) case

Case: AI-Generated Research Paper Ring

The incident: A network of researchers across multiple countries used AI to generate fake research papers in medical science, submitting them to predatory journals to inflate publication records for academic promotions. The scheme involved the fabrication of papers across several countries before it was detected.

Response.

Level 1: International organizations.

The WHE issued emergency guidelines on AI misuse in medical research affecting global health decisions.

Actions:

- created rapid identification protocols for AI-generated medical content;

- established an international database of suspicious publications;

- coordinated with WIPO on AI authorship legal frameworks.

Level 2: Regional organizations.

ENAI coordinated the European response while ICAI led North American efforts.

Actions:

- shared detection algorithms across member institutions;

- created joint training programs on AI ethics in research;

- established cross-regional reporting mechanisms.

Level 3: National level.

Multiple countries activated national research oversight bodies.

Actions:

- updated national laws to address AI-generated research fraud;

- mandated AI disclosure requirements for all research submissions;

- created national penalties for systematic publication fraud.

Level 4: Institutional level.

Universities:

- implemented AI detection software for all research submissions;

- required mandatory disclosure of AI assistance in research;

- established new promotion criteria, excluding predatory publications.

Publishers:

- major journals deployed AI detection tools;

- predatory journals were identified and blocklisted;

- industry-wide standards for AI-assisted research were established.

Funding bodies:

- required AI usage declarations for all grant applications;

- implemented retrospective audits of funded research;

- created penalties for undisclosed AI assistance.

Level 5: Individual level:

- scammers: Some researchers faced career termination, funding bans, and legal action;

- whistleblowers: Graduate students who reported suspicious patterns received protection and recognition;

- community: Some researchers voluntarily disclosed previous AI assistance in their work.

Long-term impact:

- establishment of a global AI research ethics framework;

- mandatory AI disclosure becomes an international standard;

- enhanced detection systems prevent similar schemes;

- strengthened collaboration between levels prevents future systematic fraud.

The five-level hierarchical governance system effectively addressed the AI-generated research paper ring through its coordinated, multi-scale response that leveraged each level's unique capabilities and authorities. The international organizations (level 1) provided crucial global coordination and standard-setting, while regional bodies (level 2) facilitated knowledge sharing and cross-border collaboration, preventing the scheme from migrating between jurisdictions. National governments (level 3) supplied the necessary legal frameworks and enforcement mechanisms, while institutional actors (level 4) – universities, publishers, and funding bodies – implemented practical detection tools and policy changes that directly addressed vulnerabilities in the research ecosystem. Individual-level responses (level 5) created accountability through consequences for perpetrators and protection for whistleblowers, fostering a culture of transparency and ethical responsibility.

CONCLUSION

The study aimed to identify the interconnected components of academic integrity, thereby creating a comprehensive understanding of the ethical framework governing modern scholarship. Educational integrity, research integrity, managerial integrity, professional association integrity, and publishing integrity function as mutually reinforcing elements that collectively require coordinated governance across multiple organizational levels. This interconnectedness demands sophisticated coordination mechanisms that can address the complexity of modern academic environments while maintaining coherent ethical standards.

The hierarchical system uncovered through this analysis establishes a clear cascade of responsibility that flows seamlessly from international standard-setting bodies through regional coordination networks, national policy frameworks, institutional implementation mechanisms, and ultimately to individual practitioners. This multi-level architecture ensures that academic integrity principles retain their universal character while permitting necessary cultural adaptation in implementation methodologies. The system's fundamental strength lies in recognizing that effective integrity governance requires top-down coordination to establish consistent standards and bottom-up commitment to translate those standards into meaningful, daily scholarly practice.

International organizations thus function as essential bridges within the global academic commons, creating spaces for dialogue and consensus-building that successfully transcend national boundaries while maintaining deep respect for institutional autonomy. Through this bridging function, they ensure that the fundamental commitment to honesty, originality, and fairness in scholarship remains constant and unwavering, regardless of the specific cultural context or geographical location in which scholarly work occurs. This achievement represents a remarkable balance between universal principles and local adaptation, creating a robust framework for maintaining academic integrity in an increasingly interconnected world of higher education and research.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Conceptualization: Artem Artyukhov.
Data curation: Artem Artyukhov.
Formal analysis: Artem Artyukhov, Dmytro Chumachenko.
Funding acquisition: Artem Artyukhov, Dmytro Chumachenko.
Investigation: Artem Artyukhov, Dmytro Chumachenko.
Methodology: Artem Artyukhov.
Project administration: Artem Artyukhov.
Resources: Artem Artyukhov.
Software: Artem Artyukhov.
Supervision: Artem Artyukhov.
Validation: Artem Artyukhov.
Visualization: Artem Artyukhov.
Writing – original draft: Artem Artyukhov, Dmytro Chumachenko.
Writing – review & editing: Artem Artyukhov.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Funded by
the European Union

REFERENCES

1. All European Academies (ALLEA). (2023). *European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity. 2023 Revised Edition.* https://doi.org/10.26356/ECOC

2. Fishman, T. (2024). History of the International Center for Academic Integrity (ICAI): Exigence, genesis, and impact. In S.E. Eaton (Ed.), *Second Handbook of Academic Integrity* (pp. 1827-1845). Cham: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-54144-5_170

3. Foltynek, T., Bjelobaba, S., Glendinning, I., Khan, Z. R., Santos, R., Pavletic, P., & Kravjar, J. (2023). ENAI recommendations on the ethical use of artificial intelligence in education. *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 19,* Article 12. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-023-00133-4

4. Gobierno Digital (Gob.pe). (2024). *Codigo Nacional de Integridad Cientifica [National Code of Research Integrity].* (In Spanish). Retrieved from https://cdn.www.gob.pe/uploads/document/file/6008024/5323788-r-p-028-2024-concytec-p-codigo-nacional-de-integridad.pdf?v=1710774037

5. Legislation of Ukraine. (2017). *Zakon Ukrainy Pro osvitu [Law of Ukraine On Education].* (In Ukrainian). Retrieved from https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2145-19#Text

6. Wang, L., Zhang, Q., & Wang, Z.-X. (2021). Why do Chinese students often cheat on exams at home, but less abroad? *Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Science, 9*(8), 60-76. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/353768256_Why_do_Chinese_students_often_cheat_on_exams_at_home_but_less_abroad

APPENDIX A

Table A1. The list of organizations

Organization	Website
All European Academies (ALLEA)	https://allea.org/
American Medical Association (AMA)	https://www.ama-assn.org/
American Psychological Association (APA)	https://www.apa.org/
Center of Research Integrity and Open Science (RIOS)	https://rios-vu.nl/
Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE)	https://publicationethics.org/
Council of Europe Portal. ETINED	https://www.coe.int/en/web/ethics-transparency-integrity-in-education
Council of Science Editors (CSE)	https://www.councilscienceeditors.org/
Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ)	https://doaj.org/
Elsevier	https://www.elsevier.com/
European Association for Quality Assurance (ENQA)	https://www.enqa.eu/
European Association of Science Editors (EASE)	https://ease.org.uk/
European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD)	https://www.ebrd.com/home.html
European Network for Academic Integrity (ENAI)	https://www.academicintegrity.eu/wp/
European Network for Research Ethics and Integrity (ENERI)	https://eneri.eu/
European Network of Research Integrity Offices (ENRIO)	https://www.enrio.eu/
European Research Council (ERC)	https://erc.europa.eu/homepage
Global Academic Integrity Network (GAIN)	https://www.globalacademicintegrity.network/
Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE)	https://www.ieee.org/
International Association of Universities (IAU)	https://www.iau-aiu.net/
International Center for Academic Integrity (ICAI)	https://www.academicintegrity.org/aws/ICAI/pt/sp/home_page
International Federation of Accountants (IFAC)	https://www.ifac.org/
Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine (MESU)	https://mon.gov.ua/en
National Agency for Higher Education Quality Assurance (NAQA)	https://en.naqa.gov.ua/
National Institutes of Health (NIH)	https://www.nih.gov/
National Research Foundation of Ukraine (NRFU)	https://nrfu.org.ua/en/
National Science Foundation (NSF)	https://www.nsf.gov/
Open Access Scholarly Publishing Association (OASPA)	https://www.oaspa.org/
Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)	https://www.oecd.org/
Sage Publication (Sage)	https://www.sagepub.com/
Springer Nature	https://www.springernature.com/gp
Taylor & Francis	https://taylorandfrancis.com/
Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA)	https://www.teqsa.gov.au/
UNESCO	https://www.unesco.org/en
United Nations (UN)	https://www.un.org/en
Wiley	https://www.wiley.com/en-ie
World Association of Medical Editors (WAME)	https://www.wame.org/
World Bank	https://www.worldbank.org/ext/en/home
World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)	https://www.wipo.int/portal/en/index.html

APPENDIX B

Table B1. The list of international projects

Project	Website
AI-THOS	https://www.ai-thos.eu/
BRIDGE	https://www.academicintegrity.eu/wp/bridge/
EnTIRE	https://cordis.europa.eu/project/id/741782
ETHICS	https://ethics.iliauni.edu.ge/en/
FAITH	https://academicintegrity.eu/victims/faith-project/
H2020 INTEGRITY	https://h2020integrity.eu/
IANUS	https://trustinscience.eu/

Table B1 (cont.). The list of international projects

Project	Website
ICOP	https://www.academicintegrity.eu/wp/icop/
INTEGRITY	https://integrity.iliauni.edu.ge/en/
IPPHEAE	http://plagiarism.cz/ippheae/
IRECS	https://www.irecs.eu/
OPTIMA	https://lpnu.ua/en/optima
OPUS	https://opusproject.eu/
PAICKT	http://www.plagiarism.cz/paickt/index.html
Path2Integrity	https://www.path2integrity.eu/
POESIS	https://poiesis-project.eu/
PUPP	https://pupp.uqo.ca/en/home/
RE4GREEN	https://re4green.eu/
ROSiE	https://rosie-project.eu/
SEEPPAI	http://plagiarism.cz/seeppai/
SOPs4RI	https://sops4ri.eu/
TRUSTparency	https://trustparency-project.eu/
United2Act	https://united2act.org/
VERITY	https://verityproject.eu/