INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ACADEMIC RESEARCH IN PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION & DEVELOPMENT

OPEN ACCESS JOURNAL

Vol 14, Issue 3, (2025) E-ISSN: 2226-6348

Generative Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education: Opportunities, Challenges, and Future Directions

Yanhua Zhong*[1,2], Mohd Shafie B. Rosli[1]

[1]Advanced Learning Technology Department, Faculty of Educational Sciences and Technology, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, 81310 Skudai, Johor Bahru, Johor, Malaysia

[2]Institute of Marxism, Ganzhou Polytechnic, Ganzhou, Jiangxi, 341000, China

Email: zhongyanhua@graduate.utm.my, shafierosli@utm.my

To Link this Article: http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARPED/v14-i3/25813 DOI:10.6007/IJARPED/v14-i3/25813

Published Online: 15 July 2025

Abstract

The integration of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI) in higher education has garnered significant scholarly attention. This comprehensive review synthesizes current literature to examine the transformative potential, implementation challenges, and future trajectories of textual (e.g., ChatGPT), visual (e.g., DALL-E), and multimodal GAI tools in academic settings. Our analysis reveals that GAI offers different GAI categories substantial opportunities for personalized learning, pedagogical innovation, and creative skill development while simultaneously presenting critical challenges related to academic integrity, data privacy, and algorithmic bias. We analyze these developments through three interconnected dimensions: technological applications, stakeholder perceptions, and contextual implementation. The paper concludes by proposing six key research priorities: assessment integrity and pedagogical strategies, ethical frameworks and policy development, teaching-learning process impacts, stakeholder perceptions research, technological enhancements, and future skills preparation. These findings provide both theoretical foundations and practical guidance for the responsible integration of GAI technologies in higher education institutions.

Keywords: Generative Artificial Intelligence, Higher Education, Systematic Review, ChatGPT, DALL-E, Multimodal AI, Academic Integrity

Introduction

The rapid advancement of various forms of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI) technologies, which include textual systems like large language models (e.g., ChatGPT), visual tools (e.g., DALL-E, Midjourney), and multimodal systems, is fundamentally transforming the landscape of higher education (Batista et al., 2024; Ng et al., 2025). These distinct GAI categories demonstrate different capabilities and applications in academic settings: while LLMs excel at text generation and analysis, visual GAI tools support creative disciplines, and multimodal systems enable more comprehensive learning experiences. Large Language Models (LLMs) such as ChatGPT demonstrate unprecedented capabilities in generating diverse content formats including text, code, and visual materials, creating both remarkable

opportunities and complex challenges for academic institutions (Denny et al., 2024). While these technologies promise to enhance personalized learning experiences and instructional efficiency, they simultaneously raise profound questions about academic integrity, educational equity, and the evolving role of educators (AlAli & Wardat, 2024).

As the primary incubators of future professionals, higher education institutions face pressing questions about effectively incorporating GAI while addressing its multifaceted implications. This study addresses a critical need by systematically reviewing existing scholarship to identify best practices, persistent challenges, and strategic directions for integrating GAI into higher education in a manner that maximizes benefits while minimizing risks. Existing scholarship indicates GAI's significant potential to support adaptive learning, augment teaching effectiveness, and foster creative thinking (Watermeyer et al., 2024). For instance, GAI applications can function as digital tutors providing continuous academic support or as teaching assistants reducing administrative burdens (Michel-Villarreal et al., 2023). However, these technological advancements also necessitate fundamental reconsiderations of assessment methodologies, academic honesty protocols, and digital divide mitigation strategies (Strzelecki & ElArabawy, 2024).

This systematic review of highly cited literature addresses three central research questions: (1) What are the predominant applications and demonstrated effects of GAI in higher education? (2) How do different stakeholders (students, faculty, administrators) perceive and adopt GAI technologies? (3) What are the primary challenges and responsive strategies in GAI implementation? By examining these questions, this paper aims to provide both conceptual frameworks and actionable recommendations for the appropriate utilization of GAI in academic settings. Ultimately, this research seeks to inform policymakers, institutional leaders, educators, and technology developers about how GAI can be harnessed to improve educational outcomes, promote equity, and prepare students for an AI-augmented world.

Current Applications of Generative AI in Higher Education

Categorizing GAI Educational Tools

We identify three primary categories of GAI with distinct educational applications:

1. Textual GAI (e.g., ChatGPT, Gemini): Most widely adopted in writing-intensive disciplines and programming courses
2. Visual GAI (e.g., DALL-E, Stable Diffusion): Particularly effective for design, architecture, and visual arts education
3. Multimodal GAI (e.g., GPT-4 Vision, Gemini Ultra): Emerging applications in medical education and interdisciplinary studies

The deployment of GAI in higher education exhibits both diverse applications and rapid evolutionary patterns. Batista et al. (2024) systematic literature review identifies three primary analytical lenses: technological implementation, stakeholder acceptance, and contextual adaptation. This tripartite framework offers a comprehensive structure for understanding GAI integration in academic environments. By analyzing these dimensions, we can better understand how GAI not only enhances instructional efficiency but also supports inclusive learning environments that accommodate diverse student needs.

Among textual AI applications, ChatGPT has emerged as the most prominent GAI tool. Empirical studies demonstrate its effectiveness in supporting programming education. Elkhodr et al. (2023) conducted controlled experiments revealing superior performance among students using ChatGPT for ICT coursework, with participants reporting positive evaluations of this learning aid. Similarly, Popovici (2024) observed ChatGPT's utility in functional programming courses, though noting that 43% of AI-generated solutions contained efficiency or readability issues. By contrast, visual GAI tools like DALL-E have shown particular promise in design education, where they facilitate rapid prototyping and creative exploration (French et al., 2023). These findings suggest that while GAI tools are not yet perfect substitutes for human instruction, they offer significant potential to reduce cognitive load and support self-paced learning, especially for students from under-resourced backgrounds.

Beyond computer science education, multimodal GAI shows distinctive promise in medical training. Shimizu et al. (2023) SWOT analysis identified 169 influential factors, revealing GAI's dual capacity to enhance instructional processes while potentially undermining independent critical thinking. This dual impact underscores the importance of carefully designed implementation strategies that maximize benefits while mitigating risks—particularly in high-stakes professional domains like healthcare education. In journalism education, Lopezosa et al. (2023) document how GAI tools are transforming media production and consumption, while emphasizing the urgent need to incorporate ethical considerations into curricula. The Primary Domains of GAI Application in Higher Education are detailed in Table 1.

Table 1
Primary Domains of GAI Application in Higher Education by Tool Type

Discipline	Most Effective GAI Type	Sample Applications	Key Benefits
Computer Science	Textual (ChatGPT)	Code generation, debugging	Immediate feedback, 24/7 availability
Visual Arts	Visual (DALL-E)	Concept generation, style exploration	Rapid iteration, creative stimulation
Medical Education	Multimodal	Case simulation, diagnostic training	Integrated text-image learning

At the macro level, GAI is driving systemic changes in higher education policy and curricular design. (Walczak & Cellary, 2023) surveys indicate most students believe institutions should "encourage and teach AI usage," reflecting learner expectations for technological integration. Concurrently, Watermeyer et al. (2024) caution that uncritical GAI adoption may render scholars "less inquisitive, reflective, and substantively engaged," prompting fundamental questions about the nature of academic labor. These insights reveal that GAI implementation involves not merely technological adoption but profound reconsiderations of educational philosophy and academic culture.

Notably, disciplinary differences significantly mediate GAI's effectiveness. STEM fields (e.g., engineering, computer science) have demonstrated earlier and more extensive adoption compared to humanities and social sciences, where greater emphasis is placed on ethical reasoning and critical analysis (Nikolic et al., 2023). Such transformations highlight the broader societal implications of GAI adoption, suggesting that its integration must be accompanied by robust digital literacy and ethics training to prepare students for responsible engagement with emerging technologies.

Stakeholder Acceptance and Perceptual Landscapes

The successful integration of GAI in higher education substantially depends on the acceptance and adoption patterns among various stakeholder groups. Current research examines these dynamics through multiple perspectives, specifically focusing on students, faculty, researchers, and institutional leaders, which reveals complex and often divergent perceptual frameworks. As primary users, students' acceptance is influenced by multifaceted factors. Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) studies identify performance expectancy and effort expectancy as key predictors of adoption intention (Duong et al., 2023). Strzelecki and ElArabawy (2024) further establish social influence's significant role, demonstrating how peer, instructor, and administrator attitudes shape student behaviors. These findings align with Yilmaz and Yilmaz (2023) Generative AI Acceptance Scale, which validates instrumentation for assessing student adoption intentions.

Student attitudes frequently exhibit ambivalence. While Chan and Hu (2023) survey of six Hong Kong universities found participants possessed "good understanding" and positive dispositions toward GAI technologies, respondents simultaneously expressed concerns about overreliance and reduced social interaction. Similarly, Jaboob et al. (2025) multi-country Arab study confirmed GAI's positive impacts on learning behaviors and cognitive achievement while highlighting cultural adaptation requirements. These patterns suggest students engage in cost-benefit analyses when evaluating GAI tools rather than exhibiting unconditional acceptance.

Faculty perspectives reveal greater complexity. Rose et al. (2023) computer science faculty survey identified simultaneous appreciation for GAI's debugging capabilities and profound concerns about escalating plagiarism threats to academic integrity. Greiner et al. (2023) elaborate this tension, showing that while instructors value AI assistance in semi-structured decisions like thesis evaluation, they insist on maintaining ultimate human judgment authority. Such ambivalence often correlates with disciplinary background, technological proficiency, and pedagogical philosophy (AlAli & Wardat, 2024).

Institutional-level research remains relatively sparse but yields critical insights. A survey of Saudi Arabian researchers by Al-Zahrani (2024) shows researchers optimistic about GAI's transformative research potential while emphasizing needs for ethical use training. Barrett and Pack (2023) document widespread policy-practice gaps, with many institutions struggling to develop appropriate governance frameworks—a regulatory vacuum that risks inconsistent implementation (Perkins et al., 2024).

Divergent stakeholder priorities create significant implementation challenges. Students typically emphasize utility and convenience, faculty prioritize academic standards, and administrators balance innovation with risk management (Batista et al., 2024). These value differences necessitate robust dialogue mechanisms to ensure inclusive decision-making (Denny et al., 2024). The Comparative Stakeholder Perceptions of GAI are detailed in Table 2.

Table 2
Comparative Stakeholder Perceptions of GAI

Stakeholder Group	Primary Concerns	Positive Perceptions	Apprehensions	Influencing Factors
Students	Learning efficiency, usability	Personalized support, instant feedback	Dependency, social isolation	Performance expectancy, social norms
Faculty	Educational quality, academic standards	Administrative relief, pedagogical innovation	Integrity erosion, role marginalization	Technical proficiency, disciplinary culture
Researchers	Research integrity, methodological rigor	Literature synthesis, hypothesis generation	Data bias, misconduct risks	Ethical frameworks, institutional support
Administrators	Institutional risk, educational quality	Operational efficiency, resource optimization	Liability, inequity amplification	Policy environment, resource allocation

Cross-cultural studies reveal significant geographical variations in GAI acceptance. Strzelecki and ElArabawy (2024) Poland-Egypt comparison demonstrates how cultural context mediates technology acceptance model variables. Similarly, Jaboob et al. (2025) emphasize the need for culturally adapted GAI integration strategies in Arab educational systems. These findings caution against universal implementation blueprints and advocate for localized, context-sensitive approaches that resist technological imperialism.

Implementation Challenges and Ethical Considerations

While GAI presents transformative opportunities for higher education, its integration introduces multidimensional challenges encompassing academic integrity preservation, assessment redesign, data protection, and algorithmic fairness. Addressing these concerns requires coordinated efforts among educators, institutions, and policymakers.

Academic integrity has emerged as a particularly pressing issue in the GAI era. The capability of tools like ChatGPT to produce sophisticated academic writing complicates traditional plagiarism detection (Singh, 2023). Hassoulas et al. (2023) experimental study found even experienced graders could only marginally outperform chance in distinguishing student writing from ChatGPT output, underscoring the inadequacy of conventional assessment approaches (Jarrah et al., 2023).

Assessment innovation represents a crucial response strategy. Perkins et al. (2024) evaluation of Turnitin's AI detection tool revealed limited effectiveness against adversarially engineered ChatGPT content, suggesting technological solutions alone are insufficient. This discovery indicates that relying solely on detection technology is insufficient to solve the problem of academic integrity, and it is necessary to combine innovation at the evaluation and design level. Barrett and Pack (2023) suggest adopting alternative methods such as process assessment and oral defense while Essel et al. (2024) found that integrating ChatGPT into classroom activities could promote students' critical, reflective and creative thinking. These methods all shift the evaluation focus from the final product to the learning process, thereby reducing the reliance on AI tools.

Data privacy and security constitute another critical concern. GAI systems frequently require extensive student data processing for personalization, raising ethical questions about

information collection, storage, and utilization (Baidoo-Anu & Ansah, 2023). AlAli and Wardat (2024) emphasize strict compliance with data protection regulations, though many institutions lack requisite technical and governance capacities (Walczak & Cellary, 2023).

Algorithmic bias presents equally serious challenges. Trained on datasets reflecting societal prejudices, GAI outputs may perpetuate or amplify gender, racial, and cultural stereotypes (Korngiebel & Mooney, 2021). Such biases pose particular risks in educational contexts where they could influence grading fairness and resource allocation. Pavlik (2023) recommends diverse development teams, bias detection protocols, and ongoing algorithmic audits as mitigation strategies, although these measures are rarely implemented in current academic settings (Herft, 2023).

The digital divide's potential exacerbation represents a systemic implementation barrier. Watermeyer et al. (2024) warn that unequal GAI access and utilization competencies may create new forms of educational stratification across regions, institutions, and socioeconomic groups. Denny et al. (2024) workshop discussions stress inclusive design principles to prevent GAI from becoming another elitist resource, requiring coordinated efforts among developers, educators, and policymakers (AlAli & Wardat, 2024).

Faculty role transformation introduces profound professional challenges. GAI's automation of routine tasks like grading and content generation is redefining academic identities, creating both opportunities for pedagogical innovation and anxieties about job security (Mollman, 2022). This transition demands comprehensive professional development programs to equip educators with necessary digital competencies (Hidayat & Wardat, 2024). Greiner et al. (2023) highlight the importance of faculty learning communities in navigating this paradigmatic shift. The Key GAI Implementation Challenges and Response Strategies are detailed in Table 3.

Table 3
Key GAI Implementation Challenges and Response Strategies

Application Domain	Core Functions	Demonstrated Benefits	Potential Risks
Academic Integrity	AI content indistinguishability, detection failures	Credential devaluation, assessment invalidity	Alternative assessment models, process-focused evaluation
Data Privacy	Unregulated student data collection practices	Privacy violations, information misuse	Enhanced data governance, regulatory compliance
Algorithmic Bias	Embedded gender, cultural stereotypes in outputs	Educational inequity, stereotype reinforcement	Bias detection algorithms, diversified training data
Digital Inequality	Uneven access and utilization capabilities	Exacerbated educational disparities	Inclusive design principles, resource redistribution
Faculty Transition	Professional identity reconfiguration, skill shifts	Career anxiety, resistance to change	Professional learning programs, participatory design

The interconnected nature of these challenges demands systemic rather than piecemeal solutions. Effective responses require synergistic technological, pedagogical, and policy innovations (Batista et al., 2024). For instance, addressing academic integrity concerns necessitates combined improvements in detection technologies, curriculum redesign, and

digital ethics education (Jarrah et al., 2023). This holistic perspective is essential for responsible GAI integration in higher education.

Future Research Directions and Practical Recommendations

Building upon our systematic analysis, we identify six critical research priorities for advancing GAI integration in higher education. Concurrently, we propose actionable recommendations for various stakeholders to maximize educational benefits while mitigating potential risks.

Research Priorities

Assessment Integrity and Pedagogical Innovation requires urgent scholarly attention. As GAI generation quality improves exponentially, traditional product-oriented evaluation methods become increasingly inadequate (Nikolic et al., 2023). Future research should explore novel assessment frameworks emphasizing learning processes over outputs. Promising directions include "process-oriented assessment" model (Michel-Villarreal et al., 2023) and "cognitive skills tracking" approach (Essel et al., 2024). Discipline-specific strategies are equally vital, as evidenced by the need to prioritize project-based evaluation in STEM fields while emphasizing critical analysis in humanities (Lopezosa et al., 2023).

Ethical Frameworks and Policy Development research is essential for guiding responsible GAI utilization. Current institutional policies often lag behind technological capabilities (Barrett & Pack, 2023). Scholarly work should develop multi-tiered governance models addressing classroom practices, institutional regulations, and national legislation. As AlAli and Wardat (2024) emphasize, such frameworks must emerge from inclusive stakeholder consultations balancing innovation with educational values. Particularly pressing are studies on algorithmic transparency and accountability mechanisms ensuring GAI decision interpretability and fairness (Korngiebel & Mooney, 2021). Cross-cultural ethics research also merits attention given significant regional variations in privacy and integrity norms (Strzelecki & ElArabawy, 2024).

Teaching-Learning Process Impacts demand longitudinal investigation. Most existing GAI studies employ cross-sectional designs, limiting understanding of long-term effects (Batista et al., 2024). Future research should adopt longitudinal methodologies tracking GAI's influence on learning trajectories, cognitive development, and career preparedness. Denny et al. (2024) specifically call for examining GAI's bidirectional effects on higher-order thinking skills, which represents a crucial yet understudied area. Comparative studies across instructional modalities (online vs. traditional) and learner populations (undergraduate vs. graduate) would yield valuable differentiation insights (Chan & Hu, 2023).

Human-AI Interaction Dynamics research could optimize educational applications. Current user engagements often remain superficial (Greiner et al., 2023). Investigative focus should shift toward "collaborative intelligence" models, with particular emphasis on exploring educators as AI output mediators and students as co-designers (Chang et al., 2025). Cognitive Load Theory may inform balanced AI support designs preventing information overload or intellectual complacency (Shimizu et al., 2023). Qualitative methodologies are particularly suited to capturing nuanced user experiences and meaning-making processes (AlAli & Wardat, 2024).

Educational Technology Enhancements research can address current GAI limitations. Most systems are not education-specific, exhibiting inconsistent output quality and poor pedagogical alignment (Popovici, 2024). Future development should create academically optimized models incorporating constructivist learning principles and discipline-specific requirements (Yilmaz & Yilmaz, 2023). "Resilience-by-design" features enabling self-correction of errors or biases are equally critical for educational contexts (Pavlik, 2023).

Future Skills Preparation studies must inform curriculum modernization. As GAI transforms labor market demands, higher education must correspondingly adapt its competency development objectives (Watermeyer et al., 2024). Research should identify enduring "human advantage" domains, particularly those involving complex decision-making, emotional intelligence, and intercultural coordination, as these are likely to constitute future professional differentiators. Equally important is investigating how GAI can cultivate these advanced capacities beyond technical skill training (Zakariya & Wardat, 2024). Industry-academia collaborative research can ensure curricular relevance to evolving workplace requirements (Batista et al., 2024).

Practical Recommendations

For policymakers, we recommend: (1) Developing national/regional GAI implementation guidelines delineating ethical boundaries and best practices (Baidoo-Anu & Ansah, 2023); (2) Establishing dedicated funding streams supporting GAI innovation and faculty development (Herft, 2023); (3) Facilitating cross-sectoral dialogues aligning education, technology, and industrial policies (Denny et al., 2024).

Higher education institutions should: (1) Create institution-specific GAI policies balancing innovation and risk management (Perkins et al., 2024); (2) Invest in technological infrastructure ensuring equitable access (Walczak & Cellary, 2023); (3) Cultivate faculty learning communities for sharing implementation experiences (Rose et al., 2023); (4) Integrate digital ethics into general education curricula (Jarrah et al., 2023).

Faculty members are advised to: (1) Experiment with GAI through small-scale pilot initiatives (Michel-Villarreal et al., 2023); (2) Redesign assignments emphasizing process, originality, and uniquely human skills (Essel et al., 2024); (3) Engage students in transparent discussions about GAI's educational role (Chan & Zhou, 2023); (4) Participate in professional development programs enhancing digital pedagogy (Hidayat & Wardat, 2024).

Students should: (1) Apply critical thinking when evaluating GAI-generated content (Shimizu et al., 2023); (2) Maintain clear academic integrity boundaries regarding AI assistance (AlAli & Wardat, 2024); (3) Utilize GAI for personalized learning while preserving independent thinking (Jaboob et al., 2025); (4) Contribute to institutional policy discussions (Strzelecki & ElArabawy, 2024).

Technology developers ought to: (1) Employ participatory design methods involving educators and learners (Chang et al., 2025); (2) Enhance system transparency through reliability indicators and source attribution (Pavlik, 2023); (3) Create education-specific features like learning analytics dashboards (Yilmaz & Yilmaz, 2023); (4) Implement rigorous bias detection and mitigation protocols (Korngiebel & Mooney, 2021).

Conclusion

The integration of multiple forms of generative artificial intelligence in higher education represents a profound transformation carrying both unprecedented opportunities and complex challenges. Our analysis reveals distinct applications for textual, visual and multimodal GAI across disciplines, with each category presenting unique advantages and implementation considerations. Successful implementation requires synergistic technological, pedagogical, and institutional innovations grounded in deep understanding of stakeholder needs and values. Ultimately, this research contributes to the broader discourse on educational innovation by highlighting how GAI can be harnessed to improve educational outcomes, address systemic inequities, and prepare students for emerging workforce demands.

Future higher education will increasingly feature "collaborative intelligence" ecosystems where appropriately selected GAI tools handles routine tasks while faculty focus on advanced instruction and mentorship. This evolution constitutes not simple technological substitution but fundamental reimagining of education's nature, with a focus on emphasizing complementary integration of human strengths and AI capabilities. Realizing this vision demands continued research and innovation, particularly in assessment redesign, ethical framework development, and stakeholder role redefinition.

Higher education institutions bear unique responsibilities in this transition. They must simultaneously prepare graduates for AI-augmented workplaces while themselves undergoing technology-driven organizational change (Watermeyer et al., 2024). This dual challenge requires academic leaders to combine visionary thinking with change management expertise, ensuring the preservation of core values while embracing transformative innovation.

Generative AI's integration remains in early stages, with long-term impacts still unfolding across different tool categories. However, educational approaches that strategically match GAI types to disciplinary needs while maintaining humanistic values, particularly those prioritizing both individual growth and social responsibility, are most likely to thrive in the AI era. Achieving this equilibrium necessitates intensified global collaboration, enabling diverse societies to develop contextually appropriate GAI integration pathways that harmonize educational quality, innovation, and equity.

References

Al-Zahrani, A. M. (2024). The impact of generative AI tools on researchers and research: Implications for academia in higher education. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, *61*(5), 1029-1043.

AlAli, R., & Wardat, Y. (2024). Opportunities and challenges of integrating generative artificial intelligence in education. *International Journal of Religion*, *5*(7), 784-793.

Baidoo-Anu, D., & Ansah, L. O. (2023). Education in the era of generative artificial intelligence (AI): Understanding the potential benefits of ChatGPT in promoting teaching and learning. *Journal of AI*, *7*(1), 52-62.

Barrett, A., & Pack, A. (2023). Not quite eye to AI: 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), 59.

Batista, J., Mesquita, A., & Carnaz, G. (2024). Generative AI and higher education: Trends, challenges, and future directions from a systematic literature review. *Information*, *15*(11), 676.

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), 43.

Chan, C. K. Y., & Zhou, W. (2023). An expectancy value theory (EVT) based instrument for measuring student perceptions of generative AI. *Smart Learning Environments*, *10*(1), 64.

Chang, M. A., Tissenbaum, M., Philip, T. M., & D'Mello, S. K. (2025). Co-designing AI with youth partners: Enabling ideal classroom relationships through a novel AI relational privacy ethical framework. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *8*, 100364. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2025.100364

Denny, P., Gulwani, S., Heffernan, N. T., Käser, T., Moore, S., Rafferty, A. N., & Singla, A. (2024). Generative AI for education (GAIED): Advances, opportunities, and challenges. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.01580*.

Duong, C. D., Vu, T. N., & Ngo, T. V. N. (2023). Applying a modified technology acceptance model to explain higher education students' usage of ChatGPT: A serial multiple mediation model with knowledge sharing as a moderator. *The International Journal of Management Education*, *21*(3), 100883.

Elkhodr, M., Gide, E., Wu, R., & Darwish, O. (2023). ICT students' perceptions towards ChatGPT: An experimental reflective lab analysis. STEM Education, 3 (2), 70-88. In.

Essel, H. B., Vlachopoulos, D., Essuman, A. B., & Amankwa, J. O. (2024). ChatGPT effects on cognitive skills of undergraduate students: Receiving instant responses from AI-based conversational large language models (LLMs). *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *6*, 100198.

French, F., Levi, D., Maczo, C., Simonaityte, A., Triantafyllidis, S., & Varda, G. (2023). Creative use of OpenAI in education: case studies from game development. *Multimodal Technologies and Interaction*, *7*(8), 81.

Greiner, C., Peisl, T. C., Höpfl, F., & Beese, O. (2023). Acceptance of AI in semi-structured decision-making situations applying the four-sides model of communication—An empirical analysis focused on higher education. *Education Sciences*, *13*(9), 865.

Hassoulas, A., Powell, N., Roberts, L., Umla-Runge, K., Gray, L., & Coffey, M. (2023). Investigating marker accuracy in differentiating between university scripts written by students and those produced using ChatGPT. *Journal of Applied Learning & Teaching*, *6*(2).

Herft, A. (2023). A teacher's prompt guide to ChatGPT aligned with 'What Works Best'guide. 2023. In.

Hidayat, R., & Wardat, Y. (2024). A systematic review of augmented reality in science, technology, engineering and mathematics education. *Education and Information Technologies*, *29*(8), 9257-9282.

Jaboob, M., Hazaimeh, M., & Al-Ansi, A. M. (2025). Integration of generative AI techniques and applications in student behavior and cognitive achievement in Arab higher education. *International Journal of Human–Computer Interaction*, *41*(1), 353-366.

Jarrah, A. M., Wardat, Y., & Fidalgo, P. (2023). Using ChatGPT in academic writing is (not) a form of plagiarism: What does the literature say. *Online Journal of Communication and Media Technologies*, *13*(4), e202346.

Korngiebel, D. M., & Mooney, S. D. (2021). Considering the possibilities and pitfalls of Generative Pre-trained Transformer 3 (GPT-3) in healthcare delivery. *NPJ Digital Medicine*, *4*(1), 93.

Lopezosa, C., Codina, L., Pont-Sorribes, C., & Vállez, M. (2023). Use of generative artificial intelligence in the training of journalists: challenges, uses and training proposal. *Profesional De La Informacion*, *32*(4).

Michel-Villarreal, R., Vilalta-Perdomo, E., Salinas-Navarro, D. E., Thierry-Aguilera, R., & Gerardou, F. S. (2023). Challenges and opportunities of generative AI for higher education as explained by ChatGPT. *Education Sciences*, *13*(9), 856.

Mollman, S. (2022). ChatGPT gained 1 million users in under a week. Here's why the AI chatbot is primed to disrupt search as we know it. *yahoo! finance*, *9*.

Ng, D. T. K., Chan, E. K. C., & Lo, C. K. (2025). Opportunities, Challenges and School Strategies for Integrating Generative AI in Education. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 100373.

Nikolic, S., Daniel, S., Haque, R., Belkina, M., Hassan, G. M., Grundy, S., Lyden, S., Neal, P., & Sandison, C. (2023). ChatGPT versus engineering education assessment: a multidisciplinary and multi-institutional benchmarking and analysis of this generative artificial intelligence tool to investigate assessment integrity. *European Journal of Engineering Education*, *48*(4), 559-614.

Pavlik, J. V. (2023). Collaborating with ChatGPT: Considering the implications of generative artificial intelligence for journalism and media education. *Journalism & mass communication educator*, *78*(1), 84-93.

Perkins, M., Roe, J., Postma, D., McGaughran, J., & Hickerson, D. (2024). Detection of GPT-4 generated text in higher education: Combining academic judgement and software to identify generative AI tool misuse. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, *22*(1), 89-113.

Popovici, M.-D. (2024). ChatGPT in the classroom. Exploring its potential and limitations in a functional programming course. *International Journal of Human–Computer Interaction*, *40*(22), 7743-7754.

Rose, K., Massey, V., Marshall, B., & Cardon, P. (2023). IS professors' perspectives on AI-assisted programming. *Issues in Information Systems*, *24*(2).

Shimizu, I., Kasai, H., Shikino, K., Araki, N., Takahashi, Z., Onodera, M., Kimura, Y., Tsukamoto, T., Yamauchi, K., & Asahina, M. (2023). Developing medical education curriculum reform strategies to address the impact of generative AI: qualitative study. *JMIR medical education*, *9*(1), e53466.

Singh, M. (2023). Maintaining the integrity of the South African university: The impact of ChatGPT on plagiarism and scholarly writing. *SOUTH AFRICAN JOURNAL OF HIGHER EDUCATION*, *37*(5), 203-220.

Strzelecki, A., & ElArabawy, S. (2024). Investigation of the moderation effect of gender and study level on the acceptance and use of generative AI by higher education students: Comparative evidence from Poland and Egypt. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *55*(3), 1209-1230.

Walczak, K., & Cellary, W. (2023). Challenges for higher education in the era of widespread access to Generative AI. *Economics and Business Review*, *9*(2).

Watermeyer, R., Phipps, L., Lanclos, D., & Knight, C. (2024). Generative AI and the Automating of Academia. *Postdigital Science and Education*, *6*(2), 446-466.

Yilmaz, R., & Yilmaz, F. G. K. (2023). The effect of generative artificial intelligence (AI)-based tool use on students' computational thinking skills, programming self-efficacy and motivation. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *4*, 100147.

Zakariya, Y. F., & Wardat, Y. (2024). Job satisfaction of mathematics teachers: an empirical investigation to quantify the contributions of teacher self-efficacy and teacher motivation to teach. *Mathematics Education Research Journal*, *36*(4), 791-813. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13394-023-00475-9