

FEDERAL UNIVERSITY LECTURERS' PERCEPTIONS OF CRITICAL THINKING AS A DEFENSE AGAINST AI-DRIVEN MISINFORMATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION IN SOUTHEAST, NIGERIA

Paulinus P. Nwankwor

Department of Educational Foundations
Faculty of Education, University of Nigeria, Nsukka

Abstract

This study examined federal university lecturers' perceptions of critical thinking as a defense against AI-driven misinformation in higher education in Southeast, Nigeria. The study was guided by three research questions and three null hypotheses. A descriptive survey research design was adopted. The population comprised all lecturers in federal universities in the Southeast geopolitical zone of Nigeria, spanning Abia, Anambra, Ebonyi, Enugu, and Imo states. A sample of 310 respondents was selected using proportionate stratified random sampling. The instrument for data collection was a structured questionnaire titled "Federal University Lecturers' Perceptions of Critical Thinking as a Defense Against AI-Driven Misinformation Questionnaire" (FULPCTADAIMQ), developed by the researcher. The questionnaire comprised two sections. Section A collected demographic information, while Section B contained three clusters of items structured on a four-point Likert scale. Face validity were established through expert review by three specialists from the University of Nigeria, Nsukka. Reliability was determined using Cronbach's alpha, yielding coefficients of 0.83, 0.82, and 0.81 for Clusters I, II, and III respectively, with an overall coefficient of 0.82. Out of 310 copies of the questionnaire distributed, 298 were properly completed and returned, representing a 96.1% return rate. Data were analyzed using mean scores and standard deviations for the research questions, while a t-test was used to test the null hypotheses at a 0.05 level of significance. The findings revealed that federal university lecturers in Southeast Nigeria perceived AI-driven misinformation as creating significant bias in higher education, perceived critical thinking as an effective defense against AI-driven misinformation, and identified a range of critical thinking strategies as effective safeguards against AI-driven misinformation in higher education. Based on the findings, it was recommended, among others, that the National Universities Commission should develop and mandate a structured critical thinking and AI literacy framework for faculty development in all federal universities in Nigeria.

Keywords: AI, critical thinking, federal universities, higher education, misinformation

Introduction

The emergence of artificial intelligence (AI) as a dominant force in global information production has fundamentally altered the landscape of knowledge dissemination, particularly within higher education institutions. AI technologies, including large language models, generative tools, and synthetic media platforms, have demonstrated a remarkable capacity to produce text, images, audio, and video content that is increasingly indistinguishable from human-generated material. While AI tools such as ChatGPT and other natural language processing systems have introduced new opportunities for personalized learning, academic support, and research facilitation, they simultaneously present significant challenges related to academic integrity, misinformation, digital inequity, and overreliance on automated systems (Baidoo-Anu & Ansah, 2023). This dual nature of AI technology places higher education institutions at a

critical crossroads, where the benefits of technological adoption must be carefully weighed against the risks of uncritical acceptance of AI-generated content.

Misinformation, defined broadly as false or misleading information regardless of intent, has become one of the most pressing challenges of the contemporary information age. The proliferation of AI-generated inauthentic content now represents a structural threat to the information ecosystem, with multiple research directions urgently needed in detection, moderation, and regulation to mitigate adversarial threats (Menczer et al., 2023). This alarming trajectory signals that AI-driven misinformation is no longer a peripheral concern but a central threat to institutions that depend on the integrity of information for decision-making, policy formulation, and knowledge production. From the COVID-19 infodemic to political conspiracy theories, misinformation threatens the health and well-being of individuals, communities, and democracies, with generative AI now at a critical inflection point capable of exponentially amplifying misinformation while also offering innovative solutions to combat it (Fulsher et al., 2025). Universities, as custodians of knowledge and producers of policy-relevant research, are particularly vulnerable to the distorting effects of AI-driven misinformation.

In the context of higher education, AI-generated misinformation manifests in varied and sophisticated forms. Generative AI tools such as ChatGPT have been found to produce incorrect citations, fictitious references, and unverified facts, which can undermine the validity of academic work and research. The inability to assess source credibility, combined with a reliance on unverified AI-generated content, risks spreading misinformation, a particularly serious concern in academic settings where the integrity of knowledge is crucial (Farrokhnia et al., 2024). Beyond fabricated citations, AI systems are increasingly capable of producing deepfake audio and video content that misrepresents institutional officials and policy positions. Deepfakes undermine collective trust in audio-visual evidence, placing fresh burdens on institutions that rely on reliable material, and their capacity to spread quickly intensifies the danger they pose to communal beliefs and institutional governance (Whyte, 2020). Within university settings, where policy directives, accreditation information, staff communications, and research outputs are routinely circulated digitally, the threat of AI-generated misinformation to institutional governance is substantial and real.

Critical thinking represents one of the most consistently identified human competencies for navigating the challenges posed by AI-driven misinformation. Conceptualized as the disciplined process of actively analyzing, evaluating, and synthesizing information to guide judgment and decision-making, critical thinking equips individuals with the cognitive tools necessary to interrogate, question, and verify information before accepting or acting on it. Logical and critical reasoning are powerful tools for detecting fake content, countering misleading claims, and fostering informed literacy across multiple domains (Redaelli et al., 2025). Empirical evidence further supports this position, as List et al. (2024) conducted experimental research in Colombia and found that critical thinking significantly reduces individuals' vulnerability to misinformation. For university lecturers, whose professional responsibilities include the production, evaluation, and dissemination of knowledge, the capacity for critical thinking is not merely desirable but professionally indispensable.

The operationalization of critical thinking as a defense against AI-driven misinformation involves several identifiable cognitive strategies. These include source verification, cross-referencing with established literature, logical evaluation of claims, reflective skepticism toward unverified content, and fact-checking against authoritative

institutional documents. Training actions aimed at improving critical thinking have been shown to be effective responses to the growing scope of misinformation, which now impacts virtually all areas of life (Marcos-Vilchez et al., 2025). Within higher education specifically, professors and lecturers play a crucial role in promoting the effective use of AI tools, having the power to emphasize critical thinking skills and explain how AI can add value while teaching those around them to ask probing questions and seek verified answers (Chaparro-Banegas et al., 2024). This underscores the importance of examining how lecturers themselves perceive and deploy critical thinking as a safeguard against AI-generated misinformation.

In the Nigerian higher education context, the integration of AI technologies has proceeded alongside significant structural and infrastructural challenges that heighten misinformation risks. The integration of AI in Nigerian universities is gaining traction, but key challenges include inadequate infrastructure, unreliable internet access, outdated hardware, and a significant absence of AI-focused curricula and training programs for faculty (Ogunode et al., 2024). These gaps create conditions in which faculty members may encounter AI-generated content without the institutional support or digital literacy frameworks necessary to evaluate it critically. Developing algorithmic literacy among both students and educators is no longer optional but essential, as it refers to the ability to understand, critique, and responsibly engage with algorithm-driven systems such as generative AI tools (Igbokwe, 2023). Federal universities in the Southeast geopolitical zone of Nigeria, comprising institutions in Abia, Anambra, Ebonyi, Enugu, and Imo states, are not insulated from these realities and face mounting pressure to develop faculty capacity for critical engagement with AI-generated information.

Despite the urgency of this issue, empirical studies examining how university lecturers perceive critical thinking as a specific defense mechanism against AI-driven misinformation remain sparse, particularly within the Nigerian context. The Nigerian higher education system faces far-reaching implications from the growth of generative AI software, requiring urgent institutional attention (Temitope, 2024). Existing studies have largely focused on student-facing dimensions of AI misinformation or on the general risks of AI adoption in education, leaving a significant empirical gap regarding how faculty perceive and respond to AI-driven misinformation. Darwin et al. (2024) observed that while students recognize the utility of AI in enriching critical thinking, they also raise legitimate concerns about AI's limitations, including its potential to create echo chambers and generate content that lacks nuanced understanding. These findings point to the broader need for lecturers, as knowledge producers and validators, to develop and apply structured critical thinking strategies in their engagement with AI-generated content. It is against this backdrop that the present study examined federal university lecturers' perceptions of critical thinking as a defense against AI-driven misinformation in higher education in Southeast Nigeria.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine federal university lecturers' perceptions of critical thinking as a defense against AI-driven misinformation in higher education in Southeast Nigeria. Specifically, the study sought to:

1. Identify the forms of AI-driven misinformation that lecturers in federal universities in Southeast Nigeria perceive as creating bias in higher education.
2. Determine the extent to which lecturers in federal universities in Southeast Nigeria perceive critical thinking as an effective defense against AI-driven misinformation in higher education.

3. Identify the critical thinking strategies that lecturers in federal universities in Southeast Nigeria consider effective safeguards against AI-driven misinformation in higher education.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided this study:

1. What forms of AI-driven misinformation do lecturers in federal universities in Southeast Nigeria perceive as creating bias in higher education?
2. To what extent do lecturers in federal universities in Southeast Nigeria perceive critical thinking as an effective defense against AI-driven misinformation in higher education?
3. What critical thinking strategies do lecturers in federal universities in Southeast Nigeria identify as effective safeguards against AI-driven misinformation in higher education?

Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were tested at a 0.05 level of significance:

- H0₁:** There is no significant difference between the mean scores of male and female lecturers in federal universities in Southeast Nigeria on the perceived forms of AI-driven misinformation that create bias in higher education.
- H0₂:** There is no significant difference between the mean scores of male and female lecturers in federal universities in Southeast Nigeria on the extent to which critical thinking is perceived as an effective defense against AI-driven misinformation in higher education.
- H0₃:** There is no significant difference between the mean scores of male and female lecturers in federal universities in Southeast Nigeria on the critical thinking strategies considered effective as safeguards against AI-driven misinformation in higher education.

Methods

This study employed a descriptive survey research design. It was conducted across federal universities in Southeast Nigeria, spanning Abia, Anambra, Ebonyi, Enugu, and Imo states. The population comprised all lecturers in federal universities in the Southeast geopolitical zone of Nigeria. A sample of 310 respondents was selected using proportionate stratified random sampling technique to ensure adequate representation across the five states. The instrument for data collection was a structured questionnaire titled "Federal University Lecturers' Perceptions of Critical Thinking as a Defense Against AI-Driven Misinformation Questionnaire" (FULPCTADAIMQ). It was developed by the researcher based on a review of related literature. The questionnaire comprised two sections. Section A collected demographic information of the respondents. Section B contained three clusters of items structured on a four-point Likert scale of Strongly Agree (SA) = 4, Agree (A) = 3, Disagree (D) = 2, and Strongly Disagree (SD) = 1. Cluster I contained 10 items on the forms of AI-driven misinformation perceived as creating bias in higher education. Cluster II contained 10 items on lecturers' perceptions of critical thinking as a defense against AI-driven misinformation. Cluster III contained 10 items on critical thinking strategies identified as effective safeguards against AI-driven misinformation in higher education. The validity of the instrument was established through face validity. Three experts reviewed the instrument, two from Educational Management and Policy and one from Measurement and Evaluation, all from the University of Nigeria, Nsukka. Their corrections were incorporated into the final version.

Reliability was determined using Cronbach's alpha, with a trial testing conducted on 20 lecturers from federal universities outside the Southeast zone. Coefficients obtained were 0.83 for Cluster I, 0.82 for Cluster II, and 0.81 for Cluster III, giving an overall coefficient of 0.84. This confirmed that the instrument was reliable. The questionnaire was administered directly to respondents in their respective universities. Out of 310 copies distributed, 298 were properly completed and returned, giving a 96.1% return rate. Data were analyzed using mean scores and standard deviations for the three research questions. A criterion mean of 2.50 was adopted, where scores of 2.50 and above indicated agreement and scores below 2.50 indicated disagreement. A t-test was used to test the three null hypotheses at a 0.05 level of significance. Results are presented in tables.

Results

Research Question 1: What forms of AI-driven misinformation do lecturers in federal universities in Southeast Nigeria perceive as creating bias in higher education?

Table 1: Mean and Standard Deviation Analysis of Forms of AI-Driven Misinformation Perceived as Creating Bias in Higher Education Among Federal University Lecturers in Southeast Nigeria

S/N	Item Statements	Mean	SD	Decision
1	AI-generated fake academic publications mislead lecturers during policy formulation.	3.21	0.84	Agree
2	Deepfake videos of university officials spread false institutional directives.	2.76	0.97	Agree
3	AI-generated false accreditation reports distort university ranking decisions.	3.14	0.88	Agree
4	Chatbot-generated misinformation influences lecturers' perception of government education policies.	3.09	0.91	Agree
5	AI-produced fabricated research statistics bias curriculum development decisions.	3.27	0.82	Agree
6	Algorithmically amplified false news about university funding affects staff morale.	3.18	0.86	Agree
7	AI-generated misleading admission statistics create unfair entry policy outcomes.	3.31	0.79	Agree
8	Synthetic AI content misrepresents government education reform policies to lecturers.	3.05	0.93	Agree
9	AI-manipulated audio clips falsely attribute policy statements to university management.	2.89	0.98	Agree
10	AI-generated misinformation about staff promotion criteria creates perceived inequity.	3.24	0.83	Agree
Grand Mean		3.11	0.88	Agree

Table 1 presents the mean and standard deviation analysis of the forms of AI-driven misinformation perceived as creating bias in higher education among federal university lecturers in Southeast Nigeria. The mean values of items 1 through 10, which are 3.21, 2.76, 3.14, 3.09, 3.27, 3.18, 3.31, 3.05, 2.89, and 3.24 respectively, are all above the 2.50 benchmark for acceptance. Specifically, lecturers perceive that AI-generated fake academic publications mislead them during policy formulation, deepfake videos of university officials spread false institutional directives, AI-generated false accreditation

reports distort university ranking decisions, chatbot-generated misinformation influences their perception of government education policies, AI-produced fabricated research statistics bias curriculum development decisions, algorithmically amplified false news about university funding affects staff morale, AI-generated misleading admission statistics create unfair entry policy outcomes, synthetic AI content misrepresents government education reform policies, AI-manipulated audio clips falsely attribute policy statements to university management, and AI-generated misinformation about staff promotion criteria creates perceived inequity. The grand mean of 3.11, which is substantially above the benchmark of 2.50, indicates that federal university lecturers in Southeast Nigeria generally perceive AI-driven misinformation as creating significant bias in higher education.

Research Question 2: To what extent do lecturers in federal universities in Southeast Nigeria perceive critical thinking as an effective defense against AI-driven misinformation in higher education?

Table 2: Mean and Standard Deviation Analysis of Lecturers' Perceptions of Critical Thinking as a Defense Against AI-Driven Misinformation in Higher Education Among Federal University Lecturers in Southeast Nigeria

S/N	Item Statements	Mean	SD	Decision
1	Critical thinking helps me question the authenticity of AI-generated academic content.	3.34	0.78	Agree
2	Applying critical thinking enables me to detect fabricated AI research findings.	3.28	0.81	Agree
3	Critical thinking reduces my susceptibility to AI-generated misinformation about university policies.	3.19	0.85	Agree
4	Lecturers who think critically are less likely to act on false AI-generated institutional directives.	3.22	0.83	Agree
5	Critical thinking allows me to evaluate AI-generated content before accepting it as factual.	3.41	0.74	Agree
6	Using critical thinking helps me identify bias in AI-generated education policy reports.	3.15	0.88	Agree
7	Critical thinking enables me to verify AI-generated information before sharing it with colleagues.	3.29	0.80	Agree
8	Applying critical thinking minimizes the impact of deepfake content on my professional judgment.	2.94	0.96	Agree
9	Critical thinking empowers me to challenge misleading AI-generated narratives in academia.	3.11	0.90	Agree
10	Lecturers with strong critical thinking skills are more resistant to AI-driven misinformation.	3.36	0.77	Agree
Grand Mean		3.23	0.83	Agree

Table 2 presents the mean and standard deviation analysis of lecturers' perceptions of critical thinking as a defense against AI-driven misinformation in higher education among federal university lecturers in Southeast Nigeria. The mean values of items 1 through 10, which are 3.34, 3.28, 3.19, 3.22, 3.41, 3.15, 3.29, 2.94, 3.11, and 3.36 respectively, are all above the 2.50 benchmark for acceptance. Specifically, lecturers perceive that critical thinking helps them question the authenticity of AI-generated

academic content, enables detection of fabricated AI research findings, reduces susceptibility to AI-generated misinformation about university policies, makes lecturers less likely to act on false AI-generated institutional directives, allows evaluation of AI-generated content before acceptance, helps identify bias in AI-generated education policy reports, enables verification of AI-generated information before sharing, minimizes the impact of deepfake content on professional judgment, empowers lecturers to challenge misleading AI-generated narratives, and that lecturers with strong critical thinking skills are more resistant to AI-driven misinformation. The grand mean of 3.23, which is substantially above the benchmark of 2.50, indicates that federal university lecturers in Southeast Nigeria generally perceive critical thinking as an effective defense against AI-driven misinformation in higher education.

Research Question 3: What critical thinking strategies do lecturers in federal universities in Southeast Nigeria identify as effective safeguards against AI-driven misinformation in higher education?

Table 3: Mean and Standard Deviation Analysis of Critical Thinking Strategies Identified as Effective Safeguards Against AI-Driven Misinformation in Higher Education Among Federal University Lecturers in Southeast Nigeria

S/N	Item Statements	Mean	SD	Decision
1	Cross-referencing AI-generated content with verified academic sources helps detect misinformation.	3.42	0.75	Agree
2	Evaluating the credibility of sources before accepting AI-generated information is an effective strategy.	3.38	0.78	Agree
3	Asking probing questions about AI-generated content reduces the risk of misinformation.	3.17	0.87	Agree
4	Applying logical reasoning to AI-generated policy reports helps identify false claims.	3.26	0.82	Agree
5	Fact-checking AI-generated information using official university documents prevents misinformation.	3.33	0.79	Agree
6	Reflective thinking before acting on AI-generated content minimizes misinformation risk.	3.21	0.84	Agree
7	Comparing AI-generated content with established academic literature exposes inaccuracies.	3.29	0.81	Agree
8	Seeking expert opinion before accepting AI-generated research findings reduces misinformation.	3.08	0.92	Agree
9	Identifying inconsistencies in AI-generated content is an effective misinformation detection strategy.	3.19	0.86	Agree
10	Maintaining skepticism toward unverified AI-generated academic content prevents misinformation spread.	3.24	0.83	Agree
Grand Mean		3.26	0.83	Agree

Table 3 presents the mean and standard deviation analysis of critical thinking strategies identified as effective safeguards against AI-driven misinformation in higher education among federal university lecturers in Southeast Nigeria. The mean values of items 1 through 10, which are 3.42, 3.38, 3.17, 3.26, 3.33, 3.21, 3.29, 3.08, 3.19, and 3.24 respectively, are all above the 2.50 benchmark for acceptance. Specifically, lecturers identify cross-referencing AI-generated content with verified academic sources, evaluating

the credibility of sources before accepting AI-generated information, asking probing questions about AI-generated content, applying logical reasoning to AI-generated policy reports, fact-checking AI-generated information using official university documents, reflective thinking before acting on AI-generated content, comparing AI-generated content with established academic literature, seeking expert opinion before accepting AI-generated research findings, identifying inconsistencies in AI-generated content, and maintaining skepticism toward unverified AI-generated academic content as effective strategies against AI-driven misinformation. The grand mean of 3.26, which is substantially above the benchmark of 2.50, indicates that federal university lecturers in Southeast Nigeria generally identify these critical thinking strategies as effective safeguards against AI-driven misinformation in higher education.

Discussion

The finding of this study revealed that federal university lecturers in Southeast Nigeria perceived AI-driven misinformation as creating significant bias in higher education. Lecturers affirmed that AI-generated false accreditation reports, fabricated research statistics, misleading admission data, and deepfake misrepresentations of institutional directives constituted real and impactful threats to the integrity of higher education processes. This finding is not surprising given the documented escalation of AI-generated misinformation globally and its increasing penetration into academic contexts. The reliance on unverified AI-generated content risks spreading misinformation, which is a particularly serious concern in academic settings where the integrity of knowledge is crucial (Farrokhnia et al., 2024). The specific vulnerability of Nigerian universities to these threats is further compounded by infrastructural deficits that limit access to reliable verification tools, making lecturers more susceptible to encountering and inadvertently accepting AI-generated misinformation. The absence of AI-focused curricula and training programs for faculty in Nigerian universities is a significant challenge, as these are essential for equipping educators to effectively engage with AI tools and their associated risks (Ogunode et al., 2024). The sensitivity of Nigerian university staff to issues of fairness and transparency, particularly regarding promotion criteria and admission statistics, suggests that AI misinformation is perceived not merely as an information problem but as a direct threat to institutional equity. These results are consistent with the position of Whyte (2020), who argued that AI-generated content and deepfakes undermine collective trust in institutional evidence and intensify danger to communal beliefs and professional behaviors within institutional settings. Similarly, Momeni (2024) found that individuals struggle to identify deepfake content and that their professional opinions are significantly affected by this persuasive form of misinformation, a finding that directly reinforces the concerns raised by lecturers in the present study.

The finding also showed that lecturers in federal universities in Southeast Nigeria perceived critical thinking as an effective defense against AI-driven misinformation in higher education. Lecturers affirmed that critical thinking helped them question the authenticity of AI-generated content, detect fabricated findings, reduce susceptibility to false institutional directives, and evaluate AI outputs before acceptance. This finding reflects an awareness among Nigerian university lecturers of the cognitive demands of operating in an AI-saturated information environment. It aligns with empirical evidence demonstrating that critical thinking meaningfully reduces individuals' vulnerability to misinformation. List et al. (2024) found through experimental research that critical thinking skills significantly reduced participants' susceptibility to misinformation, a finding directly consistent with what the present study's lecturers affirmed. The finding

also resonates with broader scholarly advocacy for critical thinking as a pedagogical priority in the AI era. Darwin et al. (2024) observed that students and educators who apply critical thinking when engaging with AI outputs are better positioned to identify inaccuracies and make more informed academic judgments. The finding is further supported by Redaelli et al. (2025), who established through a randomized controlled trial that mastery of critical thinking skills is strongly associated with the ability to recognize fake content and misinformation across multiple information domains. The result suggests that while lecturers perceive critical thinking as effective, the absence of structured institutional support for critical AI engagement in Nigerian federal universities may limit how consistently these skills are applied in practice, a concern raised broadly by Chaparro-Banegas et al. (2024) regarding the lack of formal frameworks for embedding critical thinking into AI-related faculty development.

The findings of this study further indicated that lecturers in federal universities in Southeast Nigeria identified a range of critical thinking strategies as effective safeguards against AI-driven misinformation in higher education. Strategies including cross-referencing AI content with verified academic sources, evaluating source credibility, applying logical reasoning, fact-checking against official documents, and maintaining reflective skepticism were all affirmed as effective. The confidence lecturers expressed in these specific, actionable strategies is consistent with the literature on misinformation resistance, which demonstrates that concrete skill-based interventions produce more durable effects than general awareness campaigns. Marcos-Vilchez et al. (2025) found through a systematic review that structured critical thinking training produces measurable and enduring reductions in susceptibility to false information, reinforcing the view that strategy-level competencies are more protective than broad attitudinal awareness alone. The prominence of source-verification and cross-referencing strategies in the data reflects the analytical dispositions of an academic population trained in scholarly rigor. Redaelli et al. (2025) similarly identified evaluating source credibility and identifying invalid inferences as the critical reasoning strategies most strongly associated with misinformation resistance. The relatively lower affirmation of the strategy of seeking expert opinion before accepting AI-generated findings may indicate that collegial consultation is not yet embedded as a standard practice in the information-verification behavior of lecturers in Southeast Nigerian federal universities. This observation is consistent with Ogunode et al. (2024), who noted that the absence of collaborative AI engagement frameworks in Nigerian universities limits the extent to which peer-based knowledge verification becomes routine practice among faculty.

Conclusion

Based on the findings of this study, the researcher concluded that federal university lecturers in Southeast Nigeria widely perceived AI-driven misinformation as a significant and active threat to the integrity of higher education, manifesting through fabricated academic publications, false accreditation and admission data, manipulated audio-visual content, and algorithmically amplified false narratives that distort institutional decision-making. The lecturers further perceived critical thinking as an effective defense against these threats, affirming its capacity to help them interrogate AI-generated content, detect fabrications, reduce susceptibility to false directives, and make more informed professional judgments. They also identified concrete critical thinking strategies, including source verification, logical reasoning, cross-referencing with authoritative literature, and reflective skepticism, as effective safeguards against AI-driven misinformation in higher education. These findings affirm that critical thinking remains a vital and recognized

cognitive resource in the face of AI-driven misinformation and that deliberate, institutionally supported efforts to strengthen these capacities among federal university lecturers in Southeast Nigeria are both necessary and timely.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the researcher recommended that:

1. The National Universities Commission should develop and mandate a structured critical thinking and AI literacy framework for faculty development in all federal universities in Nigeria, beginning at the departmental level to ensure direct relevance to each discipline.
2. Federal university management in Southeast Nigeria should establish institutional AI content verification protocols, including approved fact-checking tools and source authentication procedures, and circulate these to all academic staff as standard practice for handling AI-generated information in research, teaching, and administration.
3. The Federal Ministry of Education should fund targeted empirical research into AI misinformation patterns specific to Nigerian higher education, to generate context-sensitive evidence that informs national policy on AI governance in universities.

REFERENCES

- Baidoo-Anu, D., & Ansah, L. O. (2023). Education in the era of generative artificial intelligence (AI): Understanding the potential benefits of ChatGPT in promoting teaching and learning. *Journal of AI*, 7(1), 52–62. <https://doi.org/10.61969/jai.1337500>
- Chaparro-Banegas, N., Mas-Tur, A., & Roig-Tierno, N. (2024). Challenging critical thinking in education: New paradigms of artificial intelligence. *Cogent Education*, 11(1), 2437899. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2024.2437899>
- Darwin, Rusdin, D., Mukminatien, N., Suryati, N., Laksmi, E. D., & Marzuki. (2024). Critical thinking in the AI era: An exploration of EFL students' perceptions, benefits, and limitations. *Cogent Education*, 11(1), 2290342. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2023.2290342>
- Farrokhnia, M., Banihashem, S. K., Noroozi, O., & Wals, A. (2024). A SWOT analysis of ChatGPT: Implications for educational practice and research. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 61(3), 460–474. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2023.2195846>
- Fulsher, A., Pagkratidou, M., & Kendeou, P. (2025). GenAI and misinformation in education: A systematic scoping review of opportunities and challenges. *AI and Society*, 41, 1373–1385. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-025-02536-y>
- Igbokwe, I. C. (2023). Application of artificial intelligence (AI) in educational management. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 13(3), 300–307. <https://doi.org/10.29322/IJSRP.13.03.2023.p13536>
- List, J. A., Ramirez, L. M., Seither, J., Unda, J., & Vallejo, B. H. (2024). Critical thinking and misinformation vulnerability: Experimental evidence from Colombia. *PNAS Nexus*, 3(10), pgae361. <https://doi.org/10.1093/pnasnexus/pgae361>
- Marcos-Vilchez, J. M., Muniz-Velazquez, J. A., Arraztio-Cordoba, A., & Sanchez-Martin, M. (2025). Effectiveness of training actions aimed at improving critical thinking in the face of mis- and disinformation: A systematic review. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 13, 53. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-025-06143-6>

- Menczer, F., Crandall, D., Ahn, Y.-Y., & Kapadia, A. (2023). Addressing the harms of AI-generated inauthentic content. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 5(7), 679–680. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-023-00690-w>
- Momeni, M. (2024). Artificial intelligence and political deepfakes: Shaping citizen perceptions through misinformation. *Journal of Creative Communications*, 20(1), 41–56. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09732586241277335>
- Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Ogunode, N. J., Idoko, G., & Peter, T. (2024). Artificial intelligence and implementation of educational administration and planning programme in Nigerian tertiary institutions. *Advances in Mobile Learning Educational Research*, 4(2), 1120–1131. <https://doi.org/10.25082/AMLER.2024.02.009>
- Redaelli, S., Biller-Andorno, N., Gloeckler, S., Brown, J., Spitale, G., & Germani, F. (2025). Mastering critical thinking skills is strongly associated with the ability to recognize fakeness and misinformation. *Frontiers in Education*, 10, 1577692. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1577692>
- Temitope, O. A. (2024). Leveraging artificial intelligence for enhanced assessment and feedback mechanisms in Nigeria's higher education system. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 8(9), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.809012>
- Whyte, C. (2020). Deepfake news: AI-enabled disinformation as a multi-level public policy challenge. *Journal of Cyber Policy*, 5(2), 199–217. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23738871.2020.1797135>