Heimer Media

Education and Arts Review

http//: www.heimer.cn/index.php/ear



Education in the Age of Artificial Intelligence

Clifford Hale [1]*

1. Kazimieras Simonavičius University, Lithuania.
* Correspondence: cliffordhale@ksu.lt

Abstract: Artificial intelligence has moved from the margins of educational technology into the daily practice of schools and universities, reshaping how content is delivered, how learning is assessed, and how teachers work. This paper surveys the current evidence on AI in education across four domains: personalized and adaptive learning, generative AI and assessment, the transformation of the teacher's role, and the ethical and governance questions that accompany these shifts. It argues that the most defensible position is neither uncritical enthusiasm nor reflexive prohibition, but a human-centred integration in which AI augments — rather than substitutes for — the judgement, care, and contextual understanding that define good teaching. The paper concludes that the central educational challenge of the AI age is not technological but curricular and ethical: deciding what knowledge, skills, and dispositions learners must develop when machine intelligence is abundant.

Keywords: Artificial intelligence, education, academic integrity, personalized learning, equity

Citation: Clifford Hale (2026). Education in the Age of Artificial Intelligence. *Education and Arts Review*, 2(2), 1-10.

Academic Editor: Heimer Delgado

Received: Jul 11, 2026
Revised: Aug 10, 2026
Accepted: Aug 30, 2026
Published: Sep 31, 2026



Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

1. Introduction

The arrival of capable large language models and generative systems has produced a period of unusual turbulence in education. Higher education's responses, as Farrelly and Baker observe, "have been varied and fragmented, ranging from those that have rushed to implement full bans on the use of ChatGPT to others who have started to embrace it by publishing student guidance on how to engage with AI effectively and ethically" (Farrelly & Baker, 2023). This fragmentation reflects a deeper uncertainty: institutions are being asked to integrate a technology whose capabilities are expanding faster than the evidence base that would ordinarily inform policy.

Two competing narratives dominate the discourse. The first treats AI as a transformative instrument that can personalize instruction at scale, liberate teachers from routine labour, and widen access to quality education. The second warns of a technology that threatens academic integrity, entrenches bias, and subjects learners to new forms of surveillance. This paper argues that both narratives capture part of the truth, and that the productive path forward lies in a careful, evidence-informed, and human-centred synthesis. The sections that follow examine what the research actually shows about AI's effects on learning, assessment, teaching, and equity, and what these findings imply for policy and practice.

2. Learning Reconfigured: Personalization, Adaptation, and Intelligent Tutoring

The most mature applications of AI in education concern personalization. Adaptive learning, as Lin and colleagues describe it, is "a personalized approach to learning that makes the best out of every student's learning" (Lin et al., 2023), operating by analysing learning patterns and adjusting the sequence and difficulty of content to the individual. The mechanisms vary, but the underlying promise is consistent: by continuously assessing individual progress, AI can ensure that "learners receive content that aligns with their current proficiency levels," thereby preventing the boredom or frustration that arises when instruction is pitched too low or too high (Ayeni et al., 2024).

Intelligent tutoring systems represent the most sophisticated expression of this logic. These systems "leverage AI algorithms to emulate human tutors, providing tailored instruction and support" and adapt to individual learning styles by offering personalized feedback, guidance, and additional resources as needed (Ayeni et al., 2024). The reported effects are encouraging. One mixed-methods study involving "300 students and 50 educators" found that average post-assessment scores rose from 68.4 to 82.7 in AI-driven adaptive settings (Sari et al., 2024). A systematic review reports that "students using ITS perform much better than children in traditional teaching environments do, with significant gains in retention and academic achievement" (Kazimova et al., 2025), and cites a study of a "dialogue-based ITS for learning fractions" in which experimental-group students outperformed those in conventional classrooms, particularly among lower-performing students (Kazimova et al., 2025).

Yet the evidence base is thinner than this catalogue of positive findings suggests. A meta-systematic review of AI in higher education found that although "ten reviews found or mentioned the ability of AI to positively influence learning outcomes," the same corpus showed that "few reviews in this corpus provided real evidence of impact" (Bond et al., 2024). The gap between the volume of enthusiastic commentary and the availability of rigorous, causally identified evidence of learning gains is one of the most important features of the field. Adaptive systems may indeed improve outcomes; but claims to that effect should be held to the standard of controlled comparison and independent replication before they are treated as settled.

3. Generative AI, Writing, and the Assessment Reckoning

If adaptive tutoring represents AI's constructive potential, generative AI has concentrated attention on its disruptive consequences for assessment. The concern is not abstract. Chan and Hu note that the technology "raises the question of what constitutes unethical behaviour in academic writing including plagiarism, attribution, copyrights, and authorship" — a form of AI-plagiarism — and caution that text generators "may compromise the validity of assessment practices, particularly those involving written assignments," posing a "threat to academic integrity" in higher education (Chan & Hu, 2023). Empirical work underscores the risk: one analysis of generative AI output reported a "self-plagiarism index of 59%," a similarity level that highlights the importance of critically evaluating machine-generated text (Yusuf et al., 2024).

The problem is complicated by ambiguity around what actually constitutes misconduct. Barrett and Pack point out that because generative models are trained on diffuse internet data and recombine language, "there is no identifiable other whose work is being stolen by a chatbot," and OpenAI's terms assign users rights to the output — a combination that leads many students to not "readily see a problem" with undisclosed AI assistance (Barrett & Pack, 2023). Their conclusion is pedagogically important: while students who previously used paper mills may simply adopt new tools, "other students will need guidance on how to avoid inadvertently cheating" (Barrett & Pack, 2023). The task for educators is thus as much about clarification and education as about detection.

Generative AI has also accelerated an assessment reckoning that was already overdue. As Xia and colleagues observe, "short-form essays have become an obsolete assessment tool" in the face of systems capable of producing work that "typically qualifies for a First-Class grade" (Xia et al., 2024). Their scoping review of 31 articles found that the technology has significantly affected teachers' approaches to assessing learning, both facilitating assessment processes and challenging the diversity and innovation of assessment methods. The recommended response is a shift toward tasks that are harder to outsource: assessment methods "should be more innovative, like developing podcasts or storyboards," and generative AI itself can be recruited for "authentic assessment by challenging" students' beliefs and critical thinking (Xia et al., 2024). This means moving "beyond traditional

knowledge-based assessments" and "emphasizing problem-solving, data interpretation," and case-study-based questions (Xia et al., 2024).

Authentic assessment has consequently moved from a specialist interest to a structural necessity. Peters and Angelov argue that generative AI "has made it even more pressing for lecturers in higher education to adopt new types of assessment, such as authentic assessment, as a deterrent against the proliferation of plagiarism" (Peters & Angelov, 2025), noting that such tasks can take many forms — "project, case study, problem solving, discussions, investigation, simulation, oral presentation, critique, analysis of real data" (Peters & Angelov, 2025). Institutional responses are emerging in parallel: the GENESIS framework proposes a five-pillar, institution-wide model for assessment reform, on the premise that "many traditional assessments are now at risk of becoming obsolete" (Ahangama, 2026). Others reframe generative AI not as a threat to be policed but as a collaborator, using tools as "agents-to-support experiential learning for authentic assessment" rather than mere answer-generators (Salinas-Navarro et al., 2024).

It is worth noting that automated assessment is not new, and the evidence on it is mixed in instructive ways. Automated writing evaluation systems have long been "able to assess students' writing performance, produce individualized feedback, and offer adaptive suggestions for writing improvement" (Fleckenstein et al., 2023), and systems such as "Grammarly and Pigai" predate the current generative wave (Escalante et al., 2023). A large-scale implementation analysed "over a million student essays" written and revised with formative automated feedback (Foltz et al., 2014). Yet an earlier controlled study found that "holistic scores showed no reliable gains," though students did learn to "reduce errors of mechanics, usage, grammar, and style" (Kellogg et al., 2010). The lesson is that automated feedback tends to improve the surface features it targets while leaving deeper qualities of writing untouched.

More recent work on LLM-generated feedback is more promising. In a randomized study with "N = 459 upper secondary students," feedback generated by a large language model "increased revision performance (d = .19)" and task motivation (d = 0.36), while also increasing positive emotions relative to revising without feedback (Meyer et al., 2023). The findings suggest that large language models can supply the "timely feedback" that time-pressed teachers often cannot, with measurable benefits for both cognitive and affective outcomes.

4. Teachers at the Centre: AI Literacy and Professional Development

The fate of AI in education will be decided less by the technology than by teachers. Yet the research consistently finds teachers underprepared and apprehensive. In one institution, discussions with teachers revealed that "one of the biggest constraints to implement AI tools in the classroom is their fear of using them," rooted in a sense of not knowing enough and a fear of using the tools wrongly (Walter, 2024). That institution also lacked any "dedicated person or group that is tasked with staying on top of the matter" (Walter, 2024). A critical review of the teacher-education literature identifies three recurring challenges: "(1) insufficient AI knowledge, skills, and confidence among educators, (2) poorly designed curricula, and (3) the absence of teaching guidelines" (Daher, 2025).

These deficits are measurable. A representative study of "1540 teachers in Germany" found that the majority of participants did not feel sufficiently prepared, even as "over half of the teachers utilize AI tools" for creating assignments and lesson planning — evidence that adoption is outpacing training (Mah et al., 2026). Notably, "over 50% of respondents expressed a desire for additional training" in using AI for lesson design, with almost half seeking instruction on how to promote critical thinking and source evaluation (Mah et al., 2026). The appetite for professional learning is clearly present.

The direction of that learning matters as much as its quantity. Mah and Groß emphasize that "AI should be viewed as a tool to support lecturers rather than as a means to replace them," and that acceptance hinges on perceived self-efficacy — lecturers who feel informed and competent tend to be more open to AI-driven methods (Mah & Groß, 2024). Traga Philippakos and Rocconi frame the teacher's role in ethical terms: in a landscape where AI tools can generate "irresponsible knowledge" and lack accountability, "the teacher must act as a safeguard, ensuring that technology use aligns with pedagogical and ethical standards" (Philippakos & Rocconi, 2025). This reframes professional development as a precondition for responsible integration rather than an optional add-on.

Where such support exists, the potential is real. The literature on human-AI collaboration describes a relationship of "Augmented Intelligence" — the pairing of human judgement with machine processing to enhance cognitive abilities (Machado et al., 2025) — and experiments show that semi-automated environments can aid teachers in personalizing learning "while reducing cognitive load and time commitment" (Machado et al., 2025). AI can support teachers by "automating routine tasks, providing personalized feedback, and generating insights from student data," while teachers supply the "human touch" of emotional support and contextual understanding that AI lacks (Chan & Tsi, 2023). A well-known early example is "Jill Watson," the virtual teaching assistant deployed at Georgia Tech to answer student queries on course forums (Chan & Tsi, 2023). Chatbots more generally offer "time-saving assistance by handling routine administrative tasks such as scheduling, grading, and providing information to students" (Labadze et al., 2023), and tools such as "AutoGradr and Repl.it" automate grading to reduce "the workload of teachers and administrators" (Adıgüzel et al., 2023). The emerging design principle is one of human oversight: in hybrid systems, "human experts monitor all learning content and student activities" and "promptly intervene to correct any errors made by the system" (Feng et al., 2025). The teacher does not disappear; the teacher's role shifts from content delivery toward moderation, verification, and care.

5. Ethics, Equity, and Governance

5.1 Algorithmic Bias and the Reproduction of Inequality

AI systems learn from historical data, and educational data is saturated with historical inequity. As one review cautions, "AI tools trained on large-scale datasets often inadvertently encode and propagate harmful stereotypes and biases related to gender, race, and ethnicity" (Luo et al., 2025). In education, this can translate into "unfair advantages or disadvantages for certain student demographics," perpetuating the very disparities that education is meant to remedy (Ayeni et al., 2024). The risk is not merely technical: prominent researchers in the field have asked directly whether "AIED systems [are] biased against some groups, and are some other groups being ignored," and have warned that differing degrees of personalization could "lead to inequitable outcomes" (Holmes et al., 2021).

5.2 Privacy, Surveillance, and Datafication

A second cluster of concerns concerns data. Personalized systems "routinely collect sensitive student data, including demographic information, behavioral patterns, and academic records," often "without consent or adequate privacy safeguards" (Luo et al., 2025). The proliferation of learning analytics and AIED systems raises "key concerns about the privacy of students and security of educational data" (Alfredo et al., 2024). Critics go further, describing systems that monitor and track students — including online exam proctoring, plagiarism detection software, and "'student safety management' systems that monitor student social media use, hall-pass apps that track student restroom visits," and other tools that reframe surveillance as pedagogical care (Selwyn, 2023). Some of this is commercial in nature, tied to "surveillance capitalism" and the monetization of student data (Selwyn, 2023). The consequences are more than discomforting: one analysis warns that "students become mere data points, as surveillance becomes intensified and normalised" (Cox, 2021),

and that the opacity of AI decision-making produces a "lack of transparency, and so of accountability" (Cox, 2021). Remote proctoring based on automated facial detection has been reported to "disproportionately 'flag' as 'suspicious' groups of students who are already most marginalized" (Williamson, 2023). Where systems infer affective states through intrusive means, critics argue that students' rights to privacy, "cognitive freedom," and the "dignity of self" are at stake (Nemorin et al., 2022).

A related critique concerns how narrowly ethics is conceived. In much of the AI-literacy literature, "ethics is often reduced to an epistemic knowledge centred around data and computational approaches, rather than a moral and adaptable way of thinking" (Sperling et al., 2024). Teaching students to spot bias in a dataset is not the same as cultivating the disposition to act justly in novel, ambiguous situations — and the latter is the harder and more important educational goal.

5.3 The Digital Divide

Equity concerns extend beyond the design of algorithms to the distribution of access. The "digital divide remains a substantial ethical concern in AI-driven education," since students from economically disadvantaged backgrounds or remote areas may lack devices, high-speed internet, or necessary software (Ayeni et al., 2024). The risks are asymmetric: "AI-driven teaching methodologies could widen the achievement gap by favoring students with access to technology or resources" while disadvantaging those without (Adeleye et al., 2024). In developing-country contexts, "the affordability of digital devices, infrastructure limitations," and limited digital literacy are identified as the main drivers of the divide (Assefa et al., 2024), and digital inequality has been described as "one of the most persistent structural barriers to educational advancement" ((Jr.) et al., 2025).

Crucially, access alone is not a remedy. Research on technology initiatives for socially excluded communities found that "these mobile interventions amplified social exclusion rather than mitigated it" when they failed to account for social, cultural, and literacy contexts (Kühn et al., 2023). Simply distributing devices does not close the "gap between people who have adequate access" to technology and those without (Soomro et al., 2020); it may even deepen inequality if the surrounding conditions are ignored.

5.4 Governance and Policy

Recognition of these risks has produced a growing architecture of guidance. The UNESCO framework for AI in education is "centred around a humanistic approach," aiming to safeguard human rights and to "prioritize human control over AI" so that the technology improves the capabilities of both teachers and students (Chan, 2023). UNESCO's 2023 Guidance on Generative AI in Education and Research, the first global instrument of its kind, calls for a "human-centred approach for GenAI adoption in schools, underpinned by robust regulatory frameworks and a well-rounded teacher training regimen" (Chan & Colloton, 2024). It recommends "age-appropriate guardrails, teacher-led validation workflows, and explicit curricular integration of AI literacy," and insists that legitimate pedagogical uses of generative AI are those that "preserve human agency" and make the limits of model knowledge visible to learners (Dimić et al., 2026).

The need for such frameworks is stark. UNESCO noted that "fewer than 10% of educational institutions had formal guidance on GenAI," and it has since developed an "AI Competency Framework for Students and Educators" to support institutions in responding (Crompton et al., 2026). The governance challenge is to design responses that are flexible enough to accommodate a rapidly evolving technology while remaining firm on matters of integrity, privacy, and equity.

6. Educating for a Changing World: Skills and Curriculum

If AI is changing how students learn, it is also changing what they need to learn. Labour-market analyses converge on a shift in the skills that command a premium. The World Economic Forum estimated that "85 million jobs may disappear" due to automation, concluding that the most valuable skills will be those that are "intrinsically human and impossible to replicate in a machine," with "critical thinking and problem-solving" at the top of the list (Pedró, 2024). The composition of the top skills is itself shifting: "critical thinking is moved up to number two" in the World Economic Forum's rankings, while complex problem solving has held the first position (Li, 2022). One widely cited report projected that "up to 50% of employees will need some degree of 'reskilling'" by 2025, and identified the "4Cs" — "creativity, critical thinking, communication, and collaboration" — as central to future work and education (Thornhill-Miller et al., 2023).

The empirical pattern behind these projections is that automation displaces routine physical and sensory work more readily than cognitive work. One study finds that "jobs focusing on sensory-physical skills are more likely to be supplanted by machines," and that workers maintain their advantage by enhancing "cognitive skills, such as creativity and critical thinking" (Zhang et al., 2024). Dumitru and Halpern capture the pedagogical implication in their concept of "job-proof skills" — critical thinking, problem-solving, empathy, and ethics — which they argue can and should be taught through deliberate classroom instruction (Dumitru & Halpern, 2023). Their argument connects employability to citizenship: critical thinking is essential not only for work but for informed participation in a world saturated with information and misinformation.

This reframing of curricular priorities has a counterpart in the growing movement to teach AI itself. Definitions of AI literacy emphasize a "set of competencies that enables individuals to critically evaluate AI technologies," communicate and collaborate with AI systems, and use them as tools across contexts (Yim, 2024); one review argues that AI literacy is "as crucial as traditional literacy" for future careers in science and engineering (Yim, 2024). Frameworks have proliferated. Long and Magerko proposed "16 competencies" spanning recognition of AI, understanding machine learning, data competency, and ethical concerns (Ng et al., 2023), while Chiu and colleagues, working with 30 experienced teachers, advanced a competency framework comprising "technology, impact, ethics, collaboration, and self-reflection" (Chiu et al., 2024). Their distinction is useful: literacy is about knowing, while competency is about applying knowledge well and with confidence.

Curricular integration is uneven but accelerating. Researchers note that "clear guidelines are needed on what students are expected to learn about AI in K-12" (Otero et al., 2023), and that internationally several countries have already begun to embed AI in primary and secondary curricula — in China, "AI was officially introduced into the curriculum in 2018 by the Ministry of Education," with similar efforts in the European Union, Japan, South Korea, and Singapore (Chen et al., 2023). The design challenge is to move beyond narrow technical training toward an integrated literacy that prepares students to live and work alongside intelligent systems.

7. Conclusion

Education in the age of artificial intelligence is best understood not as a contest between human teachers and machines, but as a problem of alignment: matching powerful tools to defensible educational purposes, under conditions that protect equity and dignity. The evidence reviewed here supports several conclusions.

First, the case for AI's learning benefits is real but incomplete. Adaptive systems and intelligent tutors show measurable gains in engagement, retention, and achievement, yet systematic reviews find that rigorous evidence of impact remains scarce (Bond et al., 2024). Enthusiasm should be disciplined by evidence.

Second, generative AI has forced a necessary reckoning with assessment. Traditional written tasks are increasingly vulnerable, and the constructive response is to redesign assessment around authenticity, higher-order thinking, and process rather than to retreat into surveillance — which itself carries documented costs in bias and privacy (Williamson, 2023).

Third, teachers remain decisive. Their fear and underpreparation are the most immediate barriers to sound integration (Walter, 2024), and the remedy is sustained professional development that builds both technical competence and ethical judgement, with AI positioned as support rather than replacement (Mah & Groß, 2024).

Fourth, ethics and equity are not peripheral. Bias, datafication, surveillance, and the digital divide are constitutive features of the AI-in-education landscape, and governance frameworks — such as UNESCO's human-centred guidance — must be treated as core infrastructure rather than afterthoughts (Chan, 2023).

Finally, the curriculum itself must change. If the premium on critical thinking, creativity, and collaboration is rising, and if AI literacy is becoming foundational, then the task of education is less about transmitting content that machines can now generate and more about cultivating the judgement to use, question, and direct those machines. The age of artificial intelligence does not diminish the purpose of education; it clarifies it. What remains irreducibly human — the capacity to think critically, to act ethically, and to care about others — becomes, in this era, the very centre of the educational project.

Acknowledgments: The author acknowledges the use of Jenni as an assistant tool to support language refinement, structural organization, and drafting assistance. All ideas, interpretations, and conclusions presented in this paper are solely those of the author, who takes full responsibility for the content.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

References

1. Adeleye, O. O., Eden, C. A., & Adeniyi, I. S. (2024). Innovative teaching methodologies in the era of artificial intelligence: A review of inclusive educational practices. *World Journal of Advanced Engineering Technology and Sciences*, *11*(2), 69–79. https://doi.org/10.30574/wjaets.2024.11.2.0091
2. Adıgüzel, T., Kaya, M. H., & Cansu, F. K. (2023). Revolutionizing education with AI: Exploring the transformative potential of ChatGPT. *Contemporary Educational Technology*, *15*(3). https://doi.org/10.30935/cedtech/13152
3. Ahangama, N. (2026). Designing assessments in the generative AI era: A tailored assessment framework for ICT tertiary education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *23*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-026-00582-0
4. Alfredo, R., Echeverría, V., Jin, Y., Yan, L., Swiecki, Z., Gašević, D., & Martínez-Maldonado, R. (2024). Human-centred learning analytics and AI in education: A systematic literature review. *Computers and Education Artificial Intelligence*, *6*, 100215. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100215
5. Assefa, Y., Gebremeskel, M. M., Moges, B. T., Tilwani, S. A., & Azmera, Y. A. (2024). Rethinking the digital divide and associated educational in(equity) in higher education in the context of developing countries: the social justice perspective. *International Journal of Information and Learning Technology*, *42*(1), 15–32. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijilt-03-2024-0058
6. Ayeni, O. O., Hamad, N. M. A., Chisom, O. N., Osawaru, B., & Adewusi, O. E. (2024). AI in education: A review of personalized learning and educational technology. *GSC Advanced Research and Reviews*, *18*(2), 261–271. https://doi.org/10.30574/gscarr.2024.18.2.0062
7. Barrett, A., & Pack, A. (2023). Not quite eye to A.I.: student and teacher perspectives on the use of generative artificial intelligence in the writing process. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *20*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00427-0
8. Bond, M., Khosravi, H., Laat, M. de, Bergdahl, N., Negrea, V., Oxley, E., Pham, P., Chong, S. W., & Siemens, G. (2024). A meta systematic review of artificial intelligence in higher education: a call for increased ethics, collaboration, and rigour. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *21*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00436-z

9. 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
10. Chan, C. K. Y., & Colloton, T. (2024). *Generative AI in Higher Education*. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003459026
11. Chan, C. K. Y., & Hu, W. (2023). Students' voices on generative AI: perceptions, benefits, and challenges in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *20*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00411-8
12. Chan, C. K. Y., & Tsi, L. H. Y. (2023). The AI Revolution in Education: Will AI Replace or Assist Teachers in Higher Education? In *arXiv (Cornell University)*. Cornell University. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2305.01185
13. Chen, B., Zhu, X., & Castillo, F. D. del. (2023). Integrating generative AI in knowledge building. *Computers and Education Artificial Intelligence*, *5*, 100184. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2023.100184
14. Chiu, T. K. F., Ahmad, Z., Ismailov, M., & Sanusi, I. T. (2024). What are artificial intelligence literacy and competency? A comprehensive framework to support them. *Computers and Education Open*, *6*, 100171. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeo.2024.100171
15. Cox, A. (2021). Exploring the impact of Artificial Intelligence and robots on higher education through literature-based design fictions. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *18*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-020-00237-8
16. Crompton, H., Burke, D., Nickel, C., Bozkurt, A., Miao, F., Sharples, M., Greene, J. A., Parsons, D., Gill-Simmen, L., Edmett, A., Pegrum, M., Waard, I. de, Bonk, C. J., Garcia, M. B., Curry, J. H., Lindsey, L., Yang, M., Marshall, S., Bali, M., … Yu, S. (2026). Governing generative AI in higher education: a global Delphi study on policy and practice. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *23*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-026-00602-z
17. Daher, R. F. (2025). Integrating AI literacy into teacher education: a critical perspective paper. *Discover Artificial Intelligence*, *5*(1). https://doi.org/10.1007/s44163-025-00475-7
18. Dimić, G., Spalević, Ž., Nešić, M., Ivković, R., Sotiroski, D., Vasić, Č., & Vučković, D. (2026). Education in the Age of AI: Adaptive Systems, Assessment, and Responsible Governance. *International Journal of Cognitive Research in Science Engineering and Education*, *14*(1), 135–144. https://doi.org/10.23947/2334-8496-2026-14-1-135-144
19. Dumitru, D., & Halpern, D. F. (2023). Critical Thinking: Creating Job-Proof Skills for the Future of Work. *Journal of Intelligence*, *11*(10), 194. https://doi.org/10.3390/jintelligence11100194
20. Escalante, J., Pack, A., & Barrett, A. (2023). AI-generated feedback on writing: insights into efficacy and ENL student preference. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *20*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00425-2
21. Farrelly, T., & Baker, N. (2023). Generative Artificial Intelligence: Implications and Considerations for Higher Education Practice. *Education Sciences*, *13*(11), 1109. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13111109
22. Feng, S., Zhang, H., & Gašević, D. (2025). Mapping the evolution of AI in education: Toward a co-adaptive and human-centered paradigm. *Computers and Education Artificial Intelligence*, *9*, 100513. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2025.100513
23. Fleckenstein, J., Liebenow, L. W., & Meyer, J. (2023). Automated feedback and writing: a multi-level meta-analysis of effects on students' performance. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, *6*, 1162454. https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2023.1162454
24. Foltz, P. W., Rosenstein, M., Dronen, N., & Dooley, S. (2014). *Automated feedback in a large-scale implementation of a formative writing system: Implications for improving student*. https://www.apparent-wind.com/mbr/papers/Formative-writing-Foltz-et-AERA.pdf
25. Holmes, W., Porayska-Pomsta, K., Holstein, K., Sutherland, E., Baker, T. T., Shum, S. B., Santos, O. C., Rodrigo, Ma. M. T., Cukurova, M., Bittencourt, I. I., & Koedinger, K. R. (2021). Ethics of AI in Education: Towards a Community-Wide Framework. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, *32*(3), 504–526. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-021-00239-1
26. (Jr.), S. A. V. P., Joseph, J., (Jr.), S. A. V. P., McDonald, C., Solomon, O. K., & Rambhajan, S. (2025). Digital Inequality in Developing States: The Hidden Educational Crisis Limiting Progress in Guyana and the Caribbean. *Integrated Journal for Research in Arts and Humanities*, *5*(4), 200–202. https://doi.org/10.55544/ijrah.5.4.31
27. Kellogg, R. T., Whiteford, A. P., & Quinlan, T. (2010). Does Automated Feedback Help Students Learn to Write? *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, *42*(2), 173–196. https://doi.org/10.2190/ec.42.2.c
28. Kühn, C., Khoo, S., Czerniewicz, L., Lilley, W., Bute, S. J. R., Crean, A., Abegglen, S., Burns, T., Sinfield, S. F., Jandrić, P., Knox, J., & MacKenzie, A. (2023). Understanding Digital Inequality: A Theoretical Kaleidoscope. *Postdigital Science and Education*, *5*(3), 894–932. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-023-00395-8
29. Labadze, L., Grigolia, M., & Machaidze, L. (2023). Role of AI chatbots in education: systematic literature review. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *20*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00426-1
30. Li, L. (2022). Reskilling and Upskilling the Future-ready Workforce for Industry 4.0 and Beyond. *Information Systems Frontiers*, *26*(5), 1697–1712. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-022-10308-y

31. Lin, C.-C., Huang, A. Y. Q., & Lu, O. H. T. (2023). Artificial intelligence in intelligent tutoring systems toward sustainable education: a systematic review. *Smart Learning Environments*, *10*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-023-00260-y
32. Luo, J., Zheng, C., Yin, J., & Teo, H. (2025). Design and assessment of AI-based learning tools in higher education: a systematic review. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *22*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-025-00540-2
33. Machado, A. F., Tenório, K., Santos, M. do S. V. dos, Barros, A. P., Rodrigues, L., Mello, R. F., Paiva, R., & Dermeval, D. (2025). Workload perception in educational resource recommendation supported by artificial intelligence: a controlled experiment with teachers. *Smart Learning Environments*, *12*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-025-00373-6
34. Mah, D.-K., & Groß, N. (2024). Artificial intelligence in higher education: exploring faculty use, self-efficacy, distinct profiles, and professional development needs. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *21*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00490-1
35. Mah, D.-K., Groß, N., Egloffstein, M., & Prilop, C. N. (2026). Artificial intelligence in K-12 instruction: the role of teacher professional development. *Smart Learning Environments*, *13*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-026-00442-4
36. Meyer, J., Jansen, T., Schiller, R., Liebenow, L. W., Steinbach, M., Horbach, A., & Fleckenstein, J. (2023). Using LLMs to bring evidence-based feedback into the classroom: AI-generated feedback increases secondary students' text revision, motivation, and positive emotions. *Computers and Education Artificial Intelligence*, *6*, 100199. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2023.100199
37. Nemorin, S., Vlachidis, A., Ayerakwa, H. M., & Andriotis, P. (2022). AI hyped? A horizon scan of discourse on artificial intelligence in education (AIED) and development. *Learning Media and Technology*, *48*(1), 38–51. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2022.2095568
38. Ng, D. T. K., Leung, J. K. L., Su, J., Ng, C. W., & Chu, S. K. W. (2023). Teachers' AI digital competencies and twenty-first century skills in the post-pandemic world. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, *71*(1), 137–161. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-023-10203-6
39. Otero, L. C., Catalá, A., Fernández-Morante, C., Taboada, M., López, B. C., & Barro, S. (2023). AI literacy in K-12: a systematic literature review. *International Journal of STEM Education*, *10*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-023-00418-7
40. Pedró, F. (2024). Future Skills—Back into the Future? Emerging Trends in Educational Innovation in Higher Education. In *Zukunft der Hochschulbildung* (pp. 93–122). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-42948-5_5
41. Peters, M., & Angelov, D. (2025). Redefining assessment tasks to promote students' creativity and integrity in the age of generative artificial intelligence. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, *21*(1), 25. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-025-00201-x
42. Philippakos, Z. A. T., & Rocconi, L. (2025). AI Literacy: Elementary and Secondary Teachers' Use of AI-Tools, Reported Confidence, and Professional Development Needs. *Education Sciences*, *15*(9), 1186. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15091186
43. Salinas-Navarro, D. E., Vilalta-perdomo, E. L., Michel-Villarreal, R., & Montesinos, L. (2024). Using Generative Artificial Intelligence Tools to Explain and Enhance Experiential Learning for Authentic Assessment. *Education Sciences*, *14*(1), 83. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14010083
44. Sari, H., Tumanggor, B., & Efron, D. (2024). Improving Educational Outcomes Through Adaptive Learning Systems using AI. *International Transactions on Artificial Intelligence (ITALIC)*, *3*(1), 21–31. https://doi.org/10.33050/italic.v3i1.647
45. Selwyn, N. (2023). Constructive Criticism? Working with (Rather than Against) the AIED Back-Lash. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, *34*(1), 84–91. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-023-00344-3
46.
47. Soomro, K. A., Kale, U., Curtis, R., Akcaoğlu, M., & Bernstein, M. (2020). Digital divide among higher education faculty. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *17*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-020-00191-5
48. Sperling, K., Stenberg, C.-J., McGrath, C., Åkerfeldt, A., Heintz, F., & Stenliden, L. (2024). In search of artificial intelligence (AI) literacy in teacher education: A scoping review. *Computers and Education Open*, *6*, 100169. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeo.2024.100169
49. Thornhill-Miller, B., Camarda, A., Mercier, M., Burkhardt, J., Morisseau, T., Bourgeois-Bougrine, S., Vinchon, F., Hayek, S. E., Augereau-Landais, M., Mourey, F., Feybesse, C., Sundquist, D., & Lubart, T. (2023). Creativity, Critical Thinking, Communication, and Collaboration: Assessment, Certification, and Promotion of 21st Century Skills for the Future of Work and Education. *Journal of Intelligence*, *11*(3), 54. https://doi.org/10.3390/jintelligence11030054
50. Walter, Y. (2024). Embracing the future of Artificial Intelligence in the classroom: the relevance of AI literacy, prompt engineering, and critical thinking in modern education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *21*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00448-3
51. Williamson, B. (2023). The Social life of AI in Education. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, *34*(1), 97–104. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-023-00342-5

52. Xia, Q., Weng, X., Ouyang, F., Lin, T., & Chiu, T. K. F. (2024). A scoping review on how generative artificial intelligence transforms assessment in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *21*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00468-z
53. Yim, I. H. Y. (2024). A critical review of teaching and learning artificial intelligence (AI) literacy: Developing an intelligence-based AI literacy framework for primary school education. *Computers and Education Artificial Intelligence*, *7*, 100319. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100319
54. Yusuf, A., Pervin, N., & Román-González, Marcos. (2024). Generative AI and the future of higher education: a threat to academic integrity or reformation? Evidence from multicultural perspectives. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *21*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00453-6
55. Zhang, W., Lai, K., & Gong, Q. (2024). The future of the labor force: higher cognition and more skills. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, *11*(1). https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-02962-1
56. Kazimova, D., Tazhigulova, G. O., Shraimanova, G. S., Zatyneyko, A., & Sharzadin, A. M. (2025). Transforming University Education with AI: A Systematic Review of Technologies, Applications, and Implications. *International Journal of Engineering Pedagogy (iJEP)*, *15*(1), 4–24. https://doi.org/10.3991/ijep.v15i1.50773

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of HEIMER MEDIA and/or the editor(s). HEIMER MEDIA and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.