CHALLENGES, RISKS, AND ETHICAL CONCERNS IN THE INTEGRATION OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION: A SYSTEMATIC LITERATURE REVIEW

YÜKSEKÖĞRETİMDE YAPAY ZEKA ENTEGRASYONUNDA KARŞILAŞILAN ZORLUKLAR, RİSKLER VE ETİK KAYGILAR: SİSTEMATİK BİR LİTERATÜR TARAMASI

Zafer KADIRHAN

142

Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi
Yıl: 2026, Sayfa: 1-19

Makale Türü: Araştırma Makalesi

DOI: 10.35379/cusosbil.1696829

Geliş Received: **10.05.2025**
Kabul Accepted: **18.11.2025**

CHALLENGES, RISKS, AND ETHICAL CONCERNS IN THE INTEGRATION OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION: A SYSTEMATIC LITERATURE REVIEW

YÜKSEKÖĞRETİMDE YAPAY ZEKA ENTEGRASYONUNDA KARŞILAŞILAN ZORLUKLAR, RİSKLER VE ETİK KAYGILAR: SİSTEMATİK BİR LİTERATÜR TARAMASI

Zafer KADIRHAN [1]

Keywords:
Artificial intelligence,
Higher education,
Challenges,
Risks,
Ethical concerns.

Anahtar Kelimeler:
Yapay zeka,
Yükseköğretim,
Zorluklar,
Riskler,
Etik Kaygılar.

ABSTRACT

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into higher education (HE) has signifi-cantly transformed teaching and learning, offering both opportunities and critical challenges. This systematic literature review (SLR) analyzes 95 peer-reviewed stud-ies published between 2020 and May 2025, retrieved from Web of Science, Scopus, and EBSCO Education Source, focusing on the risks, challenges, and ethical concerns of AI adoption in HE. Four primary themes emerged: 1) Academic Integrity and Mis-use of AI Tools, highlighting risks of unethical reliance on AI and threats to cognitive engagement; 2) Data Privacy, Security, and Ethical Concerns, emphasizing the man-agement of personal data, algorithmic bias, and institutional responsibilities; 3) Over-reliance on AI and Its Impact on Learning Outcomes, addressing the potential erosion of critical thinking, problem-solving, and intrinsic motivation; and 4) Equity and Ac-cess to AI Tools, focusing on digital divides and the need for inclusive AI literacy. The findings underscore that effective AI integration requires clear institutional poli-cies, ethical frameworks, and equitable access, while future research should empiri-cally investigate AI's impact on learning, cognitive development, and educational equity.

ÖZ

Yapay zekânın (YZ) yükseköğretime (YÖ) entegrasyonu, öğretim ve öğrenme süreç-lerini önemli ölçüde dönüştürmüş; hem yeni fırsatlar sunmuş hem de çeşitli kritik zor-luklar ortaya çıkarmıştır. Bu sistematik literatür taraması (SLR), 2020–Mayıs 2025 tarihleri arasında Web of Science, Scopus ve EBSCO Education Source veri tabanla-rından elde edilen 95 hakemli çalışmayı inceleyerek, YZ'nin yükseköğretimde benim-senmesine ilişkin riskler, zorluklar ve etik kaygıları analiz etmektedir. Araştırma so-nucunda dört ana tema öne çıkmıştır: 1) Akademik Dürüstlük ve YZ Araçlarının Yan-lış Kullanımı, etik dışı YZ kullanım risklerini ve bilişsel katılım üzerindeki tehditleri vurgulamaktadır; 2) Veri Gizliliği, Güvenlik ve Etik Kaygılar, kişisel verilerin yöneti-mi, algoritmik önyargılar ve kurumsal sorumlulukları ön plana çıkarmaktadır; 3) YZ'ye Aşırı Bağımlılık ve Öğrenme Sonuçları Üzerindeki Etkisi, eleştirel düşünme, problem çözme ve içsel motivasyonun olası azalmasını ele almaktadır; ve 4) YZ Araçlarına Erişim ve Eşitlik, dijital uçurumlara ve kapsayıcı YZ okuryazarlığının gerekliliğine odaklanmaktadır. Bulgular, YZ'nin etkili entegrasyonu için açık kurum-sal politikalar, etik çerçeveler ve eşit erişimin gerekliliğini vurgulamakta; ayrıca gele-cekteki araştırmaların YZ'nin öğrenme, bilişsel gelişim ve eğitimde adalet üzerindeki etkilerini ampirik olarak incelemesi gerektiğini önermektedir.

[1] Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Ankara Üniversitesi, Mühendislik Fakültesi, Yazılım Mühendisliği Bölümü, zkadirhan@ankara.edu.tr, Orcid No: 0000-0002-7839-5319

Alıntılamak için/Cite as: Kadirhan Z. (2026) Challenges, Risks, And Ethical Concerns In The Integration Of Artificial Intelligence In Higher Education: A Systematic Literature Review, Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, s1-19.

INTRODUCTION

Numerous industries have experienced profound changes as a consequence of the fast improvements in Artificial Intelligence (AI), including higher education (HE). In recent years, AI-driven technologies, including, intelligent tutoring systems (ITS), predictive analytics, automated grading tools, and conversational agents, have been increasingly integrated into academic settings (Chanthiran et al., 2022; Durak et al., 2024; Khalifa & Albadawy, 2024) to enhance learning outcomes (Almasri, 2024; Zheng et al., 2021), improve administrative efficiency (Chen et al., 2020), and support decision-making processes (Steyvers & Kumar, 2023). As universities strive to adapt to the digital age, AI offers significant potential to personalize learning, identify at-risk students, and optimize resource allocation.

Although AI offers considerable advantages, such as improved learning outcomes and administrative efficiency, it also poses serious risks, including concerns about academic integrity, data privacy, algorithmic bias, transparency, and the ethical use of AI in the classroom. These risks must be addressed with precision. While the benefits of AI adoption, like improved learning outcomes and administrative efficiency, have been widely acknowledged (Msambwa et al., 2025; Zhang & Zhang, 2024), critical voices have emerged around concerns on academic integrity, algorithmic bias, transparency, data privacy, and the ethical implementation of AI in teaching and assessment (D'Souza et al., 2024; Nguyen et al., 2022). Educators, policymakers, and researchers are questioning whether HE institutions are adequately prepared to manage these emerging risks and guarantee AI deployment aligns with essential academic values, such as equity, autonomy, and inclusivity, which are essential for fostering a fair educational environment (Alotaibi & Alshehri, 2023; Ghiasvand et al., 2024).

Moreover, increasing dependence on AI tools has raised concerns about their emotional and cognitive effects on students, particularly their potential impact on students' emotional well-being and cognitive development (Ivanov, 2023; Lai et al., 2023). Issues such as students' excessive dependence on generative AI tools (Zhang & Xu, 2024), the corrosion of critical thinking abilities (Gerlich, 2025; Panit, 2025), and the dehumanization of educational experiences pose complex questions that are yet to be systematically addressed (Abdelaal, 2024; Ghalia et al., 2024). The governance and accountability mechanisms for AI in HE is still in development, resulting in diverse approaches across institutions and countries.

Although a growing body of literature has explored the opportunities afforded by AI in education, systematic investigations into the associated risks and challenges, particularly in the context of HE, are relatively scarce. Most existing studies tend to emphasize technological innovation and implementation, often overlooking the broader socio-ethical and institutional dimensions. This gap in the literature calls for a comprehensive synthesis of existing knowledge to inform evidence-based policy, practice, and future research.

This systematic review analyzes peer-reviewed articles that examine the challenges and potential risks of AI in higher education, with particular emphasis on its effects on teaching and learning outcomes. By synthesizing the findings of previous research, this study aims to (i) identify the most frequently reported challenges and risk categories; (ii) analyze how these challenges have been conceptualized and addressed in the literature; and (iii) highlight areas where further investigation is needed

LITERATURE REVIEW

The application of AI in HE has garnered significant scholarly interest, with research spanning a wide range of disciplines, including medical education (Zhang et al., 2023), computer science (Ng et al., 2022), social sciences (Grossmann et al., 2023), ethics (Nguyen et al., 2022), and education policy (Stracke et al., 2025). While much of the early literature focused on the capacity of AI to improve learning and teaching environments via automation and personalization, recent research has begun to critically examine the implications of these technologies from pedagogical, ethical, and socio-technical perspectives (Fošner, 2024; Ifenthaler et al., 2024). Recent studies have explored both the pros and cons of AI on students' emotional well-being and cognitive development, highlighting how AI tools influence engagement, motivation, and critical thinking in both positive and

challenging ways (Ivanov, 2023; Lai et al., 2023).

Applications of AI in HE

AI's role in higher education is growing, with applications across teaching, evaluation, and student support, with practical applications in both STEM and non-STEM fields. For example, intelligent tutoring systems (ITS) are used in fields such as mathematics and engineering to provide personalized feedback based on real-time learning analytics, improving student engagement and learning outcomes (Colliot et al., 2024; Erümit & Çetin, 2020). Automated assessment tools, driven by machine learning and natural language processing, are used to grade essays, quizzes, and programming tasks, offering immediate, objective feedback and improving performance and motivation (Calderon et al., 2023; Mekterovic et al., 2020; Messer et al., 2023).

Students at risk of dropping out can be identified early using predictive analytics, enabling rapid implementation of interventions (Adnan et al., 2021; Alruwais, 2023). Furthermore, AI-powered chatbots and virtual assistants facilitate administrative and academic responsibilities, including scheduling and responding to frequently asked questions, while simultaneously improving student engagement, performance, and convenience (Agarwal et al., 2022; Ma et al., 2024; Rahim et al., 2022).

Challenges of AI Integration

AI adoption in education raises several issues, particularly regarding institutional preparedness, infrastructure, and the alignment of AI with educational goals. A key concern is the lack of adequate technological resources and faculty expertise to implement AI systems effectively in academic settings (Ali et al., 2023). Additionally, many institutions face resistance from both educators and students, who may be skeptical of AI tools or unfamiliar with their potential applications in teaching and learning. Resistance from both faculty and students, combined with insufficient training and limited understanding of AI applications, significantly impedes the integration and adoption of AI systems. The utilization of AI in education has substantial ethical risks that must be addressed to enable the equitable and successful use of this technology. Furthermore, the integration often lacks coherent alignment with existing curricula, resulting in superficial implementations that do not substantially improve educational outcomes (Alotaibi, 2024).

Beyond concerns about data privacy and fairness, AI's influence on pedagogy and learner autonomy introduces additional ethical dilemmas that must be addressed. Concerns about data privacy and algorithmic bias are significant limitations to the proper integration of AI, raising ethical implications that must be addressed (Alotaibi & Alshehri, 2023; Monib et al., 2024). Issues such as the risk of over-automated grading, the veracity of AI-generated content, and the potential disruption to critical thinking skills further exacerbate the difficulties in integrating AI into educational environments (Ahmed et al., 2024). Addressing these challenges requires comprehensive strategies that prioritize faculty training, ethical considerations, and the development of infrastructure that supports sustainable AI integration (Ali et al., 2023).

Risks and Ethical Concerns

AI's role in education poses significant ethical challenges, including concerns about data security, algorithmic bias, and its effects on student independence. Central to these concerns are issues related to data privacy and surveillance, particularly in AI-driven systems such as learning analytics and proctoring tools that handle sensitive student information (Klimova et al., 2023). In addition, there are concerns about algorithmic bias, as AI systems may inadvertently perpetuate existing inequalities stemming from biased training data, potentially affecting access to educational opportunities and equity (Nguyen et al., 2022). Furthermore, the lack of transparency and explainability in AI technologies exacerbates accountability challenges, particularly in high-risk scenarios such as admissions, grading, and predictive analytics, where decisions significantly affect students' academic trajectories (Swindell et al., 2024).

Beyond data privacy and fairness, AI's impact on pedagogical practices and learner autonomy raises additional ethical questions (Han et al., 2025). Students have expressed concerns about the potential erosion of their autonomy in the learning process and the risk that AI

tools will reshape traditional educational roles (Lünich et al., 2024). Furthermore, while AI offers opportunities for personalized education and improved efficiency, it also presents risks such as diminished human interaction, the spread of misinformation, and the potential for academic integrity challenges, for example, the utilization of generative AI for cheating (Doğan et al., 2024; Knopp et al., 2023). These ethical and practical challenges underscore the necessity of a balanced, well-regulated approach that prioritizes transparency, fairness, and inclusivity in AI adoption, ensuring that AI integration upholds foundational educational values.

Governance and Policy Gaps

One of the most significant challenges in the literature is the absence of uniform, robust regulatory frameworks for the educational use of AI, which has led to inconsistent implementation across institutions and countries. Although AI is included in national strategies, its integration into educational settings remains largely underdeveloped, with a predominant emphasis on workforce readiness, leaving ethical issues largely unaddressed (Schiff, 2021). Moreover, the lack of unified, international policies exacerbates governance gaps, with significant variations across countries and institutions. Some literature emphasizes the importance of cross-border collaboration and adaptive supervisory methods, particularly in light of the complex legal and governance challenges posed by developing technologies, like AI, Big Data, and Blockchain (Li & Zhang, 2024).

Numerous scholars have argued in favor of participatory governance models, which involve the collaboration of a variety of stakeholders, such as students, educators, technologists, and ethicists, to develop AI policies that effectively resolve the particular challenges AI presents in education (Birkstedt et al., 2023). While AI-supported governance has gained traction, particularly in regions such as China (Knox, 2020) and Australia (Gulson & Witzenberger, 2020), a clear need remains for governance structures that are more inclusive and responsive to the developing nature of AI in education. To ensure that the advantages of AI are maximized while risk factors are minimized, research indicates that AI policies backed by evidence should prioritize AI literacy and ethical considerations (Stracke et al., 2025).

Theoretical Perspectives

Theories such as the Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK), Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT), and the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) are being used to study the integration of AI in education. These models examine key factors influencing AI acceptance, including perceived usefulness, behavioral intention, and ease of use (Saif et al., 2023; Xu et al., 2024). Extensions of these models further account for demographic influences, hedonic motivation, and social support, highlighting variations in AI adoption across educational levels, disciplines, and institutional types (Aldraiweesh & Alturki, 2025). Notably, factors such as AI-TPACK and teacher readiness are critical to facilitating meaningful integration, particularly in primary and subject-specific contexts (Celik, 2022; Li, 2024).

Alongside technology acceptance models, pedagogical and socio-cultural frameworks emphasize the importance of contextually informed and ethically grounded integration of AI. For instance, the Zone of Proximal Development offers insight into how AI can support academic growth when aligned with students' developmental needs (Cai et al., 2024). However, successful implementation requires comprehensive training and strategic design to ensure that AI complements human instruction while addressing practical and ethical concerns (Jain & Raghuram, 2024; Zaim et al., 2024). Collectively, these perspectives emphasize that AI's role in education must be carefully navigated, striking a balance between technological advancements, pedagogical intent, and socio-emotional considerations.

Gaps in the Literature

Although the volume of research on AI in HE is expanding, significant gaps continue. First, there is a lack of comparative studies across diverse cultural and institutional contexts. Second, most studies are exploratory or conceptual, with few offering longitudinal or empirical evaluations of AI's actual impact. Third, the literature is skewed toward the potential benefits of AI, often neglecting

a systematic examination of risks and failures. These gaps underscore the necessity for more extensive, longitudinal studies to assess the actual effect of AI on teaching and learning, and the evolving dynamics of institutional practices, thereby informing evidence-based policy development

METHOD

This SLR seeks to examine the application of AI in HE, concentrating on the challenges, risks, and ethical issues that emerge from incorporating AI into educational settings. The review follows a transparent, structured, and replicable methodology to ensure comprehensive coverage and mitigate potential biases. The search strategy, data extraction procedures, synthesis methodologies, and inclusion and exclusion criteria employed in the study are detailed in the subsequent sections.

Search Strategy

A thorough search was conducted, utilizing three primary scientific databases: Scopus, Web of Science (WoS), and EBSCO Education Source. These databases were carefully selected for their broad coverage of scientific research in the domains of technology and education (Falagas et al., 2007; Gusenbauer & Haddaway, 2019), their high indexing standards that ensure peer-reviewed quality, and their inclusion of interdisciplinary studies relevant to both technological advancements and higher education contexts. The selection of these databases allows for a comprehensive, reproducible, and credible search process, ensuring that all relevant studies on AI applications and associated challenges in higher education are captured. The search targeted studies published between 2020 and May 2025. To ensure the inclusion of pertinent studies, a structured methodology was implemented that used specific keywords and Boolean operators. With a wide variety of keyword combinations such as "intelligent systems," "neural networks," "machine learning," "natural language processing," and "AI," the search terms were utilized as well as terms related to HE like "university," "postsecondary education," and "e-learning." o further narrow the emphasis, terms such as "challenges," "risks," "ethical concerns," and "data privacy" to describe the problems of incorporating AI into curriculum.

Table 1 summarizes the specific search terms used in this study, highlighting the focus on both AI technologies and their applications within HE contexts, as well as the challenges and ethical issues they present.

Table 1. Search Terms Used in the Review

Topic	Search Terms
AI	"AI," "machine learning," "neural networks," "natural language processing," "intelligent systems"
HE	"HE," "university," "postsecondary education," "e-learning," "MOOCs," "blended learning"
Challenges and Risks	"Challenges," "risks," "ethical concerns," "data privacy," "teacher resistance," "barriers," "limitations"

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

To guarantee the quality and relevance of the studies, well-defined inclusion and exclusion criteria were used. The inclusion criteria required that the research be published between 2020 and 2025, written in English, indexed in the aforementioned databases, and focused on the use of AI in HE. Studies must focus on the challenges, risks, and ethical concerns linked with AI in education. Eligibility criteria were defined a priori based on the review objectives and the higher education context. The review was reported in accordance with PRISMA 2020 (Page et al., 2021).

Table 2 outlines the inclusion and exclusion criteria used in the review process. These criteria ensured that only high-quality, relevant studies were included in the analysis, excluding those that did not meet the inclusion criteria.

Table 2. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Inclusion Criteria	Exclusion Criteria
Peer-reviewed journal articles	Non-peer-reviewed sources (e.g., conference abstracts, blogs, magazine pieces)
Published between 2020 and May 2025	Published before 2020 or after May 2025
Written in English	Languages other than English
Focused on higher education contexts	Not focused on HE (e.g., K-12, corporate training)
Addresses AI use with explicit discussion of challenges/risks/ethical concerns	No substantive discussion of challenges/risks/ethical concerns
Indexed in WoS, Scopus, or EBSCO Education Source	Not indexed in WoS, Scopus, or EBSCO Education Source

Data Extraction and Synthesis Procedures

After retrieving the relevant studies, duplicates were removed, and a snowball sampling approach was applied. Thus, involving reviewing the references of selected studies to identify additional relevant articles not captured in the initial search is a well-established strategy for ensuring comprehensive coverage (Wohlin, 2014). Key data were systematically extracted from each study, including publication year, research design, sample size, AI techniques employed, and identified challenges and risks. To ensure accuracy and consistency, data extraction was conducted independently by two researchers, with any inconsistencies resolved through discussion or by an independent reviewer, as recommended by Wohlin (2014) to enhance reliability.

Screening Process

The screening process involved several stages to ensure that only the most relevant studies were included. Initially, the articles were imported into Zotero, a reference management tool that facilitates the collection, organization, and citation of research materials (zotero.org). Duplicates were removed, and all other articles were examined based on their titles, abstracts, and keywords to check their relevance. Articles failing to satisfy the inclusion criteria were excluded at this stage. Following the initial screening, full-text reviews were conducted for the remaining articles, and studies that did not align with the inclusion criteria were excluded at this stage. The snowballing approach was applied once again during the full-text review to find additional relevant articles not captured in the initial search. By the end of the process, 191 studies were considered for inclusion, and the snowballing method identified an additional 12 articles, bringing the total to 203 studies. After independent review by two researchers, with all disagreements resolved, 95 articles met the inclusion criteria and were included in the final review. The review process and reporting were conducted in accordance with the PRISMA 2020 statement (Page et al., 2021).

Summary of Database Search Results

After utilizing the inclusion and exclusion criteria, the final dataset was compiled from articles retrieved from Web of Science, Scopus, and EBSCO Education Source. The filtering process resulted in the outcomes presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Result of the Screening

Database	Initial Search	Category	Publication Year	Document Type	Language
Web of Science	7103	1207	1098	879	825
Scopus	12199	3428	3052	1892	1724
EBSCOHost	3712	2753	2121	2056	2003
Total	23104	7388	6271	4827	4552

Note. Category for WoS (Education Educational Research), Scopus (Social Science), and EBSCOHost (Academic Journals); Document Type filtered by "Article" for WoS and Scopus, and "Full Text" and "Peer-Reviewed" for EBSCOHost.

The databases included in this review were selected based on their comprehensive coverage of high-quality, peer-reviewed research in the domains of technology and education. Table 3 provides a detailed breakdown of the initial search results, filtering criteria, and document types included for each database. The categorization presented in the table ensures transparency regarding how studies were identified, screened, and selected for inclusion. By explicitly reporting the database sources, publication years, document types, and language filters applied, the review process maintains reproducibility and allows readers to assess the scope and comprehensiveness of the literature search.

Final Selection of Studies

Following the screening, 95 publications met all inclusion criteria and were included in the final systematic review. This methodology ensures that the review process is transparent, rigorous, and reproducible, in accordance with the PRISMA 2020 criteria (Page et al., 2021). The findings presented in this study are credible and valid due to the systematic search technique, inclusion/exclusion criteria, and rigorous data extraction methodologies. By adhering to these principles, the study maintains methodological soundness and credibility of its conclusions.

Data Synthesis and Study Types

The data synthesis followed a structured, multi-step approach. First, key information from the included studies was extracted and coded according to predefined categories, including study objectives, methodology, sample characteristics (where applicable), and reported challenges/risks. Subsequently, a thematic analysis was conducted to identify recurring patterns, similarities, and contrasts across studies. To support interpretive clarity, the included publications were also categorized by study approach (e.g., empirical, conceptual/theoretical, policy-oriented), without using this categorization as an exclusion criterion. Data extraction and coding were independently performed by two researchers, and discrepancies were resolved through discussion and consensus to minimize bias and enhance transparency.

RESULTS

The following results are based on a systematic synthesis of the included studies rather than a mere summary. Each theme was developed by identifying patterns, similarities, and contrasts across the studies, highlighting the distinct contribution of each study to the overall findings. This approach ensures that the results reflect an analytical integration of evidence rather than a descriptive listing of individual study outcomes.

To enhance clarity, each theme is introduced with a brief explanation of its specific focus and analytical contribution, distinguishing it from other themes. In this way, the synthesis highlights not only the reported findings but also the patterns, contrasts, and implications for practice and policy, providing a comprehensive understanding of AI integration in HE.

Academic Integrity and Misuse of AI Tools

This theme specifically addresses concerns regarding academic integrity and the potential misuse of AI tools, focusing on how students' reliance on AI may compromise cognitive engagement and ethical academic practices. While other themes explore broader ethical and learning-related issues, this theme emphasizes the challenges directly linked to academic misconduct and the responsible use of AI.

The incorporation of AI systems in HE has sparked considerable concerns regarding their impact on academic integrity. These technologies, which may produce high-quality content, make it difficult to identify traditional forms of academic dishonesty because it is difficult to distinguish between work produced by students and work produced by AI. As AI-generated material becomes increasingly difficult to identify, educators and institutions face a dual challenge: maintaining academic rigor while mitigating the misuse of AI tools to bypass cognitive engagement.

A more sustainable approach could involve using AI as a learning tool, supported by clear guidelines for responsible use, ensuring transparency and academic integrity (Chan,

2023). However, these institutional responses are often inconsistent, and it remains unclear whether such bans are the most effective long-term solution. A more nuanced approach could incorporate AI as a supplementary learning tool, rather than viewing it solely as a source of misconduct. Universities could also consider developing specific guidelines for AI-assisted assignments to promote transparency and accountability, thereby reducing the risk of misuse (Chan, 2023).

While academic integrity concerns are prominent, it is crucial to acknowledge that AI tools pose broader ethical challenges that impact cognitive development and educational equity. The ethical issues associated with the use of AI are compounded by its capacity to hinder students' cognitive and professional development. Groothuijsen et al. (2024) contend that although AI tools can aid in the acquisition of subject-specific knowledge, they do not promote critical thinking, creativity, or problem-solving—essential skills in fields such as engineering and the humanities. AI cannot replace the reflective and creative engagement required in these disciplines. To maintain academic rigor, AI tools should complement critical thinking exercises and hands-on activities, rather than supplant them. This emphasis on complementary roles should be consistent across the use of AI tools, ensuring that they enhance, rather than replace, essential cognitive processes. Overreliance on AI can lead to passive learning, in which students bypass the cognitive processes essential for deeper understanding and critical engagement with the material. This passive engagement risks reducing the development of key intellectual skills, such as synthesis, evaluation, and reflection (Cicchetti, 2024). Educational institutions should explore ways to integrate AI tools that complement critical thinking exercises and hands-on activities, rather than replacing essential cognitive processes.

Moreover, algorithmic biases inherent in AI systems can exacerbate issues of fairness and equity in education. As stated by Saihi et al. (2024), AI tools trained on biased data may unintentionally perpetuate existing societal inequalities. For instance, students from underprivileged families may have limited access to high-quality AI tools, thereby widening the educational divide. Therefore, the ethical utilization of AI must not only address issues of academic integrity but also ensure equitable access to technology across diverse student populations. Institutions must prioritize the development of AI systems trained on inclusive datasets to mitigate the risk of perpetuating bias and to ensure equitable opportunities for all students.

In light of these challenges, several scholars emphasize the necessity of clear institutional policies to regulate the use of AI while promoting digital literacy. Karkoulian et al. (2024) argue that AI literacy is crucial in helping students comprehend the ethical implications of using such tools. Institutions should prioritize developing clear AI usage policies for assignments, including strategies for verifying AI-generated content and guidelines for responsible use. Institutions should invest in training programs that promote responsible use of AI and develop strategies for detecting AI-generated content, while ensuring these efforts do not compromise educational objectives. This balanced approach could help mitigate risks associated with AI misuse, while enhancing its potential as a supportive learning tool. Institutions should consider establishing clear ethical guidelines that outline how AI tools can be ethically incorporated into assignments and assessments to prevent academic dishonesty. To address these issues, universities should develop clear AI usage policies for assignments, including strategies for verifying AI-generated content and guidelines for responsible use. Training both students and faculty on AI literacy will help mitigate misuse and promote the ethical utilization of AI in education.

In conclusion, AI tools such as ChatGPT have considerable potential to improve educational outcomes; however, their misuse can undermine academic integrity and hinder students' intellectual development. Educational institutions must adopt comprehensive AI usage policies that promote the ethical implementation of AI, AI literacy, and equitable access. By striking a balance between AI’s benefits and its responsible and ethical use, institutions can foster academic integrity, cognitive development, and educational equity. By fostering AI literacy and providing clear guidelines for its application, educators can ensure that these technologies support, rather than replace, the critical thinking and creativity essential for academic success.

Data Privacy, Security, and Ethical Concerns

This theme focuses on privacy, data security, and broader ethical concerns arising from the use of AI in higher education. It highlights how AI-driven systems collect, process, and, at times, share sensitive student data, raising issues of informed consent, surveillance, accountability, and compliance with data protection regulations. While other themes address academic misconduct, learning outcomes, or access, this theme specifically examines institutional responsibilities for transparent data governance, secure data practices, and the mitigation of algorithmic bias in high-stakes educational decisions.

The incorporation of AI in HE has raised substantial issues about data privacy, ethical problems, and security. While AI tools interact with students, they collect vast amounts of personal and academic data, including grades, learning patterns, and behavioral insights, to enhance their functionality and adaptability. While these data-driven technologies can enhance learning outcomes, they also pose risks of unauthorized access and misuse. Ensuring that AI tools comply with data protection policies is essential for safeguarding students' privacy.

Several studies emphasize the growing concerns about data privacy within AI-driven educational contexts. Al-Mughairi and Bhaskar (2024) highlight the lack of clear frameworks regulating how AI systems manage and store student data. Many AI applications rely on complex algorithms that process large datasets, raising concerns about data anonymization and security. These issues are exacerbated by the growing dependence on AI, which may result in unintended surveillance or the collection of excessive personal data. Students may be unaware of the extent to which their data is being used, raising ethical questions regarding transparency and informed consent (Karkoulian et al., 2024). AI systems must be transparent, providing clear consent processes and ensuring that students understand how their data is used. Educational institutions must implement stringent data privacy policies and controls to prevent unauthorized access to sensitive information.

The ethical dilemma surrounding consent is further compounded by the opacity in data collection processes. AI systems, particularly generative models, require substantial amounts of data from student interactions to train their algorithms. Universities must implement clear consent processes and ensure students understand how their personal data is being used. These processes should ensure transparency regarding the extent and purpose of data collection for AI training. Karkoulian et al. (2024) argue that this lack of transparency violates students' autonomy and challenges their control over personal data. Many students are unaware that their academic data could be used to refine AI models, raising concerns about ownership and the ethical implementation of their information. To mitigate these concerns, universities must be proactive in educating students about how their data is used and in ensuring that clear consent processes are in place.

A specific ethical issue highlighted in several studies is algorithmic bias, defined as the systematic and unfair discrimination embedded in AI systems arising from biased training data, incomplete datasets, or flawed design processes. In higher education, algorithmic bias may manifest in student assessment, admissions processes, or personalized learning tools, potentially disadvantaging certain groups of students and reinforcing existing social inequalities. Educational institutions must collaborate with AI developers to ensure the inclusion of diverse datasets and regularly audit AI tools for bias. This will help minimize the risk of perpetuating societal inequalities and ensure fairness across diverse student populations. As AI tools are trained on historical data, they can inherit societal biases, potentially leading to discriminatory outcomes. Groothuijsen et al. (2024) point out that AI systems may inadvertently disadvantage certain student groups on the basis of ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic status, or disability. Regular audits and inclusive dataset development are crucial to guarantee equity in AI systems. These biases underscore the need to develop AI systems that are both reliable and fair. Educational institutions must collaborate with AI developers to ensure the ethical design of AI systems, regularly audit them for biases, and ensure their implementation promotes fairness and equity.

Furthermore, the increasing reliance on AI for tasks such as grading and feedback raises concerns about the diminishing role of human supervision in educational decision-making. Kavadella et al. (2023) stress that AI cannot replicate the

nuanced understanding and emotional intelligence that teachers bring to the educational environment. Over-reliance on AI could erode the human element of education, reducing meaningful teacher-student interactions that are vital for fostering critical thinking, emotional growth, and academic development. While AI tools can assist in administrative tasks, they should not replace the personal and intellectual engagement that students require.

In order to reduce these concerns, educational organizations have to launch wide-ranging policies that emphasize data protection and transparency, and the ethical implementation of AI. Al-Mughairi and Bhaskar (2024) address the adoption of robust regulations to safeguard student data and ensure that AI tools are transparent, accountable, and free of bias. Institutions should also invest in educating both students and faculty on the ethical implementation of AI, with a focus on informed consent and data protection rights.

In conclusion, the incorporation of AI in HE offers numerous benefits while also raising serious ethical and privacy concerns. To reduce these risks, educational institutions must adopt policies that emphasize data protection, fairness, and transparency. By fostering awareness of these ethical challenges, universities can ensure that AI systems are used responsibly and securely, protecting students' privacy while enhancing the learning experience.

Over-reliance on AI and Its Impact on Learning Outcomes

This theme explores the impact of students' over-reliance on AI tools on learning outcomes and cognitive skill development. Unlike the previous themes, this theme emphasizes the pedagogical and cognitive consequences, highlighting the need for strategies that promote active learning and critical thinking alongside the use of AI.

Concerns regarding students' over-reliance on AI tools and the possible harm to their cognitive development and learning results are raised by the growing integration of these tools into HE. Overreliance on AI systems, particularly generative AI such as ChatGPT, may hinder the development of critical thinking and problem-solving skills, which are vital to success.

Several studies, including Cicchetti (2024), indicate that overreliance on AI leads to passive learning, in which students prioritize convenience over active engagement with the material. This model, while efficient for content delivery, limits the cognitive effort required for deeper learning. This shift hinders the development of key skills such as synthesis, evaluation, and reflection—skills essential for academic success in fields like engineering and the humanities. Institutions should encourage active learning strategies, such as project-based assignments, to engage students deeply with the material. For example, students who use AI to generate essays or answers without critically analyzing the content are less likely to develop their abilities to synthesize, evaluate, and apply knowledge. This shift away from active learning can hinder the acquisition of higher-order thinking skills necessary for complex problem-solving and decision-making (Cicchetti, 2024). To address these concerns, institutions could implement strategies that encourage active learning, such as project-based assignments or critical-thinking exercises, that require students to engage with the content.

AI tools can hinder the growth of crucial cognitive abilities, including creativity, ethical reasoning, and interdisciplinary thinking. AI tools should be used as complements to critical cognitive skills, rather than as replacements. For example, AI could assist with information retrieval, while creative problem-solving should remain the focus of human-driven assignments. As Groothuijsen et al. (2024) note, AI lacks the human capacity to develop these skills, which are essential in fields that require both analytical reasoning and creative application. AI tools should complement the development of cognitive skills, not replace it. This limitation is particularly concerning in disciplines such as the humanities, social sciences, and engineering, where problem-solving and critical thinking are foundational. To mitigate this, educational institutions should focus on integrating AI in ways that support, rather than replace, the development of these cognitive abilities.

Furthermore, overreliance on AI may lead to a decline in students' intrinsic motivation. Research by Plecerda (2024) suggests that when students use AI tools to complete assignments, they may detach from the learning process itself. This detachment undermines self-regulation and motivation, as students may begin to view education as a mechanical task of input and output, rather than a dynamic process of intellectual growth. Encouraging intrinsic motivation through active engagement will counterbalance these effects. To foster intrinsic motivation, educators should emphasize active engagement, critical analysis, and personal reflection in their curricula.

In the long term, excessive dependence on AI tools may erode academic authenticity. As students turn to AI for quick solutions, they bypass the deep cognitive processes necessary for understanding and mastery. This over-reliance risks producing graduates who may struggle with critical thinking and independent problem-solving, as their cognitive development has been stunted by the use of shortcuts (Groothuijsen et al., 2024). While AI can be an effective complement to traditional learning methods, its overuse can undermine the intellectual skills essential to professional success. Institutions should seek to identify the ideal state in the use of AI and pedagogical strategies that promote independent thinking and problem-solving.

In conclusion, while AI tools such as ChatGPT offer valuable educational support, over-dependence on these tools can hinder the development of essential cognitive skills and reduce students' intrinsic motivation. Educational institutions must carefully consider how to integrate AI tools to promote active learning, critical thinking, and long-term intellectual growth. Universities can optimize the advantages of AI by guaranteeing that it improves, rather than substitutes, traditional educational methodologies, while safeguarding students' cognitive development.

Equity and Access to AI Tools in HE

This theme examines equity and access issues related to AI tools, particularly the digital divide and socio-economic disparities. It distinguishes itself from other themes by emphasizing systemic and institutional factors that affect fair access to AI-enhanced education.

The utilization of AI in HE presents significant challenges regarding equity and access, particularly in the context of the digital divide. As AI becomes increasingly central to educational processes, unequal access to these technologies risks exacerbating existing educational disparities. Students from different socio-economic backgrounds, regions, and institutions face varying levels of access to AI tools, which can significantly affect their educational opportunities and outcomes.

Research by Al-Mughairi and Bhaskar (2024) highlights that students in low-income or developing regions often face substantial barriers to accessing AI tools due to limited infrastructure, internet connectivity, and AI-specific software. This digital divide creates a two-tiered education system in which students in wealthier institutions or regions benefit from advanced AI-driven learning tools, whereas those in resource-constrained environments are left behind. This disparity not only limits students' access to cutting-edge educational resources but also deepens existing inequalities in educational attainment (Al-Mughairi & Bhaskar, 2024). To bridge this gap, universities must prioritize investment in infrastructure, including affordable internet access and access to AI tools, in underserved regions. The issue of access is compounded by variations in digital literacy and institutional readiness. As noted by Espartinez (2024), many educational institutions, particularly those in under-resourced areas, lack the necessary financial resources and trained staff to implement AI technologies effectively. The educational use of AI cannot be completely recognized without supplementary systems, faculty training, and adequate infrastructure. The absence of institutional preparation results in an uneven playing field, in which students at well-funded institutions have greater opportunities to engage with AI-enhanced learning, whereas their counterparts in less affluent settings are at a disadvantage. To bridge this gap, universities could establish training programs for both faculty and students to enhance their digital literacy and AI skills, enabling them to make the most of AI tools.

Furthermore, a key component of ensuring fair access is AI literacy, the capacity to comprehend and use AI tools. Undergraduate AI literacy programs ought to be implemented, especially in underprivileged areas, to

provide students with the capabilities they need to interact critically with AI systems. Digital literacy training should be provided for both faculty and students to bridge gaps in technological access and understanding. Kavadella et al. (2023) observe that students in more technologically advanced regions often receive early exposure to AI education, equipping them with the skills to engage critically with AI tools. In contrast, students in underserved areas may have limited exposure to such technologies, leaving them ill-prepared to use AI effectively. This knowledge gap not only hinders students' ability to use AI tools but also prevents them from developing the critical thinking skills necessary to evaluate AI-generated content. Addressing this gap should be a priority for institutions and policymakers.

Addressing these challenges requires rigorous efforts by both institutions and policymakers to bridge the digital divide and promote digital literacy. Policymakers should focus on developing frameworks that bridge the digital divide, including the provision of accessible AI tools, internet access, and AI education for marginalized communities. Policymakers should collaborate with universities to ensure that digital literacy programs are available to all students, thereby guaranteeing equitable access to AI technologies and resources. Universities should work closely with policymakers to ensure that digital literacy programs are accessible to all students. Saihi et al. (2024) contend that universities must invest in infrastructure to ensure fair access to AI technologies and resources. Furthermore, faculty members should be provided with professional development opportunities to support their successful integration of AI into their teaching practices. Promoting digital literacy among students, especially in underprivileged areas, is critical to ensuring that each student, regardless of socioeconomic background, can benefit from AI-enhanced education.

Policymakers have an important role to play in figuring out gaps in access to AI tools. As Chan (2023) suggests, developing policies that focus on bridging the digital divide is essential for ensuring that AI technologies are accessible to all students. This includes developing frameworks that support the equitable distribution of resources, such as affordable internet access, AI training programs, and educational tools for students in marginalized communities.

In summary, to promote the educational use of AI, it is imperative to employ strategies that ensure equitable access for all students, regardless of background or resources. By investing in infrastructure, fostering digital literacy, and developing supportive policies, institutions can assist in bridging the digital divide and guarantee that AI tools contribute to educational equity rather than impede it. Consequently, these access challenges must be resolved in order to realize the full potential of AI for educational use for all students.

DISCUSSION

The utilization of AI in HE has generated both significant excitement and notable concern regarding its implications for academic integrity, cognitive development, privacy, and equity. This SLR offers an in-depth investigation of the challenges, risks, and ethical concerns related to AI adoption in HE. Through the synthesis of studies published between 2020 and 2025, several key issues have emerged that institutions must address to ensure AI technologies enhance educational experiences without compromising fundamental educational values.

Impact on Academic Integrity and Cognitive Development

The effect of AI on academic integrity is among the most frequently identified concerns in the studies reviewed. Generative AI models, including ChatGPT, are becoming increasingly adept at producing academic work that is both convincing and of high quality, yet can be easily misconstrued as student-generated content. This raises concerns about academic misconduct, as institutions struggle to distinguish between human- and AI-generated work (Chan, 2023; Groothuijsen et al., 2024). Although AI tools have the potential to help students comprehend course material, their misuse as a shortcut to bypass the learning process presents a substantial challenge. The studies suggest that, rather than banning AI tools outright, educational institutions should consider incorporating these technologies into the learning and teaching environment in a controlled and responsible manner, supported by clear guidelines and policies (Cicchetti, 2024).

Consistent with previous studies (Chan, 2023; Groothuijsen et al., 2024), the present review highlights that AI integration in higher education can exacerbate inequities and overreliance, underscoring the need for complementary pedagogical strategies that sustain critical thinking and creativity. Additionally, concerns regarding cognitive development are evident, as over-dependence on AI may lead to passive learning. As Groothuijsen et al. (2024) argue, AI tools such as ChatGPT may support content mastery but fail to foster critical thinking, creativity, and problem-solving abilities vital to success in fields such as engineering and the humanities. The evidence suggests that AI should supplement, rather than substitute, the cognitive engagement required in these disciplines. Educational institutions must take proactive steps to ensure that AI tools are integrated in ways that enhance learning without undermining intellectual development (Cicchetti, 2024).

Ethical Concerns: Data Privacy and Algorithmic Bias

The ethical considerations surrounding AI in education are multilayered, particularly with respect to data privacy and algorithmic bias. AI tools depend on massive volumes of data to function efficiently, including sensitive information about grades, learning patterns, and behavioral insights. Several studies highlight the lack of clear frameworks for managing this data, raising apprehensions about illegal access, misuse, and the potential for surveillance (Al-Mughairi & Bhaskar, 2024). This issue is exacerbated by the lack of transparency in AI systems, in which students may not fully understand how their data is collected and used. This circumstance requires robust data protection regulations, clear consent procedures, and honest communication with students about how their data will be used in AI applications.

Algorithmic bias is another major ethical concern. AI systems, which are frequently trained on historical data, might inherit and perpetuate societal inequalities, resulting in biased outcomes. For example, kids from underprivileged backgrounds may not have equal access to high-quality AI tools, exacerbating the educational divide. The studies that were reviewed underscore the importance of AI developers prioritizing inclusive datasets and conducting regular audits of AI systems to prevent bias and ensure equitable access to educational opportunities (Saihi et al., 2024).

Overdependence on AI and Its Impact on Learning Outcomes

A major concern raised in the review is the potential harmful effects of overreliance on AI tools, which may hinder the development of critical cognitive abilities. According to the findings, students who rely excessively on AI to complete tasks such as writing essays or solving problems may be avoiding the deeper cognitive processes necessary for learning (Cicchetti, 2024). This shift towards passive learning could have long-term consequences, as students may struggle to develop the problem-solving and critical thinking skills necessary for academic and professional success. Educational institutions must implement strategies that encourage active learning, such as project-based assignments, which require students to engage with the material and develop higher-order thinking skills. Institutions should develop AI literacy programs for both faculty and students, establish clear ethical guidelines for AI-assisted assignments, and ensure equitable access to AI technologies, particularly in under-resourced contexts. Policymakers should support infrastructure development, digital literacy initiatives, and equitable distribution of AI tools across socio-economic strata.

Additionally, overreliance on AI can reduce intrinsic motivation. Students may become disengaged and lack self-regulation as they seek AI technologies for quick fixes, which could lead them to lose interest in the learning process itself. Plecerda (2024) highlights the importance of fostering intrinsic motivation by emphasizing active engagement, critical analysis, and personal reflection in learning. Educators should strive to strike a balance between the necessity for students to engage critically with the subject matter and the advantages of AI.

Equity and Access to AI Tools in HE

The issue of equity in AI access remains a significant challenge. As AI becomes progressively integrated into, HE, students from low-income or rural areas face barriers to accessing AI tools due to limited infrastructure, internet connectivity, and access to AI-specific software (Al-

Mughairi & Bhaskar, 2024). This digital divide exacerbates existing inequalities in educational outcomes, limiting some students' ability to fully engage with AI-enhanced learning opportunities. The literature underscores the significance of prioritizing digital literacy programs for both students and faculty, as well as infrastructure investment, to guarantee equitable access to AI tools (Espartinez, 2024).

Universities and policymakers must address the digital divide by providing affordable AI tools, internet access, and targeted training programs. Furthermore, AI literacy should be included in school curricula so that all students, regardless of socioeconomic status, may effectively interact with AI tools and develop the critical thinking skills required to evaluate AI-generated content.

CONCLUSION

The integration of AI tools into HE offers immense potential for enhancing learning outcomes, improving administrative efficiency, and supporting student success. However, the challenges and risks connected with AI adoption must be thoughtfully managed to guarantee that these technologies are used ethically and equitably. Institutions are required to address several critical issues, including academic integrity, data privacy, algorithmic bias, and the influence of AI on cognitive development.

The findings of this SLR indicate that a balanced approach is required to maximize the advantages of AI and minimize its potential risks. Educational institutions must establish clear regulations and norms for AI use, promote digital literacy and AI ethics, and guarantee that AI technologies are incorporated in such a way that they complement rather than replace important cognitive functions. To ensure that all students, regardless of socioeconomic status, have an equal opportunity to benefit from AI-enhanced education, it is essential to address the equity gap in AI access.

To conclude, AI offers substantial opportunities for higher education; however, its successful integration will necessitate comprehensive strategies that address ethical concerns, promote cognitive engagement, and guarantee equitable access for all students. Universities can optimize the potential of AI as a transformative tool in education while also promoting critical thinking, safeguarding academic integrity, and advancing educational equity by implementing these measures.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

This SLR has several limitations. Only English-language peer-reviewed articles published between 2020 and May 2025 were included, which may have excluded relevant studies. Publication bias and subjective interpretation in thematic analysis may also affect the findings. Future research should broaden the scope to include non-English and gray literature, conduct longitudinal and comparative studies across contexts, and empirically investigate the effects of AI on learning, cognitive development, and academic integrity. Specifically, studies should examine the long-term cognitive effects of AI use across different academic disciplines, as current research has not sufficiently addressed these disciplinary differences. Moreover, the impact of AI access disparities across socio-economic and regional contexts should be empirically investigated to better understand and address inequities in AI-enhanced education. Finally, research exploring the ethical implementation and participatory governance of AI in HE is recommended to guide responsible adoption.

REFERENCES

Abdelaal, N., & Sawy, I. A. (2024). Perceptions, challenges, and prospects: University professors' use of artificial intelligence in education. *Australian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *7*(1), 1309. https://doi.org/10.29140/ajal.v7n1.1309

Adnan, M., Habib, A., Ashraf, J., Mussadiq, S., Raza, A. A., Abid, M., Bashir, M., & Khan, S. U. (2021). Predicting At-Risk students at different percentages of course length for early intervention using machine learning models. *IEEE Access*, *9*, 7519–7539. https://doi.org/10.1109/access.2021.3049446

Agarwal, S., Agarwal, B., & Gupta, R. (2022). Chatbots and virtual assistants: a bibliometric analysis. *Library Hi Tech*, *40*(4), 1013–1030. https://doi.org/10.1108/lht-09-2021-0330

Ahmed, Z., Shanto, S. S., Rime, M. H. K., Morol, M. K., Fahad, N., Hossen, M. J., & Abdullah-Al-Jubair, M. (2024). The Generative AI landscape in Education: mapping the terrain of opportunities, challenges and student perception. *IEEE Access*, 1. https://doi.org/10.1109/access.2024.3461874

Aldraiweesh, A. A., & Alturki, U. (2025). The Influence of Social Support Theory on AI Acceptance: Examining Educational Support and Perceived Usefulness using SEM analysis. *IEEE Access*, 1. https://doi.org/10.1109/access.2025.3534099

Ali, O., Murray, P. A., Momin, M., Dwivedi, Y. K., & Malik, T. (2023). The effects of artificial intelligence applications in educational settings: Challenges and strategies. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *199*, 123076. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2023.123076

Almasri, F. (2024). Exploring the Impact of Artificial intelligence in teaching and learning of Science: A Systematic Review of Empirical research. *Research in Science Education*, *54*(5), 977–997. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-024-10176-3

Al-Mughairi, H., & Bhaskar, P. (2024). Exploring the factors affecting the adoption AI techniques in higher education: insights from teachers' perspectives on ChatGPT. *Journal of Research in Innovative Teaching & Learning*. https://doi.org/10.1108/jrit-09-2023-0129

Alotaibi, N. S. (2024). The impact of AI and LMS integration on the future of higher Education: Opportunities, challenges, and strategies for transformation. *Sustainability*, *16*(23), 10357. https://doi.org/10.3390/su162310357

Alotaibi, N. S., & Alshehri, A. H. (2023). Prospers and Obstacles in Using Artificial Intelligence in Saudi Arabia Higher Education Institutions—The Potential of AI-Based Learning Outcomes. *Sustainability*, *15*(13), 10723. https://doi.org/10.3390/su151310723

Alruwais, N. M. (2023). Deep FM-Based predictive model for student dropout in online classes. *IEEE Access*, *11*, 96954–96970. https://doi.org/10.1109/access.2023.3312150

Birkstedt, T., Minkkinen, M., Tandon, A., & Mäntymäki, M. (2023). AI governance: themes, knowledge gaps and future agendas. *Internet Research*, *33*(7), 133–167. https://doi.org/10.1108/intr-01-2022-0042

Cai, L., Msafiri, M. M., & Kangwa, D. (2024). Exploring the impact of integrating AI tools in higher education using the Zone of Proximal Development. *Education and Information Technologies*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-13112-0

Calderon, K., Serrano, N., Blanco, C., & Gutierrez, I. (2023). Automated and continuous assessment implementation in a programming course. *Computer Applications in Engineering Education*, *32*(1). https://doi.org/10.1002/cae.22681

Celik, I. (2022). Towards Intelligent-TPACK: An empirical study on teachers' professional knowledge to ethically integrate artificial intelligence (AI)-based tools into education. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *138*, 107468. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2022.107468

Chan, C. K. Y. (2023). A comprehensive AI policy education framework for university teaching and learning. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *20*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00408-3

Chanthiran, M., Ibrahim, A. B., Rahman, M. H. A., & Mariappan, P. (2022). Artificial intelligence in education: A systematic mapping study using Scopus and Web of Science. *Journal of ICT in Education*, *9*(2), 61–70. https://doi.org/10.37134/jictie.vol9.2.5.2022

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

Cicchetti, C. C. (2024). AI in higher education: Does not help, might hurt. *Journal of Education for Business*, 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1080/08832323.2024.2432936

Colliot, T., Krichen, O., Girard, N., Anquetil, É., & Jamet, É. (2024). What makes tabletbased learning effective? A study of the role of realtime adaptive feedback. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *55*(5), 2278–2295. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13439

Doğan, M., Celik, A., & Arslan, H. (2024). AI in Higher Education: Risks and opportunities from the academician perspective. *European Journal of Education*. https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12863

D'Souza, R. F., Mathew, M., Mishra, V., & Surapaneni, K. M. (2024). Twelve tips for addressing ethical concerns in the

implementation of artificial intelligence in medical education. *Medical Education Online*, *29*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/10872981.2024.2330250

Durak, G., Çankaya, S., Özdemir, D., & Can, S. (2024). Artificial Intelligence in Education: A Bibliometric study on its role in transforming teaching and learning. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, *25*(3), 219–244. https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v25i3.7757

Erümit, A. K., & Çetin, İ. (2020). Design framework of adaptive intelligent tutoring systems. *Education and Information Technologies*, *25*(5), 4477–4500. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-020-10182-8

Espartinez, A. S. (2024). Exploring student and teacher perceptions of ChatGPT use in higher education: A Q-Methodology study. *Computers and Education Artificial Intelligence*, *7*, 100264. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100264

Falagas, M. E., Pitsouni, E. I., Malietzis, G. A., & Pappas, G. (2007). Comparison of PubMed, Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar: strengths and weaknesses. *The FASEB Journal*, *22*(2), 338–342. https://doi.org/10.1096/fj.07-9492lsf

Fošner, A. (2024). University Students' Attitudes and Perceptions towards AI Tools: Implications for Sustainable Educational Practices. *Sustainability*, *16*(19), 8668. https://doi.org/10.3390/su16198668

Gerlich, M. (2025). AI Tools in Society: Impacts on cognitive offloading and the future of critical thinking. *Societies*, *15*(1), 6. https://doi.org/10.3390/soc15010006

Ghalia, N., Isami, E., Bsoul, M., Aabed, S., Haeb, R. S., & Mustafa, M. (2024). Impact of Artificial Intelligence in Education: Insights from Students and Faculty Members at Yarmouk University. *Journal of Ecohumanism*, *3*(8). https://doi.org/10.62754/joe.v3i8.4807

Ghiasvand, F., Kogani, M., & Alipoor, A. (2024). "I'm Not Ready for This Metamorphosis": An Ecological Approach to Iranian and Italian EFL Teachers' Readiness for AI-Mediated Instruction. *Teaching English With Technology*. https://doi.org/10.56297/vaca6841//bffo7057/iski2001

Groothuijsen, S., Van Den Beemt, A., Remmers, J. C., & Van Meeuwen, L. W. (2024). AI chatbots in programming education: students' use in a scientific computing course and consequences for learning. *Computers and Education Artificial Intelligence*, *7*, 100290. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100290

Grossmann, I., Feinberg, M., Parker, D. C., Christakis, N. A., Tetlock, P. E., & Cunningham, W. A. (2023). AI and the transformation of social science research. *Science*, *380*(6650), 1108–1109. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adi1778

Gulson, K. N., & Witzenberger, K. (2020). Repackaging authority: artificial intelligence, automated governance and education trade shows. *Journal of Education Policy*, *37*(1), 145–160. https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2020.1785552

Gusenbauer, M., & Haddaway, N. R. (2019). Which academic search systems are suitable for systematic reviews or meta-analyses? Evaluating retrieval qualities of Google Scholar, PubMed, and 26 other resources. *Research Synthesis Methods*, *11*(2), 181–217. https://doi.org/10.1002/jrsm.1378

Han, B., Nawaz, S., Buchanan, G., & McKay, D. (2025). Students' Perceptions: Exploring the interplay of ethical and pedagogical impacts for adopting AI in higher education. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-024-00456-4

Ifenthaler, D., Majumdar, R., Gorissen, P., Judge, M., Mishra, S., Raffaghelli, J., & Shimada, A. (2024). Artificial intelligence in Education: Implications for policymakers, researchers, and practitioners. *Technology Knowledge and Learning*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10758-024-09747-0

Ivanov, S. (2023). The dark side of artificial intelligence in higher education. *Service Industries Journal*, *43*(15–16), 1055–1082. https://doi.org/10.1080/02642069.2023.2258799

Jain, K. K., & Raghuram, J. N. V. (2024). Gen-AI integration in higher education: Predicting intentions using SEM-ANN approach. *Education and Information Technologies*, *29*(13), 17169–17209. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-12506-4

Karkoulian, S., Sayegh, N., & Sayegh, N. (2024). ChatGPT unveiled: Understanding Perceptions of Academic Integrity in Higher Education - A Qualitative Approach. *Journal of Academic Ethics*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-024-09543-6

Kavadella, A., Da Silva, M. a. D., Kaklamanos, E. G., Stamatopoulos, V., & Giannakopoulos, K. (2023). Evaluation of CHATGPT's Real-Life Implementation in Undergraduate Dental Education: Mixed Methods study. *JMIR Medical Education*, *10*, e51344. https://doi.org/10.2196/51344

Khalifa, M., & Albadawy, M. (2024). Using artificial intelligence in academic writing and research: An essential productivity tool. *Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine Update*, *5*, 100145. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmpbup.2024.100145

Klimova, B., Pikhart, M., & Kacetl, J. (2023). Ethical issues of the use of AI-driven mobile apps for education. *Frontiers in Public Health*, *10*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2022.1118116

Knopp, M. I., Warm, E. J., Weber, D., Kelleher, M., Kinnear, B., Schumacher, D. J., Santen, S. A., Mendonça, E., & Turner, L. (2023). AI-Enabled medical Education: threads of change,

promising futures, and risky realities across four potential future worlds. *JMIR Medical Education*, *9*, e50373. https://doi.org/10.2196/50373

Knox, J. (2020). Artificial intelligence and education in China. *Learning Media and Technology*, *45*(3), 298–311. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2020.1754236

Lai, T., Zeng, X., Xu, B., Xie, C., Liu, Y., Wang, Z., Lu, H., & Fu, S. (2023). The application of artificial intelligence technology in education influences Chinese adolescent's emotional perception. *Current Psychology*, *43*(6), 5309–5317. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-023-04727-6

Li, M. (2024). Integrating Artificial intelligence in primary Mathematics Education: Investigating internal and external influences on teacher adoption. *International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10763-024-10515-w

Li, Z., & Zhang, W. (2024). Technology in education: Addressing legal and governance challenges in the digital era. *Education and Information Technologies*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-13036-9

Lünich, M., Keller, B., & Marcinkowski, F. (2024). Diverging perceptions of artificial intelligence in Higher Education: A comparison of student and public assessments on risks and damages of academic performance prediction in Germany. *Computers and Education Artificial Intelligence*, 100305. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100305

Ma, W., Ma, W., Hu, Y., & Bi, X. (2024). The who, why, and how of ai-based chatbots for learning and teaching in higher education: A systematic review. *Education and Information Technologies*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-13128-6

Mekterovic, I., Brkic, L., Milasinovic, B., & Baranovic, M. (2020). Building a Comprehensive Automated Programming Assessment System. *IEEE Access*, *8*, 81154–81172. https://doi.org/10.1109/access.2020.2990980

Messer, M., Brown, N. C. C., Kölling, M., & Shi, M. (2023). Automated Grading and Feedback Tools for Programming Education: A Systematic review. *ACM Transactions on Computing Education*, *24*(1), 1–43. https://doi.org/10.1145/3636515

Monib, W. K., Qazi, A., Apong, R. A., Azizan, M. T., De Silva, L., & Yassin, H. (2024). Generative AI and future education: a review, theoretical validation, and authors' perspective on challenges and solutions. *PeerJ Computer Science*, *10*, e2105. https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj-cs.2105

Msambwa, M. M., Wen, Z., & Daniel, K. (2025). The impact of AI on the personal and collaborative learning environments in higher education. *European Journal of Education*, *60*(1). https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12909

Ng, D. T. K., Lee, M., Tan, R. J. Y., Hu, X., Downie, J. S., & Chu, S. K. W. (2022). A review of AI teaching and learning from 2000 to 2020. *Education and Information Technologies*, *28*(7), 8445–8501. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-022-11491-w

Nguyen, A., Ngo, H. N., Hong, Y., Dang, B., & Nguyen, B. T. (2022). Ethical principles for artificial intelligence in education. *Education and Information Technologies*, *28*(4), 4221–4241. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-022-11316-w

Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J. M., Akl, E. A., Brennan, S. E., Chou, R., Glanville, J., Grimshaw, J. M., Hróbjartsson, A., Lalu, M. M., Li, T., Loder, E. W., Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S., … Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ, 372*, n71. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71

Panit, N. M. (2025). Can critical thinking and AI work together? Observations of science, Mathematics, and language instructors. *Environment and Social Psychology*, *9*(11). https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v9i11.3141

Plecerda, L. P. (2024). Academic integrity surrounding the use of generative AI in higher education: Lenses from ICT college students. *Environment and Social Psychology, 9*(12), 3177. https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v9i12.3177

Rahim, N. I. M., Iahad, N. A., Yusof, A. F., & Al-Sharafi, M. A. (2022). AI-Based Chatbots Adoption Model for Higher-Education Institutions: A Hybrid PLS-SEM-Neural Network Modelling Approach. *Sustainability*, *14*(19), 12726. https://doi.org/10.3390/su141912726

Saif, N., Khan, S. U., Shaheen, I., ALotaibi, F. A., Alnfiai, M. M., & Arif, M. (2023). Chat-GPT; validating Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) in education sector via ubiquitous learning mechanism. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *154*, 108097. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2023.108097

Saihi, A., Ben-Daya, M., Hariga, M., & As'ad, R. (2024). A Structural equation modeling analysis of generative AI chatbots adoption among students and educators in higher education. *Computers and Education Artificial Intelligence*, *7*, 100274. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100274

Schiff, D. (2021). Education for AI, not AI for Education: The Role of Education and Ethics in National AI Policy Strategies. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, *32*(3), 527–563. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-021-00270-2

Steyvers, M., & Kumar, A. (2023). Three challenges for AI-Assisted Decision-Making. *Perspectives on*

Psychological Science, *19*(5), 722–734. https://doi.org/10.1177/17456916231181102

Stracke, C. M., Griffiths, D., Pappa, D., Bećirović, S., Polz, E., Perla, L., Di Grassi, A., Massaro, S., Skenduli, M. P., Burgos, D., Punzo, V., Amram, D., Ziouvelou, X., Katsamori, D., Gabriel, S., Nahar, N., Schleiss, J., & Hollins, P. (2025). Analysis of artificial intelligence policies for higher education in Europe. *International Journal of Interactive Multimedia and Artificial Intelligence*, *In Press*(In Press), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.9781/ijimai.2025.02.011

Swindell, A., Greeley, L., Farag, A., & Verdone, B. (2024). Against Artificial Education: Towards an ethical framework for generative Artificial intelligence (AI) use in education. *Online Learning*, *28*(2). https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v28i2.4438

Wohlin, C. (2014). Guidelines for snowballing in systematic literature studies and a replication in software engineering. *ACM*, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1145/2601248.2601268

Xu, S., Chen, P., & Zhang, G. (2024). Exploring Chinese university educators' acceptance and intention to use AI tools: an application of the UTAUT2 model. *SAGE Open*, *14*(4). https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241290013

Zaim, M., Arsyad, S., Waluyo, B., Ardi, H., Hafizh, M. A., Zakiyah, M., Syafitri, W., Nusi, A., & Hardiah, M. (2024). AI-Powered EFL Pedagogy: Integrating Generative AI into University Teaching Preparation through UTAUT and Activity Theory. *Computers and Education Artificial Intelligence*, *7*, 100335. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100335

Zhang, J., & Zhang, Z. (2024). AI in teacher education: Unlocking new dimensions in teaching support, inclusive learning, and digital literacy. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, *40*(4), 1871–1885. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12988

Zhang, L., & Xu, J. (2024). The paradox of self-efficacy and technological dependence: Unraveling generative AI's impact on university students' task completion. *The Internet and Higher Education*, *65*, 100978. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2024.100978

Zhang, W., Cai, M., Lee, H. J., Evans, R., Zhu, C., & Ming, C. (2023). AI in Medical Education: Global situation, effects and challenges. *Education and Information Technologies*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-12009-8

Zheng, L., Niu, J., Zhong, L., & Gyasi, J. F. (2021). The effectiveness of artificial intelligence on learning achievement and learning perception: A meta-analysis. *Interactive Learning Environments*, *31*(9), 5650–5664. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2021.2015693