IPRPD
International Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences
ISSN 2693-2547 (Print), 2693-2555 (Online)
Volume 06; Issue no 04: April 2025
DOI: 10.56734/ijahss.v6n4a6

GENERATIVE AI IN HIGHER EDUCATION: PHILOSOPHICAL, SOCIOLOGICAL, AND PEDAGOGICAL PERSPECTIVES

Rich Yueh[1]

[1]*Assistant Professor of Teaching in Information Systems, UCR School of Business*

Abstract

Recent breakthroughs in generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) have transformed higher education, offering new possibilities for personalized learning and assessment. This paper explores GenAI's impacts on education, focusing on business programs as early adopters while extending to broader humanities contexts. We examine GenAI's potential to enhance learning through adaptive systems and real-time feedback, while addressing ethical dilemmas including algorithmic biases, equity gaps, and academic integrity concerns. From philosophical and sociological perspectives, we investigate how GenAI challenges traditional notions of knowledge production, authenticity, and human agency in education. The paper proposes an integrative framework for responsible GenAI implementation that balances technological capabilities with human-centered pedagogy through contextual adoption, ethical reflexivity, and redefined evaluation metrics. We recommend assessment redesigns that validate authentic learning and encourage a posthuman perspective that reimagines AI as collaborator rather than tool, offering productive pathways for future educational practice while preserving essential human elements of interpretation, ethics, and relational capacity.

Keywords

Generative AI, Higher Education, Business Education, Sociology of Technology, Educational Ethics, Posthuman Perspectives

Generative artificial intelligence (GenAI)—exemplified by systems such as ChatGPT, Gemini, and DALL-E—has emerged at the forefront of educational technology (Akhtar, 2024). Early adopters hail its capacity for personalized feedback, adaptive simulations, and innovative content creation (Kumar et al., 2024). However, as GenAI tools proliferate, higher education institutions wrestle with pressing questions about authenticity, equity, ethics, and broader socio-philosophical ramifications (Chiu, 2023).

Although research on AI in education is not new (Ogunleye et al., 2024), GenAI's ability to produce human-like text or images raises unique dilemmas, particularly in business schools where students are often early adopters of new technologies (Benmamoun, 2024; Guha et al., 2023; Mittal et al., 2024; Xu, 2024). The rapid spread of these tools across diverse cultural and geographic contexts is reshaping educational experiences globally, intersecting with broader societal questions about technological access, cultural values in knowledge creation, and the evolving relationship between humans and increasingly sophisticated tools (Akhtar, 2024; Bail, 2024; Obreja et al., 2024). The global implications extend beyond academic performance to fundamental questions about how societies prepare learners for a world where human-machine collaboration becomes increasingly central to creative and intellectual endeavors. These tensions point to deeper sociological concerns about who benefits from such technologies and philosophical inquiries about the nature of human knowledge once AI systems can effectively "think" for us (Bail, 2024; Chithara & Madzvamuse, 2024, Matos et al., 2024; Stockman, 2024; Yusuf et al., 2024).
This paper explores the implications of generative AI in higher education through an analysis of contemporary scholarship and emerging practices. The literature examined was identified through keyword searches related to "generative AI in higher education" and "generative AI in business education" across academic databases and recent publications from 2022-2025. By synthesizing these sources, this paper aims to provide insights into how generative AI is transforming educational experiences, particularly in business programs and related disciplines, while highlighting both opportunities and challenges presented by these technologies, specifically on:

1. GenAI features and adoption in higher education, with particular attention to business schools as early adopters.
2. Sociological dimensions concerning social influence, equity, and institutional norms.
3. Philosophical reflections on knowledge production, creativity, and moral responsibility.
4. Practical implications for curriculum design, assessment, and policy, particularly in business and management.
5. Posthuman perspectives that challenge purely human-centric views of creativity and education.

Though anchored in business education as a locus of technological adoption, the conclusions generalize across the humanities, social sciences, and professional schools. Ultimately, the paper proposes a blueprint to align GenAI's advanced capacities with the enduring values of education, intellectual exploration, and social responsibility.

Generative AI: Key Features and Adoption in Higher Education

GenAI employs large-scale neural networks to generate text, visuals, or other forms of content that closely mimic human-produced outputs. Early generative systems provided simple text completion or style suggestions, gradually evolving toward today's sophisticated generative models capable of developing entire essays, marketing campaigns, or creative concepts (Kumar et al., 2024). Such advancements entice educators seeking novel forms of student engagement.

Expanding Toolset

Higher education has seized upon GenAI across multiple domains of teaching and learning. Essay drafting and feedback tools like ChatGPT accelerate early-stage writing, refine grammar, and assist with brainstorming, providing students with immediate guidance that was previously unavailable outside instructor office hours (Chiu, 2024; Mittal et al., 2024; Monib et al., 2024; Sharma & Pandey, 2024). Adaptive learning systems leverage GenAI to create personalized quizzes or problem sets that directly address individual student needs, adjusting difficulty and focus based on performance patterns (Akhtar, 2024; Kumar et al., 2024). In business education particularly, simulation-based pedagogy has been enhanced through AI-driven case studies or role-plays that enrich learning by presenting real-time feedback loops that mimic authentic business scenarios (Benmamoun, 2024; Mittal et al., 2024; Nithithanatchinnapat, 2024; Xu, 2024).

Nonetheless, concerns endure about data privacy, student overreliance, and the intangible aspects of creativity that may be undermined through algorithmic assistance (O'Dea, 2024). Critics note that GenAI, while powerful, might trivialize or bypass the reflective struggle integral to higher-order learning, potentially creating a generation of students who can produce polished work without developing the underlying cognitive frameworks (Guha et al., 2023; Ogunleye et al., 2024).

Business Education at the Forefront

Given that commercial and analytical tasks increasingly lean on data-centric models, business schools often adopt AI-based solutions early (Guha et al., 2023; Huo & Siau, 2024; Nithithanatchinnapat, 2024). Students armed with GenAI tools may quickly produce marketing strategies, business forecasts, or venture proposals. However, the question remains whether this fosters deep managerial insight or simply yields formulaic solutions without the nuance that emerges from debate, iteration, and ethical deliberation (Matos et al., 2024).

Sociological Perspectives on GenAI in Education

Social Influence and Equity

Building on frameworks in technology acceptance, research shows that student uptake of AI depends on peer norms, educator endorsements, and institutional policies (Changalima et al., 2024; Gupta et al., 2024). Social inequalities can be aggravated when only well-resourced students leverage advanced GenAI features, thereby widening existing divides (Changalima, 2024; Gupta et al., 2024; Lim et al., 2023; Mittal et al., 2024; Ogunleye et al., 2024). This risk is pronounced where robust technical infrastructure or advanced digital literacy is unevenly distributed, such as in underserved communities (Sharma & Pandey, 2024; Obreja et al., 2024).

Institutional Authority and Policy

GenAI's robust and pervasive capabilities also shift power and authority within educational contexts. Traditional faculty roles—imparting knowledge, designing assessments, or grading—are unsettled by AI that offers instant feedback or "model solutions" (Obreja et al., 2024). Institutions that respond with rigid prohibitions might stifle constructive experimentation, whereas those that adopt a structured approach to responsible AI usage can position themselves at the leading edge of pedagogical innovation (Benmamoun, 2024; Gupta et al., 2024; Huo & Siau, 2024).

Philosophical Underpinnings: Knowledge, Ethics, and Human Agency

Beyond social systems, philosophical inquiry probes fundamental questions about knowledge, creativity, and moral agency in an AI-augmented world.

Authenticity and Creativity

In classical epistemology, knowledge arises from active human interpretation, engagement, and reflection. GenAI bypasses some parts of that process by automating ideation or analysis. Does a learner truly "own" an argument or creative concept if the machine performed most of the intellectual heavy lifting (Stockman, 2024; Swindell et al., 2024)? While AI-based drafting might accelerate output, it can also diminish the generative friction that so often sparks human creativity (Ambardekar, 2024; Guha et al., 2023; Lim et al., 2023; Swindell et al., 2024).

Ethical Complexity

The integration of generative AI into educational settings introduces multifaceted ethical challenges extending beyond technical concerns (Akhtar, 2024; Chithara & Madzvamuse, 2024; Matos et al., 2024; Monib et al., 2024; O'Dea, 2024; Swindell et al., 2024). Academic integrity concerns arise as students leverage GenAI to generate essays or solve complex problems without developing requisite skills, compelling institutions to reimagine evaluation methods that distinguish between AI-augmented work and genuine understanding. Moreover, these systems frequently perpetuate biases embedded in their training data, potentially reinforcing stereotypes in educational materials and interactions (Chithara & Madzvamuse, 2024; Swindell et al., 2024).

Accountability becomes increasingly complex when algorithmic systems participate in educational decisions. Faculty may need to defend automated assessments they did not directly authorize, while administrators grapple with determining liability when AI systems produce harmful content (Guha et al., 2023; Mittal et al., 2024; Obreja et al., 2024; Swindell et al., 2024). Students navigate environments where the boundary between human and machine guidance blurs, potentially eroding the human relationship that traditionally anchors educational experiences. These challenges intensify as generative AI systems become more sophisticated, raising fundamental questions about whether education's primary value lies in the product of learning (which AI can increasingly simulate) or in the transformative process of intellectual struggle that shapes not just knowledge but character and identity (Ambardekar, 2024; Bail, 2024; Nasr & El-Deeb, 2025; Obreja et al., 2024; Swindell et al., 2024).

Human Agency

The integration of generative AI into educational settings raises profound questions about human agency in intellectual pursuits. When students and faculty increasingly delegate cognitive tasks to AI systems, we witness not merely a technological shift but a fundamental reconfiguration of the relationship between human thought and external tools (Guha et al., 2023; Nasr & El-Deeb, 2025). The essence of learning has traditionally encompassed the struggle with difficult concepts, the pleasure of discovery, and the formation of intellectual resilience through overcoming challenges (Ambardekar, 2024). These experiences shape not only what we know but who we become as thinkers and creators (Sharples, 2023).

As generative AI assumes responsibility for analysis, synthesis, and even creative expression, we must grapple with what it means to outsource cognitive processes that have historically defined human intellectual development (Stockman, 2024). The metacognitive skills developed through sustained academic engagement—reflection, critical evaluation, and self-regulation of learning—may atrophy when AI systems offer immediate solutions devoid of the developmental journey (Chithara & Madzvamuse, 2024; Sharples, 2023). In business education particularly, where judgment and ethical decision-making are paramount, an overreliance on generative AI risks producing graduates who possess information without wisdom.

The educational challenge, then, lies not in rejecting these tools but in reimagining pedagogical approaches that preserve the essential qualities of human agency—creativity, judgment, and meaning-making—while acknowledging the irrevocable transformation of how knowledge is accessed and applied in contemporary contexts.

Practical Implications for Educational Practice

The integration of GenAI into higher education necessitates thoughtful reconsideration of established pedagogical approaches (Nithithanatchinnapat, 2024; Swindell et al., 2024). At the intersection of technological possibility and educational purpose lies an opportunity to reimagine assessment strategies, institutional policies, and faculty development in ways that honor both innovation and enduring educational values (Guha et al., 2023).

Assessment Redesign

As GenAI expands, instructors must create authentic assessments that affirm genuine student thought. Oral examinations have gained renewed attention, enabling real-time questioning to validate mastery through conversation that current AI systems struggle to simulate (Qureshi, 2024; Xu, 2024). Process-focused assignments represent another adaptation, requiring multiple drafts or reflective commentaries that capture the human-driven

iteration behind finished products (Benmamoun, 2024; Chiu, 2024; Mittal et al., 2024; Sharma & Pandey, 2024; Swindell et al., 2024). Collaborative projects foster both human interaction and appropriate technological integration, positioning AI as a co-tool rather than a solitary solver (Creely & Blannin, 2025; Sharma & Pandey, 2024).

The challenge for business educators extends beyond preventing AI-generated submissions to reimagining meaningful demonstration of learning (Huo & Siau, 2024; Xu, 2024). Performance-based assessments requiring application of knowledge in novel contexts may prove more valuable than traditional essays. Business simulations, case competitions, and live problem-solving exercises create environments where generative AI serves as augmentation rather than replacement for student capabilities. Such approaches acknowledge that graduates will work where AI tools are ubiquitous, making interaction with these technologies a legitimate educational outcome rather than a threat to academic integrity (Benmamoun, 2024).

Policy and Governance

The policy landscape surrounding GenAI in higher education requires careful navigation beyond simple prohibition or unrestricted adoption (Yusuf et al., 2024). Institutional responses vary widely, from outright bans on AI-generated content to explicit encouragement of AI as a collaborative learning tool (Changalima, 2024). A more nuanced middle path recognizes that neither extreme adequately prepares students for professional environments where AI literacy is increasingly essential. Business schools have a particular responsibility to model thoughtful AI integration, as their graduates will likely lead organizational policy development regarding these technologies.

Effective governance frameworks might distinguish between appropriate AI augmentation and inappropriate substitution of student work (Chithara & Madzvamuse, 2024; Kumar et al., 2024; Nithithanatchinnapat, 2024). For example, using GenAI for brainstorming, outlining, or receiving feedback on drafts might be explicitly permitted, while submitting AI-generated final deliverables without substantial human contribution would be prohibited. Clear guidelines developed collaboratively with faculty, students, and instructional designers can create shared understanding about the ethical boundaries of AI use. This approach recognizes that technological prohibitions often prove unenforceable, while educational conversations about appropriate use build critical discernment skills that transfer to professional contexts.

Faculty Empowerment

The rapid evolution of GenAI places significant demands on faculty who may feel unprepared for this technological shift (Huo & Siau, 2024). Professional development initiatives must move beyond technical training to include deeper explorations of how these technologies reshape knowledge creation and disciplinary practices (Benmamoun, 2024; Gupta et al., 2024; Nithithanatchinnapat, 2024; O'Dea, 2024). Workshops that begin with hands-on exploration of GenAI capabilities can build toward more substantive discussions about epistemological implications and pedagogical adaptations (Guha et al., 2023).

Business faculty occupy a unique position in this landscape, with opportunities to both adopt AI tools in their teaching and critically examine the business models and ethical implications driving these technologies (Matos et al., 2024; O'Dea, 2024). Cross-disciplinary faculty learning communities can be particularly valuable, bringing together business expertise with perspectives from ethics, philosophy, and computer science (Benmamoun, 2024; Changalima, 2024; Mittal et al., 2024). For instance, MIT has successfully implemented faculty learning communities to collectively explore and thoughtfully integrate generative AI into diverse teaching practices (MIT Open Learning, 2024). These collaborative spaces foster the interdisciplinary thinking necessary to navigate the complex landscape of GenAI in higher education, recognizing that no single discipline holds all the answers to these emerging challenges (Kumar et al., 2024).

Discussion

Our analysis suggests the need for an integrative approach to GenAI in higher education that connects sociological insights with philosophical concerns. Effective implementation depends on three key principles: contextual adoption that reflects each institution's unique culture and resources; ethical reflexivity where students and faculty collaboratively develop guidelines addressing bias, authenticity, and responsibility; and human-centered evaluation with metrics that assess critical thinking, moral reasoning, and social awareness beyond academic performance. This approach acknowledges that one-size-fits-all solutions are inadequate for the diverse landscape of higher education.

GenAI stands at a nexus of advanced computational power, fluid user interfaces, and global connectivity. Our analysis suggests that practical gains, like accelerated feedback loops, coexist with deeper questions about the nature of education itself. Critics fear that substituting human exploration with AI-generated knowledge might corrode the essence of self-directed inquiry (Xu, 2024). Proponents argue that ethical usage can amplify creativity and inclusivity (Epstein et al., 2023; Sharma & Pandey, 2024; Wang, 2025). These tensions invite us to consider

posthuman perspectives that move beyond viewing AI as merely a tool, a theme we explore in depth in the following section.

Whether in business or the liberal arts, the pivot toward AI calls for educators to reevaluate their curricular goals, ensuring that adoption aligns with the time-honored objectives of intellectual growth, moral reflection, and community well-being (Ambardekar, 2024; Nasr & El-Deeb, 2025; Qureshi, 2024).

Posthuman Perspectives on GenAI

The rise of advanced AI brings forth conversations around posthumanism, a philosophical stance that challenges purely anthropocentric notions of creativity and intelligence (Nasr & El-Deeb, 2025). Rather than viewing technology as a subordinate tool, posthumanism envisions AI as an active collaborator in shaping new forms of culture, knowledge, and potentially consciousness (Akhtar, 2024; Creely & Blannin, 2025; Lim et al., 2023). In educational contexts, this lens invites us to reconsider the traditional boundaries between human and machine.

One concept of a potential "posthuman classroom" emerges as a space where neither human nor machine intelligence claims absolute centrality, but where both participate in a dynamic ecosystem of knowledge creation (Bail, 2024; Creely & Blannin, 2025; Mittal et al., 2024; Sharples, 2023; Stockman, 2024; Swindell et al., 2024). Researchers argue that generative models can function not merely as tools but as co-creators, expanding creative processes in art, music, writing, and other domains (Creely & Blannin, 2025; Guha et al., 2023). This collaboration questions conventional notions of originality and authorship that have long underpinned educational assessment. When an essay, business plan, or artistic work emerges from the interplay of human direction and machine generation, traditional attributions of intellectual ownership become increasingly tenuous (Epstein et al., 2023; Sharples, 2023).

Research suggests that AI-human collaboration may catalyze entirely new theoretical frameworks in social sciences, as the simulation of human-like behaviors pushes us to reimagine theories of agency and interpersonal relations (Bail, 2024; Creely & Blannin, 2025; Huo & Siau, 2024; Obreja et al., 2024). In business education, where human judgment has been considered irreplaceable, generative AI introduces possibilities for modeling complex decision scenarios and generating multiple strategic alternatives that might escape human consideration. The posthuman educational framework does not surrender human values to technological determinism but seeks a middle path—acknowledging how technology reshapes our cognitive landscape while preserving distinctly human capacities for ethical reasoning and relational understanding (Chiu, 2024; Epstein et al., 2023; Matos et al., 2024; O'Dea, 2024; Swindell et al., 2024).

Research frames the central question not as whether AI will replace human educators but whether education will maintain its transformative purpose as an endeavor that shapes not just skills but character and identity. Under a thoughtful posthuman model, educators retain vital roles in guiding ethical reflection, empathic engagement, and interpretive insight. The machine may generate content, but humans continue to infuse that content with meaning, purpose, and ethical direction. This synergistic relationship suggests not the diminishment of human significance but its evolution in tandem with technological partners, creating educational experiences that neither human nor machine could achieve alone (Guha et al., 2023).

Limitations And Future Research

Though our synthesis highlights broad patterns of AI usage and debate, several limitations constrain the scope of this work. The rapidly evolving nature of GenAI technologies presents a significant challenge, as new architectures such as GPT-5 and Gemini constantly alter available features. Observations made today may require substantial reevaluation as these models continue to evolve and transform. Our discussion also applies predominantly to Western higher education contexts, necessitating cross-cultural analyses to understand how different educational traditions, resources, and values shape GenAI adoption across diverse global settings.

The field further suffers from significant empirical gaps, as many claims about GenAI revolve around potential or hypothetical impacts rather than demonstrated outcomes (Mittal et al., 2024; Obreja et al., 2024; Ogunleye et al., 2024). Systematic, longitudinal data remain sparse, suggesting the need for comparative studies between cohorts using AI-augmented instruction and control groups across multiple academic terms (Chiu, 2024). Additionally, technological biases inherent in GenAI systems can produce incomplete or skewed outputs, highlighting the need for refined detection methods for discriminatory or harmful content and the development of safer, more equitable AI training protocols.

Future research might extend this work through several promising avenues (Akhtar, 2024). Scholars could investigate posthuman pedagogies through detailed case studies of courses incorporating AI "cocreators," exploring the ethical, emotional, and intellectual transformations that occur in such classrooms (Zabojnik & Hromada, 2024; Bail, 2024). Interdisciplinary crossovers represent another fertile area, as partnerships among computer science, social sciences, and the arts could forge integrative frameworks for creative AI usage, building from established approaches like creative partnerships. The development of open-source infrastructure offers a third direction, as researchers pioneer AI tools specifically tailored for educational research, enabling more transparent data curation and responsible model usage. Finally, conducting longitudinal studies would provide invaluable insights into how

repeated exposure to GenAI shapes students' problem-solving abilities, moral reasoning, and collaborative skills throughout entire degree programs (Kumar et al., 2024).

Conclusion

This examination of generative AI in higher education reveals both transformative possibilities and profound challenges that extend far beyond technological novelty. As GenAI reshapes educational practices across disciplines, its impact on business education merits particular attention given the field's orientation toward professional preparation. The integration of these technologies necessitates a fundamental reconsideration of authentic learning and assessment (Chithara & Madzvamuse, 2024; Epstein et al., 2023), challenging educators to design learning experiences that leverage AI's capabilities while preserving critical thinking, ethical judgment, and collaborative meaning-making (Sharma & Pandey, 2024).

The ethical dimensions extend beyond academic integrity to deeper considerations of equity, accessibility, and democratic participation in knowledge production (O'Dea, 2024; Huo & Siau, 2024). Business programs, with their connections to organizational practice, can model responsible approaches that balance innovation with inclusive design. By fostering critical dialogue about societal implications, business education can prepare graduates not merely to use AI competently, but to shape its implementation in alignment with human values (Monib et al., 2024; Nasr & El-Deeb, 2025).

The future of education in a world transformed by generative AI will be written by educators and learners who thoughtfully incorporate these technologies into the ongoing human project of knowledge creation. This future invites us to reimagine not just teaching methods but fundamental conceptions of education in an age where the boundaries between human and machine intelligence grow increasingly permeable (Ambardekar, 2024; Zabojnik & Hromada, 2024).

References

Akhtar, Z. B. (2024). Unveiling the evolution of generative AI (GAI): a comprehensive and investigative analysis toward LLM models (2021–2024) and beyond. *Journal of Electrical Systems and Information Technology*, *11*(1), 22. https://doi.org/10.1186/s43067-024-00145-1

Ambardekar, P. (2024). On the epistemic value of reflection. *Ergo: An Open Access Journal of Philosophy*, *11*(30), 803-828. https://doi.org/10.3998/ergo.6784

Bail, C. A. (2024). Can Generative AI improve social science?. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *121*(21), e2314021121. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2314021121

Benmamoun, M. (2024). Reinventing international business education: Integrating the power of generative AI. *AIB Insights*, *24*(1), 1-7. https://doi.org/10.46697/001c.90397

Changalima, I. A., Amani, D., & Ismail, I. J. (2024). Social influence and information quality on Generative AI use among business students. *The International Journal of Management Education*, *22*(3), 101063. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2024.101063

Chithara, H., & Madzvamuse, S. (2024, November). Perspectives on Teaching and Learning in Higher Education in the Era of Generative AI. In *2024 4th International Multidisciplinary Information Technology and Engineering Conference (IMITEC)* (pp. 81-85). IEEE. https://doi.org/10.1109/imitec60221.2024.10851078

Chiu, T. K. (2024). Future research recommendations for transforming higher education with generative AI. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *6*, 100197. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2023.100197

Creely, E., & Blannin, J. (2025). Creative partnerships with generative AI. Possibilities for education and beyond. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, *56*, 101727. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2024.101727

Epstein, Z., Hertzmann, A., Investigators of Human Creativity, Akten, M., Farid, H., Fjeld, J., ... & Smith, A. (2023). Art and the science of generative AI. *Science*, *380*(6650), 1110-1111. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adh4451

Guha, A., Grewal, D., & Atlas, S. (2024). Generative AI and marketing education: What the future holds. *Journal of Marketing Education*, *46*(1), 6-17. https://doi.org/10.1177/02734753231215436

Gupta, P., Mahajan, R., Badhera, U., & Kushwaha, P. S. (2024). Integrating generative AI in management education: A mixed-methods study using social construction of technology theory. *The International Journal of Management Education*, *22*(3), 101017. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2024.101017

Huo, X., & Siau, K. L. (2024). Generative Artificial Intelligence in Business Higher Education: A Focus Group Study. *Journal of Global Information Management (JGIM)*, *32*(1), 1-21. https://doi.org/10.4018/jgim.364093

Kumar, S., Rao, P., Singhania, S., Verma, S., & Kheterpal, M. (2024). Will artificial intelligence drive the advancements in higher education? A tri-phased exploration. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *201*, 123258. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2024.123258

Lim, W. M., Gunasekara, A., Pallant, J. L., Pallant, J. I., & Pechenkina, E. (2023). Generative AI and the future of education: Ragnarök or reformation? A paradoxical perspective from management educators. *The international journal of management education*, *21*(2), 100790. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2023.100790

Matos, E. J., Bertoncini, A. L. C., Ames, M. C. F. D. C., & Serafim, M. C. (2024). The (lack of) ethics at generative AI in Business Management education and research. *RAM. Revista de Administração Mackenzie*, *25*, eRAMD240061. https://doi.org/10.1590/1678-6971/eramd240061

MIT Open Learning. (2024). Generative AI in teaching: Faculty learning community. https://openlearning.mit.edu/mit-faculty/residential-digital-innovations/generative-ai-teaching-faculty-learning-community

Mittal, U., Sai, S., & Chamola, V. (2024). A comprehensive review on generative ai for education. *IEEE Access*. https://doi.org/10.1109/access.2024.3468368

Monib, W. K., Qazi, A., Apong, R. A., Azizan, M. T., De Silva, L., & Yassin, H. (2024). Generative AI and future education: a review, theoretical validation, and authors' perspective on challenges and solutions. *PeerJ Computer Science*, *10*, e2105. https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj-cs.2105

Nasr, R. S., & El-Deeb, S. (2025). Generative AI and Its Potential Impact on Humanity. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, *49*(1), e70024. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijcs.70024

Nithithanatchinnapat, B., Maurer, J., Deng, X., & Joshi, K. D. (2024). Future business workforce: Crafting a generative AI-centric curriculum today for tomorrow's business education. *ACM SIGMIS Database: The DATABASE for Advances in Information Systems*, *55*(1), 6-11. https://doi.org/10.1145/3645057.3645059

O'Dea, X. (2024). Generative AI: is it a paradigm shift for higher education?. *Studies in Higher Education*, *49*(5), 811-816. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2024.2332944

Obreja, D. M., Rughiniș, R., & Rosner, D. (2025). Mapping the multidimensional trend of generative AI: A bibliometric analysis and qualitative thematic review. *Computers in Human Behavior Reports*, *17*, 100576. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbr.2024.100576

Ogunleye, B., Zakariyyah, K. I., Ajao, O., Olayinka, O., & Sharma, H. (2024). A systematic review of generative AI for teaching and learning practice. *Education Sciences, 14*(6), 636. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14060636

Qureshi, F. (2024). Redesigning Assessments in Business Education: Addressing Generative AI's Impact on Academic Integrity. *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)*, 13(10), 1761–1765. https://doi.org/10.21275/sr241021051659

Sharma, D., & Pandey, H. (2024). Pedagogical impact of text-generative AI and ChatGPT on business communication. *Business and Professional Communication Quarterly*, 23294906241249113. https://doi.org/10.1177/23294906241249113

Sharples, M. (2023). Towards social generative AI for education: theory, practices and ethics. *Learning: Research and Practice*, *9*(2), 159-167. https://doi.org/10.1080/23735082.2023.2261131

Stockman, C. (2024). Generative AI and the End of Education. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on AI Research*, 4(1), 390–397. https://doi.org/10.34190/icair.4.1.3155

Swindell, A., Greeley, L., Farag, A., & Verdone, B. (2024). Against Artificial Education: Towards an Ethical Framework for Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) Use in Education. *Online Learning*, *28*(2), n2. https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v28i2.4438

Wang, N. C. (2025). Scaffolding Creativity: Integrating Generative AI Tools and Real-world Experiences in Business Education. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.06527*.

Xu, X. (2024). Navigating the AI revolution: Implications for business education and pedagogy. *Journal of Curriculum and Teaching*, 13(1), 371. https://doi.org/10.5430/jct.v13n1p371

Yusuf, A., Pervin, N., & Román-González, M. (2024). Generative AI and the future of higher education: a threat to academic integrity or reformation? Evidence from multicultural perspectives. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *21*(1), 21. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00453-6

Zábojník, R., & Hromada, V. (2024). The Role of Generative AI in Empowering Generation Z in Higher Education. In *Conference Proceedings from the International Scientific Conference "Marketing and Media Identity: Human vs: Artificial"*, 758–776. https://doi.org/10.34135/mmidentity-2024-75