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

The Role of AI-Powered Learning Management System in Transforming Higher Education

Twinkle Verma[1], Dr. Ripudaman Singh[2], Ankita Kaushal[3]

[1,3]PhD Scholar, Chitkara School of Mass Communication, Chitkara University, Punjab , India
[2]Assistant Professor, Chitkara School of Mass Communication, Chitkara University, Punjab, India

Abstract
This chapter empirically evaluates how artificial intelligence (AI)-powered learning management systems (LMSs) are transforming higher education by combining authoritative sector statistics with observed outcomes from predictive analytics, dashboards, early-warning systems, and conversational AI. Secondary-data calculations identify an 11-percentage-point gap between student AI use and institution-provided AI access in Jisc's 2024/25 survey, a 42-point UNESCO policy-formalization gap, a 25-point regional guidance gap, and a 38-point EDUCAUSE analytics-priority/leadership gap. Intervention evidence shows that AI-LMS functions improve online practice, self-regulation, early-risk detection, and targeted support more consistently than final achievement. In a randomized dashboard experiment, online performance improved by about 0.20-0.25 standard deviations while the final-exam effect was 0.05 SD and non-significant; a quasi-experimental chatbot study improved interest and self-directed learning without significant knowledge or clinical-reasoning gains. The findings show that transformation depends on human-AI orchestration rather than automation alone. A four-domain AI-LMS Transformation Readiness Model is proposed: data readiness, pedagogical orchestration, equitable access, and accountable governance.

Keywords: artificial intelligence; learning management systems; learning analytics; higher education; predictive analytics; AI chatbots; student success; digital transformation

1. Introduction

Learning management systems have evolved from repositories for course files and submissions into data-rich infrastructures that record resource use, assessment activity, discussion, feedback, and study timing. When these traces are combined with machine learning, predictive analytics, recommender systems, natural-language interfaces, and automated feedback, the LMS can move from documenting learning to supporting decisions during learning. An AI-powered LMS is therefore not simply an LMS with a chatbot; it is an environment that converts data into predictions, explanations, interventions, and personalized support (Macfadyen & Dawson, 2010; Verbert et al., 2013; Ouyang & Jiao, 2021).

Sector data show adoption without equivalent institutional readiness. Jisc's 2024/25 survey of 15,398 higher-education students found 34% used AI for learning while 23% had institution-provided access; 60% reported Wi-Fi problems and 37% lacked a suitable device at some point. UNESCO's 2025 survey of 400 respondents across 90 countries found 19% of institutions had a formal AI policy, 42% were developing guidance, and one in four had encountered AI-related ethical issues. EDUCAUSE (2024) reported that 69% treated analytics as a strategic priority, yet 69% reported no chief analytics officer.

The empirical problem is therefore whether institutional capacity, access, pedagogy, and governance can convert rapid AI adoption into educational value.

Empirical research explains why this distinction matters. LMS traces can identify academic risk and predict performance (Hu et al., 2014; Hoffait & Schyns, 2017), but prediction changes outcomes only when educators or learners receive usable information and act on it (Jayaprakash et al., 2014; Herodotou et al., 2019). Dashboards may improve online practice without changing final examination results (Hellings & Haelermans, 2022), while AI chatbots may strengthen self-directed learning without immediate knowledge gains (Han et al., 2022). AI-LMS transformation must therefore be evaluated as a socio-technical intervention rather than a technology acquisition.

Accordingly, this chapter integrates sector indicators with intervention evidence through an outcome chain: access -> data capture -> AI inference/generation -> feedback -> human response -> learning outcome. Its contribution is to quantify breaks in this chain and identify the institutional conditions most consistently associated with useful AI-LMS deployment.

2. Research Objectives

RO1. Quantify the current gap between AI adoption and institutional readiness in higher education using authoritative secondary data.

RO2. Compare observed educational outcomes associated with predictive analytics, learning dashboards, early-warning interventions, and AI conversational support embedded in or connected to LMS environments.

RO3. Identify the conditions under which AI-LMS capabilities translate into engagement, self-regulation, retention, or achievement gains rather than merely producing predictions or automated outputs.

RO4. Develop an evidence-based institutional model for responsible AI-LMS transformation that integrates pedagogy, data capacity, equitable access, and governance.

3. Methodology

The study uses an empirical secondary-data design. Sector evidence was drawn from Jisc's 2024/25 UK Higher Education Students Digital Experience Insights survey, UNESCO's 2025 higher-education AI survey, and the 2024 EDUCAUSE Analytics Landscape Study. Peer-reviewed evidence was included when it reported observed higher-education outcomes from LMS analytics, prediction, dashboards, adaptive intervention, or AI-supported learning and provided a traceable DOI. The evidence matrix also incorporated intervention and evaluation research on data-driven support and dashboards (Lauría et al., 2013; Dodge et al., 2015; Foster & Francis, 2020; Schwendimann et al., 2017; Howard et al., 2017).

For sector data, reported percentages were extracted and four descriptive gaps calculated: student AI use-provision (34-23=11 points); UNESCO framework coverage/development versus formal policy (61-19=42 points); regional guidance development (70-45=25 points); and analytics strategic-priority versus chief-analytics-officer presence (69-31=38 points). For intervention studies, sample, capability, outcome, effect size/direction, and implementation condition were extracted. Proximal outcomes (practice, engagement, self-regulation) were separated from distal outcomes (examination, persistence, completion). Cross-study heterogeneity was retained because predictive relationships vary by discipline and instructional design (Gašević et al., 2016; Kizilcec et al., 2017). The analysis is comparative and descriptive, not a pooled meta-analysis.

4. Results and Findings

4.1 Adoption is advancing faster than institutional readiness

Table 1 shows simultaneous adoption and capacity deficits. Jisc's 11-point AI use-provision gap means some learning-related AI use occurs outside institutionally provisioned environments, fragmenting privacy, accessibility, guidance, and data governance. Connectivity and device barriers further show that an AI-LMS strategy cannot assume universal high-quality access.

Indicator	Reported data	Derived reading	Implication for AI-LMS
Student AI adoption/provision	34% use AI; 23% institution-provided access (Jisc, 2025)	11-point provision gap	Integrate sanctioned AI access and guidance inside institutional learning environments.
Digital access barriers	60% Wi-Fi issues; 37% lacked suitable device (Jisc, 2025)	High residual access risk	Design mobile/lightweight access, offline alternatives and equity monitoring.
AI governance	19% formal policy; 42% developing guidance (UNESCO, 2025)	61% covered or developing; only 19% formalized	Technical deployment is outpacing policy maturity.
Regional governance	~70% Europe/N. America vs 45% Latin America/Caribbean have/develop guidance (UNESCO, 2025)	25-point regional gap	Governance capacity is uneven across systems.
Analytics leadership	69% strategic priority; 69% report no chief analytics officer (EDUCAUSE, 2024)	Only 31% report CAO; 38-point priority/leadership gap	AI-LMS needs accountable data/analytics ownership, not only software procurement.

Table 1. Institutional AI-LMS readiness indicators derived from authoritative secondary data.

UNESCO's evidence shows an equivalent governance lag: 61% reported formal or developing AI frameworks, but only 19% had formal policies, producing a 42-point formalization gap. The 25-point Europe/North America versus Latin America/Caribbean guidance gap also indicates that comparable AI capabilities operate within unequal governance environments.

4.2 Predictive capability creates value only when prediction becomes intervention

LMS traces can support early detection because they reveal pace, participation, assessment behavior, and interaction. Studies show that such signals can predict performance and identify students requiring support (Macfadyen & Dawson, 2010; Hu et al., 2014; Hoffait & Schyns, 2017; Howard et al., 2018). Yet prediction is only an input to action. Jayaprakash et al. (2014) linked risk information to intervention workflows, while Herodotou et al. (2019), across 59 teachers, nine courses and 1,325 students, found that access to predictive analytics did not produce systematic teacher use. Human follow-up is therefore a core causal mechanism of AI-LMS value.

4.3 Dashboards improve proximal learning behavior more reliably than distal achievement

Hellings and Haelermans' (2022) randomized experiment with 556 first-year computer-science students provides a causal benchmark. A dashboard showing LMS progress and predicted performance raised online quiz performance by 0.16 SD; estimated effects of actual dashboard use were about 0.20 SD, with mastery effects around 0.20-0.25 SD. The final-exam effect, however, was only 0.05 SD and non-significant, and effects differed by specialization. AI-LMS effectiveness therefore cannot be inferred from usage, prediction accuracy, or proximal gains alone.

Empirical evidence	Design/context	Observed result	Interpretation
Hellings & Haelermans (2022)	RCT; 556 programming students; LMS dashboard + weekly email	Online performance ~0.20-0.25 SD; final exam 0.05 SD, non-significant	Process gains do not automatically transfer to summative outcomes.
Herodotou et al. (2019)	59 teachers; 9 courses; 1,325 students; predictive analytics	Potential positive impact when teachers engaged; use was not systematic	Teacher interpretation and follow-up mediate system value.
Han et al. (2022)	Quasi-experiment; 61 nursing students; AI chatbot	Higher interest (p=.020) and self-directed learning (p=.006); no significant knowledge/reasoning gain	Motivational/self-regulatory gains may precede cognitive gains.
Jayaprakash et al. (2014)	Multi-institution early-alert analytics initiative	Predictive risk information linked to intervention workflows	Analytics becomes educationally meaningful through timely human support.
Gašević et al. (2016)	4,134 students across 9 blended courses	Predictive relationships changed with instructional conditions	One-size-fits-all AI prediction is inappropriate.
Wu & Yu (2024)	Meta-analysis of AI-chatbot learning outcomes	Overall large positive effect; effects varied by conditions	Conversational AI can be effective, but design/context moderate outcomes.

Table 2. Empirical outcome benchmarks for AI-supported LMS transformation.

4.4 Conversational AI expands the LMS from monitoring to interactive support

Conversational AI extends the LMS from monitoring to interactive scaffolding. In Han et al.'s (2022) quasi-experiment (N=61), the chatbot group reported higher educational interest (p=.020) and self-directed learning (p=.006), but not significantly higher knowledge, clinical reasoning, confidence, or feedback satisfaction. Wu et al. (2024) likewise found ChatGPT-based support useful for self-regulation and knowledge construction, and Wu and Yu (2024) reported a large overall chatbot learning effect with moderation by education level and intervention duration. The evidence supports conversational AI as guided scaffolding, not as a substitute for verified instruction (Kasneci et al., 2023).

4.5 Transformation depends on feedback quality, instructional design, and ethical legitimacy

Three conditions explain the mixed effects. Feedback must be interpretable and actionable (Hattie & Timperley, 2007); analytics must reflect instructional design because identical traces can mean different things across courses (Joksimović et al., 2015; Nguyen et al., 2017; van Leeuwen et al., 2015); and governance must protect privacy, agency, and students vulnerable to opaque or self-fulfilling classifications (Pardo & Siemens, 2014; Slade & Prinsloo, 2013; Prinsloo, 2017).

5. Discussion

The combined evidence indicates that AI transforms the LMS by shortening the distance between evidence and intervention. Traditional systems mainly document content, submissions, and grades; AI-enabled systems can identify emerging risk, weak concepts, relevant resources, and possible feedback while a course is still underway (Ali et al., 2013; Verbert et al., 2013; Ouyang & Jiao, 2021).

The results reject a simple automation thesis. Dashboards can improve online practice without final-exam gains; predictive analytics can be available without consistent teacher use; and chatbots can improve self-regulation without immediate knowledge improvement. AI thus supplies scalable signals and interaction, but educators and learners still interpret, trust, and act on them. Research on instructor presence and learning-analytics interventions reaches the same conclusion (Ma et al., 2015; Bodily & Verbert, 2017; Larrabee Sønderlund et al., 2019; Wong & Li, 2020).

Personalization should therefore mean context-sensitive intervention rather than individualized classification. Self-regulatory behavior predicts learning trajectories (Kizilcec et al., 2017), while predictive relationships vary with instructional conditions (Gašević et al., 2016). Responsible systems should expose context, uncertainty, and options so that personalization expands learner and teacher agency.

The sector indicators also explain fragmented implementation: student AI use exceeds institutional provision, policy development exceeds formalization, and strategic interest in analytics exceeds dedicated leadership. AI-LMS projects therefore need interoperable data, staff development, evaluation protocols, and accountable ownership; more data alone do not guarantee useful feedback (Tempelaar et al., 2015).

5.1 AI-LMS Transformation Readiness Model

The secondary-data findings support four readiness domains, presented as simultaneous institutional conditions rather than a fixed maturity sequence.

Readiness domain	Evidence-based requirement	Failure mode if absent	Practical indicator
1. Data readiness	Interoperable LMS, assessment and student-support data; validated indicators	Prediction from incomplete/noisy traces; misleading alerts	Documented data definitions, model validation and monitoring.

Readiness domain	Evidence-based requirement	Failure mode if absent	Practical indicator
2. Pedagogical orchestration	Teachers/advisers know how and when to act on AI signals	Accurate analytics with no meaningful intervention	Intervention protocol, staff development, response-time targets.
3. Equitable access	Institution-provided tools, devices/connectivity support, accessible design	Benefits concentrated among students with better private resources	Access-gap monitoring by learner group; non-AI/offline alternatives.
4. Accountable governance	Policy, privacy, transparency, appeals and human oversight	Opaque profiling, inconsistent rules, low trust	Named accountable owner; student notice/consent; audit and appeal routes.

Table 3. AI-LMS Transformation Readiness Model derived from the empirical synthesis.

The model reframes procurement: institutions should ask whether a capability produces a valid signal, whether that signal enables an appropriate intervention, whether all students can benefit, and whether consequential decisions can be explained and challenged. These questions align with learning-analytics ethics and with warnings against excluding educators from AI design (Pardo & Siemens, 2014; Popenici & Kerr, 2017; Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019).

6. Practical Implications for Higher Education Institutions

Institutions should first prioritize use cases with clear intervention pathways, such as missed assessments or repeated low-stakes failure, and validate models within each discipline rather than transferring them untested (Gašević et al., 2016; Howard et al., 2018).

AI feedback should scaffold learning and teacher work: dashboards should give understandable reasons and next steps, while conversational systems should encourage retrieval, reflection, source checking, and disclosure of uncertainty. High-stakes decisions require human review (Kasneci et al., 2023).

Evaluation should separate proximal from distal outcomes. Institutions should measure action on feedback, practice, completion, and subgroup effects—not only model accuracy or chatbot usage. Hellings and Haelermans (2022) show why online-quiz gains cannot be reported as final-learning gains unless distal outcomes also improve.

Equity and governance should also be implementation metrics: institutions should monitor access, opt-outs, alert allocation, subgroup false positives, and routes for explaining or contesting consequential predictions (Pardo & Siemens, 2014; Prinsloo, 2017).

7. Limitations

The evidence sources differ in geography, sampling frame, discipline, duration, and outcome measurement, so their percentages and effects should not be treated as one global causal estimate. Generative-AI capabilities and policies also change rapidly, while secondary data cannot reveal all local configuration or workload details. Institution-specific validation remains necessary.

8. Conclusion

AI-powered learning management systems transform higher education when they connect institutional data with timely, interpretable, and ethically governed action. The secondary data show that adoption can exceed institution-provided access, policy development can exceed formal governance, and strategic analytics interest can exceed dedicated leadership. Intervention studies show a similar pattern: AI more reliably improves proximal outcomes such as practice, awareness, and self-regulation than distal achievement. The decisive mechanism is human-AI orchestration—valid data identify a need, the system communicates it transparently, educators or learners can act, and institutions evaluate benefit and harm. Data readiness, pedagogical orchestration, equitable access, and accountable governance are therefore the four core conditions for turning the LMS from a digital record system into a responsive learning infrastructure.

References

1. EDUCAUSE. (2024). 2024 EDUCAUSE Analytics Landscape Study. https://library.educause.edu/resources/2024/9/2024-educause-analytics-landscape-study
2. Jisc. (2025). 2024/25 UK higher education students digital experience insights survey findings. https://digitalinsights.jisc.ac.uk/reports-and-briefings/our-reports/2024-25-uk-higher-education-students-digital-experience-insights-survey-findings/
3. UNESCO. (2025, September 2). UNESCO 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
4. Ali, L., Asadi, M., Gašević, D., Jovanović, J., & Hatala, M. (2013). Factors influencing beliefs for adoption of a learning analytics tool: An empirical study. Computers & Education, 62, 130-148. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2012.10.023
5. Bodily, R., & Verbert, K. (2017). Trends and issues in student-facing learning analytics reporting systems research. Proceedings of the Seventh International Learning Analytics & Knowledge Conference, 309-318. https://doi.org/10.1145/3027385.3027403
6. Dodge, B., Whitmer, J., & Frazee, J. P. (2015). Improving undergraduate student achievement in large blended courses through data-driven interventions. Proceedings of LAK '15, 412-413. https://doi.org/10.1145/2723576.2723657
7. Foster, C., & Francis, P. (2020). A systematic review on the deployment and effectiveness of data analytics in higher education to improve student outcomes. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 45(6), 822-841. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2019.1696945
8. Gašević, D., Dawson, S., Rogers, T., & Gašević, D. (2016). Learning analytics should not promote one size fits all: The effects of instructional conditions in predicting academic success. The Internet and Higher Education, 28, 68-84. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2015.10.002
9. Han, J.-W., Park, J., & Lee, H. (2022). Analysis of the effect of an artificial intelligence chatbot educational program on non-face-to-face classes: A quasi-experimental study. BMC Medical Education, 22, 830. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-022-03898-3
10. Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. Review of Educational Research, 77(1), 81-112. https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487

11. Hellings, J., & Haelermans, C. (2022). The effect of providing learning analytics on student behaviour and performance in programming: A randomised controlled experiment. Higher Education, 83, 1-18. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-020-00560-z
12. Herodotou, C., Rienties, B., Boroowa, A., Zdrahal, Z., & Hlosta, M. (2019). A large-scale implementation of predictive learning analytics in higher education: The teachers' role and perspective. Educational Technology Research and Development, 67, 1273-1306. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-019-09685-0
13. Hoffait, A.-S., & Schyns, M. (2017). Early detection of university students with potential difficulties. Decision Support Systems, 101, 1-11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dss.2017.05.003
14. Howard, C., Jordan, P., di Eugenio, B., & Katz, S. (2017). Shifting the load: A peer dialogue agent that encourages its human collaborator to contribute more to problem solving. International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education, 27(1), 101-129. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-015-0071-y
15. Howard, E., Meehan, M., & Parnell, A. (2018). Contrasting prediction methods for early warning systems at undergraduate level. The Internet and Higher Education, 37, 66-75. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2018.02.001
16. Hu, Y.-H., Lo, C.-L., & Shih, S.-P. (2014). Developing early warning systems to predict students' online learning performance. Computers in Human Behavior, 36, 469-478. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2014.04.002
17. Jayaprakash, S. M., Moody, E. W., Lauría, E. J. M., Regan, J. R., & Baron, J. D. (2014). Early alert of academically at-risk students: An open source analytics initiative. Journal of Learning Analytics, 1(1), 6-47. https://doi.org/10.18608/jla.2014.11.3
18. Joksimović, S., Gašević, D., Loughin, T. M., Kovanović, V., & Hatala, M. (2015). Learning at distance: Effects of interaction traces on academic achievement. Computers & Education, 87, 204-217. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2015.07.002
19. Kasneci, E., Seßler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., 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
20. Kizilcec, R. F., Pérez-Sanagustín, M., & Maldonado, J. J. (2017). Self-regulated learning strategies predict learner behavior and goal attainment in massive open online courses. Computers & Education, 104, 18-33. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2016.10.001
21. Larrabee Sønderlund, A., Hughes, E., & Smith, J. (2019). The efficacy of learning analytics interventions in higher education: A systematic review. British Journal of Educational Technology, 50(5), 2594-2618. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12720
22. Lauría, E. J. M., Moody, E. W., Jayaprakash, S. M., Jonnalagadda, N., & Baron, J. D. (2013). Open academic analytics initiative: Initial research findings. Proceedings of LAK '13, 150-154. https://doi.org/10.1145/2460296.2460325
23. Macfadyen, L. P., & Dawson, S. (2010). Mining LMS data to develop an 'early warning system' for educators: A proof of concept. Computers & Education, 54(2), 588-599. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2009.09.008
24. Ma, J., Han, X., Yang, J., & Cheng, J. (2015). Examining the necessary condition for engagement in an online learning environment based on learning analytics: The role of the instructor. The Internet and Higher Education, 24, 26-34. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2014.09.005

25. Nguyen, Q., Rienties, B., Toetenel, L., Ferguson, R., & Whitelock, D. (2017). Examining the designs of computer-based assessment and its impact on student engagement, satisfaction, and pass rates. Computers in Human Behavior, 76, 703-714. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2017.03.028
26. Ouyang, F., & Jiao, P. (2021). Artificial intelligence in education: The three paradigms. Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 2, 100020. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2021.100020
27. Pardo, A., & Siemens, G. (2014). Ethical and privacy principles for learning analytics. British Journal of Educational Technology, 45(3), 438-450. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12152
28. Popenici, S. A. D., & Kerr, S. (2017). Exploring the impact of artificial intelligence on teaching and learning in higher education. Research and Practice in Technology Enhanced Learning, 12, 22. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41039-017-0062-8
29. Prinsloo, P. (2017). Fleeing from Frankenstein's monster and meeting Kafka on the way: Algorithmic decision-making in higher education. E-Learning and Digital Media, 14(3), 138-163. https://doi.org/10.1177/2042753017731355
30. Schwendimann, B. A., Rodriguez-Triana, M. J., Vozniuk, A., Prieto, L. P., Boroujeni, M. S., Holzer, 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
31. Slade, S., & Prinsloo, P. (2013). Learning analytics: Ethical issues and dilemmas. American Behavioral Scientist, 57(10), 1510-1529. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764213479366
32. Tempelaar, D. T., Rienties, B., & Giesbers, B. (2015). In search for the most informative data for feedback generation: Learning analytics in a data-rich context. Computers in Human Behavior, 47, 157-167. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2014.05.038
33. van Leeuwen, A., Janssen, J., Erkens, G., & Brekelmans, M. (2015). Teacher regulation of cognitive activities during student collaboration: Effects of learning analytics. Computers & Education, 90, 80-94. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2015.09.006
34. Verbert, K., Duval, E., Klerkx, J., Govaerts, S., & Santos, J. L. (2013). Learning analytics dashboard applications. American Behavioral Scientist, 57(10), 1500-1509. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764213479363
35. Wong, B. T.-M., & Li, K. C. (2020). A review of learning analytics intervention in higher education (2011-2018). Journal of Computers in Education, 7(1), 7-28. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40692-019-00143-7
36. Wu, R., & Yu, Z. (2024). Do AI chatbots improve students' learning outcomes? Evidence from a meta-analysis. British Journal of Educational Technology, 55(1). https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13334
37. Wu, T.-T., Lee, H.-Y., & Li, P.-H. (2024). Promoting self-regulation progress and knowledge construction in blended learning via ChatGPT-based learning aid. Journal of Educational Computing Research, 61(8), 1539-1567. https://doi.org/10.1177/07356331231191125
38. 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