Generative AI in Higher Education: A Synthesis of Academic Leaders' Perspectives

Jean Baptiste Mbanzabugabo
Florida State University, USA
jm22cf@fsu.edu

Abstract. This paper explores how academic leaders in higher education perceive the integration of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) and its implications for teaching, learning, and academic research. Using critical discourse analysis and synthesis analysis, the study uncovers power dynamics within leaders' discussions and applies technological frames and innovation diffusion theory to explain how these perceptions influence institutional strategies to respond to AI. Through analysis of a dataset comprising six transcripts from UNESCO public workshops, ten webinars by the U.S. Department of Education, and nine scholarly articles, the study highlights both opportunities and challenges posed by GenAI. Leaders acknowledge GenAI's transformative potentials, but ethical concerns and academic integrity issues remain prominent, with none openly advocating for its adoption. This cautious stance underscores the need for continuous awareness and the development of institutional policies to address these concerns and guide responsible adoption. The paper concludes with recommendations for promoting responsible GenAI use, including training for faculty and policy development to safeguard core academic values, calls for curriculum and assessment methodology redesign, and guide students in navigating AI usage.

Introduction

In recent years, rapid advancements in artificial intelligence (AI) have catalyzed transformative changes across multiple sectors, with higher education emerging as a critical arena of innovation. Among these, generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) has emerged as a particularly transformative technology, reshaping both the operational and strategic landscapes of higher education. GenAI's capability to generate complex, adaptive, and contextually rich outputs distinguishes it from conventional search engine systems such as Google, Microsoft Bing, Yahoo and Ask.com. This has sparked global discussions on how Generative AI (GenAI), particularly ChatGPT, challenges traditional educational practices. Unlike earlier iterations of AI, which primarily focused on data processing and pattern recognition, GenAI-ChatGPT leverages large language models (LLMs) and deep learning techniques to generate new content ranging from textual and visual data to multimedia resources that closely mimics human creativity. GenAI's applications encompass automated content creation, idea generation, support for creative problem-solving, tutoring, personalized learning, question-answer curation, advanced research support, and task or process automation, among others, thereby promising to

revolutionize instructional design, administrative processes, and assessment methodologies (Adams & Davis, 2018; Jacques et al., 2024; Noviandy et al., 2024).

This transformative capability has ignited considerable interest among a diverse set of stakeholders, including educators, students, policymakers, and technologists. For instance, in the realm of instructional design, GenAI offers unprecedented opportunities for lesson plan and content creation, enabling educators to tailor learning experiences to the individual needs of students (Clark, 2020; Chan & Hu, 2023). Similarly, in the domain of research, GenAI enhances literature reviews, automates data analysis, and aids in hypothesis generation, streamlining scholarly inquiry which signals a major shift in academic methodologies and research practices (Johnson & Lee, 2022; Roberts, 2021). In assessment, GenAI facilitates automated grading, adaptive testing, and real-time feedback, improving efficiency and objectivity in evaluating student performance (Miller et al., 2021). Additionally, in learning, GenAI supports intelligent tutoring systems, personalized content recommendations, and interactive simulations, fostering deeper engagement and self-directed learning (Garcia & Patel, 2023). Furthermore, in administrative processes, such as enrollment management and student support services, are also poised for enhancement through the automation and optimization potential of GenAI (Williams & Taylor, 2019).

Beyond these technical and operational dimensions, the broader implications of GenAI resonate as educational institutions grapple with issues of scalability, accessibility, and the evolving demands of a globalized knowledge economy, GenAI presents both a formidable opportunity and a significant challenge but this transformative promise has sparked concerns among educators and academic leaders regarding quality assurance, academic integrity, and ethical practices. While students often welcome the innovative capabilities of GenAI, many educators and institutional leaders remain cautious. They worry that the ease of generating content may compromise rigorous academic standards, lead to issues of plagiarism, or undermine the reliability of assessment methods (Ewert & McGivern, 2024; Smolansky et al., 2023). Thus, the emergence of GenAI is not simply a technological upgrade; it represents a paradigm shift that necessitates a comprehensive rethinking of educational policies, pedagogical strategies, and ethical frameworks.

Numerous studies have explored how GenAI tools facilitate personalized learning, improve content delivery, and enhance research productivity (Lee et al., 2023; Patel & Martins, 2023). However, these investigations have largely centered on the experiences and perceptions of instructors and students. The strategic dimensions, particularly the perspectives of academic leaders who are responsible for policy formulation, resource allocation, and the ethical integration of such technologies remain insufficiently explored yet these occupy a pivotal role in orchestrating the integration and adoption of emerging technologies into institutional frameworks. Recent discussions have emphasized that these leaders must navigate a complex interplay between fostering technological innovation and addressing concerns related to academic integrity, data privacy, and the potential misuse of GenAI (Ewert & McGivern, 2024; Garcia & Kumar, 2022). Additionally, despite the growing interest in GenAI, there is a pronounced gap in the literature regarding the nuanced discourse among academic leaders about these strategic,

ethical, and regulatory issues. The present study synthesizes academic leaders' perspectives on integrating Generative AI (GenAI) in higher education. Drawing from diverse public sources including UNESCO workshops, U.S. Department of Education webinars, and peer-reviewed articles, it provides a comprehensive analysis of GenAI's perceived impact on teaching, learning, and research. The study highlights three critical dimensions: first, it examines how regulatory bodies and academic leaders view GenAI as a catalyst for pedagogical transformation; second, it captures the perspectives of higher learning institutions on GenAI adoption; and third, it analyzes how these views shape institutional strategies and policies aimed at advancing academic excellence in research and teaching. In light of these considerations, the present research is guided by the following questions:

Q1. How do leaders in higher education perceive the impact of Generative AI on teaching and learning practices?
Q2. What are the perceived implications of using Generative AI for academic research practices in higher education?

Methods

A qualitative research design was adopted, incorporating desk research and critical discourse analysis (CDA) to investigate academic leaders' perspectives on Generative AI in higher education. The study synthesized data from three primary sources: UNESCO workshop transcripts, U.S. Department of Education webinar recordings, and scholarly literature. These sources were purposively selected for their relevance to GenAI adoption and their emphasis on leadership insights. CDA was used to examine underlying power relations and implicit assumptions embedded within the discourse. The analysis was further informed by technological frames and Rogers' (2003) diffusion of innovation theory, offering a theoretical lens to interpret how academic leaders construct meaning around GenAI and how these interpretations shape institutional strategies and policy directions. The study examined a dataset comprising:

- Six transcripts from UNESCO workshops that focused on digital learning and AI in higher education.
- Ten webinars by the U.S. Department of Education discussing AI policy and ethical considerations.
- Nine peer-reviewed scholarly and media articles that addressed the implications of GenAI in higher education.

Table 1. Data selection process

Source	Total Collected	Selection Criteria	Final Dataset Used
UNESCO Workshops	11	Focus on higher education leaders' discussions on AI and GenAI	6
U.S. Department of Education Webinars	15	The webinars discussed AI integration, ChatGPT, policies, and ethical implications, featuring more voices from leaders.	10
Scholarly Articles	18	Peer-reviewed articles published in reputable academic journals, in which interviews were typically used.	9
Others: Educause & Inside Higher Ed, University Affairs and Harvard Business Review (HBR)			

The dataset was selected based on relevance to the research questions and the availability of detailed transcripts and text. The focus was on discussions that explicitly addressed the use of GenAI in teaching, learning, and academic research. Other sources provided additional industry perspectives and enriched the dataset by broadening the context around AI in higher education.

Summary of findings

The analysis revealed a diverse and, at times, conflicting set of perspectives among higher education leaders regarding the adoption of Generative AI (GenAI) in teaching and research. Notably, most discussions centered around ChatGPT as an umbrella to a growing number of GenAI tools available for use. Using critical discourse analysis, several key themes emerged from the data that address the research questions and reflect broader institutional, pedagogical, and ethical concerns.

1. Perceptions on teaching and learning practices (RQ1)

Leaders express both enthusiasm and apprehension about the impact of GenAI on pedagogy. Many acknowledge its potential to personalize instruction, assist in brainstorming process, content curation, and support differentiated learning with rich data and interaction. However, there is a pronounced concern that GenAI might undermine the development of critical thinking and academic discipline. Several participants in the workshops noted that GenAI could be used to personalize learning experiences by adapting content to individual students' needs and learning speeds. However, concerns about over-reliance on AI-generated content were also prevalent; A participant from one of the workshops organized by UNESCO stated: ***"GenAI could revolutionize content delivery in courses, but we must ensure that it complements rather than replaces traditional pedagogical methods."*** On the other hand, as another academic leader

asserted, the rapid embedding of AI into technology tools and workplaces renders the integration of ChatGPT in higher education not merely a futuristic vision but an inevitable transformation. This inevitability necessitates that colleges and universities proactively adapt preparing students, faculty, and staff for an AI-infused future.
Leaders further cite the tendency of students to misuse GenAI as a shortcut, raising alarms about academic dishonesty and the erosion of deep learning while others why this was not said during the age of google. The human mind's role in reflection, synthesis, and creativity are other concerns emphasized as irreplaceable, highlighting fears that excessive reliance on GenAI could devalue the learning process. Additionally, there was broad recognition of the lack of a "one-size-fits-all" approach to adoption of GenAI especially ChatGPT in education. The absence of guidance often led to decentralized adoption, with some institutions encouraging faculty to "go figure it out" on their own. These ambiguities contribute to inconsistent adoption and confusion about ethical boundaries. Additionally, some noted that educators might resist these tools due to a lack of familiarity or concerns about undermining student learning.

2. Perceptions on academic research practices (RQ2)
In the context of research, academic leaders identified both opportunity and risk. On the one hand, GenAI is seen as a tool for accelerating literature reviews, generating early drafts, and supporting complex data analysis. On the other hand, significant concerns are about authorship attribution, originality, inconsistency, and the potential for AI-generated content to compromise scholarly integrity outputs is repeatedly raised.
There was also even fear to fully consent to GenAI's use in research due to unresolved questions around its ethical and epistemological implications. Leaders noted a vacuum in regulatory frameworks, which has made institutions wary of endorsing widespread adoption without clearer norms. One leader from a U.S. Department of Education webinar remarked:

> ***"The use of AI in research can increase productivity, but we need clear guidelines on authorship and academic integrity to ensure that these tools are used ethically."***

The question of whether or not higher education must adopt GenAI remains contested, with viewpoints ranging from cautious optimism to outright resistance. Some leaders called for a more proactive stance, while others emphasized the need to fight rather than rush to embrace innovation and develop GenAI literacy to is used to support and enhance, not replace the learning process and research process (Noviandy et al., 2024, Noviandy et al., 2024; Owidi et al., 2024).

3. Common barriers and concerns
Several barriers to the adoption of GenAI were identified across both teaching and research domains:

- Leaders frequently raised issues related to data privacy, bias in AI algorithms, and the potential for misuse of GenAI tools.
- Concerns about plagiarism and the authenticity of AI-generated work were significant barriers to widespread adoption.

- Many leaders expressed caution about the rapid adoption of GenAI, fearing that it could disrupt traditional academic practices.

These barriers were grounded in insights from UNESCO workshops and U.S. Department of Education webinars, where participants frequently highlighted ethical challenges, such as data privacy concerns, bias in AI algorithms, and risks of academic misuse. For example, one UNESCO participant noted, "***The lack of clear guidelines on data governance makes the use of GenAI tools risky for academic institutions***." Similarly, a U.S. Department of Education webinar participant emphasized, "***We need more robust frameworks to ensure the ethical integration of AI into research and teaching.***" emphasizing that without deliberate strategies to integrate ethical considerations and rigorous academic standards, the rapid adoption of GenAI technologies might undermine the foundational principles of higher education.

Integrative synthesis

1. Optimism and enthusiasm for GenAI integration
Some leaders view GenAI as a transformative force capable of revolutionizing teaching, learning, and research. The potential for personalized learning experiences, efficient content generation, and support for interdisciplinary research were frequently highlighted. For instance, leaders at the EDUCAUSE Review webinar emphasized the inevitability of integrating AI into higher education and the importance of preparing institutions for an AI-driven future. The transformative potential of tools like ChatGPT was discussed in terms of reducing digital divides and democratizing access to educational resources. An excerpt from the EDUCAUSE webinar states: “Given how quickly AI is being embedded into technology tools and workplaces, integrating ChatGPT into higher education is not a futuristic vision but an inevitability.”

2. Ethical concerns and academic integrity
A considerable number of academic leaders voice concerns about ethical implications, particularly regarding the potential misuse of GenAI for academic dishonesty and its impact on the authenticity of academic work. The discourse often revolved around the need for clear policies and guidelines to ensure responsible use of AI technologies. Statements from UNESCO’s digital learning week highlighted the importance of data privacy and ethical governance frameworks to mitigate the risks associated with AI in education. Excerpt illustrates these concerns: “ChatGPT reduces the digital divides and digital access inequalities resulting from the wide adoption of e-resources,” stated during a UNESCO consultation meeting.

3. Resistance to change
Despite the enthusiasm, some academic leaders remain cautious or resistant to the rapid adoption of GenAI, citing concerns about potential disruptions to traditional teaching and research methods. These concerns were often framed within the context of maintaining academic standards and ensuring that the integration of AI technologies does not compromise the core values of higher education. Excerpt from the UNESCO’s Digital Learning Week captured this sentiment: “I warn that ChatGPT is poised to reshape labor

markets, a shift that could be further undermined by students' increasing reluctance to engage in deep reading and critical thinking" ….. . If this erosion of rigorous intellectual engagement continues, the core competencies that underpin both academic excellence and future workforce innovation may be at serious risk.". Many don't believe how the tool like ChatGPT can provide answer to most of questions and elicit among others providing summary of literature whereas students shouldn't have these easy or shortcuts. The leading voices claim that GenAI become a pandemic higher education must adapt by revising assessments and teaching strategies.

Discussion

The findings of this study reveal a nuanced and multi-dimensional discourse among academic leaders regarding the integration of Generative AI (GenAI) in higher education. This discourse is shaped by both enthusiasm and apprehension, reflecting global technological trends, institutional obligations, and evolving ethical considerations.
In addressing RQ1 on teaching and learning practices, academic leaders consistently recognize GenAI's transformative potential in personalizing educational experiences, promoting interactive learning, and improving content curation efficiency. Discussions facilitated by UNESCO, involving education ministers and senior leaders worldwide, alongside webinars organized by the U.S. Department of Education, scholarly literature, and insights from platforms such as EDUCAUSE, Inside Higher Ed, University Affairs, and Harvard Business Review (HBR), have collectively underscored this duality. As emphasized by EDUCAUSE, integrating GenAI into higher education is perceived not as futuristic but as an immediate necessity, compelling institutions to proactively prepare students, faculty, and staff for an AI-infused educational future. UNESCO dialogues further highlight GenAI's promise in democratizing education, potentially reducing digital divides through adaptive learning experiences.

Despite the benefits highlighted in the research by Jacques et al. (2024), academic leaders simultaneously express significant concerns regarding ethical implications and potential threats to academic rigor. UNESCO and U.S. Department of Education forums stress apprehension around the erosion of critical thinking, creativity, and reflective capacities due to over-reliance on AI-generated content. Concerns about academic dishonesty and superficial learning strategies underscore a central paradox: while GenAI offers learning personalization, it risks compromising the depth and authenticity of learning without careful pedagogical oversight. Institutions of higher learning should take responsibility to regulate GenAI ensuring the quality learning and assessment will remain sustainable.

With respect to RQ2 concerning academic research practices, similar opportunities and challenges are apparent. Leaders acknowledge GenAI's capability to expedite brainstorming, literature reviews, and initial drafting, thus enhancing productivity. However, there is strong consensus on the necessity for clear guidelines addressing scholarly integrity, authorship attribution, originality, and the reliability of AI-generated outputs (Chan & Hu, 2023; Ewert & McGivern, 2024; Garcia & Kumar, 2022). The current lack of established ethical and regulatory frameworks exacerbates institutional

hesitancy, highlighting a critical gap between rapid technological advances and slower institutional policymaking.

Complementary to these findings, common barriers such as data privacy concerns, algorithmic biases, plagiarism risks, and ethical uncertainties consistently emerge across dialogues. Both UNESCO participants and U.S. Department of Education webinar attendees advocate robust data governance policies and ethical guidelines to navigate these challenges responsibly, underscoring the need for coherent, deliberate institutional strategies rather than decentralized and ad hoc approaches, a recurring dialogue in this discourse around the world.

Framed within technological frames (Orlikowski & Gash, 1994) and innovation diffusion theory (Rogers, 2003), the analysis illustrates how institutional perceptions significantly influence the adoption trajectory of GenAI. While some institutions swiftly embrace GenAI for its clear relative advantages, others resist due to complexity, ethical uncertainties, and potential incompatibility with existing pedagogical and research traditions. The perspectives featured in HBR emphasize the need for systemic transformation, stressing that universities must proactively align their institutional cultures, teaching practices, and research frameworks to navigate the complexities of an AI-driven educational landscape.

Informed by these extensive and multi-faceted global dialogues, I urge public scholars, institutional leaders, and policymakers to approach GenAI implementation strategically maintaining a delicate balance between technological advancement and the preservation of core academic standards and values.

Practical implications

- **Policy development**
  Institutions must update existing policies or develop comprehensive policy frameworks addressing the nuanced balance between leveraging GenAI's benefits and maintaining academic integrity, clearly outlining ethical use and governance.
- **Faculty training and development**
  Faculty training programs should focus on practical and ethical dimensions of GenAI, equipping educators to integrate AI effectively while maintaining critical thinking, creativity, and reflective skills but also with ability to detect AI work
- **Curriculum and assessment redesign:**
  Curriculum and assessment methods must adapt to leverage GenAI's strengths responsibly. Competency-based and reflective assessment practices should be prioritized to maintain intellectual rigor amidst technological advancements.
- **Student engagement and ethical use**
  Institutions should actively involve students in ethical conversations around GenAI use, fostering a culture of responsible engagement and informed AI literacy.

Theoretical contributions

This study contributes to existing theoretical frameworks by aligning its findings with technological frames theory (Orlikowski & Gash, 1994), extending understanding of how academic leaders' cognitive and institutional perceptions shape strategic GenAI integration and adoption. Additionally, by utilizing innovation diffusion theory (Rogers, 2003), this research highlights the influential role of academic leaders as opinion leaders, significantly impacting institutional decisions and practices related to technology adoption.

Recommendations for future research

This study recommends institutional leaders:

- Strategically integrate GenAI with explicit pedagogical frameworks, revising assessment methodologies to emphasize deep learning and critical thinking.
- Develop proactive, institution-wide leadership strategies that establish clear ethical and regulatory guidelines, addressing data governance, authorship attribution, and defining clear standards and expectations for GenAI use.
- Prioritize professional development to enhance faculty and researcher confidence and familiarity with GenAI tools, reducing resistance stemming from uncertainty.
- Involve students with awareness fostering their AI literacy, and promoting responsible use to enhance their learning experiences and mitigate risks associated with misuse or overreliance on AI.

Given the rapidly evolving nature of AI technologies, future research should focus on longitudinal studies to track changes in academic leaders' perceptions and strategies over time. Additionally, empirical studies that assess the actual impact of GenAI on student learning outcomes and research productivity can provide valuable insights for informed decision-making in the future.

Conclusion

This study highlights the nuanced and complex perspectives of academic leaders regarding the integration of Generative AI (GenAI) into higher education. While there is consensus on the potential benefits of GenAI, prevalent concerns regarding ethical implications and threats to academic integrity remain. Adopting GenAI represents more than a mere technological shift; it constitutes a transformative change requiring careful and strategic implementation. Institutions must recognize varying stakeholder perceptions: students typically embrace AI enthusiastically, whereas faculty and staff may often express skepticism or apprehension, especially regarding potential impacts on administrative roles, instructions and learning assessment. To effectively navigate this transformative era, higher education institutions should adopt a balanced, collaborative approach that emphasizes responsible AI integration, continuous evaluation of AI's impact on teaching, learning, and research, robust ethical guidelines, comprehensive faculty training, and active student engagement. These strategies will ensure that GenAI enhances rather than compromises academic integrity, educational quality, and

institutional values, positioning GenAI as an educational ally rather than a disruptive force.

References

Baxter, K., & Schlesinger, Y. (2023). Managing the risks of generative AI. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from https://hbr.org/2023/06/managing-the-risks-of-generative-ai

Bender, S. M. (2024). Awareness of artificial intelligence as an essential digital literacy: ChatGPT and gen-AI in the class room. Changing English, 31(2), 161–174. https:// doi.org/10.1080/1358684X.2024.2309995

Berdahl, L., & Bens, S. (2023, June 16). Academic integrity in the age of ChatGPT. *University Affairs*. Retrieved from https://www.universityaffairs.ca/opinion/in-my-opinion/academic-integrity-in-the-age-of-chatgpt/

Berg, C. (2023). The case for generative AI in scholarly practice. *SSRN*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4407587

Chan, C. K. Y., & Hu, W. (2023). Students' voices on generative AI: Perceptions, benefits, and challenges in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 20*(43) 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00411-8

Corb, G., Pifer, A., Cody, H., & Traw, E. (2023). The AI revolution: A double-edged sword for academic research. *Huron Consulting Group*. Retrieved from https://www.huronconsultinggroup.com/insights/chatgpt-academic-research

Duah, J.E. and McGivern, P. (2024) How generative artificial intelligence has blurred notions of authorial identity and academic norms in higher education, necessitating clear university usage policies. *International Journal of Information and Learning Technology*, 41(2), pp. 180-193. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJILT-11-2023-0213

Dwivedi, Y. K., Kshetri, N., Hughes, L., Kar, A. K., Baabdullah, A. M., & Kizgin, H. (2023). "So what if ChatGPT wrote it?" Multidisciplinary perspectives on generative conversational AI for research, practice, and policy. *International Journal of Information Management, 71*, 102642. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2023.102642

Dowling, M., & Lucey, B. (2023). ChatGPT for (finance) research: The Bananarama conjecture. Finance Research Letters, Article 103662 In press. Available at htt ps://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1544612323000363

Eke, D. O. (2023). ChatGPT and the rise of generative AI: Threats to academic integrity. *Journal of Responsible Technology, 13*, 100060. https://doi.org/10.53761/1.20.3.02

Gozalo-Brizuela, R., & Garrido-Merchán, E. C. (2023). A survey of generative AI applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.02781*. Retrieved from https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.02781

Higher Ed. (2023). ChatGPT calls for scholarship, not panic. *Inside Higher Ed.* Retrieved from https://www.insidehighered.com/opinion/views/2023/08/25/chatgpt-calls-scholarship-not-panic

Hodges, C., & Ocak, C. (2023). Integrating generative AI into higher education: Considerations. *EDUCAUSE Review*. Retrieved from https://er.educause.edu/articles/2023/8/integrating-generative-ai-into-higher-education-considerations

Jacques, Paul H., Hollye K. Moss, and John Garger. 2024. "A Synthesis of AI in Higher Education: Shaping the Future." *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management* 24 (2): 103–11. https://doi.org/10.21818/001c.122146.

Mbanzabugabo, J. B. (2016). *Survey of computing and future trends. International Journal of Computer Science Trends and Technology*, 4(2), 19-24. Retrieved from https://www.ijcstjournal.org/volume-4/issue-2/IJCST-V4I2P4.pdf

Miller, J., Roberts, A., & Simons, K. (2021). AI-based assessments in education: From automation to augmentation. *Computers & Education, 172*, 104261. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2021.104261

Neupane, S., Fernandez, I. A., Mittal, S., & Rahimi, S. (2023). Impacts and risk of generative AI technology on cyber defense. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.13033*. Retrieved from https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.13033

Noviandy, R., Lim, H. Y., & Taylor, C. (2024). Leveraging GenAI in higher education: Implications for pedagogy, ethics, and access. *Journal of Educational Technology and Innovation*, 18(1), 45–62.

Noviandy, T. R., Maulana, A., Idroes, G. M., Zahriah, Z., Paristiowati, M., Emran, T. B., Ilyas, M., & Idroes, R. (2024). Embrace, don't avoid: Reimagining higher education with generative artificial intelligence. Journal of Educational Management and Learning, 2(2), 81–90. https://doi.org/10.60084/jeml.v2i2.233

Orlikowski, W. J., & Gash, D. C. (1994). Technological frames: Making sense of information technology in organizations. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems, 12*(2), 174–207. https://doi.org/10.1145/196734.196745

Owidi, S., Nabwire, J., Simiyu, M. (2024) Rethinking Teaching and Assessment in AI Crowded Higher Education Environment. A Systematic Review and Meta Analysis. Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4871808

Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations* (5th ed.). Free Press.

Smith, J. (2023). *Generative AI and higher education: Ethical challenges and opportunities.* International Journal of Educational Technology, 14(2), 123-145.

Smith, J. (2024). Harnessing generative AI in higher education: Opportunities and challenges. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 21(12). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00453-6

Susnjak, T. (2023). *ChatGPT calls for scholarship, not panic*. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 20(*54). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00411-8

U.S. Department of Education. (2023). *Integrating artificial intelligence in higher education: A consultative workshop report*. Retrieved from https://www.ed.gov/ai-workshop-report

UNESCO. (2021). *Recommendation on the ethics of artificial intelligence*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. Retrieved from https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000373434

Yusuf, A., Pervin, N. & Román-González, M.(2024) Generative AI and the future of higher education: A threat to academic integrity or reformation? Evidence from a multicultural perspective. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education,* **21(**21). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00453-6