

THE IMPACT OF AI ON HIGHER EDUCATION: NAVIGATING THE POST-PANDEMIC LANDSCAPE THROUGH EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION

Nataša Simeunović Bajić¹, Ilija Milosavljević²

^{1,2}Univerzitet u Nišu, Filozofski fakultet, Niš, Srbija

¹natasasimeunovic.bajic@filfak.ni.ac.rs, ²ilija.milosavljevic@filfak.ni.ac.rs

Abstract: The COVID-19 pandemic fundamentally disrupted higher education, forcing an unprecedented acceleration in digital technology adoption while simultaneously exposing critical gaps in digital literacy among students and faculty alike. This paper examines the convergence of three interrelated phenomena: the lasting transformation of educational delivery systems, the rapid integration of Artificial Intelligence technologies, and the persistent challenges of maintaining academic quality and equity in increasingly digitized learning environments. Rather than presenting AI as an unambiguous solution to post-pandemic challenges, we adopt a critical perspective that interrogates both the transformative potential and inherent limitations of these technologies. Our analysis emphasizes that successful AI integration depends fundamentally on transparent communication, robust ethical frameworks, and genuine collaboration among all stakeholders in the learning community.

Key Words: AI, digital communication, education

1. INTRODUCTION

This analysis has adopted a deliberately critical stance toward AI in higher education, interrogating enthusiastic claims while highlighting risks and limitations. AI technologies possess genuine potential to enhance aspects of higher education: providing personalized support, automating routine tasks, analyzing patterns invisible to human observation, and expanding access for some student populations. However, realizing this potential while mitigating serious risks requires conditions not yet widely present: robust digital literacy among all educational actors, transparent governance processes, ethical frameworks operationalized through concrete practices, ongoing assessment and accountability, and adequate resourcing of human educational infrastructure.

Most fundamentally, responsible AI integration requires sustained attention to questions of power: whose interests does AI serve, whose voices shape its development and deployment, and how do we ensure it enhances rather than undermines educational equity and democratic values? The post-pandemic moment presents both opportunity and danger. By engaging these questions thoughtfully, critically, and collectively, higher education can harness AI's potential while preserving what remains most valuable: human relationships of teaching and learning through which knowledge is collaboratively constructed, questioned, and transformed. The path forward requires what might be called "conditional optimism" - hope tempered by vigilance, innovation guided by ethics, and progress measured not by technological sophistication but by genuine advancement of educational equity and human flourishing. AI is meant to serve as an assistant, not a substitute, and using it effectively requires AI literacy that must be learned and developed through practice.

2. AI APPLICATIONS IN HIGHER EDUCATION: PROMISES AND CONCERNS

This analysis uses comprehensive literature synthesis to map AI in post-pandemic higher education, encompassing empirical studies, theoretical frameworks, policy documents, and institutional reports (Bozkurt et al., 2022; Castillo-Martínez et al., 2024). The approach is deliberately synthetic, identifying patterns, tensions, and unresolved debates. Drawing from critical pedagogy and science and technology studies (STS), it emphasizes that technologies embody particular values, assumptions, and power relations rather than being neutral tools. The pandemic exposed how many students and faculty lacked broader capacities for critical engagement with digital environments, revealing how narrow our conceptions of "digital literacy" had been. Earlier frameworks treated it as functional competency: operating software, navigating platforms, creating digital artifacts. Recent scholarship argues for expanded definitions encompassing critical understanding of how digital systems work, whose interests they serve, and how they shape knowledge production (Aristovnik et al., 2023). In the AI context, this means asking not just "How do I use this tool?" but "What biases might it embody? What labor exploitation enabled its creation? Who profits from my use of it?" Human communication occurs within a symbolic world where meaning is constantly created through verbal and nonverbal forms. Language allows expression and interpretation of reality, while gestures and visual signs complement what words cannot convey. These symbolic exchanges form the foundation of mutual understanding, an aspect that becomes fragile when mediated through technology (Simeunović Bajić, 2022). The abrupt shift to online learning revealed how much educational communication had relied on unexamined assumptions

about physical co-presence. Faculty accustomed to "reading the room" found themselves facing black Zoom rectangles. Students who would spontaneously ask questions after class struggled to articulate concerns through formal discussion boards. These were epistemological problems, not just logistical ones. Education depends on relationships, dialogue, and mutual understanding, all mediated through platforms designed for corporate meetings rather than pedagogical interaction. As Hodges et al. (2020) note, "emergency remote teaching" often replicated the worst aspects of traditional lecturing while losing the human connection that made even mediocre in-person teaching tolerable. Even as institutions invested in Learning Management Systems and video conferencing, they often neglected underlying infrastructure disparities. Students with inadequate internet, shared devices, or unstable housing couldn't meaningfully participate regardless of course design quality. These material realities matter enormously but often disappeared from institutional discourse about "building resilience" or "embracing innovation." Rather than asking why students lacked reliable internet access, the rhetoric of transformation framed the problem as individual "barriers to overcome."

AI's rapid integration during and after the pandemic reflected both genuine potential and concerning haste. Institutions facing unprecedented challenges proved receptive to technological solutions, sometimes without adequate consideration of implications (Bozkurt et al., 2022). AI's capacity for personalized learning represents its most touted benefit. Adaptive systems analyze student performance to tailor content difficulty, pacing, and presentation style (Mellado & Castro, 2023). Intelligent tutoring systems provide customized feedback. Learning analytics identify struggling students and suggest targeted interventions. However, personalization raises concerns. It assumes learning is fundamentally individual rather than social, potentially undermining collaborative knowledge construction. It depends on constant data collection, raising privacy concerns. The algorithms determining "appropriate" content embody particular pedagogical assumptions that may not align with instructor values or student needs (European Commission, 2020). Most fundamentally, personalization often means adapting students to predetermined objectives rather than questioning those objectives themselves. Automated grading systems promise to reduce faculty workload while providing faster feedback. However, automated assessment tends to reward conformity to algorithmic preferences rather than genuine intellectual risk-taking. Students learn to write for the algorithm, potentially stifling creativity and critical thinking. Assessment is not merely measurement but pedagogical relationship. When instructors evaluate student work, they engage in dialogue with student thinking. Automated systems cannot replicate this dialogic dimension. Moreover, automation may exacerbate existing biases. Baker and Hawn (2021) document how AI grading systems have reproduced racial and socioeconomic biases from their training data. Many institutions now use AI-powered predictive analytics to identify "at-risk" students based on patterns in their data. The goal is early intervention to prevent failure or dropout. However, prediction can become self-fulfilling prophecy. Students flagged as "at risk" may be tracked into remedial programs or subjected to additional monitoring, affecting their educational experience and self-perception. Predictive models trained on historical data tend to reproduce existing patterns of inequality (van de Werfhorst & Kessenich, 2022). If students from particular demographic groups have historically struggled at higher rates, algorithms will identify similar students as "at risk" regardless of individual potential. The emergence of ChatGPT has sparked intense debate. Some see revolutionary potential for tutoring, writing assistance, and curriculum development (Lin et al., 2024). Others fear academic integrity crises. Both perspectives hold truth but miss important nuances. The real challenge isn't preventing AI use but teaching students to engage with these tools critically and ethically, which means rethinking assessment methods that AI easily circumvents. Some research points to productive approaches. Sicka (2024) shows how ChatGPT can help develop decolonized curricula by identifying diverse voices instructors might otherwise miss. Michel-Villarreal et al. (2023) approach of "interviewing" ChatGPT about its capabilities models the critical engagement students need. Yet enthusiasm must be tempered by recognition of significant limitations. ChatGPT produces confident-sounding text regardless of accuracy and reflects biases in its training data. When students use it uncritically, they develop superficial understanding that crumbles under scrutiny.

The European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (2022) emphasizes that addressing algorithmic bias demands fundamental rethinking of how AI systems are developed and deployed. This includes involving affected communities in design, establishing transparent accountability, and conducting regular audits. In education, this means questioning not just how AI makes decisions but whether certain decisions should be algorithmically mediated at all. Should AI influence admissions? Determine who receives support services? Evaluate teacher performance? These are political and ethical questions, not purely technical ones. Baker and Hawn (2021) point out that algorithmic systems in education often replicate existing disparities, rewarding conformity to historical patterns rather than encouraging inclusive pedagogies. The European Commission's (2020) Digital Education Action Plan 2021-2027 underscores the need for digital and ethical literacy among educators and learners. The EU's (2024) Regulation 2024/1689 establishes transparency, accountability, and human oversight as key principles. These frameworks reinforce that algorithmic fairness requires institutional commitment to transparency, participatory governance, and continuous ethical evaluation, not just technical optimization. AI in education depends on massive data collection: every click, keystroke, and pause potentially becomes data for analysis. This creates what scholars call a "surveillance infrastructure" that fundamentally alters student-institution relationships. Privacy regulations like FERPA and GDPR establish important protections, but AI systems often operate in gray areas with unclear regulatory coverage. Privacy-by-consent frameworks prove inadequate when students can't meaningfully refuse data collection without sacrificing educational opportunities. The EU framework (European Union, 2024) emphasizes data minimization, transparency, security safeguards, and purpose limitation. Beyond compliance, there are deeper questions about what educational

relationships become when they're comprehensively monitored. AI's potential to automate educational tasks raises existential questions for the academic profession. If AI can deliver personalized instruction, grade assignments, and provide student support, what remains of traditional faculty roles? Adjunct instructors and graduate teaching assistants, already precarious workers, are most vulnerable to displacement. If AI can deliver lower-level courses cheaply, institutions face financial incentives to expand AI use while contracting human teaching staff. Even for tenured faculty, AI integration may hollow out professional expertise. When algorithms determine curriculum content, assessment criteria, and pedagogical approaches, faculty become technicians implementing systems designed elsewhere rather than autonomous professionals. Mellado and Castro (2023) document institutions experimenting with AI-driven course delivery that minimizes human involvement. Many AI systems function as "black boxes": even their designers can't fully explain how they produce particular outputs. This opacity creates accountability vacuums. Molina (2023) argues that meaningful algorithmic accountability requires explainability, contestability, auditability, and human oversight. Yet implementing these principles proves difficult. Commercial AI systems are often proprietary, with vendors claiming algorithms are trade secrets. This prevents independent scrutiny while creating vendor dependence that undermines institutional autonomy.

Addressing AI's implications requires integrating expertise across multiple domains. Computer scientists understand algorithmic capabilities but may lack insight into pedagogical objectives. Educators understand teaching but may lack technical literacy to critically evaluate AI systems (Alshatti Schmidt et al., 2025). Ethicists can identify normative concerns but may not grasp practical implementation challenges. Genuine interdisciplinarity isn't optional, it's essential. Yet it faces real obstacles: different disciplines have distinct epistemologies, methodologies, and professional incentives that can impede collaboration (Bauer et al., 2025). The literature reveals AI in higher education as a site of tension between promise and peril, innovation and inequality, empowerment and surveillance. The pandemic showed that digital literacy isn't a static skill set but an evolving capacity for critical engagement with emerging technologies (Milosavljević, 2020; Aristovnik et al., 2023; Bozkurt et al., 2022). Digital literacy education must move beyond functional training toward critical consciousness: students need to interrogate AI tools, not just operate them. Digital literacy is unevenly distributed along lines of race, class, geography, and other dimensions of inequality (Milosavljević et al., 2023; van de Werfhorst & Kessenich, 2022). Faculty digital literacy deserves equal attention (Hodges et al., 2020; Alshatti Schmidt et al., 2025). Institutional discourse often frames AI integration as inevitable technological progress, an ideologically loaded view that obscures the deliberate choices involved (European Commission, 2020). AI should be treated as one pedagogical option among many, adopted when it genuinely supports educational objectives and rejected when it doesn't. Institutions must articulate educational values clearly, evaluate technologies against them, and ensure transparency, dialogue, and equity in implementation (Castillo-Martínez et al., 2024; European Union, 2024). Many institutions have adopted AI ethics principles but struggle to operationalize them, highlighting the need for concrete mechanisms: algorithmic impact assessments, ethics reviews, audits, sunset provisions, and redress processes (Baker & Hawn, 2021; European Commission, 2020). Ultimately, AI can't solve educational inequities rooted in structural disadvantage, it may intensify them (Mellado & Castro, 2023; Bauer et al., 2025). Real transformation demands renewed commitment to equity, fair compensation for academic labor, and recognition that teaching and learning remain fundamentally human endeavors (Alshatti Schmidt et al., 2025). The future of AI in higher education depends not on technological inevitability but on our collective capacity for ethical reflection, transparent communication, and commitment to human-centered learning.

3. CONCLUSION

This analysis has adopted a deliberately critical stance toward AI in higher education, interrogating enthusiastic claims while highlighting risks and limitations. AI technologies possess genuine potential to enhance aspects of higher education: providing personalized support, automating routine tasks, and expanding access for some student populations. However, realizing this potential while mitigating serious risks requires robust digital literacy among all educational actors, transparent governance processes, ethical frameworks operationalized through concrete practices, and adequate resourcing of human educational infrastructure.

Most fundamentally, responsible AI integration requires sustained attention to questions of power: whose interests does AI serve, whose voices shape its development and deployment, and how do we ensure it enhances rather than undermines educational equity and democratic values? By engaging these questions thoughtfully, critically, and collectively, higher education can harness AI's potential while preserving what remains most valuable: human relationships of teaching and learning through which knowledge is collaboratively constructed, questioned, and transformed. The path forward requires "conditional optimism" - hope tempered by vigilance, innovation guided by ethics, and progress measured by genuine advancement of educational equity and human flourishing. AI technology appeared at a historical moment when its arrival was both timely and necessary, given the overwhelming volume and speed of information, and the increasing shortage of time to process it. It is meant to serve as an assistant, not a substitute. Using it effectively requires a level of AI literacy that, like any other skill, must be learned and developed through practice.

4. REFERENCES

- [1] Alshatti Schmidt, D., Alboloushi, B., Thomas, A., & Magalhaes, R. (2025). *Integrating artificial intelligence in higher education: Perceptions, challenges, and strategies for academic innovation*. Computers and Education Open, 6, 100274. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeo.2025.100274>
- [2] Aristovnik, A., Karampelas, K., Umek, L., & Ravšelj, D. (2023). *Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on online learning in higher education: a bibliometric analysis*. Frontiers in Education, 8, 1225834. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2023.1225834>
- [3] Baker, R. S., & Hawn, A. (2021). *Algorithmic Bias in Education*. <https://doi.org/10.35542/osf.io/pbmvz>
- [4] Bauer, E., Greiff, S., Graesser, A. C., Scheiter, K., & Sailer, M. (2025). *Looking beyond the hype: Understanding the effects of AI on learning*. Educational Psychology Review, 37, 45. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-025-09945-2>
- [5] Bozkurt, A., Karakaya, K., Turk, M., Karakaya, Ö., & Castellanos-Reyes, D. (2022). *The impact of COVID-19 on education: A meta-narrative review*. TechTrends, 66(5), 883-896. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-022-00759-0>
- [6] Castillo-Martínez, I., Ramírez-Montoya, M. S., & Burgos, D. (2024). *Artificial intelligence in higher education: A systematic literature review on its ethical, pedagogical, and organizational implications*. Education and Information Technologies, 29(4), 6123-6147. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-12245-1>
- [7] European Commission. (2020). *Digital Education Action Plan 2021-2027: Resetting education and training for the digital age*. Brussels. <https://education.ec.europa.eu/focus-topics/digital-education/plan>
- [8] European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA). (2022). *Bias in algorithms: How to address challenges of fairness in artificial intelligence systems*. https://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra_uploads/fra-2022-bias-in-algorithms_en.pdf
- [9] European Union. (2024). *Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council on data privacy and security*. Official Journal of the European Union. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=OJ:L_202401689
- [10] Hodges, C., Moore, S., Lockee, B., Trust, T., & Bond, A. (2020). *The difference between emergency remote teaching and online learning*. Educause Review, 27(1). <https://er.educause.edu/articles/2020/3/the-difference-between-emergency-remote-teaching-and-online-learning>
- [11] Lin, X., Chan, R. Y., Sharma, S., & Bista, K. (2024). *The Use of ChatGPT in Higher Education*. In X. Lin, R. Y. Chan, S. Sharma, & K. Bista (Eds.), *ChatGPT and Global Higher Education: Using Artificial Intelligence in Teaching and Learning* (pp. 1-17). Baltimore, MD: STAR Scholars Press.
- [12] Mellado, J., & Castro, A. (2023). *The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Education and the Labor Market: Challenges and Opportunities*. Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Education, 4(4), 27. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ai4040027>
- [13] Michel-Villarreal, R., Vilalta-Perdomo, E., Salinas-Navarro, D. E., Thierry-Aguilera, R., & Gerardou, F. S. (2023). *Challenges and opportunities of generative AI for higher education as explained by ChatGPT*. Education Sciences, 13(9), 856. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13090856>
- [14] Milosavljević, I. (2020). *The phenomenon of the internet memes as a manifestation of communication of visual society: Research of the most popular and the most common types*. Applied Media Studies Journal, 1(1), 9-27.
- [15] Milosavljević, I., Trajković, J., & Nedić, N. (2023). *Information chaos on the Internet: Perception in relation to the age of users*. Applied Media Studies Journal, 4(1), 65-80.
- [16] Molina, M. (2023). *The Role of Artificial Intelligence in Education: Opportunities and Challenges for Teachers and Students*. SSRN. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4961260>
- [17] Sicka, B. (2024). *ChatGPT as a pedagogical tool for decolonizing curriculum*. In X. Lin, R. Y. Chan, S. Sharma, & K. Bista (Eds.), *ChatGPT and Global Higher Education: Using Artificial Intelligence in Teaching and Learning* (pp. 76-98). Baltimore, MD: STAR Scholars Press.
- [18] Simeunović Bajić, N. (2022). *Međukulturno komuniciranje i mediji*. Niš: Filozofski fakultet Univerziteta u Nišu. <https://izdanja.filfak.ni.ac.rs/udzbenici/2022/međukulturno-komuniciranje-i-mediji>
- [19] van de Werfhorst, H. G., & Kessenich, E. (2022). *The Digital Divide in Online Education: Inequality in Digital Readiness of Students and Schools*. Computers and Education Open, 3(11), 100100. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeo.2022.100100>