International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research (IJFMR)
E-ISSN: 2582-2160 ● Website: www.ijfmr.com ● Email: editor@ijfmr.com

AI-Driven Educational Transformation in Higher Education: A Review of Current Practices

Shivani Negi

Research Scholar, Department of Education, Hemvati Nandan Bahuguna Garhwal University (A Central University), Srinagar Garhwal, Uttarakhand

Abstract

Despite the fact that artificial intelligence has already gained ground in higher education systems, especially in the field of online learning, it is important not to mistake its development for actual transformation. In this section, we will show that AI is rapidly gaining a foothold in teaching, learning, and online learning. To verify the hypothesis concerning the positive impact of the use of AI in class, we will review the empirical data from the authoritative institution Paper, a test conducted in the course of professional training, positive results achieved through intelligent tutoring, learning analytics and automatic feedback, and supportive arguments regarding the answer in the view of prepared arguments. In comparing these statistics, there have been 45,398 students and faculty respondents from 35 countries surveyed for the Digital Education Council (DEC) in the 2026 survey, 1,054 UK undergraduate students included in the 2026-HEPI survey, 400 higher education respondents responding from 90 countries surveyed by UNESCO in 2025, and 1,681 faculty included from 28 countries in the 2025 DEC-WG Faculty survey. Among the findings is an asymmetry of transformation: AI deployment activities are commonly observed; however, only 15% of students claim integration in many subjects, and only 29% rated their classroom teachers very highly in terms of abilities in guiding AI use, and only 28% rated most or many of the assessments as being appropriate to the use of AI in the workplace. An experiment within a physics course has validated that effective AI tutoring structures can be more effective than rudimentary active learning, but it has also been shown that most other AI classroom applications are primarily incidental and only indirectly related to educational design. It further argues that changes that last over time, or sustainable change, require coherent improvement of teaching, assessment, educator capabilities, leadership, and equity objectives and offers the ALIGN framework Access, Learning design, Integrity, Governance, and new capabilities as an evidence-based institutional implementation model.

Keywords: generative AI; higher education; educational transformation; intelligent tutoring; assessment; faculty readiness; AI literacy; academic integrity

1. Introduction

Artificial intelligence has burst the bubble of being a specialized learning technology and has become an almost common layer in higher education. Initial AI systems typically solved problems within a smaller section of the entire educational realm, like diagnosing errors with respect to a learning task in

intelligent tutor systems, institutional data triggering risk in a learning analytics system, or submitting structured homework to an automated feedback response system.

Generative AI has altered this ecology because students and faculty can now use a single conversational interface for explanation, summarization, coding, ideation, feedback, translation, and text production. Consequently, the central institutional question is no longer whether AI will enter higher education, but whether its widespread informal use will be converted into demonstrable learning, fair assessment, and public value.

The research base suggests neither love nor hate. Technology, at least potentially, increases with some types of available studies, but most reviewers show that they do not address the main deficiencies in research. Instead, they call for improvements such as combining educators' practical knowledge with rigorous and systematic research and evaluation (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019; Chen et al., 2020; Crompton & Burke, 2023; Bond et al., 2024). Several studies on Generative AI find that it may be beneficial in terms of improvement in teaching, assessments, and accessibility as well as efficiency gains, but they also warn and see risks in that solutions create content, may be incorrect, cause dependence, violate personal data, and even change one's levels of working memory (cf., Kasneci et al., 2023; Tlili et al., 2023; Lo, 2023; Chan & Hu, 2023). The question then is not one of whether to adopt the system or not, but rather the degree and effectiveness of the social system encompassing technology.

The reason for this differentiation lies in the fact that the current practice is mainly propelled by the users. The book Digital Education Council (DEC) conducted a survey into the above practices involving the participation of 27,284 students and 18,114 faculty members across 35 countries in the year 2026. Only 15% of the students stated that AI was a component of a lot of courses; 43% encountered it in specific courses, and the other 43% reported that the participation took place only in theory. The most striking fact is that more students (25%) answered negatively to the question, and quite a few acknowledged some contributions of information transformations even among those students who experienced integration. At the same time, according to the HEPI 2026 survey, 95% of UK undergraduates used AI at least once, and 94% of them used generative AI as part of their assessed work. In other words, the first numbers call for the Total Replacement, the second the Refinement and the Refocused Integration. This can be called the adoption-integration gap: While AI is extensively used by students, it is not purposefully woven into the curriculum.

This discusses this gap through the use of secondary data, instead of the standard way where a review employing narratives is done, because this method aims at establishing clarity and presents statistical evidence rather than relying on individual examples. It reviews also analysis of items such as adoption, learning value, assessment redesign, faculty readiness, governance, and equity, among others used and then complements particular sets of evidence with correlation and meta-analysis, as well as some explanatory and causal systems. Its primary assertion is that there is a new world order within higher education, but its current position is beneath a logical correctness orientation being such that the consumer is moving with more speed than the university or college, and in turn, educational policies are more advanced than the existing educational methods.

2. Research Objectives and Analytical Questions

RO1: Measure the degree of difference that exists within schools between their students and faculty who use AI and between operations that use it in instructional design.

RO2: Determine what specific application areas that have evolved is the AI in the sector of education.

RO3: Analyze how artificial intelligence is transforming evaluation methods, impacting honesty in academics, and shaping views on fairness.
RO4: Derive the desired operational constructs and policy environment from the latest definition of sustainable transformation.
In its essence, the analysis is concerned with the determination of the current stage of university pedagogy development. It focuses on the attempt to answer the question of how far present practice resembles pedagogical transformation and how far it is primarily technological substitution. It also explores where the biggest readiness gaps are detected and which institutional actions are more strongly supported by the data of the literature review.

3. Methodology

A secondary-data design was conducted as part of the researchers' study. Evidence was not ignored if it satisfied any one of three different rules: (a) A recent survey conducted across multiple institutions or nationally that reports on current practices in higher education. (b) A study that is either controlled or meta-analytical, focusing on reporting learning results;(c) a well-established empirical review which will be useful for presenting in the sphere of support, assessment, academic integrity, and control of the academic process, and control of the academic process.

Source	Coverage	N	Indicators used	Analytical role
DEC Global Survey, 2026	35 countries	45,398	Course integration, learning value, readiness, assessment alignment	Global adoption–integration benchmark
HEPI/Kortext, 2026	UK undergraduates	1,054	Use, assessment, student experience, skills support	Current student-practice benchmark
UNESCO, 2025	90 countries	400	Professional use, confidence, policy, ethics, investment	Institutional governance benchmark
DEC Faculty Survey, 2025	52 institutions; 28 countries	1,681	AI literacy, concerns, future use, institutional clarity	Faculty-capacity benchmark

Source	Coverage	N	Indicators used	Analytical role
Kestin et al., 2025	Harvard physics course	194	Post-test learning, time, engagement, motivation	Controlled pedagogical effectiveness test

Table 1. Core secondary datasets used in the empirical analysis.

The main descriptive datasets have been listed in Table 1. Owing to the different locations, survey clientele, and questions asked, the percentages were not aggregated. Instead, the data were analyzed within differences and similarities of percentage points from the same survey when available, use of time series for repeating an indicator within the same survey program, and triangulation between sources for one-sided and two-sided points.

The extraction framework, in this case, coded the evidence into five domains: adoption and access; pedagogical design and learning outcomes; assessment and integrity; faculty capability; and institutional governance. There were also some quick little calculations in the background, like the 20-point gap between students who said AI skills are essential (68%) and students who felt the teaching staff were actually helping them build those skills (48%). A discrepancy of 35 points was observed between the perspectives of faculty respondents who undertook AI literacy training (64%) and students who felt that their tutors were well prepared (29%) in the survey conducted in December 2026. The next sizeable gap was a 25-point regional governance gap between Europe and North America having this guidance or developing it, at about 70% in UNESCO's 2025 survey, and Latin America and the Caribbean at 45%. Such contrastive descriptions do not provide causal assessment.

4. Results and Findings

4.1 Adoption has outpaced designed integration

The primary limitation (if any) is that the expansion is driven by Fear of missing out on AI-driven activities. In 2026, AI was used by almost all students, with studies showing that 95% interacted with it at least once within the course, with 94% even using it for days on end in Summative Tasks. The percentage of the students' work that contained illogical AI-generated content grew from 3% in 2024 and 8% in 2025 to 12% in 2026, showing that AI is no longer just the domain of academia where it is left to languish with no use. Interestingly, just about half 49% thought or believed that AI added value to the student experience, whereas 16% held a view that it ruined things. This proportion did not change for a further 35% period. This condition of prevalence and diversity of costs is quite paradoxical.

Putting together the evidence from field experiments reinforces this interpretation, even though it is ambiguous about which execution is more efficient. Only one-third of the students who were exposed to Artificial Intelligence in the form of a course say they experienced very clear change or a stronger understanding of the course materials (5% and 28%, respectively); 42% replied that it was only somewhat helpful and 24% that it was not helpful. In putting it in those terms, though, it appears more like this is an issue of several institutions incorporating AI in practice without changing the aim of their learning objectives. This kind of substitution is able to achieve the same results, maybe even more timely, but it does not induce prioritization, improvement of metacognition, discipline-based self-assessment, variations in the content and mode of interaction, or engagement of critical thinking and subsequent enriching quality of feedback.

Faculties totally agree in terms of intention, while the level of operational certainty is dampened and perceived as quite lamentable. As per the DEC 2025 faculty initiative, 86% of the respondents expected AI to be adopted in delivering their teaching services in the recent and the coming future; moreover, sixty-four percent noticed that there was a substantial shift in the teacher-to-facilitator role. It is only 40% among those who indicate they do not know A, and as many as 17% among those who argue that they are confident in their skills in Artificial Intelligence, and the remaining 80% have noted how Sparse the chances are that the institutions have clear methods of deploying AI in their teaching. To re-conceptualize it briefly, it is not clear in the evidence displayed that willingness is a function of ability, no matter how eager the goodwill is.

4.2 Learning gains depend on structured pedagogy

The use of instructional materials is enhanced when learning processes are structured by a clear rationale. Take, for example, what Kestin et al. (2025) present in this randomized crossover design with 194 students taking undergraduate physics. The authors basically created an enhanced AI tutor that addresses the basic needs of students, and then compared this to traditional methods of classroom instruction or active learning. In this case, within the regular in-class active learning group mode, the authors reported median post-test scores of 4.5, whereas the same score for the AI tutoring was 3.5. Exploratory statistical analysis indicated a large to very large, approximately 0.63 standard deviation, effect size, which makes this a statistically exceptional test. Also, most AI-tutoring sessions were conducted within approximately 49 minutes, which is less than the typical length of a lesson that lasted approximately 60 minutes, but the former was found to be more effective. To boot, students have informed us that they did not get bored and over their heads as even with the reduced time, they were actually rather enthusiastic about the lessons. This is a bit of encouraging news in the sector, indicating the power of AI in learning and teaching when appropriately managed.

The outcomes cannot be easily extrapolated to behavioral chatbot settings. One would also opt for the design's instructional strategy if focus on sequencing, scaffolding, corrective feedback, and certain instructional constraints were clearly associated with the goals of the course. Similar studies conducted previously have demonstrated the efficacy of ITS when employed in both higher education and school settings, and these results further endorse the present findings (VanLehn, 2011; Ma et al., 2014; Steenbergen-Hu & Cooper, 2014; Kulik & Fletcher, 2016). Furthermore, this tendency is consistent with the belief that active learning combined with informative feedback facilitates learning relatively well, especially when the audience is required to generate, test, and adjust their constructs (Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Freeman et al., 2014). It is actually not about admittance of 'AI technology' but involves restraint in the use of cognitive resources.

The designs that are more solid in terms of educational benefits at the moment are characterized by adaptive help, low-stakes practice and quizzing, automatic assessments and feedback provided through assignments, and experiences that can provide teachers with consumed analytic insights. Chatbot reviews, on the other hand, suggest that there is value in fast response times as well as the possibility of help being stretched thinly across many users, but at a cost. They exposit how provoked critique can sometimes lack roundness and that there is a general tendency to give attention to how efficiently content is learnt in time, where the content is rarely, if ever, revisited. This is also true of some studies mentioned by the authors themselves, for example, (Okonkwo & Ade-Ibijola, 2021; Wollny et al., 2021; Kuhail et al., 2023; Labadze et al., 2023). It is especially tempting in respect to automated feedback, when the criteria of ‘success’ is particularly concrete and students are obliged to do something with the

information, not just get it and skim through it (Keuning et al., 2019). Learning dashboards and early-warning systems can sponsor the process of making sense of data, but it is not just about the statistics' predictive quality because the person needs to interpret the rows and columns of data, the point of action and the purpose of using the analytics to conclude whether the interventions effect the outcomes for the better are Key Aspects of Action enacted upon the signal (Arnold & Pistilli, 2012; Gašević et al., 2015; Schwendimann et al., 2017; Ifenthaler & Yau, 2020).

4.3 Assessment is changing faster than consensus

A lot of people think that evaluation is the most evolving sector through the use of AI at different levels in institutions. Further to the above, some 65% of students feel that there's an alarming extent of changes in assessments following AI introduction, a significant number indeed. In fact, as per DEC's 2026 global survey, only 28% of the respondents asserted that most assessments were complimentary towards the nature of tasks, skills, and principles required of an AI workplace; the remaining 72% pointed to various lacks of consistency. It gets worse with more than half, 60% actually, worried that the AI will be abused by fellow workers to one's advantage, for instance, momentarily escaping hard work and claiming to be correct. This is not just about spotting malpractice; it is concerned with the fact that trust is being eroded in the historical standards of originality and hard work. Confidence standards of originality and hard work.

In relation to the identification method, governance is relatively weak both structurally and educationally. Several studies into plagiarism detection systems have shown considerable errors or poor duplication, discrepancies, and overall failure (Weber-Wulff et al., 2023), while experts in assurance stress consultation, involvement and agreement, reliable decision-making based on facts and logic, and responses directed towards the specifics rather than claims, which are not confirmed by relevant information (Perkins, 2023; Foltýnek et al., 2023). At the moment, the activity is turning oriented towards the use of portfolio assessment, which includes tasks that can be done by a human and those that can be done by a human with the help of AI as well as tasks that include AI. The more studies that can be defended are likely to take the form of viva voce presentations, many changes in draft work, interpretation-prompts commentaries or in-house statements, validation of sources, reliance on local or private data, literary criticism of texts, and evaluation of the new values induced by AI computation.

Basically, this transformation, distorting the concept of integrity, converts it from a mere enforcement of quality to a realisation of scientific ethics or similar values, does it? The problem really is whether students can defend what they have done, prove what is said, point out mistakes, and propose alternative solutions using a specific discipline? In a survey of student attitudes, most respondents were very encouraged by the prospect of AI feature in classrooms that is useful in whatever way to them, although its mechanism is still also questioned when it comes to the questions of its validity, ethical concerns, and the fear that the skill of being analytical might grow weak with time (Chan & Hu, 2023; Strzelecki, 2024). With regards to the use of AI in the academia, it has been tried to be regulated with the help of a long list of rules, guidelines and prohibitions, all of which risk that the first positive steps will erupt into the use of covert avoidance of the prohibitions by students, or do without it at all until the generating society acquires the cognitive functions being measured through such assessments (Cotton et al., 2024; Farrokhnia et al., 2024).

4.4 Governance is expanding, but unevenly

The basic functioning of institutions has greatly accelerated. According to the preliminary results of the recent surveys of 436 elementary schools and pre-schools conducted by UNESCO, not more than 10%

had rules as such; however, universities were more likely to have them, the figure being around 13% versus the earlier 7%. And in a 2025 survey on higher education also conducted by UNESCO, it indicated that 19% of them had a written policy in place while 42% were in the process of developing such a policy. Although these two samples do not suffice for the drawing of a definitive longitudinal cause analysis, they still suggest a rapid greenfield progression in the sphere of education policy.

The Policy scope is still kind of a tie, that is, geographically. The presence of policy guidelines can be said to be around seventy percent in Europe and North America, while Latin America and the Caribbean exhibit about forty-five percent. UNESCO went further to claim that one out of four interviewees had come across an ethical issue that was linked to the use of AI, while more than fifty percent of them still had concerns more towards the use, prospects, and general outcomes of AI in education and training. 2025 Education Landscape Study, however, encapsulated it differently in that dynamics among institutions in the development of AI refer to the digital divide that is strategy, policy, workforce, infrastructure, and resources- and not just tools.

Organisations often raise issues of fairness and unfairness within higher educational institutions. There exist differences in students' previous experiences, disciplinary infractions and language skills, device capabilities, internet connections, and access to high-end facilities. The entrance and acceptance of the claim has also been supported by the Higher Education Policy Institute (HEPI), as one in three tertiary students never pursued the subject of generative AI in their last course, and those in Arts and Humanities especially felt that they were not prepared for career changes. If informal language abilities are considered equivalent to literacy, the use of AI may be expected to widen rather than narrow educational disparities.

Table 2. Empirical indicators of transformation asymmetry.

Domain	Indicator	Observed value	Interpretation
Student practice	Use AI / use for assessed work	95% / 94% (HEPI 2026)	Adoption is effectively universal
Course design	AI integrated into many courses	15% (DEC 2026)	Formal integration remains limited
Learning value	Transformed learning / enhanced outcomes	5% / 28% among exposed students	Most integration is not yet transformative
Instructor readiness	Students judge instructors well equipped	29% (DEC 2026)	Low confidence in guidance capability
Capability gap	Faculty training minus perceived readiness	35 percentage points	Training participation may not translate into visible practice
Assessment	Most/many assessments aligned with AI-enabled work	28% (DEC 2026)	Curricular and workplace alignment is weak

Domain	Indicator	Observed value	Interpretation
Skills support	AI skills essential / staff helping development	68% / 48% (HEPI 2026)	20-point institutional support gap
Governance equity	Guidance in Europe/N. America vs LAC	70% / 45% (UNESCO 2025)	25-point regional policy gap

5. Discussion

While the available evidence provides various conclusions on the existence of AI technology in various aspects, such as learning, knowledge gain, and teaching, there are certain contradictions. Three conclusions follow from these facts; each is expressed in a rather particular way. First, the change takes place from the bottom up: the introduction of AI by students and lecturers at the individual level has preceded the inclusion of AI in the curricula of institutions being of an entire level, so the change in the organizational design comes afterwards. Second, pedagogical effectiveness varies with the rectilinear course: the best results are seen with scenarios that are going to be experienced by the learners in that order, i.e., assessing what is taught in the course, but many other reasons weaken claims that integrating ordinary courses taxes students any more or less. Third, it is the credibility of assessment practices and academia that are starting to hamper it. Institutions can no longer hold trust intact when faculty members do not understand the new evaluation standards, fail to reliably detect cheats, and students find the differential treatment of them by acquisition advantage present.

The information discussed reinforces the very tenets of the word customization. Generative systems can change the language, pace, examples, and responses, but it is essential to point out that being adaptive is very different from real personalized content that is proven by facts. Educating one, however, shall have a learner model in place, specific objectives to achieve, diagnostics carried out, appropriate difficulty adjusted, and a monitoring plan put in place to ascertain that the adaptations do add value in learning. All of these terms make perfect sense in the context of conversational interaction. It may sound like conversational fluency is personal because a few questions are being posed, but it does not lead to the teaching of any content in order to handle it better in the future. Enhance engagement in the areas in which the students and the teacher interact. From the above account, one can deduce that AI has the potential to improve support services on a larger scale, but it also entails fears regarding social boundaries, control machinery, and interpersonal deterioration (Seo et al., 2021).

ALIGN framework is a new method that is used for deploying institutions, and the details of this are explained in one of the chapters. Among other things, students need to have fair access, which includes support in other languages, accessibility features, and options for those who would wish to use other forms instead of these ones. Deciding on the activities to employ in the learning process has to be understood within the perspective where AI will take a role to record data, explain, assist in the execution of the tasks and give feedback, and engage in reviewing activities rather than performing the primary cognitive steps. Confidentiality relies on the way push is portrayed; clear guidelines and objective sanctions, the means of their examination, as well as the service's appeals body. Control encompasses reviewing the acquisition of goods and services, above all the state's compliance with national data protection legislation, limiting how much information is collected and processed, supervising people's involvement in activities, and assessing outcomes. AI, an evolving technology, is a

prerequisite for the integration of new and enhanced features into the curriculum for learners and allows for any additional and up-to-date information to be imparted to the teaching staff at any given time. Since these components are interdependent, changes should be treated as a chain with the principle of the weakest link in relation to the center: any clever device of its own will fail, like iEP or paper grade or crcl; any he loses his density or most suffers will never help.

Hence, the investigation stands in contrast to what is typically relied upon as a pointer of success in the number of licenses, login counts, or the volume of published policies. But more accurate definitions of impact would revolve around components such as improved academic performance, attention given to the feedback, the results of revisions, the evaluation of different assessment levels, student perceptions, the amount of stress, as well as the patterns of access that lead to different outcomes in specific social groups. Also count the fraction of educators who can actually demonstrate, and not just claim or report that they employ these tools in an educationally correct manner. Furthermore, the level of innovation and development in universities should be estimated depending on effective pedagogical factors and not on the amount of technology being earmarked for use in educational activities as depicted in the institutional strategic plan or on the various computer screens.

6. Practical Implications for Higher-Education Institutions

Establish a collaborative AI repository. Provide orientation to every student or job-delineated training to the staff, more like personalized growth. Include teaching, assessments, privacy issues, bias awareness, reference protocols, and disciplinary constraints till it's evident that an infraction is direct.

Re-structure the program in its entirety rather than just random tasks. Instead of focusing on singular tasks, identify the areas where students are supposed to learn through the application of AI, as well as the areas where they are supposed to learn AI-related content. Arrange the various learning modes throughout the program in the correct order so that the basic aspects are done before the advanced capacities are present.

Develop an assessment-based approach. Beginning from specific task level and actual data-rich evidence.

Also, make students explain why they used certain sources, the exact prompts, any revisions, and the decisions they made, kind of in a traceable way, not just the final answer.

Evaluate how well the pilots meet the objectives required in the course. Bring in elements of control such as comparison groups or pre/post measures if possible. Rather than depend wholly on satisfaction figures, compliance, or adherence, monitor learning, time on course, attitudes, use of feedback, and any consequences in different market groups.

This involves the development of such accountable governance criteria as vendor agreement, treatment of data, what compromises the model could have, ways of settling disputes between parties promptly, and recourse against decisions.

Support economic integration rather than making education exclusive to those who can afford to buy a better supported adaptation middleware. Provide accessible opportunities and non-intelligent services where similar participation will not be ensured.

7. Limitations

A huge chunk of the analysis is based on the data gathered from different unrelated sources. Due to differences in the groups and sample selection, various surveys, such as DEC, HEPI, UNESCO, and

EDUCAUSE, have been very keen on noting that most of the data is self-reported. Since almost all of the indicators have self-estimation, the percentage differences between various surveys can be seen as trend-valid rather than. The trial of Kestin et al. is performed within a rigorous STEM education environment, with a structured field of material and a fixed teacher, only shielding it from other domains and artificial code-writing machines. Constant updating also signifies the possibility of the information on specific instruments becoming obsolete. The discussion will therefore be centered on reported activities and student performance; such aspects as memory freeze, academic self-sufficiency, limiting workload, and strategic expenditure require correlative longitudinal studies to be initiated.

8. Conclusion

In higher education, the spread of AI-inspired changes can be understood as a full-fledged introduction under conditions of incomplete institutional adjustment. The practically complete habituation of students, the trend of growing faculty willingness, and the rush of policy interventions show that AI has not remained in the peripheral stage. Yet, the reality of the situation is still mixed with respect to its transformative role: the mode of teaching is not particularly interactive; the quality of information on assessment by institutions is poor, teachers' skills and competencies still have some gaps, and the quality of self-assessment hardly meets the level of an AI-empowered workplace. Experimental studies have been conducted to establish that the use of AI in pedagogy has a very good effect on learning outcomes. This assumption, however, cannot be applied to using an AI learning assistant help that is available to students from a free chatbot. This means that the most important thing scientifically should shift towards making the ad hoc use of technology structured educationally. Institutions that also include Access, Learning design, Integrity, Governance, and New capabilities in their activities will find it easier to use AI to enhance learning and judgments than as a substitute for them. The issue of concern is not automating pre-existing academic activities per se; it concerns the design of more efficient, fair, and reliable educational models of study.

References

1. Arnold, K. E., & Pistilli, M. D. (2012). Course Signals at Purdue: Using learning analytics to increase student success. Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Learning Analytics and Knowledge, 267–270. https://doi.org/10.1145/2330601.2330666
2. Bond, M., Khosravi, H., de Laat, M., Bergdahl, N., Negrea, V., Oxley, E., Pham, P., Chong, S. W., & Siemens, G. (2024). A meta systematic review of artificial intelligence in higher education: A call for increased ethics, collaboration, and rigour. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 21, 4. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00436-z
3. Chan, C. K. Y., & Hu, W. (2023). Students' voices on generative AI: Perceptions, benefits, and challenges in higher education. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 20, 43. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00411-8
4. Chen, L., Chen, P., & Lin, Z. (2020). Artificial intelligence in education: A review. IEEE Access, 8, 75264–75278. https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2020.2988510
5. Cotton, D. R. E., Cotton, P. A., & Shipway, J. R. (2024). Chatting and cheating: Ensuring academic integrity in the era of ChatGPT. Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 61(2), 228–239. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2023.2190148

6. Crompton, H., & Burke, D. (2023). Artificial intelligence in higher education: The state of the field. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 20, 22. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00392-8
7. Deng, R., & Yu, Z. (2025). Does ChatGPT enhance student learning? A systematic review and meta-analysis. Computers & Education, 105224. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2024.105224
8. Dwivedi, Y. K., et al. (2023). "So what if ChatGPT wrote it?" Multidisciplinary perspectives on opportunities, challenges and implications of generative conversational AI. International Journal of Information Management, 71, 102642. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2023.102642
9. 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
10. Foltýnek, 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, 12. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-023-00133-4
11. Freeman, S., et al. (2014). Active learning increases student performance in science, engineering, and mathematics. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 111(23), 8410–8415. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1319030111
12. Gašević, D., Dawson, S., & Siemens, G. (2015). Let's not forget: Learning analytics are about learning. TechTrends, 59, 64–71. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-014-0822-x
13. Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. Review of Educational Research, 77(1), 81–112. https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487
14. Ifenthaler, D., & Yau, J. Y.-K. (2020). Utilising learning analytics to support study success in higher education: A systematic review. Educational Technology Research and Development, 68, 1961–1990. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-020-09788-z
15. Kasneci, E., et al. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. Learning and Individual Differences, 103, 102274. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274
16. Kestin, G., Miller, K., Klales, A., Milbourne, T., & Ponti, G. (2025). AI tutoring outperforms in-class active learning: An RCT introducing a novel research-based design in an elite university physics course. Scientific Reports, 15, 17458. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-025-97652-6
17. Keuning, H., Jeuring, J., & Heeren, B. (2019). A systematic literature review of automated feedback generation for programming exercises. ACM Transactions on Computing Education, 19(1), Article 3. https://doi.org/10.1145/3231711
18. Kuhail, M. A., Alturki, N., Alramlawi, S., & Alhejori, K. (2023). Interacting with educational chatbots: A systematic review. Education and Information Technologies, 28, 973–1018. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-022-11177-3
19. Kulik, J. A., & Fletcher, J. D. (2016). Effectiveness of intelligent tutoring systems: A meta-analytic review. Review of Educational Research, 86(1), 42–78. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654315581420
20. Labadze, L., Grigolia, M., & Machaidze, L. (2023). Role of AI chatbots in education: Systematic literature review. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 20, 56. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00426-1
21. Lim, W. M., Gunasekara, A., Pallant, J. L., Pallant, J. I., & Pechenkina, E. (2023). Generative AI and the future of education: Ragnarök or reformation? A paradoxical perspective from management

educators. The International Journal of Management Education, 21(2), 100790. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2023.100790

22. Lo, C. K. (2023). What is the impact of ChatGPT on education? A rapid review of the literature. Education Sciences, 13(4), 410. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13040410
23. Ma, W., Adesope, O. O., Nesbit, J. C., & Liu, Q. (2014). Intelligent tutoring systems and learning outcomes: A meta-analysis. Journal of Educational Psychology, 106(4), 901–918. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037123
24. Okonkwo, C. W., & Ade-Ibijola, A. (2021). Chatbots applications in education: A systematic review. Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 2, 100033. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2021.100033
25. Perkins, M. (2023). Academic integrity considerations of AI large language models in the post-pandemic era: ChatGPT and beyond. Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice, 20(2). https://doi.org/10.53761/1.20.02.07
26. Schwendimann, B. A., et al. (2017). Perceiving learning at a glance: A systematic literature review of learning dashboard research. IEEE Transactions on Learning Technologies, 10(1), 30–41. https://doi.org/10.1109/TLT.2016.2599522
27. Seo, K., Tang, J., Roll, I., Fels, S., & Yoon, D. (2021). The impact of artificial intelligence on learner–instructor interaction in online learning. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 18, 54. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-021-00292-9
28. Steenbergen-Hu, S., & Cooper, H. (2014). A meta-analysis of the effectiveness of intelligent tutoring systems on college students' academic learning. Journal of Educational Psychology, 106(2), 331–347. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034752
29. Strzelecki, A. (2024). To use or not to use ChatGPT in higher education? A study of students' acceptance and use of technology. Interactive Learning Environments, 32(9), 5142–5155. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2023.2209881
30. Tlili, A., et al. (2023). What if the devil is my guardian angel: ChatGPT as a case study of using chatbots in education. Smart Learning Environments, 10, 15. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-023-00237-x
31. VanLehn, K. (2011). The relative effectiveness of human tutoring, intelligent tutoring systems, and other tutoring systems. Educational Psychologist, 46(4), 197–221. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2011.611369
32. Weber-Wulff, D., et al. (2023). Testing of detection tools for AI-generated text. International Journal for Educational Integrity, 19, 26. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-023-00146-z
33. Wollny, S., Schneider, J., Di Mitri, D., Weidlich, J., Rittberger, M., & Drachsler, H. (2021). Are we there yet? A systematic literature review on chatbots in education. Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence, 4, 654924. https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2021.654924
34. Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V. I., Bond, M., & Gouverneur, F. (2019). Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education—Where are the educators? International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 16, 39. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0
35. Digital Education Council. (2026). AI in Higher Education Global Survey 2026. https://www.digitaleducationcouncil.com/resource-library-items/ai-in-higher-education-global-survey-2026

36. Digital Education Council. (2025). Global AI Faculty Survey 2025. https://www.digitaleducationcouncil.com/post/digital-education-council-global-ai-faculty-survey
37. Higher Education Policy Institute. (2026). Student Generative Artificial Intelligence Survey 2026 (Report 199). https://www.hepi.ac.uk/reports/student-generative-ai-survey-2026/
38. Robert, J., & McCormack, M. (2025). 2025 EDUCAUSE AI Landscape Study: Into the Digital AI Divide. https://library.educause.edu/resources/2025/2/2025-educause-ai-landscape-study
39. UNESCO. (2023). Survey: Less than 10% of schools and universities have formal guidance on AI. https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/unesco-survey-less-10-schools-and-universities-have-formal-guidance-ai
40. UNESCO. (2025). Survey: Two-thirds of higher education institutions have or are developing guidance on AI use. https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/unesco-survey-two-thirds-higher-education-institutions-have-or-are-developing-guidance-ai-use