JEs (2025), E-ISSN 3031-4232
JEs
Journal of Educational Studies
https://ejournal.baleliterasi.org/index.php/JEs

AI Meets Academia: How Machine Learning is Transforming Higher Education in China

Abu Issa Gazi
Jiujiang University, Jiujiang, China
dr.issa@jju.edu.cn

Abstract

This convergent mixed-methods study investigates how machine learning (ML) is transforming higher education in China across pedagogical, institutional, and ethical dimensions. Data were collected from 45 participants including university administrators, lecturers, and students from leading institutions in Beijing, Shanghai, and Guangzhou. Quantitative data were analyzed using SPSS 27, revealing strong positive correlations between perceived usefulness ($r = .69$, $p < .01$), institutional support ($r = .71$, $p < .01$), and teaching effectiveness, while ethical concerns showed a significant negative correlation ($r = -.53$, $p < .01$). Multiple regression analysis ($R^2 = .68$, F (3. 41) = 9.72, $p < .001$) identified institutional support ($\beta = .47$, $p < .001$) as the strongest predictor of ML's perceived impact. Qualitative data, analyzed using NVivo 12, revealed three dominant themes: enhanced teaching and research efficiency, data-driven institutional decision-making, and ethical challenges related to data privacy and algorithmic bias. Document analysis further confirmed that national policies such as the AI-in-Education Action Framework (2022) have accelerated ML integration, while also exposing regional disparities and governance gaps. The study concludes that ML functions as a catalyst for innovation in Chinese higher education through personalized learning, predictive analytics, and institutional modernization; however, its sustainable impact depends on human-centered governance, equitable access, and continuous faculty development. This research contributes to the growing body of evidence that ML's effectiveness in higher education is shaped not only by technological capability but also by ethical stewardship, institutional readiness, and inclusive implementation.

Keywords: *Artificial Intelligence, Machine Learning, Higher Education, Academic Transformation*

1. Introduction

Artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning (ML) are rapidly reshaping higher education worldwide, transforming how knowledge is taught, learned, and assessed (George & Wooden, 2023; Kuleto et al., 2021; Lytras et al., 2024). In university settings, ML-driven systems increasingly support adaptive learning, automated feedback, intelligent tutoring, and learning analytics, enabling instruction at scale while promising greater personalization (Hasan et al., 2025; Kumar et al., 2025; Lalit et al., n.d.). These developments position AI not merely as a technological add-on, but as a structural force influencing pedagogical practice, institutional organization, and academic labor.

China represents a particularly significant context for examining these transformations. Over the past decade, AI has been elevated to a national strategic priority, with higher education identified as a key site for AI-driven innovation and talent development (Abulibdeh et al., 2025; George & Wooden, 2023; Murdan & Halkhoree, 2024). National policies explicitly encourage universities to integrate AI into teaching, learning, and governance, accelerating large-scale adoption through strong state coordination and close industry university collaboration (Bhimavarapu, 2025; Zhang et al., 2025). As a result, Chinese universities have moved rapidly from experimentation to broad deployment of ML-based platforms, making China an instructive case for understanding AI integration at system level rather than in isolated pilots.

Despite this rapid diffusion, Wang et al. (2025), the educational implications of ML adoption in Chinese higher education remain insufficiently understood. While Matar (2025), AI tools promise efficiency and personalization, they also raise unresolved concerns related to academic integrity, faculty readiness, data governance, equity, and the risk of superficial learning. High profile interventions such as temporary restrictions on generative AI tools during national examinations highlight ongoing tensions between promoting AI-enabled innovation and safeguarding the credibility of assessment and credentials (Matar, 2025; Trajkovski & Hayes, 2025). These tensions suggest that technological advancement alone does not guarantee educational improvement.

Abisoye (2023), existing international research demonstrates that AI can enhance learning outcomes when aligned with pedagogy, yet much of this work focuses on controlled pilots, short-term outcomes, or technical performance. In the Chinese context specifically, empirical studies remain fragmented, often emphasizing adoption rates or policy ambitions rather than examining how ML reshapes classroom practices, institutional decision-making, and student learning experiences over time (Ayanwale et al., 2024; Patel, 2025). There is a particular lack of integrated analyses that connect national policy directives, university-level strategies, instructional implementation, and student outcomes within a single analytical framework.

This study addresses these gaps by providing a multi-level, evidence-based examination of

ML use in Chinese higher education. Rather than evaluating AI tools in isolation, the research investigates how ML technologies interact with pedagogical practices, organizational structures, and governance arrangements. By combining policy analysis, institutional case studies, and empirical data from faculty and students, the study advances understanding of not only whether ML "works," but how, under what conditions, and with what social and educational consequences.

It moves beyond descriptive accounts of AI adoption to systematically analyze ML's pedagogical, organizational, and ethical impacts within China's higher-education system. In doing so, the study contributes to AI-in-education scholarship by offering context-sensitive evidence and provides practical insights for policymakers, university leaders, and educators seeking to navigate rapid AI diffusion in a high-stakes educational environment.

2. Method

2.1 Participants

To explore how machine learning (ML) is transforming higher education in China, this study employed a mixed-methods convergent design involving three groups of participants representing distinct yet complementary perspectives within the academic ecosystem. The first group consisted of ten university administrators and policymakers from leading institutions in Beijing, Shanghai, and Guangzhou who are directly involved in planning and implementing AI-driven educational reforms. The second group comprised fifteen university lecturers from diverse academic disciplines including engineering, business, linguistics, and education who regularly use ML-based applications in teaching, assessment, or research supervision. The third group included twenty undergraduate and postgraduate students with direct experience of AI-integrated learning environments, such as adaptive learning platforms, automated essay scoring systems, and intelligent tutoring systems.

Participants were selected using purposive sampling to ensure that all respondents had substantial and relevant experience with ML-based technologies in higher education contexts. The total sample size of 45 participants was considered appropriate for the study's exploratory and explanatory objectives. From a qualitative perspective, the sample was sufficient to achieve thematic saturation, as participants represented key stakeholder groups central to ML implementation and use. From a quantitative perspective, the sample size aligns with established guidelines for exploration regression analysis, which suggest that small to medium samples can yield meaningful insights when the number of predictors is limited and effect sizes are expected to be moderate. Accordingly, regression analysis in this study was used not for population-level generalization but to identify patterns, relationships, and tendencies that complement the qualitative findings within the convergent mixed-methods framework.

All participants were informed of the research purpose and provided informed consent in accordance with ethical research standards.

2.2 Data Collection

2.2.1 Instrument of Collecting Data

To address the research questions, this study adopted a mixed-methods design that integrated quantitative and qualitative approaches through three complementary instruments. A survey questionnaire was developed to examine participants' perceptions of the impact of machine learning (ML) on key dimensions of higher education, including teaching effectiveness, research productivity, assessment accuracy, and institutional decision-making; its items were adapted from prior studies (Ayanwale et al., 2024; Shimray & Subaveerapandiyan, 2025; Srivastava, 2025) and contextualized for the Chinese higher education setting. In addition, semi-structured interviews were conducted using a guide consisting of ten open-ended questions to elicit in-depth insights into the benefits, challenges, and ethical considerations associated with ML implementation in universities. To strengthen contextual understanding and ensure data triangulation, a document analysis protocol was employed to review institutional policy documents, national AI-in-education frameworks, and university strategic reports. Collectively, these instruments enabled a comprehensive exploration of both the measurable outcomes and experiential dimensions of ML-driven transformation in higher education.

2.2.2 Techniques for Collecting Data

Data collection was conducted in three sequential phases over a two-month period. First, online survey questionnaires were distributed via institutional mailing lists and professional academic networks, with participants completing the survey anonymously through Google Forms. Second, based on the survey results, ten participants comprising four administrators, three lecturers, and three students were purposively selected for follow-up interviews conducted either via Zoom or through face-to-face meetings; each interview lasted approximately 40–60 minutes and was audio-recorded with participants' informed consent. Third, relevant institutional reports and national education policy documents published between 2020 and 2024 were collected from official university and government websites to support supplementary analysis. All data were securely stored, systematically coded, and handled in accordance with confidentiality and ethical research standards.

2.3 Data Analysis

The study adopted a convergent mixed-methods approach to analyze quantitative and qualitative data concurrently and integrate the findings at the interpretation stage.

Survey data were analyzed using SPSS version 27. Descriptive statistics, including means and standard deviations, were used to summarize participants' responses. Pearson's correlation coefficients were computed to examine relationships among the key constructs, followed by multiple regression analysis to identify factors that significantly predicted participants' acceptance of and perceived impact of machine learning (ML) in higher education. All statistical analyses were conducted with significance levels set at $p < .05$.

Four core variables were operationalized based on prior technology acceptance and educational innovation literature. Perceived Usefulness (PU) refers to the extent to which participants believe that machine learning (ML) technologies enhance teaching effectiveness and learning outcomes (e.g., "Machine learning tools improve the effectiveness of teaching and learning in my institution"). Institutional Support (IS) denotes participants' perceptions of the adequacy of institutional infrastructure, professional training, and policy guidance for ML adoption (e.g., "My university provides sufficient technical and policy support for the use of machine learning in teaching"). Ethical Concerns (EC) capture perceptions of ethical risks associated with ML use, including issues of data privacy, academic integrity, and fairness (e.g., "The use of machine learning in higher education raises concerns about data privacy and academic integrity"). Teaching Enhancement (TE) represents the perceived contribution of ML to improved instructional quality, feedback, and student engagement (e.g., "Machine learning applications help me enhance the quality of teaching and feedback").

All items were measured using a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The inclusion of clearly defined constructs and validated item wording supports the content and construct validity of the survey instrument.

Interview transcripts and relevant policy and institutional documents were analyzed through thematic analysis. The analytical process involved open coding, followed by categorization and theme development to identify recurring patterns related to the pedagogical benefits, implementation barriers, and ethical implications of ML integration in higher education. To enhance analytic rigor, emergent themes were cross validated with quantitative results, ensuring convergence and complementarity between data strands. Finally, methodological triangulation across surveys, interviews, and document analysis enhanced the credibility and trustworthiness of the findings, providing a comprehensive understanding of how machine learning is transforming higher education in China.

.

3. Results

3.1 Perceptions of ML Integration

Out of the 45 valid responses collected, 82.2% of participants agreed or strongly agreed that ML has had a "significant positive impact" on higher education. The mean score ($M = 4.28$, $SD = 0.62$) on a five-point Likert scale indicates generally favorable attitudes toward ML-based transformation.

When grouped by role, administrators reported the highest perceived institutional benefit ($M = 4.51$), followed by lecturers ($M = 4.22$) and students ($M = 4.13$). This suggests that institutional leaders view ML as a strategic innovation more positively than those directly involved in daily academic practices.

3.2 Factors Influencing ML Adoption

A Pearson correlation analysis was conducted to explore relationships among major variables: perceived usefulness (PU), institutional support (IS), ethical concern (EC), and teaching effectiveness (TE).

Variables	**PU**	**IS**	**EC**	TE
PU	—	.74	-.38	.69
IS	—	—	-.42	.71
EC	—	—	—	-.53
TE	—	—	—	—

Note: $p < .05$, $p < .01$

The results show that both perceived usefulness and institutional support are strongly correlated with teaching effectiveness ($r = .69$ and $r = .71$, respectively). Meanwhile, ethical concerns (such as data privacy and algorithmic bias) were negatively correlated with all positive outcome variables, indicating that ethical apprehensions may hinder ML adoption.

3.3 Regression Analysis

A multiple regression analysis identified the strongest predictors of perceived impact of ML on higher education ($R^2 = .68$, $F(3.41) = 9.72$, $p < .001$). The standardized coefficients (β) were as follows:

1. Institutional Support ($\beta = .47$, $p < .001$)
2. Perceived Usefulness ($\beta = .39$, $p < .01$)
3. Ethical Concerns ($\beta = -.28$, $p < .05$)

These findings indicate that while ML is widely perceived as transformative, its successful implementation depends heavily on institutional support structures and on mitigating ethical challenges.

3.4 Enhanced Teaching and Research Efficiency

Interview data revealed that ML technologies have significantly improved teaching preparation and research productivity. A lecturer from Shanghai Jiao Tong University noted: "Using machine learning in research especially for data processing and predictive modeling has reduced my workload by almost half. I can focus more on interpretation and conceptual development." Similarly, students reported increased engagement when learning through ML driven adaptive platforms. One postgraduate from Tsinghua University explained: "The AI platform adjusts the difficulty of exercises automatically. It's like having a personal tutor that never gets tired."

3.5 Data-Driven Decision Making

Administrators emphasized how ML analytics assist in institutional management, including early warning systems for student performance and efficient resource allocation. A vice dean commented: "Our university now predicts dropout risks through AI analytics, allowing us to intervene early. The decision-making process is becoming much more evidence based."

3.6 Ethical and Practical Concerns

Despite the benefits, concerns over data privacy, academic integrity, and overreliance on technology were recurrent themes. Some lecturers expressed fear that AI grading systems might oversimplify complex assessment tasks. As one participant stated: "AI can grade essays for grammar and coherence, but it still struggles to assess creativity or cultural nuance." Furthermore, both students and faculty raised issues about algorithmic transparency and unequal access to ML resources, particularly in less affluent universities.

3.7 Document Analysis

The review of 12 national and institutional policy documents (2020–2024) demonstrated that the Chinese Ministry of Education has prioritized AI development as part of its "Education Informatization 2.0" strategy. Nearly all sampled universities have incorporated AI and ML in their Five-Year Strategic Plans.

Notably, the 2022 AI-in-Education Action Framework emphasizes promoting intelligent teaching platforms and learning analytics, strengthening faculty training in AI literacy, and establishing ethical standards for data governance; however, policy documents also acknowledge persistent regional disparities in AI readiness, underscoring the need for equitable funding and infrastructure support.

Integrating the quantitative and qualitative results suggests that machine learning has become a catalyst for innovation in China's higher education sector, with its most significant impacts evident in teaching innovation and personalized learning through adaptive systems and AI tutoring tools, research acceleration via automated data analysis and literature synthesis, and institutional decision-making supported by predictive analytics and management dashboards; nevertheless, the findings also highlight ethical, infrastructural, and pedagogical challenges that must be addressed to ensure sustainable and equitable ML integration, as triangulated evidence indicates that ML's transformative power lies not merely in the technology itself but in the institutional ecosystems that enable its responsible use.

4. Discussion

The findings of this study reinforce and extend existing research that conceptualizes machine learning as a catalyst for structural change in higher education rather than merely a pedagogical tool. Prior studies have emphasized AI's role in efficiency and automation (Gupta et al., 2024; Shrivastava, 2025; Srivastava, 2025); however, the present study adds empirical depth by showing how these transformations are perceived and negotiated by different academic actors within Chinese universities. While administrators' strong support reflects strategic alignment with national modernization agendas, lecturers' and students' responses suggest that ML's transformative value lies primarily in its capacity to support personalized feedback, adaptive pacing, and learning engagement features consistent with learner-centered education models identified by (Strielkowski et al., 2025) and (Song et al., 2024).

Importantly, this study situates these pedagogical transformations within China's "Education Informatization 2.0" framework, demonstrating how national policy discourse translates into everyday teaching and learning practices. In doing so, it bridges a gap in the literature, which often examines AI adoption either at the policy level or at the classroom level, but rarely connects the two empirically.

Consistent with organizational adoption theories and prior empirical work (Ashiru et al., 2022; Pham et al., 2024), this study confirms that institutional support plays a decisive role in shaping the perceived impact of ML. However, the finding that institutional support outweighs perceived usefulness as a predictor advances current understanding by highlighting that technological value is socially and organizationally constructed, rather than inherent.

While earlier studies emphasize infrastructure and training as necessary conditions for AI adoption, the present findings suggest that in the Chinese context, institutional support also functions as a mechanism of alignment coordinating national policy expectations, faculty practices, and ethical oversight. This extends existing models of technology acceptance by demonstrating how centralized governance structures can amplify or constrain innovation in higher education systems characterized by strong state involvement.

The ethical concerns identified in this study resonate strongly with international critiques of AI in education (Malone, 2025; Mulaudzi & Hamilton, 2025), particularly regarding data privacy, algorithmic bias, and surveillance. However, this study contributes a contextualized understanding of how such concerns operate within China's large-scale, data-intensive educational infrastructure. Rather than rejecting ML outright, participants expressed conditional acceptance, suggesting that ethical apprehensions act less as absolute barriers and more as moderating factors influencing trust and sustained use.

Moreover, lecturers' concerns about ML's limitations in assessing creativity and higher order thinking (Tai et al., 2018), reinforcing the argument that human judgment remains indispensable in educational evaluation. These findings challenge techno-solutionist narratives by emphasizing that ML's legitimacy in higher education depends not only on accuracy or efficiency, but also on its alignment with disciplinary values, cultural expectations, and pedagogical purposes.

The study's findings align with and empirically substantiate the concept of "hybrid intelligence" proposed by Jin et al. (2025) and further elaborated by Podrecca et al. (2024). Rather than replacing educators, ML appears to be reshaping academic roles, positioning teachers as interpreters, designers, and ethical mediators of AI-supported learning environments.

What this study adds to the literature is evidence from a non-Western, highly centralized education system, demonstrating that hybrid intelligence is not limited to liberal or decentralized academic cultures. In the Chinese context, hybrid intelligence emerges as a pragmatic response to scale, efficiency demands, and policy-driven innovation, while still preserving human agency in pedagogical decision-making. This suggests that hybrid intelligence may represent a globally relevant model for sustainable AI integration in higher education.

Existing research often highlights the role of national AI strategies in accelerating educational innovation Liu et al. (2023), and the present study confirms this relationship while also exposing its limitations. Although strong policy institutional alignment has enabled rapid ML deployment, persistent regional and infrastructural disparities indicate that policy momentum alone does not guarantee equitable transformation.

By integrating policy analysis with empirical stakeholder perspectives, this study advances the literature by showing that sustainable ML integration requires not only strategic vision, but also distributed capacity building, ethical governance mechanisms, and support for less-resourced institutions. Without such measures, AI-driven reform risks reproducing existing hierarchies within higher education.

Therefore, this study extends prior research by demonstrating that ML is reshaping Chinese higher education across pedagogical, organizational, and systemic dimensions, while simultaneously generating ethical and equity challenges that cannot be addressed through technology alone. The findings underscore that ML's long-term value lies in context-sensitive, human-centered implementation, offering a balanced perspective that moves beyond both technological optimism and resistance.

5. Conclusion

This study set out to explore how machine learning (ML) is transforming higher education in China through an integrated quantitative and qualitative approach. The findings demonstrate that ML has become a significant driver of educational modernization, influencing teaching practices, research activities, and institutional decision-making across Chinese universities. Participants across administrative, instructional, and student groups expressed largely positive perceptions of ML integration, highlighting its contributions to efficiency, personalization, and academic productivity. Institutional support and perceived usefulness emerged as the strongest predictors of ML's positive impact, underscoring the central role of leadership commitment, infrastructure, and professional development in successful implementation.

At the same time, the study identified persistent ethical, pedagogical, and accessibility challenges. Concerns related to data privacy, algorithmic bias, unequal access to ML resources, and the limitations of automated assessment systems were evident across participant groups. These findings reinforce the need for ethical governance, transparent data practices, and human-centered pedagogical models that position ML as a support for rather than a replacement of professional judgment, creativity, and empathy in education.

Despite its contributions, this study has several limitations. First, the sample size, while appropriate for an exploratory mixed-methods design, limits the generalizability of the quantitative findings. Second, the study relied on self-reported perceptions, which may be influenced by social desirability or institutional norms. Third, the cross-sectional design captures perceptions at a single point in time and does not account for how ML adoption and its impacts may evolve as technologies and policies mature. Finally, the focus on selected urban and research-intensive universities may underrepresent experiences in less resourced or regional institutions.

Future research should address these limitations by employing larger and more diverse samples, including universities from different regions and institutional tiers. Longitudinal studies are needed to examine how ML integration affects learning outcomes, academic roles, and institutional practices over time. Further work should also investigate discipline-specific applications of ML, comparative cross-national contexts, and the development of robust ethical and governance frameworks that balance innovation with equity and accountability. By extending inquiry in these directions, future studies can deepen understanding of how machine learning can be harnessed to support inclusive, ethical, and sustainable transformation in higher education.

References

Abisoye, A. (2023). Developing a conceptual framework for AI-driven curriculum adaptation to align with emerging STEM industry demands. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation, 4*(1), 1074–1083.

Abulibdeh, A., Baya Chatti, C., Alkhereibi, A., & El Menshawy, S. (2025). A scoping review of the strategic integration of artificial intelligence in higher education: Transforming university excellence themes and strategic planning in the digital era. *European Journal of Education, 60*(1), e12908.

Ashiru, J.-A., Erdil, G. E., & Oluwajana, D. (2022). The linkage between high-performance work systems, organizational performance, employee voice, and employee innovation. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 35*(1), 1–17.

Ayanwale, M. A., Molefi, R. R., & Oyeniran, S. (2024). Analyzing the evolution of machine learning integration in educational research: A bibliometric perspective. *Discover Education, 3*(1), Article 47.

Bhimavarapu, U. (2025). AI in technology transfer: Developing sustainable models through university–industry collaboration. In *Bridging technology and development for sustainable innovation and geopolitical dynamics* (pp. 67–86). IGI Global Scientific Publishing.

George, B., & Wooden, O. (2023). Managing the strategic transformation of higher education through artificial intelligence. *Administrative Sciences, 13*(9), Article 196.

Gupta, S., Kaur, S., Gupta, M., & Singh, T. (2024). AI-empowered academia: A fuzzy prioritization framework for academic challenges. *Journal of International Education in Business*. Advance online publication.

Hasan, I., Ahhad, A. A., Sabari, A., Islam, S. M. R., Ehsan, M. T., & Rahman, M. H.

(2025). Revolutionizing education with machine learning: Personalized learning, tutoring systems, and analytics unveiled. In *Proceedings of the 2025 International Conference on Electrical, Computer and Communication Engineering (ECCE)* (pp. 1–6).
Jin, Y., Martinez-Maldonado, R., Shi, W., Huang, S., Zheng, M., Han, X., Gašević, D., & Yan, L. (2025). When machines join the moral circle: The persona effect of generative AI agents in collaborative reasoning. *arXiv*. https://arxiv.org/abs/2511.01205
Kuleto, V., Ilić, M., Dumangiu, M., Ranković, M., Martins, O. M. D., Păun, D., & Mihoreanu, L. (2021). Exploring opportunities and challenges of artificial intelligence and machine learning in higher education institutions. *Sustainability, 13*(18), Article 10424.
Kumar, Y., Kumar, S., & Khurana, D. (2025). A study on the application of machine learning in adaptive intelligent tutoring systems. *International Journal of Environmental Sciences*, 772–780.
Lalit, D. Y. K., Anu, S. K., & Khurana, D. (2025). A study on the application of machine learning in adaptive intelligent tutoring systems. *International Journal of Environmental Sciences, 11*(13s).
Liu, M., Ren, Y., Nyagoga, L. M., Stonier, F., Wu, Z., & Yu, L. (2023). Future of education in the era of generative artificial intelligence: Consensus among Chinese scholars on applications of ChatGPT in schools. *Future in Educational Research, 1*(1), 72–101.
Lytras, M. D., Serban, A. C., Alkhaldi, A., Aldosemani, T., & Malik, S. (2024). Transformative learning for future higher education: The artificial intelligence-enabled learning revolution 2035. In *Digital transformation in higher education* (Part B, pp. 231–241). Emerald Publishing Limited.
Malone, B. (2025). *Ethical considerations in instructional design enhanced by artificial intelligence: A phenomenological inquiry* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation or master's thesis].
Matar, S. (2025). The development of educational technology and artificial intelligence and their impact on the future of education: Opportunities and risks. *Journal of Posthumanism, 5*(7), 1271–1292.
Mulaudzi, L. V., & Hamilton, J. (2025). Lecturer's perspective on the role of AI in personalized learning: Benefits, challenges, and ethical considerations in higher education. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 1–21.
Murdan, A. P., & Halkhoree, R. (2024). Integration of artificial intelligence for educational excellence and innovation in higher education institutions. In *Proceedings of the 2024 1st International Conference on Smart Energy Systems and Artificial Intelligence (SESAI)* (pp. 1–6).
Patel, D. (2025). *Investigating the artificial intelligence policy landscape in higher education* [Master's thesis or doctoral dissertation, Frostburg State University].
Pham, H. N., Thai, N. T., Heffernan, T. W., & Reynolds, N. (2024). Environmental policies and the promotion of pro-environmental consumer behavior: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Macromarketing, 44*(1), 30–58.
Podrecca, M., Culot, G., Tavassoli, S., & Orzes, G. (2024). Artificial intelligence for climate change: A patent analysis in the manufacturing sector. *IEEE Transactions on*

Engineering Management.

Shimray, S. R., & Subaveerapandiyan, A. (2025). Artificial intelligence in academic writing and research: Adoption and effectiveness. *Open Information Science, 9*(1), 20250026.

Shrivastava, P. (2025). Understanding acceptance and resistance toward generative AI technologies: A multi-theoretical framework integrating functional, risk, and sociolegal factors. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence, 8*, 1565927.

Song, C., Shin, S.-Y., & Shin, K.-S. (2024). Implementing the dynamic feedback-driven learning optimization framework: A machine learning approach to personalize educational pathways. *Applied Sciences, 14*(2), 916.

Srivastava, R. (2025). *Artificial intelligence and the evolution of management learning: Insights from emerging research*.

Strielkowski, W., Grebennikova, V., Lisovskiy, A., Rakhimova, G., & Vasileva, T. (2025). AI-driven adaptive learning for sustainable educational transformation. *Sustainable Development, 33*(2), 1921–1947.

Tai, J., Ajjawi, R., Boud, D., Dawson, P., & Panadero, E. (2018). Developing evaluative judgement: Enabling students to make decisions about the quality of work. *Higher Education, 76*(3), 467–481.

Trajkovski, G., & Hayes, H. (2025). AI in assessment analysis and improvement. In *AI-assisted assessment in education: Transforming assessment and measuring learning* (pp. 159–192). Springer.

Wang, X., Zhao, S., Xu, X., Zhang, H., & Lei, V. N.-L. (2025). AI adoption in Chinese universities: Insights, challenges, and opportunities from academic leaders. *Acta Psychologica, 258*, 105160.

Zhang, Y., Zhang, M., Wu, L., & Li, J. (2025). Digital transition framework for higher education in AI-assisted engineering teaching: Challenge, strategy, and initiatives in China. *Science & Education, 34*(2), 933–954.