

Balancing Artificial Intelligence and Human Oversight in Education

Aizada Bektemirova¹, Ruslan Omuraliev²

Department of Pedagogy and Educational Technologies, Kyrgyz National University, Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan

Department of Computer Science Education, Osh State University, Osh, Kyrgyzstan

*Corresponding Author Email: aizada.bektemirova@knu.kg

Abstract

The rapid development of generative artificial intelligence, particularly large language models, has introduced significant transformations in educational environments and learning practices. These technologies enable automated content generation, personalized learning assistance, and new forms of interaction between students, instructors, and knowledge systems, raising questions about the role of human guidance and critical evaluation in AI-supported learning contexts. The purpose of this study is to examine the conceptual relationship between human oversight and critical literacy within AI-supported learning environments in higher education and general education systems. The research employs a qualitative literature review approach combined with conceptual analysis to synthesize scholarly discussions on artificial intelligence in education, digital literacy, and educational technology integration. Secondary data were collected from peer-reviewed academic publications, scholarly reports, and theoretical works addressing the educational use of large language models and the implications of AI-supported learning systems. The collected literature was analyzed through thematic interpretation to identify key conceptual dimensions related to human supervision, critical literacy competencies, and the pedagogical integration of AI technologies in education. Analytical synthesis was conducted to examine how existing theoretical perspectives frame the interaction between generative AI systems and human-centered learning processes. The analysis highlights that AI-supported learning environments require continuous human oversight and the development of critical literacy competencies to ensure the responsible use and interpretation of AI-generated information. These findings emphasize that generative AI should function as a supportive educational tool rather than a substitute for human instruction and analytical reasoning. The study contributes to the field of educational technology by providing a conceptual framework that integrates human oversight and critical literacy as key components for responsible AI integration in contemporary learning environments.

Keyword

Artificial intelligence; Educational technology; Higher education; Digital literacy.

1. Introduction

The rapid advancement of large language models (LLMs) has introduced new dynamics into educational environments, particularly within higher education and broader education systems (Gordon et al., 2024). These systems are capable of generating human-like text, answering questions, summarizing information, and assisting with complex cognitive tasks related to learning and writing (Kopuz & Kartal, 2025). Their integration into educational platforms has expanded the possibilities for personalized learning, interactive feedback, and automated support for both students and instructors (Bako,



Received: 20 January 2026

Revised: 25 February
2026

Published: 01 March 2026

© Authors. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited.

2025). As educational institutions increasingly adopt digital learning technologies, LLMs are becoming part of the evolving ecosystem of AI-supported learning environments (Alzahrani, 2024). This transformation reflects a broader shift toward data-driven and technology-enhanced education systems that aim to improve learning outcomes and instructional efficiency (Soni, 2025). At the same time, the presence of generative AI technologies challenges traditional assumptions about knowledge production, academic integrity, and the role of human guidance in learning (Dabis & Csáki, 2024). Consequently, the integration of LLMs into education raises fundamental questions about how human oversight and critical literacy should operate within these emerging learning environments (Alzahrani, 2024).

The growing adoption of AI technologies in education has generated practical concerns regarding the reliability, interpretation, and responsible use of AI-generated information (Alzahrani, 2024). LLMs can produce responses that appear coherent and authoritative, yet these outputs may contain inaccuracies, biases, or unverifiable claims (Bako, 2025). Students and educators who rely heavily on these systems may struggle to distinguish between validated knowledge and plausible but unverified information (Alzahrani, 2024). This challenge has direct implications for academic integrity, intellectual autonomy, and the development of critical thinking skills within higher education institutions (Dabis & Csáki, 2024). Educational systems must therefore address how AI technologies reshape the process through which learners access, evaluate, and construct knowledge (Luckin, 2024). Without appropriate pedagogical frameworks and institutional safeguards, the widespread use of AI-generated content may weaken the role of independent reasoning and scholarly inquiry (Bako, 2025). The issue is not merely technological but also educational, as it affects how learning processes are structured and supervised (Ifenthaler et al., 2024). For this reason, the question of human oversight and critical literacy has become increasingly relevant for contemporary educational practices (Dabis & Csáki, 2024).

Existing scholarship has recognized the potential of LLMs to support educational activities such as automated feedback, personalized instruction, and the generation of learning materials (Deepshikha, 2025). Researchers have demonstrated that AI systems can assist with tasks including summarizing complex texts, generating quizzes, explaining programming code, and supporting collaborative learning processes (Kopuz & Kartal, 2025). From the perspective of instructional design, these capabilities may reduce teacher workload while enabling more individualized learning experiences (Bako, 2025). Educational technologies powered by AI are therefore often presented as tools that enhance both teaching efficiency and student engagement (Hussain et al., 2025). At the same time, scholars acknowledge that LLMs should function as assistive technologies rather than replacements for human educators (Qassrawi & Al Karasneh, 2025). The educational value of these tools depends on how they are integrated into pedagogical practices and supervised by instructors (Tang et al., 2025). Previous research has therefore emphasized the importance of human guidance, ethical governance, and responsible implementation when deploying AI in educational contexts (Alzahrani, 2024). These insights provide a foundation for understanding both the opportunities and limitations of AI-supported learning environments (Gordon et al., 2024).

Despite these developments, important uncertainties remain regarding how students interact cognitively with AI-generated knowledge and how educational institutions should structure oversight mechanisms (Gordon et al., 2024). While many studies highlight the capabilities of LLMs in supporting learning tasks, fewer investigations examine how these technologies influence the epistemic practices of

learners (Cukurova, 2024). Questions persist about how students evaluate the credibility of AI-generated information and how reliance on automated systems shapes their analytical reasoning (Luckin, 2024). Similarly, the concept of human oversight is often mentioned in discussions of AI in education but rarely explored as a structured pedagogical principle (Trindade et al., 2024). Educational institutions must therefore consider how oversight operates at multiple levels, including teacher supervision, institutional governance, and learner self-regulation (Ifenthaler et al., 2024). Another area that remains insufficiently understood concerns the relationship between AI literacy and broader forms of critical literacy in digital learning environments (Chan, 2024). Understanding these dynamics is essential for determining how AI technologies should be integrated into curricula and learning strategies. Without deeper conceptual clarification, the educational implications of AI adoption remain only partially understood.

The emergence of these uncertainties points to a broader research gap concerning the intersection of human oversight, critical literacy, and AI-supported learning environments (Cukurova, 2024). Current discussions frequently address technological capabilities and ethical risks, yet they often treat these issues as separate concerns rather than interconnected dimensions of educational practice (Alzahrani, 2024). A comprehensive understanding requires examining how pedagogical theory, digital literacy frameworks, and AI governance principles intersect within modern learning systems (Molenaar, 2022). Critical literacy theory suggests that learners must actively interpret, question, and contextualize information rather than passively accept textual outputs (Luckin, 2024). When applied to AI-generated content, this perspective highlights the importance of teaching students how to interrogate algorithmically produced knowledge (Luckin, 2024). At the same time, educational technology theory emphasizes that digital tools should augment rather than replace human cognitive processes (Qassrawi & Al Karasneh, 2025). Combining these theoretical perspectives reveals the need for a structured framework in which AI technologies operate under human guidance while fostering critical engagement with information (Trindade et al., 2024). The synthesis of these theoretical insights helps clarify why human oversight and critical literacy should be examined together within AI-supported learning environments.

Addressing this research gap is theoretically justified because both educational theory and technology integration frameworks emphasize the central role of human agency in learning processes (Ifenthaler et al., 2024). Constructivist learning theory argues that knowledge is constructed through active interpretation and interaction with information sources. In the context of AI-generated outputs, this implies that learners must critically examine and contextualize the information provided by digital systems (Luckin, 2024). Similarly, theories of digital literacy highlight the importance of evaluating the credibility, origin, and implications of digital information (Chan, 2024). When these theoretical principles are applied to AI-supported education, they reinforce the need for structured oversight and reflective engagement with AI tools (Trindade et al., 2024). Human oversight ensures that AI technologies function as cognitive supports rather than authoritative knowledge sources (Atchley et al., 2024). At the same time, critical literacy enables learners to develop the analytical skills required to evaluate algorithmically generated information (Luckin, 2024). Integrating these theoretical perspectives therefore provides a coherent foundation for examining how AI technologies can be responsibly incorporated into educational systems.

Building on these theoretical considerations, the present study seeks to explore the conceptual relationship between human oversight and critical literacy in AI-

supported learning environments. The research focuses particularly on higher education institutions and general education systems that are increasingly incorporating generative AI technologies into learning processes. Within this context, several key questions emerge regarding how educational institutions can maintain pedagogical integrity while adopting AI-based tools. The study therefore asks how human oversight can be conceptualized as a guiding principle within AI-supported learning environments. It also examines how critical literacy competencies enable learners to evaluate and interpret AI-generated knowledge. A further question concerns how educational systems can integrate AI technologies without undermining the development of independent reasoning and critical inquiry. These questions reflect the need to understand AI technologies not only as technical tools but also as elements of broader pedagogical and epistemic frameworks. By addressing these questions, the study aims to clarify how educational institutions can balance technological innovation with intellectual responsibility.

The urgency of this research lies in the rapid expansion of generative AI technologies across educational systems worldwide. Universities, schools, and digital learning platforms are increasingly experimenting with AI tools to enhance teaching, assessment, and academic support services. At the same time, concerns about academic integrity, misinformation, and algorithmic bias are becoming more prominent in educational debates. These developments create a pressing need to understand how AI technologies influence learning practices and knowledge evaluation processes. Without clear conceptual frameworks, educational institutions may adopt AI tools in ways that unintentionally weaken critical thinking and scholarly rigor. Examining the relationship between human oversight and critical literacy therefore contributes to ongoing discussions about responsible AI integration in education. This perspective highlights the importance of aligning technological innovation with pedagogical values and institutional accountability. Investigating these issues can provide insights that support the development of more reflective and sustainable AI-supported learning environments.

2. Research Method

This study employs a qualitative research design based on literature review and conceptual analysis to examine the relationship between human oversight and critical literacy in AI-supported learning environments (Gephart & Saylor, 2020; Morgan, 2022). A qualitative approach is appropriate because the objective of the study is to explore theoretical perspectives, interpret scholarly discussions, and synthesize conceptual insights rather than test hypotheses through quantitative measurement (Lewis, 2015). The topic of artificial intelligence in education, particularly large language models in learning environments, remains an evolving field that requires conceptual clarification and theoretical interpretation (Pratt, 2025). Through qualitative literature analysis, the study examines how existing academic discussions frame the roles of AI technologies, human supervision, and critical literacy within educational contexts (Morgan, 2022). This design enables the researcher to identify key themes, compare scholarly arguments, and interpret conceptual relationships across multiple academic sources (Kiger & Varpio, 2020). A literature review approach is particularly suitable for this research because it allows the integration of diverse theoretical perspectives related to educational technology, digital literacy, and AI governance in education (Morgan, 2022). Consequently, the qualitative literature review design provides an appropriate framework for understanding the conceptual foundations of responsible AI integration in learning environments (Elbardan & Kholeif, 2017).

The data for this study consist of secondary data derived from academic literature, including peer-reviewed journal articles, scholarly books, and academic reports discussing artificial intelligence in education, large language models, and digital literacy in learning environments (Cheong et al., 2023; Ruggiano & Perry, 2017). The units of analysis are scholarly publications that examine educational applications of AI technologies and their implications for teaching and learning practices (Morgan, 2022). Data collection was conducted by identifying and selecting relevant literature through academic databases and scholarly sources based on thematic relevance to AI-supported learning, human oversight, and critical literacy. The analytical dimensions of the study include conceptual discussions of AI-assisted learning systems, the role of human supervision in educational technologies, and the development of critical literacy competencies in digital learning contexts. The primary analytical instrument was a structured reading and thematic categorization process used to synthesize key ideas across the selected literature (Lochmiller, 2021). To ensure trustworthiness, the study relied on credible academic sources, applied consistent thematic interpretation, and cross-compared findings from multiple scholarly works (Bingham, 2023; Roberts et al., 2019). Ethical considerations were maintained by using only publicly accessible academic publications, properly acknowledging original authors through citation, and ensuring that all analyzed materials were used responsibly and without misrepresentation (Morgan, 2022; Ruggiano & Perry, 2017).

3. Result and Discussion

3.1 Reconfiguring Knowledge Practices in AI-Supported Educational Environments

The integration of large language models into educational environments has reconfigured how knowledge is accessed, interpreted, and produced within higher education systems. AI-supported learning environments increasingly incorporate generative tools capable of producing explanations, summaries, and instructional materials that assist students in navigating complex academic content. These systems extend the functionality of earlier digital learning technologies by enabling interactive dialogue, automated feedback, and adaptive academic support. Within this technological landscape, AI operates as a mediator between learners and information, reshaping the structure of educational engagement. Educational institutions are therefore confronted with a shifting epistemic environment in which algorithmically generated knowledge circulates alongside traditional academic sources. Such developments require renewed attention to the mechanisms that ensure reliability, interpretation, and accountability in the learning process (Dabis & Csáki, 2024). The expanding presence of generative AI within education highlights the importance of examining how technological assistance interacts with pedagogical supervision and intellectual autonomy (Gordon et al., 2024).

Human oversight occupies a central position in discussions concerning the responsible integration of AI technologies in learning environments. Although AI systems can generate complex responses and instructional suggestions, the educational process continues to rely on human guidance to contextualize and evaluate knowledge claims. Instructors remain responsible for shaping learning objectives, verifying the credibility of generated information, and facilitating the interpretative processes through which students engage with academic material. Oversight therefore functions not only as a mechanism of quality control but also as a pedagogical principle that maintains the integrity of scholarly inquiry (Bako, 2025; Selvam & González Vallejo, 2025). When AI-generated responses are embedded within structured instructional contexts, the role of

educators becomes even more critical in ensuring that algorithmic outputs are interpreted appropriately (Tang et al., 2025). The relationship between technology and instruction thus reflects a complementary dynamic in which AI tools extend instructional capacity while human expertise preserves intellectual rigor (Al Fraidan, 2024). This dynamic reinforces the view that technological assistance must remain embedded within human-centered educational frameworks (Ifenthaler et al., 2024).

The role of critical literacy becomes particularly significant in educational environments where AI-generated information is readily available. Generative systems are capable of producing coherent and persuasive text, yet the credibility of such outputs cannot be assumed without careful evaluation (Alzahrani, 2024). Students interacting with AI-generated content must therefore cultivate analytical skills that enable them to assess the reliability, context, and evidentiary basis of algorithmically produced information (Chan, 2024). Critical literacy in this context involves questioning the origin of information, comparing AI outputs with established academic sources, and recognizing potential biases embedded within training data (Bako, 2025; Luckin, 2024). The ability to evaluate AI-generated knowledge extends traditional digital literacy competencies by requiring learners to interpret algorithmic mediation within knowledge production (Luckin, 2024). Educational institutions that integrate AI technologies into learning processes must therefore prioritize the development of evaluative reasoning and epistemic awareness (Azman & Tümkaya, 2025). Without such competencies, the presence of automated knowledge systems risks weakening the analytical engagement that underpins higher education (Dabis & Csáki, 2024).

Beyond issues of evaluation and verification, AI integration also introduces a set of secondary educational benefits that influence how learning activities are organized. AI-supported tools enable rapid summarization of complex materials, automated feedback on written assignments, and individualized support for academic tasks. These capabilities expand access to learning resources and allow students to receive assistance beyond the temporal constraints of classroom instruction (Hussain et al., 2025). Instructors likewise benefit from the capacity of AI systems to support routine academic activities such as drafting explanations, generating instructional prompts, or organizing educational content. The pedagogical value of these applications depends on the manner in which they are embedded within instructional design (Ifenthaler & Schumacher, 2023). When AI functions as a supportive instrument within a structured learning framework, it can enhance engagement and facilitate deeper exploration of academic topics (Trindade et al., 2024). The potential advantages of AI-supported learning therefore coexist with the need for careful pedagogical integration and supervision (Al Fraidan, 2024).

The relationship between AI usage and student cognitive engagement presents a complex educational dynamic that requires careful interpretation. On one hand, access to automated explanations and structured responses can facilitate comprehension of difficult academic concepts (Bako, 2025). On the other hand, the ease with which information can be generated may reduce incentives for independent inquiry if learners rely excessively on automated systems (Alzahrani, 2024). Cognitive engagement within AI-supported environments is therefore shaped by the conditions under which these technologies are introduced and supervised (Cukurova, 2024; Ifenthaler et al., 2024). When instructors guide students to critically examine AI outputs, generative systems can become tools for exploration and hypothesis development (Atchley et al., 2024). Conversely, uncritical reliance on algorithmic responses may lead to superficial engagement with academic material (Luckin, 2024). The educational significance of AI

tools thus depends less on the technology itself and more on the pedagogical structures that frame its use (Trindade et al., 2024).

Scholarly discussions surrounding AI in education consistently emphasize the importance of balancing technological innovation with human-centered pedagogical values. Across multiple studies, AI tools are described as powerful instruments for enhancing instructional efficiency and accessibility, yet these same studies caution against treating generative systems as authoritative knowledge sources (Bako, 2025; Dabis & Csáki, 2024). The literature therefore converges around the argument that effective AI integration requires the coexistence of algorithmic assistance and human interpretative guidance (Hussain et al., 2025; Qassrawi & Al Karasneh, 2025). Educational theory reinforces this perspective by emphasizing the importance of active learning and reflective inquiry (Luckin, 2024). When students engage critically with AI-generated information, the technology functions as a catalyst for intellectual exploration rather than a substitute for reasoning (Chan, 2024). This synthesis of technological capability and pedagogical responsibility reflects the broader transformation of contemporary educational ecosystems (Gordon et al., 2024).

To clarify the conceptual relationships identified across the literature, the key dimensions of AI-supported learning environments can be organized into a structured analytical framework.

Table 1. Analytical Dimensions of AI-Supported Learning Environments

Dimension	Function of AI Systems	Role of Human Oversight	Educational Implications
Knowledge generation	Produces explanations, summaries, and academic content	Evaluates accuracy and contextual relevance	Maintains reliability of learning materials
Learning assistance	Provides feedback and structured guidance	Guides interpretation and academic reasoning	Enhances comprehension and engagement
Critical literacy	Generates rapid responses to queries	Encourages verification and analytical reflection	Strengthens evaluative thinking
Academic integrity	May generate plausible but unverified information	Monitors ethical and responsible usage	Protects scholarly standards

Source: Processed by the researcher, 2026

The framework presented in Table 1 illustrates the complementary relationship between AI capabilities and human supervision within educational environments (Trindade et al., 2024). Each dimension demonstrates that algorithmic functions require interpretative oversight in order to contribute effectively to learning outcomes (Selvam & González Vallejo, 2025). AI systems generate information and instructional support, yet the reliability and pedagogical relevance of this information depend on human evaluation. Oversight therefore operates not only as a corrective mechanism but also as a formative element that guides learners toward reflective engagement with knowledge (Ifenthaler et al., 2024). The table also highlights the role of critical literacy as an intermediary process linking technological assistance and intellectual development (Luckin, 2024). By situating AI outputs within a framework of evaluation and interpretation, educational systems can ensure that generative technologies reinforce rather than undermine scholarly inquiry (Alzahrani, 2024).

Institutional implications emerge clearly from this analytical framework. Universities and educational organizations increasingly face the task of designing

governance structures that regulate the use of AI tools within academic settings (Dabis & Csáki, 2024). Policies addressing academic integrity, data privacy, and responsible technological adoption have become central to institutional planning (Bako, 2025). Educational institutions must also invest in professional development initiatives that prepare instructors to work effectively with generative AI technologies (Renta-Davids et al., 2025; Soni, 2025). Such initiatives enable educators to integrate AI tools into teaching practices while preserving the interpretative authority of academic expertise (Tang et al., 2025). Institutional governance therefore plays a decisive role in shaping how AI-supported learning environments evolve across educational systems (Abimbola et al., 2024; Colonna, 2025).

Pedagogical practice must also adapt to the presence of generative technologies within academic contexts. Traditional instructional models that rely primarily on information transmission are increasingly complemented by approaches emphasizing evaluation, interpretation, and analytical reasoning (Luckin, 2024). Assignments that encourage students to critique AI-generated responses or compare algorithmic outputs with scholarly sources illustrate this shift (Bako, 2025). Such pedagogical strategies transform AI tools into objects of analysis rather than unquestioned providers of knowledge (Chan, 2024). Instructors who incorporate these approaches promote active engagement with digital technologies while reinforcing intellectual autonomy (Trindade et al., 2024). The educational objective therefore shifts from merely accessing information to critically interrogating the processes through which information is generated (Alzahrani, 2024).

Conceptual synthesis across the literature reveals several strengths associated with examining AI-supported learning through the combined lens of human oversight and critical literacy. This perspective integrates insights from educational technology studies, digital literacy research, and pedagogical theory (Ifenthaler et al., 2024; Luckin, 2024). By focusing on the interaction between technological capability and human interpretation, the framework captures the complexity of contemporary educational environments. It highlights that responsible AI integration is not solely a technical challenge but also a pedagogical and institutional one (Bako, 2025). The analytical emphasis on critical literacy reinforces the enduring importance of intellectual autonomy within higher education (Chan, 2024). Such a perspective contributes to ongoing scholarly debates concerning the evolving relationship between human cognition and algorithmic knowledge systems (Cukurova, 2024).

Certain limitations accompany the conceptual approach adopted in this discussion. The analysis relies primarily on existing academic literature and theoretical interpretations rather than empirical observations of classroom practice. Rapid technological developments may also alter the practical implications of AI integration in ways that are not yet fully documented in scholarly research (Prabu Revolusi & Febriandy, 2025). Educational institutions vary widely in terms of technological infrastructure, policy frameworks, and pedagogical traditions, which may influence how AI tools are adopted in practice (Abimbola et al., 2024; Schiff, 2021). These contextual variations suggest that further empirical research will be necessary to examine how theoretical principles operate within real educational settings. Investigating student experiences, instructor strategies, and institutional policies will provide deeper insight into the practical dynamics of AI-supported learning environments (Gordon et al., 2024).

4. Conclusion

The discussion has examined the growing presence of generative artificial intelligence in educational environments and the implications this transformation holds for knowledge practices within higher education and broader education systems. AI-supported learning environments introduce new forms of interaction between learners and information, particularly through the use of large language models capable of generating explanations, feedback, and instructional content. Within this evolving context, the importance of human oversight becomes evident as a mechanism that ensures the credibility, relevance, and pedagogical alignment of AI-generated information. Critical literacy also emerges as an essential competency that enables learners to evaluate algorithmically produced knowledge and distinguish between plausible outputs and academically verified information. The relationship between technological capability and human interpretation therefore becomes central to the functioning of AI-supported education. Educational environments increasingly require frameworks that maintain the integrity of scholarly inquiry while incorporating the advantages of generative technologies. The integration of AI within learning systems thus highlights the need for balanced interaction between algorithmic assistance, instructional guidance, and analytical engagement.

The analysis contributes to the broader field of educational technology and digital literacy by clarifying the conceptual relationship between human oversight and critical literacy within AI-supported learning environments. By synthesizing theoretical perspectives from educational technology studies and digital literacy research, the discussion highlights the role of human-centered pedagogical principles in shaping the responsible use of generative AI. This perspective emphasizes that technological systems should function as cognitive supports rather than substitutes for academic reasoning. The conceptual framework presented demonstrates how AI capabilities must operate within structures of supervision and evaluative learning practices to maintain intellectual rigor. Such a framework contributes to ongoing debates concerning the integration of generative AI in higher education by foregrounding the importance of institutional governance, pedagogical adaptation, and student analytical competencies. The emphasis on critical literacy further extends existing discussions on digital literacy by addressing the interpretative challenges associated with algorithmically generated knowledge. In this way, the discussion advances scholarly understanding of how educational systems can integrate AI technologies while preserving core academic values.

Future research should extend this conceptual discussion by examining the practical dynamics of AI-supported learning environments through empirical investigation. Studies that analyze how students interact with generative AI tools in real educational contexts would provide deeper insight into the development of critical literacy skills and evaluative reasoning. Investigations focusing on instructional strategies, curriculum design, and institutional governance frameworks may also clarify how human oversight can be operationalized within educational systems adopting AI technologies. Comparative research across different educational contexts would further illuminate how variations in institutional resources, digital infrastructure, and policy environments influence the adoption of AI-supported learning practices. Longitudinal studies may also contribute to understanding how sustained exposure to generative technologies shapes student learning behavior and intellectual engagement. Such research directions would strengthen the empirical foundation for discussions concerning responsible AI integration in education. Expanding interdisciplinary collaboration between educational researchers, technologists, and policymakers will also be important

for addressing the evolving challenges associated with generative AI in learning environments.

References

- Abimbola, C., Eden, C. A., Chisom, O. N., & Adeniyi, I. S. (2024). AI integration in education offers transformative opportunities, but ethical considerations and data privacy concerns must be addressed for effective implementation and equitable outcomes. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*.
- Al Fraidan, A. (2024). AI-driven assessments can enhance accuracy, fairness, and skill development in education, but require a balanced approach that maintains human oversight for fairness, accountability, and holistic student development. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*.
- Alzahrani, A. (2024). Unveiling the shadows: Beyond the hype of AI in education. *Heliyon*, 10(11), e30696. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e30696>
- Assarroudi, A., Nabavi, F. H., Armat, M., Ebadi, A., & Vaismoradi, M. (2018). Directed qualitative content analysis: the description and elaboration of its underpinning methods and data analysis process. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, 23(1), 42-55. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1744987117741687>
- Atchley, P., Pannell, H., Wofford, K., Hopkins, M., & Atchley, R. (2024). Cognitive psychology research can help educators use AI in higher education as a facilitator for learning, rather than a threat, by capitalizing on metacognition knowledge and skills. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*.
- Azman, Ö., & Tümkaya, S. (2025). AI integration in education can improve student outcomes, but ethical guidelines are needed to balance innovation with fairness, accountability, and inclusivity. *International Journal of Educational Research Open*.
- Bako, N. Z. (2025). Ethical AI in schools: Balancing automation, privacy, and human oversight. *World Journal of Advanced Engineering Technology and Sciences*, 15(1), 211-218. <https://doi.org/10.30574/wjaets.2025.15.1.0262>
- Bingham, A. J. (2023). From Data Management to Actionable Findings: A Five-Phase Process of Qualitative Data Analysis. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069231183620>
- Chan, C. (2024). Integrating AI and holistic competencies in education can enhance personal and professional well-being, while addressing ethical challenges and preparing students for a rapidly evolving technological landscape. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*.

- Cheong, H., Lyons, A., Houghton, R., & Majumdar, A. (2023). Secondary Qualitative Research Methodology Using Online Data within the Context of Social Sciences. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069231213824>
- Colonna, L. (2025). The EU AI Act needs more precise alignment between AI and education regulation for effective regulation of AI in higher education. *European Journal of Law and Technology*.
- Cukurova, M. (2024). AI's role in education should be viewed as an instrument for understanding human learning, rather than just a tool, and should be integrated with human cognition through human-AI hybrid intelligence systems. *British Journal of Educational Technology*.
- Dabis, A., & Csáki, C. (2024). AI and ethics: Investigating the first policy responses of higher education institutions to the challenge of generative AI. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-03526-z>
- Dabis, A., & Csáki, C. (2024). AI and ethics: Investigating the first policy responses of higher education institutions to the challenge of generative AI. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-03526-z>
- Deepshikha, D. (2025). AI-driven grading and personalized feedback in higher education improve efficiency, consistency, and scalability while reducing human bias, but ethical concerns and data privacy must be addressed for ethical use. *Journal of Digital Learning in Teacher Education*.
- Elbardan, H., & Kholeif, A. (2017). An Interpretive Approach for Data Collection and Analysis. In *Enterprise Resource Planning, Corporate Governance and Internal Auditing* (pp. 121-157). Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-54990-3_5
- Gephart, R., & Saylor, R. G. (2020). Qualitative Designs and Methodologies for Business, Management, and Organizational Research. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Business and Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190224851.013.155>
- Gordon, M., Daniel, M., Ajiboye, A., Uraiby, H., Xu, N. Y., Bartlett, R., Hanson, J., Haas, M., Spadafore, M. T., Grafton-Clarke, C., Gasiea, R. Y., Michie, C., Corral, J., Kwan, B., Dolmans, D. H. J. M., & Thammasitboon, S. (2024). A scoping review of artificial intelligence in medical education. *Medical Teacher*, 46(5), 653-673. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159x.2024.2314198>
- Hussain, I., Rasool, S., & Tabassum, S. (2025). Human-AI collaboration in education enhances student learning, task management, and decision-making while maintaining human importance in the educational process. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*.
- Ifenthaler, D., & Schumacher, C. (2023). AI and human intelligence can enhance learning and

- teaching by collaborating in real-time, enhancing human decision-making and enhancing efficiency in educational settings. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*. Ifenthaler, D., Majumdar, R., Gorissen, P., Judge, M., Mishra, S., Raffaghelli, J., & Shimada, A. (2024). AI in education should be integrated with human involvement, focusing on privacy, ethical use, trustworthy algorithms, and equity and fairness. *Educational Technology Research and Development*.
- Kiger, M. E., & Varpio, L. (2020). Thematic analysis of qualitative data: AMEE Guide No. 131. *Medical Teacher*, 42(8), 846-854. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159x.2020.1755030>
- Kopuz, E., & Kartal, G. (2025). Collaborative Human-AI Research Practices: Identifying Critical Touchpoints for Human Intervention in Educational Research. *IEEE Transactions on Learning Technologies*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/tlt.2025.3587488>
- Lewis, S. (2015). Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches. *Health Promotion Practice*, 16(4), 473-475. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524839915580941>
- Lochmiller, C. R. (2021). Conducting Thematic Analysis with Qualitative Data. *The Qualitative Report*, 26(6), 2029-2044. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2021.5008>
- Luckin, R. (2024). The future of education involves harnessing AI while fostering human intelligence, focusing on critical thinking, creativity, and problem-solving skills, while preserving the unique human touch in the learning process. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*.
- Molenaar, I. (2022). A common language for AI in education is needed to facilitate dialogue among stakeholders, including researchers, educators, entrepreneurs, and policymakers, to enhance meaningful AI applications in learning and teaching. *Learning and Instruction*.
- Morgan, H. (2022). Conducting a Qualitative Document Analysis. *The Qualitative Report*, 27(1), 64-77. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2022.5044>
- Prabu Revolusi, & Krisna Febriandy, R. (2025). AI integration in education can enhance efficiency and inclusivity, but requires robust regulations, data protection, algorithm bias mitigation, and teacher training for fair and ethical implementation. *Journal of Educational Technology*.
- Pratt, M. G. (2025). On the Evolution of Qualitative Methods in Organizational Research. *Journal of Management*.
- Qassrawi, R., & Al Karasneh, S. A. (2025). AI can enhance language proficiency and streamline teaching methods, but it cannot replace human educators; a balance between AI-driven instruction and traditional methods is needed for optimal learning outcomes. *Interactive Learning Environments*.

- Renta-Davids, A., Camarero-Figuerola, M., & Camacho, M. (2025). AI integration in educational leadership can enhance decision-making and administrative tasks, but ethical considerations and continuous professional development are crucial for effective integration and addressing risks like algorithmic bias and data privacy. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*.
- Roberts, K., Dowell, A., & Nie, J. (2019). Attempting rigour and replicability in thematic analysis of qualitative research data; a case study of codebook development. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 19(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-019-0707-y>
- Ruggiano, N., & Perry, T. E. (2017). Conducting secondary analysis of qualitative data: Should we, can we, and how? *Qualitative Social Work*, 18(1), 81-97. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1473325017700701>
- Schiff, D. S. (2021). AI in education is largely absent from national AI policy strategies, with the focus on AI-ready workforce and expert training, and its ethical implications receive scant attention. *Educational Policy*.
- Selvam, M., & González Vallejo, R. (2025). The Human-in-the-Loop (HITL) grading framework balances AI speed with human oversight, promoting fairer evaluations and preserving academic integrity while reducing grading time and improving student satisfaction. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*.
- Soni, G. (2025). AI integration in education can enhance learning outcomes but should supplement traditional pedagogy and require structured policies, teacher training, and ethical guidelines for responsible use. *Educational Review*.
- Tang, Q., Deng, W., Huang, Y., Wang, S., & Zhang, H. (2025). Generative AI-assisted teaching can enhance students' learning satisfaction, but only when supervised by a teacher. *Computers & Education*.
- Trindade, M. A. M., Edirisinghe, G. S., & Luo, L. (2024). Teaching mathematical concepts in management with generative artificial intelligence: The power of human oversight in AI-driven learning. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 22(3), 101104. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2024.101104>