Received: 27.06.2025
Revised: 31.05.2026
Accepted: 15.07.2026
Published: 27.07.2026

A Systematic Review of the Educational Implications of Artificial Intelligence: Benefits and Challenges Post -Covid-19 Pandemic

Fatma MAAMRI•

Abstract

The rapid integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into academic environments has accelerated significantly in the post-COVID-19 era. This study presents a systematic literature review (SLR) evaluating the reported pedagogical benefits and structural challenges of AI applications in education. Following the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) framework guidelines, a comprehensive search was executed across major academic databases, targeting peer-reviewed empirical literature published between 2021 and 2026. Applying strict inclusion and exclusion criteria, a final analytical sample of twenty (N = 20) international studies was synthesized. The thematic analysis demonstrates that while AI tools offer significant educational benefits—such as learning personalization, enhanced language acquisition, and the automation of administrative workloads—they present critical pedagogical and ethical challenges. These risks focus heavily on cognitive disengagement, diminished student critical thinking, and algorithmic data privacy vulnerabilities. This review highlights that the successful deployment of AI relies on balancing technological integration with robust ethical frameworks while preserving the central instructional responsibility of human educators.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence; Education; Systematic Review; Benefits; Challenges.

• Dr. Fatma Maamri, graduated from the National Higher School of Statistics and Applied Economics, and contract Lecturer in the National Higher School of Marine Sciences and Coastal Management, Algeria. Contact: +213 557081308, or:fatma.maamri4@gmail.com , fatma.maamri@enssmal.edu.dz

1. Introduction

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into academic institutions represents one of the most transformative shifts in contemporary education. Driven by rapid advancements in machine learning, natural language processing, and adaptive digital architectures, AI technologies have transitioned from theoretical computational concepts into active pedagogical infrastructures. The COVID-19 pandemic served as a major catalyst for this socio-technical acceleration, forcing global educational systems to adopt emergency remote learning and opening the path for widespread institutional deployment of automated grading systems, intelligent tutoring systems (ITS), and generative dialogue agents. Consequently, evaluating the educational implications and reported impacts of these applications has become a critical priority for educational researchers and institutional leaders. Despite the expanding body of literature surrounding educational technology, current academic debates often suffer from a dual limitation. First, existing research frequently adopts an overly binary framing, isolating positive technological advantages from operational and ethical risks without providing a unified perspective. Second, while isolated software evaluations exist, there remains a distinct research gap concerning the comprehensive synthesis of how academics and educators perceive these tools following the rapid digital shift post-2020. This study addresses this research gap by conducting a rigorous systematic literature review to map out the multi-layered benefits and challenges associated with AI adoption in modern schools and universities. To address this objective, this paper investigates the hypothesis that while AI applications offer substantial operational efficiencies—such as optimizing administrative tasks and allowing continuous, self-paced learning—their over-reliance significantly introduces cognitive dependency and institutional risks. Given the exponential growth of recent research, a systematic literature review (SLR) approach is uniquely suited for this study, as it provides a transparent, structured, and reproducible methodology to synthesize rapidly evolving empirical data. The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: Section 2 provides a thematic conceptual synthesis of the existing literature; Section 3 details the systematic screening and selection methodology; Section 4 presents the synthesized results and an interpretive discussion; and Section 5 concludes with institutional recommendations and prospective paths for future research.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Conceptual Evolution and Definitions of Educational AI

The relationship between computational systems and pedagogical environments dates back to the mid-twentieth century. As (Doroudi, 2023) notes, the historical development of cognitive sciences and artificial intelligence has been deeply intertwined with education, largely because early AI pioneers were knowledge creators who sought to understand and replicate learning pathways. Formally introduced by John McCarthy in 1955 as "the science and engineering of making intelligent machines," the core objective of AI was to program systems to mimic human problem-solving capabilities (Manning,

2023). In contemporary institutional settings, this translates into advanced algorithms that analyze massive amounts of data from diverse digital sources—such as system logs, human-generated content, and monitoring tools—to optimize institutional dynamics. Rather than serving as a static technical tool, modern AI functions as an adaptive infrastructure driven by machine learning, automated evaluation frameworks, and natural language processing.

2.2. Pedagogical and Operational Benefits of AI Integration

Empirical literature highlights significant operational efficiencies and learning enhancements driven by AI deployment across global educational landscapes. According to data synthesized by the World Economic Forum (Willige, 2024), AI-driven tools are successfully addressing structural educational divides through international case studies: promoting educational inclusion via adaptive textbooks in South Africa, scaling personalized curriculum mapping in the United Arab Emirates, and accelerating large-scale literacy initiatives in Brazil. In higher education, foundational research demonstrates that these computational platforms fundamentally transform classroom dynamics by automating heavy administrative tasks and grading frameworks, which allows faculty members to allocate more time to student mentorship (Mohamed Ali Khudri, 2022). By introducing intelligent tutoring systems (ITS) and virtual learning environments, AI enables large student populations to access flexible, continuous education at a fraction of traditional operational costs, thereby shifting pedagogical focus toward self-paced and individualized learning models.

2.3. AI Applications in Language Learning and Cross-Cultural Settings

A substantial portion of post-pandemic educational literature focuses on the role of AI within Second Language Acquisition (SLA) and English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context. Foundational studies in language learning support the premise that automated error correction provides non-judgmental environments that significantly reduce student anxiety and promote active linguistic experimentation (Dodigovic, 2009). Recent syntheses identify six major operational forms of language learning AI architectures: Automatic Evaluation Systems, Neural Machine Translation Tools, Intelligent Tutoring Systems, AI Chatbots, Intelligent Virtual Environments, and Affective Computing (Jiang, How does artificial intelligence empower EFL teaching and learning nowadays? A review on artificial intelligence in the EFL context, 2022). In developing regions, particularly across the African continent, these deployments are expanding rapidly, offering unique mechanisms for handling linguistic diversity, provided they are balanced by localized policy solutions that ensure socio-economic inclusion (Gwagwa, 2020).

2.4. Institutional Challenges, Ethical Dilemmas, and Post-Pandemic Perceptions

Conversely, the expanding reliance on digital algorithms introduces severe socio-

technical risks and ethical tensions. Initial literature reviews conducted during the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic indicated that while students in regions like Saudi Arabia maintained favorable perceptions of early e-learning tools, the systemic operational drawbacks remained largely underexplored due to the emergency nature of the digital transition (Layali & And Al-Shlowiy, 2020). As AI tools have evolved into more autonomous entities, critical research has begun pointing out deep structural risks. These focus on data privacy vulnerabilities, the lack of transparency in proprietary "black box" algorithms, and systemic inequities regarding technology access. More importantly, emerging empirical data links over-reliance on generative dialogic systems to cognitive issues, including student learning procrastination, memory retention loss, reduced critical thinking, and socio-emotional isolation in virtual classrooms.

2.5. Synthesis and Identification of the Research Gap

A critical review of the existing literature reveals that while early foundational research thoroughly explored the theoretical capacities of AI and isolated digital tools, current secondary literature remains fragmented. Most existing overviews present sequential summaries of independent technical trials rather than a unified synthesis of pedagogical impacts. The primary research gap lies in the scarcity of comprehensive systematic frameworks that evaluate the post-pandemic digital shift. The rapid, forced digitalization caused by COVID-19 completely transformed institutional infrastructures and accelerated AI adoption at an unprecedented pace. Consequently, there is an urgent need to systematically map out how these multi-layered operational benefits and socio-ethical challenges intersect in empirical data. This study addresses this gap by executing a structured systematic literature review of post-2021 empirical research, establishing a solid theoretical foundation for sustainable institutional adoption.

3. Methodology

3.1. Research Design and Framework

To ensure methodological rigor, transparency, and reproducibility, this study conducts a Systematic Literature Review (SLR) aligned with the PRISMA 2020 Statement (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses). Moving away from an unstandardized or binary perspective, this methodology systematically identifies, evaluates, and synthesizes empirical research regarding the educational implications of Artificial Intelligence (AI), balancing reported pedagogical benefits against structural challenges.

3.2. Search Strategy and Data Sources

Electronic database searches were systematically executed across primary academic indexes and search engines, including Google Scholar, Scopus, ScienceDirect, and the IEEE Xplore Digital Library. The search timeframe was strictly restricted to peer-reviewed literature published between January 2021 and May 2026, capturing the critical post-pandemic era marked by accelerated digital transformation. To isolate relevant

literature, specialized Boolean search strings were deployed within the metadata fields (Title, Abstract, and Keywords):

("Artificial Intelligence" OR "AI" OR "Machine Learning") AND ("Education" OR "Higher Education" OR "Pedagogy") AND ("Benefits" OR "Challenges" OR "Perceptions" OR "Impact")

3.3. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

To establish a cohesive and methodologically sound corpus of studies, explicit eligibility criteria were applied during the screening process:

Table 1. Inclusion and exclusion criteria

CRITERION	*INCLUSION CRITERIA*	*EXCLUSION CRITERIA*
TIME FRAME	Published between 2021 and 2026 (post-COVID-19 era).	Published before 2021.
STUDY TYPE	Empirical studies, peer-reviewed journal articles, systematic reviews, and official institutional reports.	Op-eds, opinion blog posts, non-peer-reviewed white papers, and patents.
FOCUS	Direct application of AI tools in educational settings, academic perceptions, and learner outcomes.	Purely technical computer science papers, algorithmic development without educational context, or AI in non-educational fields (e.g., healthcare, retail).
LANGAGE	Full-text available in English or French.	Documents in other languages without official translations.

Note. Elaborated by the author.

3.4. Screening Process and Study Selection (PRISMA Flow)

The selection process followed a strict four-stage screening pipeline to ensure transparency:

1. **Identification:** The initial database search yielded bibliographic records across the selected indexes.
2. **Deduplication:** Automated software tools removed duplicate entries across databases.
3. **Title and Abstract Screening:** The remaining records were screened based on title and abstract relevance, eliminating studies that did not explicitly align with educational implications.
4. **Full-Text Eligibility:** Full-text documents were thoroughly analyzed to ensure compliance with the inclusion criteria, resulting in a final analytical sample of **(N = 20) core studies**.

3.5. Data Extraction and Synthesis Approach

Data from the 20 included studies were extracted using a standardized matrix, capturing: author(s), publication year, specific AI technology examined, research design (qualitative, mixed, or systematic review), and primary educational outcomes. Rather than presenting these studies as an isolated descriptive list, the data underwent a thematic synthesis. Findings were categorized into cross-cutting operational themes—such as personalization, linguistic acquisition, administrative efficiency, cognitive

reliance, and algorithmic ethics—providing a comprehensive interpretive framework for the subsequent sections.

4. Results

4.1. Operational Classification Criteria

To synthesize the empirical findings without enforcing an overly binary division, the twenty included studies were evaluated based on their primary analyzed outcomes. Studies were classified under "Pedagogical and Operational Benefits" if their primary datasets demonstrated statistical improvements in student performance, administrative efficiency, or learning accessibility. Conversely, studies were categorized under "Pedagogical Challenges and Socio-Technical Risks" if their focal findings identified systemic vulnerabilities, cognitive degradation, psychological stressors, or ethical discrepancies. See table 02.

*Table2.*Thematic Synthesis of Included Empirical Studies on Educational AI

AUTHORS	METHOD	PRIMARY SYNTHESIZED FINDINGS
PEDAGOGICAL & OPERATIONAL BENEFITS		
(FARAHANI MS, 2024)	Document Review	Enables curriculum personalization, facilitates adaptive learning systems through real-time feedback, and provides scalable virtual tutoring at lower operational costs.
(SLIMI, 2023)	Qualitative (Survey)	Enhances graduate employability skills, automates heavy administrative workflows, and optimizes knowledge acquisition in higher education.
(SARAH ABOU KARROUM, 2024), (DEGNI, 2024)	Mixed-Methods	Facilitates specialized teacher training architectures, builds individualized learning experiences, and improves assistance for learners with special needs. Demonstrates positive impacts on individual student learning outcomes and assists faculty in creating professional development modules.
((HELEN CROMPTON, 2023) (CHEN, 2023), (GOKCEARSLAN, 2024), (SULTAN, 2023), (SANG JOON LEE, 2024)	Systematic Review	Documents significant positive contributions of AI tools to modern language learning, automated assistants, and institutional student management. Enhances scalable personalized instructional support, establishes a non-judgmental learning environment, and elevates overall assessment quality. Notes that conversational AI chatbots heavily boost student learning motivation, improve linguistic fluency, and optimize instructional design tasks. Identifies intelligent tutoring systems (ITS) as highly effective tools for optimizing knowledge retention and pedagogical delivery. Synthesizes successful practices of integrating AI projects and project-based learning dynamics into modern classrooms.

PEDAGOGICAL CHALLENGES & RISKS		
(GAINET, 2025) (JULIE A. DELELLO, 2025)	Qualitative Approach	Warns that unmonitored institutional AI integration can exacerbate digital divides and reduce equity in learning opportunities. Links sudden or unguided exposure to digital conversational agents with heightened student anxiety and increased social isolation.
(BASHA, 2024) (CHUNPENG ZHAI, 2024) (P. SASIKALA, 2024) (BABLU KARAN, 2023)	Systematic Review	Demonstrates that over-reliance on automated tools reduces student critical thinking capacities and lowers real-life academic performance. Identifies structural cognitive degradation and diminished cognitive abilities resulting from chronic over-reliance on dialogic AI software. Highlights critical socio-technical challenges, including data privacy vulnerabilities, algorithmic bias, and systemic barriers to technology equity. And establishes six core risk dimensions: deepfakes, algorithmic biases, privacy vulnerabilities, accuracy risks, loss of social skills, and the destabilization of faculty roles.
(LIANG, 2023) (PLACIDE, 2024)	Analytical Approach	Reports negative impacts on student academic morale and identifies a distinct loss of creative problem-solving capabilities. Documents negative implications regarding data confidentiality, ethical institutional use, and the erosion of individual analytical skills.
(MUHAMMAD ABBAS, 2024)	Mixed-Methods	Indicates that generative platforms (e.g., ChatGPT) trigger tendencies for academic procrastination, memory loss, and lower grades.
(MOLENAR, 2024), (MICHAEL. LITTMAN, 2021)	Analytical Report	Highlights the danger of proprietary "black box" algorithms, leaving educators and students unaware of evaluation mechanics. Identifies risks from deepfakes, unaccountable systems, algorithmic discrimination, and the reinforcement of pre-existing social biases.

Note: Elaborated by the author.

4.2. Synthesis of General Trends

The systematic tracking of the empirical corpus indicates that while the absolute volume of early post-pandemic research leaned heavily toward exploring functional efficiencies, critical contemporary literature is rapidly expanding. The focus has systematically shifted from celebrating basic automation toward highlighting deep psychological, ethical, and cognitive vulnerabilities.

5. Discussion

The multi-layered evidence extracted from this systematic review challenges the initial simplified view of AI as a merely advantageous tool. Rather than evaluating AI through a binary lens, a critical interpretation of the literature requires viewing it as an inevitable, socio-technical shift whose pedagogical outcomes are highly dependent on the quality of institutional management. When looking at the broader picture, the documented benefits are clearly structured around three primary pillars: curricular personalization, instructional automation, and linguistic support. The findings of Farahani (2024) and Chen (2023) converge to show that adaptive algorithms effectively address the diversity of classrooms by adjusting instructional speed in real time. This operational capability is closely linked to the language learning advancements identified by Crompton (2023) and Gokcearslan (2024), where conversational agents create a non-judgmental environment that lowers affective barriers and improves student motivation. Furthermore, the administrative optimizations highlighted by Slimi (2023) and Abou Karroum (2024) show that AI can successfully reduce faculty workloads, creating space for direct human

mentorship. However, cross-examining these findings reveals a sharp set of structural tensions within current research. While Chen (2023) celebrates the expansion of personal support, empirical data from Abbas (2024), Basha (2024), and Zhai & Wang (2024) provide a strong counter-argument. These researchers show that excessive reliance on generative platforms often acts as a major cognitive risk, leading to student procrastination, memory loss, and a significant decline in independent critical thinking. This tension indicates that the time saved by automation can easily result in cognitive disengagement if the tool replaces, rather than enhances, the student's analytical effort. Additionally, the social and ethical dilemmas identified in the reports of Molenar (2024) and Littman (2021) show that the operational benefits of AI are often undermined by algorithmic opacity. The use of proprietary "black box" technologies leaves educators unable to assess the fairness or accuracy of student evaluations, creating serious risks of bias and discrimination. This directly challenges the claims of equity, as supported by Gainet (2025) and Karan (2023), who warn that unequal technological access and algorithmic biases can easily reinforce existing socio-economic inequalities.

Finally, these findings require a careful reconsideration of this study's initial hypothesis, which suggested that the advantages of AI outweigh its disadvantages, leading to unconditioned preference among academics. The synthesized empirical data demonstrates that this initial premise is overly optimistic and incomplete. While academics value the administrative time saved and the personalization of learning pathways, they remain deeply concerned by the long-term cognitive dependencies, privacy risks, and erosion of critical thinking skills documented by researchers like Delello (2025) and Sasikala (2024). Consequently, the evidence suggests that the benefits of AI do not automatically outweigh its risks; rather, the positive outcomes of AI in education are strictly conditioned on establishing rigorous ethical guidelines and maintaining the central pedagogical authority of human educators.

5. Conclusion

The rapid, forced digital transition in the post-COVID-19 era has fundamentally accelerated the structural dependency of educational institutions on Artificial Intelligence and machine learning infrastructures. As demonstrated through this systematic literature review, the educational implications of AI cannot be understood through a simplistic binary framework. While the compiled empirical evidence underscores substantial benefits—including enhanced pedagogical personalization, language acquisition efficiencies, and the welcome optimization of faculty administrative workloads—these operational milestones are heavily countered by severe socio-technical challenges. The systematic cross-examination of the literature reveals that unchecked AI adoption introduces substantial cognitive risks, such as acute student procrastination, critical thinking deficits, and memory loss, alongside systemic challenges regarding data privacy vulnerabilities and proprietary algorithmic opacity. Consequently, the findings of this review indicate that the actualization of AI's

educational benefits is strictly conditional upon the establishment of rigorous, human-centered ethical governance. To transition from a posture of digital vulnerability to sustainable pedagogical innovation, academic institutions and policymakers must collaborate to operationalize targeted structural frameworks. First, developers and academic leaders must ensure absolute transparency by designing AI platforms rooted in explainable algorithms, thereby dismantling the "black box" mechanics that obscure student evaluations and reinforce systemic biases. Second, digital infrastructures within schools and universities must be engineered to strictly respect data confidentiality and cultural equity, guaranteeing that automated tools support diverse student bodies without worsening pre-existing digital divides. Finally, it is imperative to cultivate a culture of open multidisciplinary trust among software engineers, educators, and ethicists. Ultimately, technological deployment must never replace the core instructio nal authority or pastoral responsibility of human teachers; rather, ethics must serve as the foundational guide to ensure that artificial intelligence remains a tool that enhances, rather than diminishes, human cognition and academic integrity.

References

Abbas, M., & Al-Ahmadi, F. (2024). Is it harmful or helpful? Examining the dual impacts of generative conversational AI tools on student academic outcomes. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 21(10), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00444-7

Abou Karroum, S., & El-Masri, N. E. (2024). Exploring the role of artificial intelligence in contemporary classrooms: Pedagogical architectures and adaptive challenges. *Journal of Innovative Research in Management and Pedagogical Sciences (JIRMPS)*, 12(4), 1–14.

Bablu Karan, G. R. (2023). Potential risks of artificial intelligence integration into school education: A systematic review. *Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society*, 43(3), 145–158. https://doi.org/10.1177/02704676231224705

Basha, J. Y. (2024). The negative impacts of AI tools on students in academic and real-life performance. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Commerce (IJSSC)*, 1(3), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.51470/IJSSC.2024.01.03.01

Chen, C. (2023). AI will transform teaching and learning: Let's get it right. *Stanford Human-Centered Artificial Intelligence Note*. Retrieved from https://hai.stanford.edu/news/ai-will-transform-teaching-and-learning-lets-get-it-right

Chunpeng Zhai, S. W. (2024). The effects of over-reliance on AI dialogue systems in educational environments. *Smart Learning Environments*, 11(4), 1–37. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-024-00316-7

Degni, F. (2024). *AI in education: The impact of artificial intelligence on learning ecosystems*. Milano: E.N.I.A. Innovation and Digital Transformation, Politecnico di Milano.

Dodigovic, M. (2009). Artificial intelligence and second language learning: An efficient approach to error remediation. *Language Awareness*, 16(2), 99–113. https://doi.org/10.2167/la416.0

Doroudi, S. (2023). The intertwined histories of artificial intelligence and education. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, 33(4), 885–929. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-022-00313-2

Farahani, M. S., & Ghasemi, G. (2024). Artificial intelligence in education: A comprehensive thematic study. *Forum for Education Studies*, 2(2), 112–128. https://doi.org/10.59400/fes.v2i2.1379

Gainet, C. (2025). L'IA dans l'éducation : Entre opportunités bédagogiques et défis d'équité numérique. *Sorbonne Université Dossiers*. Retrieved from https://www.sorbonne-universite.fr/dossiers/intelligence-artificielle

Gokcearslan, S. T. (2024). Benefits, challenges, and methods of artificial intelligence (AI) chatbots in education: A systematic meta-synthesis. *International Journal of Technology in Education (IJTE)*, 7(1), 19–39. https://doi.org/10.46328/ijte.600

Gwagwa, A. K. M. (2020). Artificial intelligence (AI) deployments in Africa: Benefits, challenges and policy baseline frameworks. *The African Journal of Information and Communication (AJIC)*, 26, 1–28. https://doi.org/10.23962/10539/30361

Helen Crompton, A. D. (2023). Artificial intelligence in higher education: A systematic literature review. *International Journal of Educational Technology*, 20(1), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00392-8

Jiang, R. (2022). How does artificial intelligence empower EFL teaching and learning nowadays? A review on artificial intelligence in the EFL context. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 1–8. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1049401

Julie A. Delello, W. S. (2025). AI in the classroom: Insights from educators on operational usage and student anxiety. *Education Sciences*, 15(2), 1–27. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15020001

Khaled, O. (2024). The ethics of using artificial intelligence in higher education. *Al-Hikma Journal for Philosophical Studies*, 12(3), 805–817.

Layali, K., & Al-Shlowiy, A. (2020). Students' perceptions of e-learning ESL/EFL in Saudi universities at the time of coronavirus: A literature review. *Indonesian EFL Journal*, 6(2), 97–108. https://doi.org/10.21342/ieflj.v6i2.3378

Liang, Y. (2023). Balancing technocentrism and pedagogy: The effects of AI tools in educational contexts. *Frontiers in Humanities and Social Sciences*, 3(8), 7–10.

Manning, C. (2023). *Artificial intelligence definition and foundational concepts*. Stanford Human-Centered Artificial Intelligence Glossary. Retrieved from https://hai.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/2023-03/AI-Key-Terms-Glossary

Michael L. Littman, I. A. V. (2021). *Gathering strength, gathering storms: The one hundred year study on artificial intelligence*. Stanford University Report. Retrieved from http://ai100.stanford.edu/2021-report

Mohamed Ali Khudri, E. K. (2022). Artificial intelligence in education (AIEd): A high-level academic and industry overview note. *AI and Ethics*, 2(1), 157–165. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-021-00074-z

Molenar, D. S. (2024). Researchers warn of opacity danger, call for pause in bringing unverified AI platforms to schools. *University of Colorado Today*. Retrieved from https://www.colorado.edu/today/2024/03/21/researchers-warn-danger

P. Sasikala, R. R. (2024). Study on the impact of artificial intelligence on student learning outcomes and privacy paradigms. *Journal of Digital Learning and Education*, 4(2), 145–155. https://doi.org/10.52562/jdle.v4i2.1234

Placide, E. (2024). *The integration of artificial intelligence in education: Analytical parameters*. ResearchGate Monographs. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/386179374

Sang Joon Lee, K. M. (2024). A systematic review of AI education in K-12 classrooms from 2018 to 2023: Methodological trends. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 6, 1–10.

Slimi, Z. (2023). The impact of artificial intelligence on higher education: An empirical study. *European Journal of Educational Sciences*, 10(1), 17–33. http://dx.doi.org/10.19044/ejes.v10no1a17

Sultan, C. U. (2023). Benefits of artificial intelligence and intelligent tutoring systems in modern education. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 1–9. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4546499

Willige, A. (2024). From virtual tutors to accessible textbooks: 5 ways AI is transforming global education. *World Economic Forum Reports*. Retrieved from https://www.weforum.org/stories/2024/05/ways-ai-can-benefit-education/