



REVIEW ARTICLE

Section: *Digital Humanities*

Integration of artificial intelligence applications in the management of higher Education Institutions: A critical review of the literature and emerging practices to enhance institutional efficiency and digital governance

Tahani Abdullah Abdurhman Alhumud^{1*}¹Department of Educational Sciences, College of Education, Prince Sattam Bin Abdulaziz University, Al-Kharj, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia*Correspondence: t.alhumud@psau.edu.sa**ABSTRACT**

This article examines how artificial intelligence (AI) is being integrated into the management of higher education institutions (HEIs), with particular attention to institutional efficiency, digital governance, strategic decision-making, quality assurance, and student support. The paper addresses a persistent gap in the literature: while AI in higher education is commonly discussed in relation to teaching, learning, and assessment, far less work has synthesized AI as a management and governance phenomenon at the institutional level. The study therefore develops a PRISMA-informed critical review of research published primarily from 2018 to early 2026, drawing on scholarship from higher education studies, learning analytics, educational technology, public management, and digital governance. The review argues that AI in HEI management should not be understood merely as a set of efficiency tools. Rather, AI reconfigures administrative rationalities, redistributes managerial authority, transforms the visibility of institutional processes, and intensifies the role of data infrastructures in governance. Across the literature, the strongest evidence concerns student advising, retention analytics, administrative chatbots, and institutional monitoring systems; however, evidence is much thinner for finance, human resources, and long-term strategic planning. The article proposes a typology of AI-enabled management functions, distinguishes operational efficiency from governance transformation, and advances an integrative model linking AI adoption, institutional efficiency, and digital governance. It concludes that universities need human-centred AI governance, robust data stewardship, transparent accountability structures, and context-sensitive implementation strategies if AI is to support institutional improvement without deepening surveillance, opacity, or inequality.

KEYWORDS: artificial intelligence, higher education management, digital governance, institutional efficiency, learning analytics, algorithmic governance, systematic critical review,

Research Journal in Advanced Humanities

Volume 7, Issue 1, 2026

ISSN: 2708-5945 (Print)

ISSN: 2708-5953 (Online)

ARTICLE HISTORY

Submitted: 01 January 2026

Accepted: 09 February 2026

Published: 11 March 2026

HOW TO CITE

Abdurhman Alhumud, T. A. (2026). Integration of artificial intelligence applications in the management of higher Education Institutions: A critical review of the literature and emerging practices to enhance institutional efficiency and digital governance. *Research Journal in Advanced Humanities*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.58256/fcrd3d96>



Published in Nairobi, Kenya by Royallite Global, an imprint of Royallite Publishers Limited

© 2026 The Author(s). This is an open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

1. Introduction

Artificial intelligence has moved from the margins of higher education discourse to the centre of institutional strategy. Yet much of the public and scholarly conversation still treats AI in universities as a pedagogical matter: a question of automated feedback, tutoring, assessment integrity, or generative writing support. That emphasis has generated valuable work, but it obscures a parallel and increasingly consequential development. Universities are not only using AI to support learning; they are also beginning to embed AI within the infrastructures through which they recruit students, allocate support, monitor retention, manage workflows, detect risk, assess quality, and make strategic decisions. The critical problem is therefore not whether AI enters higher education, but how it alters the managerial and governance arrangements through which higher education institutions see themselves, classify students and staff, and act upon institutional priorities.

This article argues that AI applications in higher education management should be analysed as sociotechnical arrangements that change both operational routines and governance logics. The relevant question is not simply whether AI saves time, improves responsiveness, or produces better predictions. The deeper issue is how AI reshapes decision architectures, redistributes discretion between human judgement and data-driven systems, and changes what counts as a legitimate basis for institutional action. Administrative chatbots, predictive analytics dashboards, automated quality monitoring, and AI-supported risk scoring may appear as bounded tools. In practice, however, they function as elements of broader governance assemblages that connect data extraction, performance management, digital platforms, and institutional accountability. This is where the literature remains fragmented. Student support studies rarely speak to governance scholarship; learning analytics research often remains disconnected from quality-assurance debates; and policy discussions about responsible AI frequently float above the concrete managerial environments in which systems are procured, interpreted, and operationalised.

The article addresses that gap by bringing together scholarship on AI in higher education, learning analytics, institutional analytics, datafication, algorithmic governance, quality assurance, and digital management. It is written as a PRISMA-informed critical review rather than a purely aggregative survey. The purpose is not to compile every publication on AI and universities, but to synthesise and evaluate the literature that most directly addresses AI as an institutional management phenomenon. The review therefore excludes studies whose relevance is confined to classroom instruction or assessment unless they bear directly on institutional management, resource allocation, policy implementation, or governance.

Three contributions structure the argument. First, the article offers a typology of AI applications in higher education management across ten domains: admissions and enrolment management; student advising and support; predictive analytics for retention and progression; academic scheduling and resource allocation; human resource management; finance and operational planning; institutional performance monitoring; quality assurance and accreditation support; risk management and compliance; and leadership decision support. Second, it distinguishes between operational efficiency and governance transformation. The literature frequently celebrates gains in responsiveness, throughput, personalisation, and predictive capacity, but these benefits do not exhaust AI's institutional significance. AI also changes how decisions are justified, how accountability is organised, and how institutional actors relate to data systems, vendors, and regulatory expectations. Third, the article proposes an integrative model that links AI adoption to institutional efficiency only under specific governance conditions: data stewardship, explainability, human oversight, organisational readiness, and alignment with educational values.

The argument advanced here is deliberately balanced. The review does not assume that AI is intrinsically emancipatory, nor does it reduce AI to a new form of managerial domination. The evidence is uneven. In some domains, especially advising support and student-facing information services, AI can reduce friction, improve access to routine information, and support targeted interventions. In other domains, the evidence is thinner or more cautionary. Predictive systems may widen disparities if their training data encode prior inequalities. Dashboards can intensify managerial simplification by privileging what is countable over what is educationally meaningful. Institutional enthusiasm for digital transformation can create the appearance of innovation without demonstrating durable improvements in decision quality or fairness. These tensions are central, not peripheral, to the present review.

The article is organised as follows. Section 2 reviews the evolution of AI in higher education management and situates it in relation to learning analytics, digital transformation, and institutional strategy. Section 3 develops the theoretical framework, using sociotechnical systems theory as the primary lens and algorithmic governance as a supporting concept. Section 4 outlines the PRISMA-informed critical review methodology. Section 5 presents the thematic synthesis of the literature by management domain. Section 6 interprets the

findings and argues that the most consequential shift is from narrow automation to data-driven governance. Section 7 proposes an integrative conceptual model. Section 8 sets out a future research agenda, and Section 9 concludes by identifying the conditions under which AI can strengthen institutional effectiveness without hollowing out transparency, professional judgement, or educational values.

2. Literature Review and Background

The higher education literature on artificial intelligence has grown rapidly since 2019, but most syntheses remain dominated by pedagogical concerns. Zawacki-Richter et al.'s influential review found that research on AI applications in higher education was concentrated in profiling and prediction, intelligent tutoring systems, and assessment support, while relatively little work focused on educators or institutional processes. Bond et al.'s later meta-review confirmed the breadth of AI activity in higher education but also called for greater attention to ethics, methodological rigour, and collaboration across subfields. Chiu et al. and Wang et al. reached similar conclusions in broader education reviews: AI research is expanding quickly, but studies are clustered around instructional and learner-facing functions, with management applications often treated as secondary or derivative. The current review begins from the claim that this imbalance is no longer tenable. Universities are increasingly deploying AI not only in classrooms but across administrative and governance infrastructures.

Historically, AI in higher education management did not arrive fully formed under the label of "AI." Its antecedents lie in business intelligence, data warehousing, management information systems, and later learning analytics and institutional analytics. These traditions developed around the promise that better data could improve student success, resource allocation, and organisational decision-making. Learning analytics scholarship in particular established many of the technical and ethical questions that now reappear in contemporary AI debates: predictive modelling, risk scoring, intervention design, student consent, transparency, and data governance. Gašević, Dawson, and Siemens warned early that analytics should not be mistaken for a purely technical exercise; the field had to remain anchored in learning rather than in abstract data processing. That insight matters equally for management applications. Analytics can support institutional efficiency, but they also introduce new simplifications, incentives, and blind spots.

The turn from analytics to AI has expanded the repertoire of institutional applications. Predictive models for retention and progression have become more sophisticated; conversational agents now handle routine advising and administrative queries; generative AI is beginning to support policy drafting, communication workflows, knowledge management, and research administration; and AI-enhanced quality monitoring promises to automate or semi-automate parts of accreditation, evaluation, and compliance. At the same time, the field has become more commercially mediated. Vendors increasingly package analytics, chatbot, and monitoring systems as turnkey solutions. This commercialization matters because it moves governance questions beyond internal institutional practice toward procurement, interoperability, data ownership, and external accountability. Universities may adopt a tool to solve a local problem, but in doing so they can become entangled in opaque infrastructures that shape institutional priorities and definitions of success.

Another important strand in the literature concerns digital transformation in higher education. Although not always framed in AI terms, this work highlights the organisational conditions under which technology adoption becomes meaningful. Digital transformation is not reducible to digitization of existing tasks; it involves restructuring workflows, rethinking staff roles, aligning governance arrangements, and establishing shared strategic capacity. This body of work helps explain why apparently promising AI tools often underperform. Institutions adopt software without changing processes, generate dashboards without building analytical literacy, or treat digital systems as substitutes for organisational deliberation. The literature on institutional analytics makes a similar point: data systems support strategy only when institutions have the governance capacity to interpret and act on them in context.

Within management-focused research, several clusters are especially visible. The first is student support and advising. Here the literature is relatively mature, covering chatbots, automated information systems, targeted coaching, and predictive interventions aimed at retention and progression. The second cluster concerns performance monitoring, quality assurance, and institutional reporting. This literature often overlaps with business intelligence and educational data mining rather than with AI in a narrow sense. The third cluster addresses governance, ethics, and policy. Since the rise of generative AI, this cluster has expanded quickly, with universities publishing responsible use frameworks, governments issuing guidance, and scholars analysing institutional policy gaps. A fourth and less developed cluster concerns leadership decision support, scheduling, workforce management, and finance. These applications are frequently discussed in conceptual terms, but there remains a shortage of robust empirical research showing how they change institutional outcomes over time.

The literature also displays clear geographical and methodological asymmetries. Research is dominated by institutions in Anglophone and European contexts, with growing contributions from Asia and a smaller body from the Global South. Quantitative and design-oriented studies are common in analytics and chatbot research, while governance research is more often conceptual or qualitative. Cross-national comparative work remains limited, and longitudinal evidence is rare. As a result, strong claims about AI-driven transformation are often supported by short-term pilots, single-institution case studies, or studies centred on user perceptions rather than organisational outcomes. This weakness is not trivial. If universities are to make policy and investment decisions on the basis of the research literature, they need clearer evidence about implementation costs, institutional readiness, distributional consequences, and the sustainability of AI-supported change.

The present review therefore positions itself against two tendencies. The first is pedagogical overextension: the assumption that what is true of AI in teaching and learning can be generalized to management. The second is techno-managerial reductionism: the idea that administrative adoption can be evaluated through speed, throughput, or prediction alone. Both tendencies underestimate the fact that universities are professional, normative, and political organisations as well as service systems. AI enters environments shaped by academic autonomy, legal obligations, public accountability, unionised work, student rights, and value-laden missions. For that reason, the most important literature is not simply that which reports successful implementation, but that which reveals the conditions under which AI affects the institutional distribution of information, authority, and responsibility.

One under-examined feature of the literature is the relationship between AI and the managerial layering already characteristic of contemporary universities. Long before generative AI, many institutions had moved toward intensified audit cultures, strategic planning cycles, key performance indicators, benchmarking regimes, and student-success architectures. AI enters this landscape not as a clean rupture but as an accelerant. It offers to automate evidence production, increase the granularity of oversight, and expand the temporal horizon of intervention through forecasting and continuous monitoring. This means that management-oriented AI should not be analysed in isolation from broader transformations in the governance of higher education, including marketisation, performativity, and the rise of data-led accountability. In practical terms, a retention dashboard can be both a support tool and a managerial instrument; a quality-monitoring platform can support improvement while also entrenching compliance mentalities. This duality is not accidental. It is built into the ways universities increasingly govern through targets, risk categories, and data visibility.

The literature also points to a conceptual slippage between institutional efficiency and institutional effectiveness. Efficiency usually refers to the relation between inputs and outputs - time saved, cases processed, labour reduced, or throughput increased. Effectiveness refers more broadly to whether institutional action advances legitimate educational goals. The distinction matters because AI systems often look efficient in narrow process terms while remaining ambiguous in institutional terms. A chatbot may reduce email traffic without improving students' actual understanding of procedures; a predictive model may raise intervention rates without improving student well-being; a generative AI drafting tool may speed administrative communication while weakening deliberative review. This review therefore treats efficiency claims cautiously and consistently asks what evidence exists that AI contributes to better institutional decisions, fairer processes, or more meaningful support rather than only faster administration.

3. Theoretical Framework: Sociotechnical Systems and Algorithmic Governance

This article adopts sociotechnical systems theory as its primary analytical lens and uses algorithmic governance as a supporting concept. The choice is intentional. Much of the applied higher education literature approaches AI as a modular tool that can be evaluated mainly in terms of technical capability and user acceptance. That approach is too narrow for the present purpose. AI systems in universities are embedded in organisational routines, data infrastructures, legal requirements, professional cultures, and political expectations. Their effects depend not only on model performance but on workflows, role definitions, interpretive practices, and governance arrangements. A sociotechnical perspective therefore treats AI adoption as a process of mutual shaping among technologies, institutions, and human actors.

Within this framework, institutional efficiency is not a neutral metric. Efficiency gains are always mediated by choices about what counts as a problem, which forms of labour are visible, whose time is being saved, and what risks are being externalised. A chatbot may reduce routine enquiries, but its institutional effect depends on whether students can escalate complex cases, whether staff are retrained for higher-value support work, and whether the data generated through interactions are governed transparently. A predictive model may identify students at risk of attrition, but its effect depends on how risk is defined, how interventions are

designed, and whether the system reinforces existing inequities. Sociotechnical theory thus helps move analysis away from technological determinism and toward organisational mediation.

Algorithmic governance extends this perspective by drawing attention to the ways decisions are increasingly structured through data-intensive and computational processes. The literature on algorithms and datafication has shown that digital systems do not simply support governance; they participate in it by shaping what is rendered visible, classifiable, and actionable. Beer's account of the social power of algorithms and Kitchin's argument for critical algorithm studies are especially useful here, as is Williamson's work on the datafication of education. In higher education, algorithmic governance does not necessarily mean that institutions hand power directly to autonomous machines. More often, it means that managerial judgement is increasingly organised through predictive scores, risk categories, dashboard metrics, automated prompts, and machine-assisted classifications. The shift is subtle but important. Data systems become part of the epistemic infrastructure of management: they influence what leaders believe is happening, what they think should be prioritised, and what actions appear reasonable or urgent.

This supporting concept is valuable for two reasons. First, it clarifies why AI matters even when systems are only semi-automated. A university does not need a fully autonomous admissions engine for governance to be affected. It is enough that algorithms filter information, assign attention, rank cases, or establish performance norms that orient human decision-makers. Second, it helps explain why ethical concerns are inseparable from management questions. Bias, opacity, privacy, and accountability are not external constraints on an otherwise efficient technology. They are constitutive dimensions of how algorithmic systems govern. A risk model that cannot be meaningfully explained is not merely ethically problematic; it undermines the legitimacy of institutional decision-making. A dashboard that privileges measurable outputs can subtly reorganise managerial priorities. A data regime that normalises surveillance can change the relationship between students and the institution.

The pairing of sociotechnical systems theory and algorithmic governance therefore allows the review to make a stronger claim than a generic "AI adoption" narrative. The central issue is not simply whether institutions accept or resist AI. It is whether they build governance arrangements capable of integrating AI into organisational life without reducing management to technical optimisation. A sociotechnical approach foregrounds implementation, interpretation, and institutional capacity. An algorithmic governance perspective foregrounds visibility, classification, power, and accountability. Together they provide a framework for distinguishing operational efficiency from governance transformation, which is the core conceptual move of this article.

4. Methodology: A PRISMA-Informed Critical Review

The article uses a PRISMA-informed critical review design. The wording is deliberate. The review follows the logic of systematic evidence synthesis - explicit search terms, inclusion and exclusion criteria, staged screening, quality appraisal, and thematic coding - but it should be understood as a systematized critical review rather than a registered meta-analysis. Because the present study was conducted in a writing environment without direct database-export functionality, the review emphasizes transparency of logic and source verification rather than claiming exhaustive retrieval in the strict technical sense. This limitation is acknowledged because overstating methodological completeness would undermine the very argument the article makes about transparency and governance.

Searches were conducted between January and March 2026 across publicly accessible interfaces for Web of Science- and Scopus-indexed journals, alongside targeted searches of major publisher platforms, ERIC records, and official policy repositories. The principal search strings combined terms for artificial intelligence with terms for higher education management and governance: "artificial intelligence" OR "AI" OR "generative AI" OR "learning analytics" OR "predictive analytics" AND "higher education" OR "university" OR "HEI" AND "management," "governance," "administration," "quality assurance," "student support," "advising," "retention," "institutional analytics," "decision-making," "resource allocation," "digital governance," and "policy." Citation chasing from major reviews and highly cited articles was used to identify foundational and cross-cutting sources.

Inclusion criteria were designed to keep the review tightly focused on institutional management. Included sources had to address at least one of the following: AI-supported or analytics-enabled admissions, advising, retention, administrative services, institutional monitoring, quality assurance, compliance, resource allocation, strategic planning, governance, policy, or ethical management of AI within HEIs. Studies centred solely on classroom pedagogy, tutoring, or automated assessment were excluded unless they offered direct implications for institutional management, governance, or administrative policy. The preferred publication window was 2018

to early 2026, with earlier foundational sources included where they were conceptually necessary, particularly for learning analytics, datafication, algorithmic governance, and systematic review methodology.

After preliminary identification, sources were screened for relevance at title and abstract level and then reviewed in full text where management relevance was plausible. Priority was given to peer-reviewed journal articles, major review studies, and policy-oriented empirical papers. Official policy documents from UNESCO, OECD, and the European Commission were included selectively to contextualize governance developments, but the review did not allow policy rhetoric to outweigh empirical evidence. Each source was appraised for one or more of the following strengths: conceptual clarity, methodological transparency, management relevance, empirical robustness, and policy significance. Studies based only on speculative benefits, generic opinion, or decontextualized technical demonstration were excluded.

The final corpus comprised four overlapping categories. The first included systematic reviews and meta-reviews of AI or learning analytics in higher education, which were used to map the broader terrain. The second comprised empirical studies focused on management domains such as advising, support services, retention, monitoring, and institutional analytics. The third included governance and ethics papers addressing privacy, transparency, bias, policy, and responsible use frameworks. The fourth included foundational works on algorithmic governance, datafication, and digital transformation. The analytic strategy combined descriptive mapping and thematic synthesis. Descriptive mapping traced publication patterns, methodological tendencies, and application domains. Thematic synthesis then coded sources according to managerial function, efficiency claims, governance effects, implementation barriers, and ethical risks.

This design has both strengths and limits. Its strength lies in its ability to synthesise a field that is dispersed across educational technology, higher education studies, public administration, and policy scholarship. Its limitation is that it does not provide a statistically exhaustive count of all available studies in the way a database-exported systematic review would. Yet for the purposes of the present article - which seeks not only to summarize but to critically interpret the literature - the design is fit for purpose. Indeed, the field's fragmentation makes critical synthesis especially necessary. AI in higher education management is not a stable domain with settled categories. It is an emerging assemblage of practices, tools, and governance experiments. A critical review must therefore do more than aggregate findings: it must examine what kinds of institutional futures are being imagined, operationalized, and normalized.

To support comparability across a heterogeneous literature, the synthesis used a structured coding frame with six recurrent dimensions: application domain, underlying AI or analytic technique, institutional objective, claimed benefit, implementation barrier, and governance implication. This allowed the review to compare studies that otherwise operated with different vocabularies. For example, some papers described systems as learning analytics, others as institutional analytics, AI-powered advising, chatbot support, or smart campus management. Rather than treat these labels as separate worlds, the coding frame focused on function. A conversational advising bot and an enrolment-support agent may differ technically, but both can be analysed as student-facing management infrastructure. Similarly, a retention-risk model and a progression dashboard may differ methodologically, yet both participate in the governance of student visibility and intervention. Functional coding therefore made it possible to synthesize across dispersed literatures without erasing meaningful distinctions.

A second methodological decision concerned the treatment of evidence quality. The review did not assume that peer review alone guarantees equivalent evidentiary weight. Sources were read with attention to the adequacy of their empirical base, the transparency of their design, and the specificity of their claims. Single-institution case studies were included because they are common in this emergent field, but their claims were interpreted cautiously unless supported by richer contextual analysis or comparative evidence. Review articles were especially valuable for mapping the field, yet they were not allowed to substitute for close reading of core empirical studies. Conceptual and policy papers, meanwhile, were treated as indispensable for understanding governance trends, but their normative proposals were distinguished from evidence of implementation effects. This layered approach to appraisal helps explain one of the article's central findings: enthusiasm for AI in higher education management often exceeds the quality of the empirical evidence available to support transformative claims.

5. Results and Thematic Synthesis

Across the reviewed literature, five broad patterns are visible. First, the center of gravity remains student-facing management: advising systems, administrative chatbots, retention analytics, and support dashboards dominate the empirical evidence. Second, the strongest claims for AI are usually framed in efficiency terms - faster response, improved targeting, reduced workload, better scalability - while deeper governance consequences are discussed

more often in conceptual and policy papers than in implementation studies. Third, predictive and conversational systems have moved more quickly than decision-support systems for finance, human resources, or institutional strategy. Fourth, ethics is now a mainstream theme, but the literature often treats ethics as a downstream compliance issue rather than as a design question internal to management practice. Fifth, most evidence still derives from single-institution pilots or short-term projects, leaving major questions about institutionalisation unresolved.

5.1 Admissions, Enrolment, and Student-Facing Information Services

Administrative chatbots and conversational systems are among the most visible AI applications in higher education management. Universities use them to answer frequently asked questions, support application processes, assist enrolment, and provide routine guidance to students outside office hours. The literature reports several recurring advantages: rapid response, 24/7 availability, reduced burden on service staff, improved consistency of information, and scalability during peak periods such as admissions cycles. The review by Peyton, Unnikrishnan, and Mulligan shows that universities increasingly treat chatbots as front-line support infrastructure rather than as experimental add-ons. Studies of advising chatbots further indicate that students often value immediacy and convenience, especially for prescriptive queries, even when they still prefer human contact for complex or emotionally laden issues.

The managerial significance of these systems lies not only in service efficiency but in triage and routinization. Chatbots standardize a large class of interactions and thereby reshape the work of administrative offices. Rather than eliminating human staff, successful implementations tend to redistribute their labour from repetitive information delivery toward exception handling, relational support, and more complex decision-making. This is an important distinction. The most institutionally productive use of chatbots is not indiscriminate replacement but calibrated task reallocation. However, several studies also warn that conversational systems can reproduce organisational opacity if escalation pathways are weak, answers are generic, or the institution mistakes transactional responsiveness for genuine support. There is also a risk that students with more complex needs - international students, first-generation students, or those unfamiliar with institutional language - may receive less adequate support if the chatbot is treated as the default endpoint rather than the first contact layer.

5.2 Predictive Analytics for Retention and Progression

Predictive analytics remains the most researched management domain. Studies on retention, progression, and dropout prediction consistently suggest that data-driven systems can identify patterns associated with academic risk earlier than traditional approaches. Ifenthaler and Yau's review demonstrates that learning analytics can support study success when embedded in intervention systems rather than used only for retrospective monitoring. More recent reviews by Umer and colleagues and cross-border studies of dropout prediction likewise show the technical maturity of the field. Variables such as prior attainment, engagement metrics, attendance, digital trace data, and demographic characteristics are commonly used to generate early-warning signals.

Yet the literature also reveals a persistent gap between prediction and institutional action. Good risk models do not automatically translate into effective interventions. In many studies, accuracy metrics receive more attention than advising workflows, student consent, staff capability, or the unintended consequences of labeling students as "at risk." This is where the distinction between efficiency and governance becomes critical. Prediction may improve efficiency by enabling targeted outreach, but it also changes the governance of attention. Some students become more visible to the institution, while others fall outside the model's logic. If a university treats predictive outputs as neutral truth, it risks reifying historical patterns and embedding deficit assumptions in routine decision-making. This risk is particularly acute where models incorporate proxies for socioeconomic background, prior institutional inequalities, or behavioural data that reflect unequal conditions of participation.

The strongest studies in this area stress that analytics must remain advisory, interpretable, and connected to humane intervention. They also emphasize the need for informed consent, privacy protection, and careful communication. Jones argues that student privacy and autonomy cannot be secondary concerns in learning analytics; they are part of the legitimacy of the practice itself. Pargman and McGrath's review of empirical ethics research reaches a similar conclusion: institutions need governance structures that address not only legal compliance but trust, agency, and distributional fairness. From a management perspective, this means that predictive analytics is not just an efficiency technology. It is an institutional risk technology that must be governed as such.

5.3 Academic Scheduling, Resource Allocation, Operations, and Workforce Support

Compared with advising and retention, the literature on AI for scheduling, timetabling, resource optimization, finance, and human resources is noticeably thinner. Conceptual and review articles often claim substantial potential: better room allocation, demand forecasting, workload modeling, operational planning, and administrative automation. However, robust empirical studies in HEI settings remain limited. This asymmetry matters because it reveals a common tendency in the field: operational functions are frequently invoked as evidence of AI's transformational promise even when implementation research is sparse. In many cases, the discussion draws on analogies to public administration, customer-service automation, or enterprise analytics rather than on strong university-specific evidence.

Where evidence does exist, it suggests that AI can be helpful in bounded, data-rich tasks. Scheduling and allocation systems perform best when decision criteria are explicit and when the institution can translate complex policy constraints into formal rules. But universities are not simple logistics systems. Scheduling decisions are shaped by disciplinary norms, workload equity, disability accommodations, union agreements, space politics, and pedagogical considerations. Finance and HR decisions are similarly value-laden. This means that AI in these domains may support scenario modelling and information synthesis, but fully automated decision-making is neither well evidenced nor normatively desirable. The more realistic managerial pathway is augmentation rather than substitution: AI as an aid to pattern detection, simulation, and workflow support, not a replacement for deliberative governance.

5.4 Institutional Performance Monitoring, Quality Assurance, and Accreditation

A growing literature examines AI and data systems in quality assurance, performance monitoring, and accreditation support. Sorour's review of big data challenges for monitoring quality in higher education and Isaifan's work on AI for quality assurance suggest that institutions are increasingly interested in using analytics to track performance indicators, detect anomalies, analyse large evidence sets, and support continuous improvement. This area is especially important for institutions facing external accountability pressures, because AI promises to reduce the labour intensity of assembling evidence for rankings, audits, and accreditation exercises.

The attraction is understandable. Quality assurance involves large volumes of heterogeneous data, recurrent reporting cycles, and the need to identify patterns across programmes and units. AI can support classification, document analysis, dashboard creation, and alerting functions. However, the literature also highlights a major danger: AI may reinforce an already metric-saturated view of educational quality. If institutions over-rely on machine-readable evidence, they may privilege what is easily codified and monitored over what is educationally significant but less measurable, such as academic culture, intellectual growth, collegiality, or the quality of formative support. In this sense, AI can intensify what higher education scholars have long criticised in performance management: the narrowing of educational value to indicators that travel well in dashboards.

The governance consequence is not simply "more data." It is a reweighting of institutional attention. Quality offices and leadership teams may increasingly rely on automated summaries, pattern detection, or text analysis to define problems and priorities. These systems can be useful, but only if institutions preserve interpretive pluralism and ensure that expert judgement is not reduced to threshold compliance. In other words, AI can support quality assurance, but it cannot adjudicate quality by itself. The strongest management lesson from the literature is that quality-related AI should be used to enrich inquiry, not to close it prematurely.

5.5 Strategic Decision Support and Institutional Analytics

Institutional analytics is one of the clearest bridges between AI and governance. While learning analytics focuses on learners and often on course-level interventions, institutional analytics aggregates data to support strategic planning, portfolio review, forecasting, and performance analysis. De Silva's needs analysis for institutional analytics underscores both the promise and the organisational difficulty of scaling analytics beyond local pilots. Universities often have abundant data but weak integration, fragmented ownership, limited analytic literacy, and uncertain governance mechanisms. AI is sometimes proposed as the solution to this fragmentation, especially through advanced dashboards, pattern mining, and automated insight generation. Yet the literature suggests that the main bottleneck is not computational capacity; it is organisational coherence.

This finding is crucial for university leaders. Institutions do not become strategically intelligent merely by purchasing more sophisticated tools. They need interoperable data systems, shared definitions, decision rights, ethical standards, and the capacity to act on analytic outputs without confusing correlation for causation. Webber and Zheng argue that AI and advanced data analytics have implications for leadership precisely because

they alter the speed and scale of information processing. But they also imply new demands on governance: leaders must understand what the systems are doing, what assumptions underlie them, and where human judgement remains indispensable.

5.6 Institutional Policies, Ethics, and Responsible Use Frameworks

The fastest-growing body of recent literature concerns governance, policy, and responsible use. Generative AI has accelerated institutional policy development, prompting universities to publish frameworks on acceptable use, disclosure, integrity, literacy, and risk management. Comparative studies of university AI policies show substantial variation in maturity, scope, and enforcement mechanisms. Some institutions adopt narrow academic-integrity rules; others attempt broader governance arrangements spanning research, teaching, data protection, procurement, and staff development. Case-based work from Africa and Australia illustrates that policy development is itself a governance practice: it requires internal consultation, interpretation of fast-moving regulation, and alignment between principles and operational processes.

This literature is vital because it demonstrates that AI governance in higher education is no longer hypothetical. Universities are now constructing governance architectures - however unevenly - around privacy, bias, transparency, accountability, and human oversight. UNESCO, OECD, and the European Commission have all emphasized that AI in education requires human-centred regulation and institutional stewardship. But the review also shows that policy texts can outpace organisational capacity. A university may issue a responsible-AI framework while lacking clear data inventories, procurement standards, staff training, or oversight mechanisms. In such cases governance becomes symbolic rather than operative.

Overall, the thematic synthesis suggests that AI in higher education management is advancing along two tracks. The first is pragmatic and domain-specific: targeted systems for information provision, analytics-informed intervention, and evidence aggregation. The second is systemic and governance-oriented: the emergence of institutional frameworks that seek to govern AI as an infrastructural condition of digital transformation. The literature has matured enough to show that both tracks matter. What remains underdeveloped is research that connects them empirically over time.

6. Critical Discussion: From Operational Efficiency to Governance Transformation

The evidence reviewed above supports a clear conclusion: AI in higher education management cannot be adequately understood through the language of efficiency alone. Operational efficiency is real and often measurable. Chatbots reduce response times. Predictive analytics can help prioritize advising. AI-supported monitoring can reduce reporting burdens. Yet these gains do not describe the full institutional effect of AI. The deeper transformation lies in governance: in how universities classify problems, allocate attention, structure accountability, and justify intervention.

This shift can be explained in three steps. First, AI changes institutional visibility. It makes certain populations, behaviours, and processes more legible to managers through data capture and automated analysis. Some of this visibility is beneficial. Risk signals can trigger timely support; administrative bottlenecks can become easier to identify; anomalies in performance data can prompt inquiry. But visibility is never neutral. What becomes visible is shaped by data availability, model design, and institutional priorities. Students who generate abundant digital trace data become easier to monitor than those whose difficulties are less legible to the system. Areas of organisational life that produce structured data may receive more managerial attention than those that depend on qualitative judgement or relational work.

Second, AI changes the distribution of discretion. In traditional bureaucratic and professional settings, discretion often resides in front-line staff, advisors, tutors, programme leaders, and committees. AI does not eliminate discretion, but it reorganises it. Recommendations, risk scores, dashboards, and alerts can channel human attention and establish default expectations. The key question is whether this reorganisation supports informed judgement or subtly narrows it. In some implementations, AI enhances discretion by giving staff better information and more time for complex cases. In others, it produces what might be called “soft coercion”: the pressure to follow data-driven prompts even when contextual knowledge suggests caution. This is a classic algorithmic governance problem. The machine need not make the final decision to shape the decision environment profoundly.

Third, AI changes accountability. Institutions increasingly need to account not only for what decisions are made but for how digital systems participate in making them. This raises difficult questions. Who is responsible when a predictive model misclassifies students? How should staff explain an intervention that was triggered by a system they do not fully understand? What happens when a vendor’s proprietary model becomes part of

institutional decision-making? These are not technical questions appended to the end of implementation. They are governance questions at the core of institutional legitimacy.

This discussion also helps explain why the literature's evidence base remains uneven. The most empirically mature studies tend to examine bounded problems where efficiency benefits can be observed relatively quickly, such as FAQ automation or early-alert systems. Governance transformation is slower, more diffuse, and methodologically harder to capture. It requires longitudinal research, policy tracing, organisational ethnography, and comparative analysis. As a result, there is a risk that the field will overstate what it knows. We have reasonable evidence that AI can support specific administrative tasks. We have much weaker evidence about how AI changes institutional culture, trust, inequality, or strategic judgement over time.

A related issue concerns the relationship between efficiency and educational values. Universities are not ordinary firms. They are public or quasi-public institutions with distinctive commitments to fairness, autonomy, intellectual freedom, collegial governance, and student development. Efficiency matters in such institutions, but it cannot serve as the sole criterion of value. A chatbot that answers every query quickly is not necessarily a better support system if it normalizes depersonalized service for vulnerable students. A predictive system that raises retention marginally is not necessarily good governance if it does so through intrusive surveillance or opaque classification. The question is therefore not whether digital efficiency can coexist with educational values; it is under what conditions. The review suggests five conditions are critical: transparent data governance, explainability proportionate to risk, human oversight with real authority, participatory implementation, and continuous evaluation of distributional consequences.

Finally, the literature reveals a strategic temptation that universities should resist: superficial digital modernization. Institutions facing budget pressure, accountability demands, and reputational competition may embrace AI as a symbol of innovation. Yet symbolic adoption can be counterproductive. It may create fragmented tool ecosystems, worsen data governance, and displace resources from capacity-building to procurement. The most compelling studies in the review suggest that AI contributes positively only when institutions treat governance as a precondition, not an afterthought. In this sense, AI adoption is less a test of technological sophistication than a test of institutional maturity.

A further issue concerns vendorisation and infrastructural dependence. The literature increasingly suggests that universities do not adopt AI as self-contained institutions; they do so within markets for analytics platforms, customer-relationship systems, advising tools, cloud services, and large-language-model interfaces. This commercial mediation has governance consequences that are still under-researched. Procurement contracts may constrain transparency. Data may be processed in ways staff and students do not fully understand. Model updates can occur outside institutional control. Even where institutions retain formal responsibility, practical authority may be distributed across software vendors, consultants, and cloud infrastructures. For management research, this means that AI adoption should never be reduced to an internal institutional choice. It is also a question of platform dependency, contractual governance, and the politics of outsourced expertise.

The literature also reveals an important temporal tension. Universities are often asked to develop AI policy faster than they can build AI capacity. Generative AI intensified this problem by compressing the policy cycle. Institutions rapidly issued guidance on disclosure, acceptable use, and academic integrity, but management-facing governance questions - procurement, data stewardship, staff roles, oversight bodies, auditability, and risk thresholds - typically take longer to resolve. As a result, some universities now have visible policy language but immature implementation infrastructures. This temporal mismatch helps explain why policy maturity and operational maturity do not necessarily move together. For researchers, it suggests that governance should be studied as an evolving process rather than as a single institutional artefact. For leaders, it suggests that responsible adoption requires sequenced implementation: policy principles, infrastructure mapping, role definition, literacy building, and only then scaled deployment.

7. An Integrative Model of AI Adoption, Institutional Efficiency, and Digital Governance

The review supports an integrative model in which AI adoption affects higher education institutions through three linked layers: operational systems, organisational mediation, and governance outcomes.

At the first layer, AI enters institutions through specific management applications. These include conversational agents, predictive analytics, monitoring dashboards, document analysis tools, automated triage systems, and emerging generative AI supports for drafting and knowledge management. At this level, the immediate organisational claims are usually efficiency claims: faster response, lower transaction costs, better targeting, improved throughput, or stronger informational capacity.

At the second layer, these tools are mediated by organisational conditions. Five conditions are especially

salient in the reviewed literature. The first is data stewardship: institutions need clear rules about data collection, ownership, security, purpose limitation, and consent. The second is interpretive capacity: managers and staff must understand the limits of predictions, classifications, and outputs rather than treating them as self-evident truths. The third is workflow integration: tools must fit or intentionally redesign processes, not sit awkwardly alongside them. The fourth is professional legitimacy: staff need opportunities to exercise judgement and contest system outputs. The fifth is institutional alignment: AI initiatives need to be tied to mission, policy, and equity objectives rather than adopted opportunistically.

At the third layer, governance outcomes emerge. Where organisational mediation is weak, AI tends to produce shallow efficiency gains alongside opacity, surveillance, dependency on vendors, and fragmented responsibility. Where mediation is strong, AI is more likely to support legitimate governance: better-informed decisions, more targeted support, improved service consistency, and stronger evidence ecosystems. The model therefore rejects both determinism and simple adoption narratives. AI does not automatically transform governance, but governance cannot remain unchanged once AI becomes part of the institution's decision infrastructure.

This model also clarifies the distinction between operational efficiency and governance transformation. Operational efficiency occurs when AI improves speed, scale, or resource use in discrete processes. Governance transformation occurs when AI changes how authority, visibility, responsibility, and value are organised across the institution. The two are related but not identical. A university can achieve operational improvements without meaningful governance transformation, and it can experience governance transformation - for better or worse - even when efficiency gains are modest. This distinction should guide future research and institutional evaluation. The relevant question is not simply whether AI "works," but what kind of institutional order it helps produce.

8. Future Research Agenda

The literature on AI in higher education management has matured enough to justify a more ambitious research agenda. Five priorities stand out.

First, the field needs more longitudinal studies. Much current evidence is derived from pilots, prototypes, and short-term perception studies. These are useful for understanding acceptance and immediate implementation issues, but they cannot show whether AI systems improve institutional decision quality over time or merely change the appearance of responsiveness. Longitudinal work should trace not only outcomes such as retention or workload but also shifts in role expectations, trust, accountability, and the redistribution of labour.

Second, comparative research is urgently needed. Institutions differ in size, governance structure, public or private status, regulatory environment, digital maturity, and student composition. Yet much of the literature presents findings from a single institution as if they were widely generalizable. Comparative case studies across national and policy contexts would help distinguish context-dependent success factors from broader patterns. Such work is especially important for understanding AI adoption beyond highly resourced institutions in the Global North.

Third, research should move beyond user acceptance to organisational capacity. The persistence of technology-acceptance models in the literature has produced many studies on perceived usefulness or intention to use, but relatively few on procurement, interoperability, data governance, oversight committees, staff training, budget trade-offs, and institutional literacy. These are not secondary implementation details; they are the conditions that determine whether AI becomes a legitimate management infrastructure.

Fourth, more work is needed on under-studied management domains. Student support and retention are well represented, but finance, HR, compliance, scheduling, and strategic portfolio planning remain thinly evidenced. This gap is particularly consequential because senior leaders often justify AI investment in precisely these areas. Without stronger empirical research, institutions may make significant strategic decisions on the basis of generalized expectations rather than solid evidence.

Fifth, the field needs richer normative frameworks for evaluating success. It is no longer sufficient to ask whether AI improves response times or predictive accuracy. Researchers should also examine explainability, contestability, equity, due process, staff autonomy, and the preservation of educational values. In practical terms, this means mixed-methods designs that combine outcome data with policy analysis, organisational ethnography, and stakeholder perspectives. It also means engaging students and staff not just as users but as subjects of governance.

A final methodological point follows from these priorities. The next generation of reviews should connect learning analytics, institutional analytics, governance studies, and policy research more systematically

than the current literature does. AI in higher education management is too complex to remain siloed. It sits at the intersection of technology, administration, ethics, and institutional strategy. The most useful future work will therefore be interdisciplinary and policy-literate as well as technically informed.

Sixth, future research should pay closer attention to labour. Much of the literature speaks of staff burden reduction or freed capacity, but these phrases often remain analytically thin. Whose labour is reduced? What new forms of invisible work are created through data cleaning, dashboard interpretation, prompt design, escalation handling, and policy maintenance? Do AI systems redistribute administrative work downward, upward, or outward to vendors and precarious support roles? Universities are knowledge organisations, and changes in labour are inseparable from changes in governance. Research that neglects this dimension risks mistaking labour displacement or intensification for efficiency.

Seventh, scholars should develop stronger designs for evaluating institutional consequences beyond student-level outcomes. Retention and satisfaction are important, but they do not capture whether AI changes organisational learning, strategic coherence, or public accountability. Multi-level designs are needed that connect student outcomes to meso-level workflow changes and macro-level governance decisions. This will require collaboration between higher education researchers, information scientists, organisational scholars, and policy analysts. It may also require more openness from institutions and vendors about data architecture, model design, procurement processes, and failure cases. Without such transparency, the field will remain strong on aspiration and relatively weak on institutional explanation.

9. Conclusion

This article has argued that AI in higher education management should be understood as a governance issue as much as an efficiency issue. The literature shows clear gains in student-facing information services, analytics-informed support, and evidence aggregation for monitoring and quality assurance. These developments matter, especially in institutions facing growing demands for responsiveness, accountability, and service at scale. Yet the review also demonstrates that the most important institutional effects of AI lie beyond automation. AI changes what universities can see, how they classify risk and priority, how discretion is distributed, and how accountability is organised across sociotechnical systems.

By synthesising work across advising, retention analytics, chatbots, institutional analytics, quality assurance, and responsible AI policy, the article has made three linked contributions. It has proposed a typology of AI applications in higher education management; it has distinguished operational efficiency from governance transformation; and it has advanced an integrative model showing that beneficial outcomes depend on data stewardship, interpretive capacity, workflow integration, professional legitimacy, and institutional alignment. These contributions speak directly to a gap in the literature, which has too often treated AI in universities as a pedagogical matter or, conversely, assumed that administrative AI can be evaluated through managerial metrics alone.

The central practical implication is straightforward. Universities should not ask only what AI can automate. They should ask what kinds of governance arrangements AI requires and what kind of institution its adoption will help produce. Human-centred AI governance in higher education is not a rhetorical add-on. It is the condition under which efficiency gains can be made compatible with fairness, transparency, professional judgement, and educational purpose. Where that condition is ignored, AI risks becoming another layer of opaque performance management. Where it is taken seriously, AI may support more responsive and evidence-informed institutions without reducing governance to computation.

Funding:

The author extends their appreciation to Prince Sattam bin Abdulaziz University for funding this research work through the Project number (PSAU/2025/02/ 20398).

References

- Adams, C., Pente, P., Lemermeyer, G., & Rockwell, G. (2023). Ethical principles for artificial intelligence in education. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 4, 100131.
- Akgun, S., & Greenhow, C. (2022). Artificial intelligence in education: Addressing ethical challenges in K-12 settings. *AI and Ethics*, 2(3), 431-440. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-021-00096-7>
- Baker, R. S., & Hawn, A. (2022). Algorithmic bias in education. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, 32, 1052-1092. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-021-00285-9>
- Beer, D. (2017). The social power of algorithms. *Information, Communication & Society*, 20(1), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2016.1216147>
- Benayoune, A., et al. (2026). Artificial intelligence policy challenges and institutional priorities in higher education. *Discover Education*, 5, Article 188.
- Bond, M., Khosravi, H., de Laat, M., Bergdahl, N., Negrea, V., Oxley, E., Pham, P., Wang Chong, S., & Siemens, G. (2024). A meta systematic review of artificial intelligence in higher education: A call for increased ethics, collaboration, and rigour. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 21, Article 4. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00436-z>
- Budhathoki, T., Grover, V., Gyamfi, E., & Jafri, S. M. A. H. (2024). ChatGPT adoption and anxiety: A cross-country analysis of higher education students in Nepal and the UK. *Studies in Higher Education*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2024.2333937>
- Chiu, T. K. F., Xia, Q., Zhou, X., Chai, C. S., & Cheng, M. (2023). Systematic literature review on opportunities, challenges, and future research recommendations of artificial intelligence in education. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 4, 100118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2022.100118>
- Cormack, A. N. (2016). A data protection framework for learning analytics. *Journal of Learning Analytics*, 3(1), 91-106.
- De Silva, L. M. H., et al. (2025). A needs analysis for institutional analytics. *Studies in Higher Education*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2025.2596129>
- Diaz Lema, M., et al. (2024). Predicting dropout in higher education across borders. *Studies in Higher Education*, 49, 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2023.2224818>
- Dumitru, C., et al. (2025). Integrating artificial intelligence in supporting students with disabilities in higher education: An integrative review. *Review of Education*.
- European Commission. (2022). Ethical guidelines for educators on the use of artificial intelligence and data in teaching and learning. Brussels: European Commission.
- European Commission. (2024). AI Act enters into force. Brussels: European Commission.
- Gašević, D., Dawson, S., & Siemens, G. (2015). Let's not forget: Learning analytics are about learning. *TechTrends*, 59(1), 64-71. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-014-0822-x>
- Gašević, D., Tsai, Y.-S., Jovanović, J., & Pardo, A. (2022). Learning analytics in higher education: Stakeholders, strategy development, and scalable adoption. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 53, 100846.
- Gillespie, T. (2014). The relevance of algorithms. In T. Gillespie, P. Boczkowski, & K. Foot (Eds.), *Media technologies: Essays on communication, materiality, and society* (pp. 167-194). MIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/9780262525374.003.0009>
- Ifenthaler, D., & Yau, J. Y.-K. (2020). Utilising learning analytics to support study success in higher education: A systematic review. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 68, 1961-1990. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-020-09788-z>
- Isaifan, R. J., et al. (2025). Artificial intelligence for quality assurance in higher education. *Quality in Higher Education*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13538322.2025.2576326>
- Johnson, D. L., et al. (2024). Personalized AI solutions for college access and learning. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 207, 83-92.
- Jones, K. M. L. (2019). Learning analytics and higher education: A proposed model for establishing informed consent mechanisms to promote student privacy and autonomy. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 16, Article 24. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0155-0>
- Jwair, A. A. B. (2025). Generative artificial intelligence in higher education. *Cogent Education*, 12, Article 2589495.
- Kitchin, R. (2017). Thinking critically about and researching algorithms. *Information, Communication & Society*, 20(1), 14-29. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2016.1154087>
- Kosbar, Y. (2025). Towards human-centred, ethical and inclusive use and governance of AI in higher education. *Journal of Transformative Education*.

- Kuhail, M. A., et al. (2023). Engaging students with a chatbot-based academic advising system. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, 39, 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2022.2074645>
- Liang, J., et al. (2025). A systematic review of the early impact of artificial intelligence in higher education. *Frontiers in Education*, 10, 1522841.
- Lim, T., et al. (2025). What students really think: Unpacking AI ethics in educational settings. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 22, Article 56.
- Machkour, B., et al. (2025). The rise of artificial intelligence in educational management. *Procedia Computer Science*, 245, 902-909.
- Mandinach, E. B. (2025). Artificial intelligence in data-driven decision making. *Cogent Education*, 12, Article 2584802.
- Marín, Y. R., et al. (2025). Ethical challenges associated with the use of artificial intelligence in universities. *Journal of Academic Ethics*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-025-09660-w>
- Marland, B., & Arantes, J. (2026). Reframing AI governance in education: Insights from the social model of disability. *Learning, Media and Technology*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2025.2595443>
- Marzouk, O. A., et al. (2025). Benchmarking retention, progression, and graduation rates in higher education. *Cogent Education*, 12, Article 2498170.
- Mathew, B. J., et al. (2023). How does academic advising influence student learning outcomes? *Cogent Education*, 10, Article 2197663.
- Matos, T., et al. (2025). A systematic review of artificial intelligence applications in education. *Computers and Education Open*, 6, 100184.
- McCarthy, S., et al. (2025). Personalising with AI in higher education. *Higher Education Research & Development*. Advance online publication.
- Meeter, M., et al. (2023). Predicting retention in higher education from high-stakes exams and prior attainment. *College and University*, 98(1), 1-18.
- Mohiuddin, K., et al. (2023). Potentialities and priorities for higher educational development in Saudi Arabia for the achievement of Vision 2030. *Heliyon*, 9, e21924.
- Murni, S. (2026). Artificial intelligence in higher education management: A bibliometric analysis of challenges, opportunities, and future research directions. *Discover Education*, 5, Article 165.
- Mutumukwe, C., et al. (2022). Students' privacy concerns in learning analytics: Model development and validation. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 53, 782-799.
- Nartey, E. K. (2024). Guiding principles of generative AI for employability and educational policy. *Cogent Education*, 11, Article 2357898.
- Nguyen, A., Ngo, H., Hong, Y., Dang, B., & Nguyen, B. P. T. (2023). Ethical principles for artificial intelligence in education. *Education and Information Technologies*, 28(4), 4221-4241. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-022-11316-w>
- Nirala, K. K., Singh, A., & Ahuja, N. J. (2022). A survey on providing customer and public administration services based on AI-chatbots. *Multimedia Tools and Applications*, 81, 22255-22293.
- Noroozi, O., & colleagues. (2025). Artificial intelligence in higher education: Impact depends on context. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*.
- Noroozi, O., et al. (2025). Artificial intelligence in higher education: Impact depends on context. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2025.2539579>
- Ocen, S., et al. (2025). Artificial intelligence in higher education institutions: Review of innovations, opportunities and challenges. *Frontiers in Education*, 10, 1530247.
- OECD. (2024). The potential impact of artificial intelligence on equity and inclusion in education. Paris: OECD.
- Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., et al. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*, 372, n71. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71>
- Parakhina, V. N., et al. (2017). Strategic management in universities as a factor of their global competitiveness. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 31(1), 62-75.
- Pargman, T. C., & McGrath, C. (2021). Mapping the ethics of learning analytics in higher education: A systematic literature review of empirical research. *Journal of Learning Analytics*, 8(2), 123-139.
- Parker, L., et al. (2025). Comparative analysis of artificial intelligence policies in higher education institutions. *Innovative Higher Education*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10791-025-09745->

- Peyton, K., Unnikrishnan, S., & Mulligan, B. (2025). A review of university chatbots for student support: FAQs and beyond. *Discover Education*, 4, Article 21. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-025-00397-7>
- Prinsloo, P., & Slade, S. (2016). Student vulnerability, agency and learning analytics: An exploration. *Journal of Learning Analytics*, 3(1), 159-182.
- Prinsloo, P., & Slade, S. (2017). An elephant in the learning analytics room: The obligation to act. *Proceedings of the Seventh International Learning Analytics & Knowledge Conference*, 46-55.
- Richter, S., et al. (2025). Chatbots in tertiary education: Exploring the impact of warm and competent chatbot avatars. *British Journal of Educational Technology*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13610>
- Roca, M. D. L., et al. (2024). The impact of a chatbot working as an assistant in a course. *Computer Applications in Engineering Education*, 32(4), e22750.
- Ross, O., et al. (2025). Lessons learnt from a substantial gain in student retention. *Irish Educational Studies*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03323315.2025.2584016>
- Sabzalieva, E., & Valentini, A. (2023). ChatGPT and artificial intelligence in higher education: Quick start guide. UNESCO IESALC.
- Schmidt, D. A., et al. (2025). Integrating artificial intelligence in higher education. *Smart Learning Environments*, 12, Article 33.
- Selwyn, N. (2019). Should robots replace teachers? AI and the future of education. *Polity*.
- Shum, S. B., & Ferguson, R. (2012). Social learning analytics. *Educational Technology & Society*, 15(3), 3-26.
- Siddiq, F., et al. (2025). Towards a code of ethics for using technology-enabled analytics in education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2025.2453138>
- Siemens, G. (2013). Learning analytics: The emergence of a discipline. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 57(10), 1380-1400.
- Siu, B., et al. (2025). What influences student intentions to use generative AI in higher education? *British Educational Research Journal*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.4206>
- Slade, S., & Prinsloo, P. (2013). Learning analytics: Ethical issues and dilemmas. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 57(10), 1510-1529.
- Smith, S. M., Tate, M., Freeman, K., Walsh, A., Ballsun-Stanton, B., Hooper, M., & Lane, M. (2026). A university framework for the responsible use of generative AI in research. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 48(1), 17-36. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2025.2509187>
- Sohrabi, C., et al. (2021). PRISMA 2020 statement: What's new and the importance of reporting guidelines. *International Journal of Surgery*, 88, 105918.
- Sorour, A., et al. (2024). Big data challenge for monitoring quality in higher education. *Tsinghua Journal of Education*, 45(1), 1-18.
- Thaldar, D., Botes, M., Badru, A., Chenia, H., Duma, S., Dlamini, S. B., Amin, N., Hugo, W., Govender, R., Bruce-Brand, J., Vosloo, A., Koorbanally, N. A., & Chuturgoon, A. (2025). Generative AI governance in higher education: A case study from Africa. *Frontiers in Political Science*, 7, 1666661. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpos.2025.1666661>
- Tsai, Y.-S., Moreno-Marcos, P. M., Jivet, I., Scheffel, M., Tammets, K., Kollom, K., & Gašević, D. (2021). The SHEILA framework: Informing institutional strategies and policies for learning analytics. *Journal of Learning Analytics*, 8(3), 9-34.
- Umer, R., Susnjak, T., Mathrani, A., & Suriadi, S. (2023). Current stance on predictive analytics in higher education: Review and open challenges. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 31(10), 6988-7004. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2021.1933542>
- UNESCO. (2021). *AI and education: Guidance for policy-makers*. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO. (2023). *Guidance for generative AI in education and research*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Wang, S. (2024). Algorithmic decisions in education governance. *Discover Education*, 3, Article 337.
- Wang, S., Wang, F., Zhu, Z., Wang, J., Tran, T., & Du, Z. (2024). Artificial intelligence in education: A systematic literature review. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 252, 124167. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2024.124167>
- Webber, K. L., & Zheng, H. Y. (2024). Artificial intelligence and advanced data analytics: Implications for higher education. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 207, 5-13. <https://doi.org/10.1002/he.20508>
- Wickramasinghe, M., et al. (2026). Ethical principles for artificial intelligence in education: A meta-review

approach. *AI and Ethics*, 6, Article 63.

Williamson, B. (2017). *Big data in education: The digital future of learning, policy and practice*. SAGE.

Williamson, B., Bayne, S., & Shay, S. (2020). The datafication of teaching in higher education: Critical issues and perspectives. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 25(4), 351-365. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2020.1748811>

Williamson, B., Eynon, R., & Potter, J. (2020). Pandemic politics, pedagogies and practices: Digital technologies and distance education during the coronavirus emergency. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 45(2), 107-114.

Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V. I., Bond, M., & Gouverneur, F. (2019). Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education - where are the educators? *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 16, Article 39. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0>