The North African Journal of Scientific Publishing (NAJSP)
مجلة شمال إفريقيا للنشر العلمي (NAJSP)
E-ISSN: 2959-4820
Volume 4, Issue 2, 2026
Page No: 60-67
Website: https://najsp.com/index.php/home/index
SJIFactor 2024: 5.49 معامل التأثير العربي (AIF) 2025: 0.69 ISI 2024: 0.696

Artificial Intelligence as a Double-Edged Sword in Higher Education: A SWOT Analysis

Ayman A. Elhaji*
Department of Pedodontics and Preventive Dentistry, Faculty of Dentistry, University of Zawia, Zawia, Libya

الذكاء الاصطناعي كسلاح ذو حدّين في التعليم العالي: تحليل نقاط القوة والضعف والفرص والتهديدات (SWOT)

إيمان الحاجي*
قسم طب أسنان الأطفال وطب الأسنان الوقائي، كلية طب وجراحة الفم والأسنان، جامعة الزاوية، الزاوية، ليبيا

*Corresponding author: a.elhaji@zu.edu.ly

Received: February 10, 2026	Accepted: March 25, 2026	Published: April 06, 2026

Abstract:
The issue of how higher education is to deal with the rapid adoption of artificial intelligence presents a strategic paradox. On one hand, AI demonstrates transformative potential for personalized learning and efficiency, but also very serious issues, which include questions of academic integrity, ethical issues, and faculty de-professionalization. This tension puts forth a major challenge for institutional leaders who, at present, do not have a clear picture of how to approach these issues. This paper addresses the problem through a systematic SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats) analysis, which looks at the two faces of AI in the academic setting. This study is based on recent research that maps internal strengths (for instance, adaptive learning) and weaknesses (for instance, overdependence) against external opportunities (for instance, education for all) and threats (for instance, algorithmic bias). The paper finds that AI's main strengths also present its greatest threats, thus it is a "double-edged sword" issue. For example, while automation - a strength - enhanced efficiency, it also led to faculty deskilling and de-professionalization, which are very real weaknesses. The paper concludes with a call for a proactive and broad-scale strategy from higher education institutions. It recommends a dialectical approach that one that recognizes and operates within these contradictions, and urges universities to establish robust governance policies, invest in faculty training, and prioritize pedagogical values over technological solutions in the pursuit of a responsible and sustainable future for AI in academia.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Higher Education, SWOT Analysis, Academic Integrity, Personalized Learning, Educational Strategy.

الملخص:
تُجسّد مسألة تعامل مؤسسات التعليم العالي مع التبنّي المتسارع للذكاء الاصطناعي مفارقةً استراتيجية معقّدة. فمن جهة، يكشف الذكاء الاصطناعي عن إمكانات تحويلية واعدة في مجال التعلّم المُخصّص وتعزيز الكفاءة المؤسسية، ومن جهة أخرى يثير جملةً من الإشكاليات الجوهرية، من بينها قضايا النزاهة الأكاديمية، والتحديات الأخلاقية، وتراجع الطابع

الاحترافي لأعضاء هيئة التدريس. ويطرح هذا التوتر تحديًا محوريًا أمام القيادات الجامعية التي لا تزال تفتقر إلى رؤية واضحة ومتكاملة لكيفية التعاطي مع هذه التحولات. تعالج هذه الدراسة هذه الإشكالية من خلال توظيف تحليل منهجي قائم على إطار (SWOT) لنقاط القوة والضعف والفرص والتهديدات، بهدف استكشاف الطبيعة الازدواجية للذكاء الاصطناعي في السياق الأكاديمي. وترتكز الدراسة على أدبيات حديثة ترصد نقاط القوة الداخلية (مثل التعلّم التكيفي) ونقاط الضعف (مثل الاعتماد المفرط على الأنظمة الذكية)، في مقابل الفرص الخارجية (مثل إتاحة التعليم على نطاق أوسع) والتهديدات المحتملة (مثل التحيّز الخوارزمي). وتُفضي نتائج الدراسة إلى أن أبرز مكامن قوة الذكاء الاصطناعي تنطوي في الوقت ذاته على أهم مصادر التهديد، بما يؤكد طبيعته بوصفه «سلاحًا ذا حدّين». فعلى سبيل المثال، في حين تسهم الأتمتة — باعتبارها عنصر قوة — في رفع مستويات الكفاءة، فإنها قد تؤدي في المقابل إلى إضعاف المهارات المهنية لأعضاء هيئة التدريس وتقويض أدوارهم التقليدية، وهو ما يُعد من أبرز جوانب الضعف. وتختتم الدراسة بالدعوة إلى تبنّي مقاربة استراتيجية استباقية وشاملة من قبل مؤسسات التعليم العالي، قائمة على منظور جدلي يعترف بهذه التناقضات ويتعامل معها بفاعلية. كما توصي بضرورة إرساء أطر حوكمة مؤسسية متينة، وتعزيز الاستثمار في تنمية قدرات أعضاء هيئة التدريس، مع إعطاء الأولوية للقيم التربوية على الحلول التقنية، بما يضمن توظيفًا مسؤولًا ومستدامًا للذكاء الاصطناعي في البيئة الأكاديمية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الذكاء الاصطناعي، التعليم العالي، تحليلSWOT ، النزاهة الأكاديمية، التعلّم المُخصّص، الاستراتيجية التعليمية.

Introduction:

As the rapid growth of artificial intelligence (AI) continues, higher education stands at a crossroads, navigating between what is possible and what is problematic [1]. AI has become part of the fabric of teaching, learning, research, and administration, enabling personalized learning experiences, real-time feedback, data-driven decision-making, and smooth operation [2]. These changes are transforming the educational field, influencing pedagogy, assessment methods, curriculum design, faculty development, and institutional policy [3].

In the age of digital transformation, global competition, and the pursuit of lifelong learning, AI is emerging as a major engine of innovation and efficiency [4]. Intelligent tutoring systems, predictive analytics, automated assessment, and generative model's new educational models introduce new educational approaches that reduce faculty workload and create tailored learning paths for students [5, 6]. The fast adoption of AI systems without proper assessment creates multiple substantial security threats. The implementation of AI systems has led to three main problems, which include biased algorithms and unexplained operations, and inconsistent output results [7]. The recent deployment of ChatGPT has prompted academic communities to discuss how AI tools affect the authenticity of student work and the reliability of assessments [8]. At the same time, large-scale collection of student data raises ethical issues related to privacy and surveillance, while unequal access to AI technology threatens to deepen educational inequality [4, 7]. If left unaddressed, these challenges risk undermining the fundamental values of higher education, including critical thinking, creativity, and meaningful human interaction [1, 9].

In this particular context, the equilibrium between opportunity and risk necessitates a methodical evaluative framework. The SWOT analysis provides a structured approach to artificial intelligence adoption by evaluating internal organizational elements together with external market factors. The SWOT analysis originated as a business strategy tool [10], but educational researchers now use it to study institutional performance and create curricula and execute policies [11, 12]. By employing this structured framework, educational institutions can discern not only technological advantages but also ethical, organizational, and societal concerns that significantly influence the sustainable integration of artificial intelligence.

This study uses a SWOT analysis to examine the use of artificial intelligence in higher education. The framework compares internal strengths and weaknesses with external opportunities and threats to build a clear understanding of AI's role. The goal is to provide practical insights that help educators, administrators, and policymakers guide the ethical and responsible integration of AI in line with higher education's core values.

SWOT Analysis: Deconstructing AI's Impact on Higher Education:

In higher education, a complex shift is taking place as traditional models of pedagogy are increasingly integrated. A SWOT analysis provides a useful framework to examine this issue by analyzing internal elements (strengths and weaknesses) that are within institutional control and external issues (opportunities and threats) that are beyond it. This approach also positions AI as a powerful agent of change that simultaneously introduces significant risks.

Strengths: AI's role in Academia:

Personalized and Adaptive Learning at Scale:

AI's notable success lies in its use in creating customized learning pathways for each student, which fit their specific needs. In the case of Intelligent Tutoring Systems (ITS) like Carnegie Learning's MATHia, this capability is demonstrated. MATHia uses advanced AI, which, in real time, uses performance data to modify content and provide instant feedback. At a very detailed level, which is skill by skill, MATHia delivers personalized just in time feedback and contextual hints to the students [2, 13].

These present-day systems do what one-on-one tutoring does best, which is improve comprehension, support retention, and allow students to progress at their own pace in large groups. MATHia's AI looks at the actions a student takes to get to an answer, identifying the support required and providing highly targeted assistance. This approach differs from the traditional standardized methods, which, instead of flexibility and learner autonomy, impose a more structured framework. Furthermore, adaptive learning strategies can be integrated with many other didactic methods, like the flipped classroom and self-regulated learning, producing better results and engagement for the students.

Automated Efficiency for Educators and Administrators:

AI also outperforms in terms of reduced admin work through automation. Tools like Grade scope, which implement AI in grade analysis and review, improve the consistency and efficiency of the assessment, allowing faculty to dedicate more time to higher-level teaching activities like mentorship and critical thinking development [15, 5]. At the institutional level, predictive analytics and automated processes improve admissions, scheduling, and resource allocation, thereby increasing overall institutional efficiency [6].

Accelerating Research and Knowledge Discovery:

In research, AI serves as a transformative partner in the pursuit of scientific discovery. Tools such as Elicit and Research Rabbit, among the new generation of scholarly AI tools, support the synthesis of large-scale literature datasets, identify anomalies, and create intellectual network maps [16]. Beyond literature analysis, AI improves data processing in the fields of genomics to climate science, producing faster results and expanding the scope of research across previously separate academic domains [17]. This computational power not only accelerates discovery but also facilitates integration across academic fields, fostering a more interconnected research community [18].

Weaknesses: Internal Issues and Problems:

Risks to Academic Integrity:

The use of AI tools has shown a major growth pattern with ChatGPT being one of the leading tools. Students can now use AI tools to create essays and solve complex problems and generate computer code which threatens to undermine established standards for original work and genuine learning [8]. The reliability of AI tools used for academic misconduct detection remains unclear which creates a risk of unjust accusations that affect non-native English speakers more frequently [19]. The current assessment methods show a major mismatch with the new learning environment that uses artificial intelligence technology.

Infrastructure and Capacity Barriers:

The integration of AI into higher education requires large-scale investment in financial, technical, and human resources. Issues of cost related to software licensing, IT infrastructure, and ongoing faculty training in AI skills present significant barriers to adoption [1, 15]. Furthermore, universities with the greatest resources are typically the ones adopting advanced AI systems, whereas underfunded institutions struggle to keep pace, thereby widening the digital divide [16, 19].

Risk of Deskilling and Overdependence:

The use of AI beyond reasonable limits results in students and teachers losing their fundamental abilities. The use of automatic grade and content generation tools by faculty members leads to reduced proficiency in curriculum development and assessment creation and individual feedback delivery. Students who depend on AI for cognitive work will not build their essential abilities to think critically and create independently. The excessive use of AI technology prevents both educators and learners from developing creative thinking abilities which results in lower educational standards [20], 21]. Additionally, heavy dependence on AI may impair critical thinking skills, with students who overuse AI-generated answers exhibiting reduced independent critical thinking abilities [22]. Statistical analyses also indicate a significant negative correlation between AI tool use and critical thinking scores, highlighting AI's potential detrimental effects on cognitive skills [23, 24].

Opportunities: Expanding Higher Education's Research:

Democratization and Inclusion:

AI can help make education accessible globally. Large-scale personal electronic health solutions utilize AI to overcome geographic and financial barriers, aligning with the UN's SDG 4. AI-powered

assistive devices, such as real-time captioning for hearing-impaired students and enhanced screen readers for vision-impaired students, help create more inclusive classrooms [24].

Pedagogical and Research Innovation:

AI has ushered in a new era for the field of teaching and research. In medicine and engineering, learners' complex skills can be practiced in immersive simulations within safe, controlled environments [25]. AI is also disrupting traditional models of education by enabling personalized professional development pathways, positioning universities at the forefront of continuous and flexible education [2].

Data-Informed Institutional Governance:

AI–driven analysis enhances institutional decision-making processes. The predictive models help institutions detect students who need help before they fail which leads to better student retention and success rates [17]. AI technology enables higher education institutions to create better curricula and allocate resources and plan workforces which results in improved organizational agility during fast-changing environments.

Threats: Systems that risk failure and ethical issues:

Bias, Privacy, and Governance Challenges:

AI may replicate existing social inequalities by introducing biased elements into admissions, assessments, and student reporting [8]. The growing collection and use of student data raises very serious concerns regarding privacy, surveillance, and transparency about data usage. These issues are compounded by weak regulatory frameworks; UNESCO reports that only 10% of the world's universities have formal policies regarding generative AI [26].

Erosion of Academic Values:

Excessive dependence on AI can undermine the development of original ideas, critical thinking, and academic integrity. When students outsource their cognitive work to AI, higher education risks shifting from intellectual growth toward credentialing, diminishing the institution's core purpose of developing of human mind. A study by Wiley reported that 96% of professors observed increased instances of classroom cheating, largely attributed to the accessibility of AI tools. The report also examined cases from 2019 and 2020, noting increased plagiarism in academic circles as a consequence of AI resources.

De-professionalization of Faculty:

Automation of tasks such as grading, advising, and instruction in basic courses is a threat to faculty jobs, professional autonomy, and academic freedom [1]. The trend toward centralized, data–driven decision making further weakens faculty governance and reduces the academic profession's role in setting institutional agendas [16].

The SWOT Matrix: A Visual Synthesis:

The SWOT matrix functions as a widely used strategic planning instrument which transforms intricate assessments into straightforward visual representations [10]. The two-dimensional matrix structure of the SWOT framework enables organizations to observe how internal capabilities respond to external factors. The framework combines previous analyses into one framework while helping organizations develop strategies through its identification of four actionable paths.

- Organizations use Strength–Opportunity (SO) Strategies to convert their internal strengths into external business opportunities.
- Organizations can defend against external threats by using their internal strengths through Strength–Threat (ST) Strategies.
- Organizations use Weakness–Opportunity (WO) Strategies to handle their internal weaknesses while improving their ability to seize external business opportunities.
- Organizations use Weakness–Threat (WT) Strategies to reduce internal vulnerabilities while defending against outside threats.

SWOT analysis serves as a fundamental organizational tool for strategic planning because it helps businesses take proactive steps during the AI era.

Table (1): SWOT Matrix for AI in Higher Education

	Opportunities (O)	**Threats (T)**
Strengths (S)	SO, Strategies - The implementation of adaptive learning technologies should occur to create an inclusive learning environment which supports students who have disabilities. - AI-powered research tools enable scientists to develop new innovations across multiple scientific domains. - The institution should use automation to expand its ability to serve students worldwide.	ST Strategies - AI analytics tools help organizations detect and resolve algorithmic bias before it becomes a problem. - The institution should automate its operations to enable faculty members dedicate their time to teaching ethics and critical thinking skills. - Academic institutions must use AI research tools ethically through strict ethical guidelines to protect academic integrity.
Weaknesses (W)	WO Strategies - The organization should train all faculty members to learn AI basics while using tools that serve all users. - The organization should create open-source AI solutions because this approach reduces vendor dependence and supports continuous learning. - The organization should obtain funding and create alliances to reduce AI expenses while using data for governance decisions.	WT Strategies - The institution needs to create detailed AI policies which handle dishonesty and privacy matters. - The organization should use multiple assessment approaches because this practice helps decrease dependence on automated testing systems. - The organization should let faculty members participate in AI acquisition decisions and governance processes to prevent job displacement and maintain their professional status.

Discussion:

Tackling the issue of the Double-Edged Sword:

The SWOT analysis reports that in higher education, AI is a complex issue. What appear to be positives are often linked to serious risks. For example, personalization of learning through adaptive systems, which is great (Strength), enhances individualization, but it also involves the collection and analysis of large amounts of student data, raising concerns about privacy, surveillance, and consent (Threat) [17, 26]. Similarly, efficiency gained from automated grading and admin processes (Strength) can reduce faculty roles, leading to professional de-skilling (Weakness) and de-professionalization (Threat) [1, 25]. These parallel issues indicate that technological optimism can mask significant ethical and professional challenges and requires a dialectical approach to AI governance in education [10, 15, 16].

The Evolving Role of the Educator:

This paradox requires a redefinition of academic roles. As AI takes over content delivery, formative assessment, and preliminary feedback - the routine functions - faculty must transform into facilitators, mentors, and ethical guides [2, 20]. In this evolving role, educators design learning experiences that promote critical evaluation, ethical reasoning, and responsible use of AI-generated information in practical settings [9]. Constructivist and inquiry-based pedagogies, centred on collaboration, reflection, and co – co-creation, highlight faculty expertise as essential for maintaining intellectual rigor and ethical standards [12, 17].

Engagement of students in critical analysis of AI issues builds digital resilience, enabling learners to differentiate between algorithmic outputs and evidence-based knowledge, thereby enhancing problem-solving in academic and professional settings [18]. Educators serve as the central figure in preserving higher education's fundamental values - creativity, originality, and human-centred learning.

The Imperative for Institutional Strategy:

Universities must implement coordinated institution-wide AI strategies. To view AI merely as a technical upgrade is to succumb to technological determinism and external market pressures [6]. AI

implementation must align with the institution's mission, ensuring that pedagogical goals guide adoption [16].

Three interconnected elements should be present in a successful strategy:

1. **Transparent Governance:** Put in place clear rules and moral standards to stop prejudice, invasions of privacy, and academic dishonesty [14, 23].
2. **Increase capacity:** by promoting responsible, efficient, and creative behaviours through digital literacy initiatives and continual professional development [10, 7].
3. **Shared Governance:** Ensure faculty participation in AI procurement and policy development to protect academic freedom and institutional integrity while balancing administrative efficiency [15].

AI adoption cannot be treated as a purely technical decision; it is an issue of institutional identity and values. Successful universities will integrate AI within a culture of responsible innovation -balancing efficiency with equity, and technical progress with human-centred pedagogy.

Limiting Factors and a Look to the Future Research:

Although the current SWOT analysis provides a thorough overview of artificial intelligence in higher education, it is important to recognise several inherent limitations.

- **First,** the investigation mostly uses recent literature rather than conducting original empirical research. Although the current collection of research provides a broad picture of AL adoption and its effects, it may not delve sufficiently into examining how various academic disciplines, institutional classifications, and geographical locations influence these outcomes [5, 6]. Future studies should employ mixed-methods methodologies and comprehensive case studies to get insights into the integration of AI in various educational contexts.
- **Second**, the rapid progress of AI technology, particularly generative AI models, is rendering numerous previous discoveries obsolete at an alarming pace. In the last two years, there have been big changes in how teachers educate, how they grade students, and how they want students to act honestly in school [10, 23]. Research studies that span multiple years need to analyse how educational institutions transform their operations through time-based observations of policy changes and teacher responsibilities and student learning methods.
- **Third,** the research fails to analyse the complete economic and political and geopolitical effects of AI on higher education although it examines educational and teaching aspects. Significant issues are brought up by the usage of AI, including competition between the commercial and academic AI sectors, global knowledge equality, and intellectual property rights [14, 16]. To tackle these intricate challenges, educators, computer scientists, ethicists, and politicians must work together across disciplinary boundaries.
- **Finally,** AI's human-centric aspects are still frequently overlooked. More research is required to determine how AI affects classroom dynamics, instructor autonomy, student identity formation, and institutional culture, even though there is already literature on both the positive and negative sides of AI [19]. Higher education institutions need to answer specific questions to ensure AI development supports their core educational goals. Research should focus on human-centred results while taking a long-term perspective and uniting interdisciplinary knowledge with empirical evidence to create responsible and equitable AI systems for higher education.

Conclusion: Shaping a Responsible and Sustainable AI Future in Higher Education:

AI enables personalized education delivery while boosting operational performance and speeding up knowledge development. The same potential benefits create major challenges for maintaining academic integrity and ensuring fairness and protecting student privacy and preserving teacher independence. The SWOT analysis shows that AI's core advantages directly link to its fundamental weaknesses and external threats.

The solution to this complex situation needs more than basic technological abilities. Higher education institutions need ethical leadership together with strategic planning and robust governance systems to achieve their mission through AI implementation. The successful integration of AI in higher education requires collaborative efforts between faculty members and administrators and lawmakers to protect human-centred teaching methods which foster critical thinking and creativity and maintain academic freedom.

The research identifies five evidence-based methods which help higher education institutions to implement AI technology responsibly:

Focus on AI Literacy:

All members of the university community need to receive ongoing AI literacy training which should include both technical competencies and ethical knowledge and system limitation understanding. The programs need to extend beyond short-term duration because they should teach students to use AI

tools effectively throughout their entire academic journey. The academic community will learn to use AI tools responsibly through these programs which promote both safety and innovation [2, 19].

Develop Strong Ethical Frameworks:

The development of AI governance policies requires institutions to establish collaborative frameworks which unite faculty members with students and administrators and policymakers. The established rules need to protect student data privacy while preventing algorithmic discrimination and upholding academic standards through ETHICAL Principles and UNESCO guidelines [14].

Reconceptualise Assessment and Pedagogy:

The emergence of generative AI technology enables educational institutions to create new assessment methods which focus on developing critical thinking abilities and creative thinking and practical problem-solving competencies that AI systems cannot replicate [21, 10].

Adopt Human-in-the-Loop Systems:

AI systems should enhance human decision-making abilities instead of replacing them. The faculty members need to stay actively involved in student admissions and grading processes and student counselling activities. The implementation of human-in-the-loop systems protects academic freedom and ethical standards and maintains accountability according to human-centred AI principles [7].

Invest in People and Equitable Infrastructure:

The successful deployment of AI technology demands organizations to allocate funds for technological development alongside investments in their human workforce. Educational institutions need to offer continuous teacher training and ensure students have equal access to AI resources to fight digital inequality [5, 14].

These concepts enable higher education institutions to handle AI's dual nature as a transformative power and academic standards protector. The path that artificial intelligence will take in academic institutions depends on the choices made by institutions. The combination of technological capabilities with human-centred teaching methods will enable AI to serve as a tool for empowerment instead of generating dependency or social inequalities.

References:

1. D. Abdurohman, "The role of artificial intelligence in transforming higher education," J. Educ. Technol., vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 45–59, 2024.
2. C. M. Chen et al., "Adaptive learning systems and AI in education," Comput. Educ., vol. 189, p. 104625, 2023.
3. O. Zawacki-Richter and C. Latchem, "Exploring the role of AI in the future of global higher education," Distance Educ., vol. 42, no. 4, pp. 473–478, 2021.
4. A. Chadha, "AI and the future of global higher education," Int. High. Educ., no. 117, pp. 10–12, 2024.
5. A. Alam, "The future of assessment in the age of AI," J. Appl. Learn. Teach., vol. 6, no. 2, 2023.
6. S. Alam, "Barriers to AI adoption in education: Insights from teacher's perspectives," ResearchGate, 2023. [Online]. Available: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/390638523
7. American Association of University Professors (AAUP), Artificial intelligence and the future of the professoriate. AAUP Press, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://www.aaup.org
8. K. Holstein, S. Doroudi, J. Mathews, V. Aleven, and N. Rummel, "Fairness and equity in AI in education: A systematic review of the field," Int. J. Artif. Intell. Educ., vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 745–781, 2023.
9. B. Jose, "The cognitive paradox of AI in education," Front. Psychol., vol. 16, pp. 1–10, 2025.
10. V. Kovanović, S. Joksimović, and D. Gašević, "AI tools for literature reviews: ResearchRabbit, Scispace, and beyond," J. Educ. Technol. Soc., vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 45–58, 2024.
11. R. Luckin, W. Holmes, M. Griffiths, and L. B. Forcier, Intelligence unleashed: An argument for AI in education. Pearson, 2016.
12. E. J. Topol, Deep Medicine: How Artificial Intelligence Can Make Healthcare Human Again. Basic Books, 2019.
13. UNESCO, AI and education: Guidance for policy-makers. UNESCO Publishing, 2021. [Online]. Available: https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000376709
14. UNESCO, Generative AI in education and research: A global snapshot. UNESCO Publishing, 2023. [Online]. Available: https://www.unesco.org/en/digital-learning/ai-ethics
15. Y. K. Dwivedi, L. Hughes, E. Ismagilova, G. Aarts, C. Coombs, T. Crick, Y. Duan, R. Dwivedi, J. Edwards, A. Eirug, V. Galanos, P. V. Ilavarasan, M. Janssen, P. Jones, A. K. Kar, H. Kizgin, B. Kronemann, B. Lal, B. Lucini, R. Medaglia, et al., "Artificial Intelligence (AI): Multidisciplinary

perspectives on emerging challenges, opportunities, and agenda for research, practice and policy," International Journal of Information Management, vol. 57, p. 101994, Apr. 2021.
16. I. Oncioiu and A. R. Bularca, “Artificial Intelligence Governance in Higher Education: The Role of Knowledge-Based Strategies in Fostering Legal Awareness and Ethical Artificial Intelligence Literacy,” Societies, vol. 15, no. 6, p. 144, 2025, [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.3390/soc15060144
17. E. G. Rincon-Flores, "Improving the learning-teaching process through adaptive learning strategies," Smart Learn. Environ., vol. 11, no. 1, 2024.
18. B. Phadermrod, R. M. Crowder, and G. B. Wills, "Importance-performance analysis based SWOT analysis," Int. J. Inf. Manage., vol. 44, pp. 194–203, 2019.
19. A. Tierney, P. Peasey, and J. Gould, “Student perceptions on the impact of AI on their teaching and learning experiences in higher education”, RPTEL, vol. 20, p. 005, Jan. 2025.
20. A. Tlili et al., "What if the devil is in the details? A systematic review of the challenges of ChatGPT in education," Smart Learn. Environ., vol. 10, no. 1, p. 33, 2023.
21. A. Tlili et al., "AI-enhanced pedagogy in higher education: A global review," Comput. Educ. Artif. Intell., vol. 4, p. 100099, 2023.
22. K. Zhang, Y. Wang, and C. P. Lim, "Predictive analytics for student success: A review and future directions," J. Learn. Analytics, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 5–25, 2024.
23. Q. Zhang, J. J. Li, and F. You, "AI and machine learning in climate and education research," World J. Adv. Res., vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 112–126, 2024.
24. M. Ahmad et al., "The effects of over-reliance on AI dialogue systems on creativity and innovative thinking," Smart Learn. Environ., vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 1–18, 2023.
25. P. J. LeBlanc, Higher education in the age of intelligence. Johns Hopkins University Press, 2025.
26. EDUCAUSE Review, "AI detection tools are not the answer," 29-Jan-2024. [Online]. Available: https://er.educause.edu/articles/2024/1/ai-detection-tools-are-not-the-answer
27. T. Phys.org, "Increased AI use linked to eroding critical thinking skills," 2025. [Online]. Available: https://phys.org/news/2025-01-ai-linked-eroding-critical-skills.html
28. Center on Inclusive Technology & Education Systems (CIDDL), "AI in special education: A new frontier," 2023. [Online]. Available: https://ciddl.org/resource-library/ai-in-special-education/
29. G. E. Gürel and M. Tat, "SWOT analysis: A theoretical review," J. Int. Soc. Res., vol. 10, no. 51, pp. 994–1006, 2017.
30. M. M. Helms and J. Nixon, “Exploring SWOT analysis – where are we now?: A review of academic research from the last decade,” Journal of Strategy and Management, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 215–251, Aug. 2010, [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1108/17554251011064837
31. H. Song, "AI and academic integrity: Exploring student perceptions and implications for policy," 2024. [Online]. Available: https://ci.unt.edu/computational-humanities-information-literacy-lab/aiandai.pdf