Associated conference: Shaping the Future of Education in the age of AI: Empowering inclusion, innovation and ethical growth

Conference location: Bologna, Italy

Conference date: 15–17 June, 2025

How to cite: Leitgeb, T., Leitgeb, M. 2025. Artificial Intelligence and Large Language Models in Higher Education: Results of a Systematic Review. *Ubiquity Proceedings*, 6(1): 33. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5334/uproc.201

Published on: 03 September 2025

UBIQUITY PROCEEDINGS

ubiquity press open access https://ubiquityproceedings.com

Artificial Intelligence and Large Language Models in Higher Education: Results of a Systematic Review

Thomas Leitgeb[1], Michael Leitgeb[2]

[1] Centre for Digital Education and STEAM, University College of Teacher Education, Austria; thomas.leitgeb@ph-burgenland.at
[2] Centre for Digital Education and STEAM, University College of Teacher Education, Austria; michael.leitgeb@ph-burgenland.at

Correspondence: Thomas Leitgeb: thomas.leitgeb@ph-burgenland.at

Abstract:

Artificial Intelligence (AI)—especially Large Language Models (LLMs)—has become increasingly important in higher education, offering applications ranging from personalized learning paths to administrative process automation. Despite these advancements, there is a clear need for integrative frameworks that address both technical efficiency and ethical standards, particularly in data-sensitive academic contexts. This paper presents findings from a systematic literature review of 111 relevant studies (2014–2024) identified in Web of Science, Scopus, and Google Scholar. Guided by PRISMA methodology, we synthesized the potential benefits (e.g., adaptive feedback, administrative automation) and significant challenges (e.g., privacy issues, algorithmic bias, lack of model explainability). We propose three essential pillars for responsible and effective AI integration in higher education:

1. Institution-owned AI systems to ensure robust data governance,
2. Continually updated policy guidelines emphasizing transparency and academic integrity, and
3. High-quality professional development for faculty to build both technical and ethical capacities.

Our findings underscore the need for holistic approaches that unite technical innovation with ethical accountability, thus facilitating sustainable, equitable, and data-protective AI adoption in universities. The conclusions and recommendations presented here provide a practical roadmap for institutions seeking to optimize learning processes while maintaining the highest standards of fairness and privacy.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education, Systematic Literature Review, Large Langauge Models

1. Introduction

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has undergone a significant surge in importance within higher education, transforming teaching, learning, and institutional operations (Kasneci et al., 2023). Large Language Models (LLMs), including chatbots capable of generating human-like text, offer new possibilities for creating adaptive learning environments and automating assessments. However, empirical evidence suggests that many institutions still struggle to balance these tools' technical potential with stringent ethical and legal requirements (Vincent-Lancrin & Vlies, 2020).

The question of how to implement AI in higher education in a manner that prioritizes fairness, privacy, and transparency remains underexplored (Holmes et al., 2019). While existing literature points to broad trends—such as AI-based predictive systems for academic performance and the personalization of learning materials (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019)—few studies provide an integrative perspective encompassing both the technical and ethical dimensions. Thus, this paper seeks to contribute to "Empowering Inclusion, Innovation and Ethical Growth" by presenting results of a comprehensive review that addresses the following research question:

How can AI systems—particularly LLMs—be designed and implemented in higher education to improve learning processes while ensuring technical efficiency and compliance with ethical standards, such as data protection and fairness?

2. Theoretical Background and Research Gaps

Early work on AI in education often centered on discrete technical gains—e.g., improved predictive models or more automated grading—without considering the broader context of data privacy, fairness, or user acceptance (Selwyn, 2019). Meanwhile, ethical concerns about bias, transparency, and accountability have garnered increased attention (Floridi & Cowls, 2019).

Despite a variety of systematic reviews (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019; Crompton & Burke, 2023; Chu et al., 2022) and domain-specific investigations (e.g., chatbots in language learning; Fryer et al., 2019), several gaps persist:

1. **Holistic Approaches**

   Existing studies rarely integrate technical efficiency (e.g., accuracy, reliability) with stringent ethical concerns (e.g., privacy, equity).

2. **Concrete Mitigation of AI Challenges**

   Issues such as "hallucinations" in LLMs (Valentin et al., 2024) and the "black box" nature of advanced AI models (Lipton, 2018) require targeted solutions.

3. **Privacy Solutions in Institutional Contexts**

   Few sources provide actionable strategies for implementing data protection measures that comply with, for instance, the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR).

4. **Bias Avoidance**

   Systematic distortions in datasets and models risk reinforcing social inequities (Baker & Hawn, 2022; Omughelli et al., 2024). Few studies offer institution-level frameworks to detect and mitigate algorithmic biases.

These gaps underline the urgent need for integrative research that combines technical and ethical dimensions to build trust in AI systems (Drachsler & Greller, 2016).

3. Methodology

3.1 PRISMA-Based Systematic Review

We conducted a systematic literature search following the PRISMA guidelines (PRISMA, 2020). Searches were carried out in September 2024 in three databases: Web of Science, Scopus, and Google Scholar. We focused on the period 2014–2024 to capture recent trends and included only English- and German-language publications pertinent to higher education and AI/LLM applications.

Search Strings and Selection

- Combined Boolean operators (e.g., "AI" AND "Higher Education" AND "Data Privacy")
- Yielded 1,946 initial results (845 from Web of Science, 367 from Scopus, 734 from Google Scholar)
- After removing duplicates, 467 records remained

Studies were retained only if they explicitly addressed AI or LLM applications in higher education and provided empirical or theoretical insights relevant to data protection, bias, explainability, or technical integration.

3.2 Qualitative Content Analysis

We adopted an inductive–deductive scheme (Mayring, 2015) to categorize the final pool of 111 articles. Core categories included:

1. **Potentials of AI and LLMs** (personalized learning, automated assessment)
2. **Challenges** (data quality, resource requirements)
3. **Ethical Implications** (data protection, bias)
4. **Recommended Measures** (guidelines, professional development, institutional AI systems)

Intercoder reliability was established through iterative review of coding procedures, ensuring consistent interpretation.

4. Findings

4.1 Potential of AI and LLMs in Higher Education

4.1.1 Personalized Learning

Adaptive learning models guided by LLMs enable real-time student profiling and customized feedback (Wen et al., 2024; Ng & Fung, 2024). For instance, GPT-4–driven course management systems can dynamically suggest tasks aligned with individual performance data (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019). Empirical studies point to increased student motivation, especially when LLM-based platforms adapt content difficulty in real time (Suresh & Misra, 2024).

4.1.2 Efficiency Gains

AI-based automation can expedite administrative tasks (Abimbola et al., 2024) and reduce manual grading workloads (Larondo et al., 2024). LLMs employed in intelligent tutoring systems also generate personalized feedback—improving student outcomes while freeing academic staff for more in-depth pedagogical engagement (Stamper et al., 2024).

4.1.3 Innovative Teaching Methods

Chatbots—such as Jill Watson at Georgia Tech—showcase how AI can offer immediate guidance and address common queries at scale (Taneja et al., 2024). In language-learning contexts, chatbots can serve as conversational partners, fueling interest and skill development (Fryer et al., 2019). Studies also confirm a positive correlation between adaptive chatbot usage and learners' self-reported critical thinking (Ali et al., 2024).

4.2 Challenges

4.2.1 Data Quality and Infrastructure

Machine learning outcomes heavily depend on comprehensive, high-quality datasets (Budach et al., 2022). Institutions lacking sufficient resources or infrastructure may face suboptimal model performance, hampering broad access to AI's pedagogical benefits (Li, 2023). Additionally, advanced AI systems consume substantial energy, raising sustainability concerns (Strubell et al., 2019).

4.2.2 Algorithmic Bias

Systemic biases in training data risk perpetuating social inequities (Baker & Hawn, 2022). In educational contexts, biased models can influence admission decisions or academic performance predictions, undercutting equal opportunities for students (Omughelli et al., 2024). Tools for bias detection and mitigation are critical but often underutilized (Pagano et al., 2023).

4.2.3 Privacy and Security

Compliance with GDPR and other data-protection laws is a key institutional barrier (Drachsler & Greller, 2016). The large-scale processing of sensitive student data raises serious confidentiality questions. A single breach can deeply undermine trust in AI, thereby stalling further integration (Slade & Prinsloo, 2013).

4.3 Ethical Implications

Data Protection: The broad adoption of LLMs in universities magnifies data privacy risks. Systems must incorporate encryption and anonymization to safeguard student information (Singhal, 2024).
Transparency: The "black box" nature of deep learning raises accountability challenges, prompting calls for explainable AI (XAI) frameworks (Chaudhary, 2024).
Fairness and Inclusion: Ongoing audits are required to detect and correct algorithmic discrimination (Chinta et al., 2024).

4.4 Recommended Measures

Institution-Owned AI Systems: Developing and hosting AI solutions on institutional servers allows universities to maintain end-to-end control over data flows (Drachsler & Greller, 2016). This approach mitigates privacy concerns, ensures alignment with university-specific requirements, and lessens reliance on external vendors (Bai et al., 2024).
Continually Updated Guidelines: Rapid advancements in LLM and generative AI necessitate dynamic policy environments. Institutions should define clear usage policies—covering data collection, permissible scope of AI-based assessments, and intellectual property—reviewing and revising them regularly (Leitgeb et al., 2024).
Comprehensive Professional Development: Teachers require both technical (ML concepts, platform usage) and ethical–pedagogical training (fairness, bias detection, data responsibility) to integrate AI effectively

(Brandão et al., 2024). Long-term professionalization fosters sustainable AI adoption and helps navigate moral dilemmas posed by advanced automation.

5. Discussion

By synthesizing 111 studies, this review provides evidence that AI—particularly LLMs—can advance higher education through greater personalization, enhanced efficiency, and novel teaching approaches. However, to avoid the pitfalls of algorithmic bias, data breaches, and unsustainable resource usage, institutions must embed AI solutions within robust ethical and regulatory frameworks.

Our analysis supports the notion that universities should take deliberate steps—owning AI infrastructures, establishing dynamic guidelines, and emphasizing human-centered professional development—if they hope to harness AI responsibly (Holmes et al., 2019).

Limitations

1. **Study Heterogeneity**: Our sources vary widely in methodology and focus, limiting strict comparability of results.
2. **Underrepresentation of Long-Term Outcomes**: Empirical data on the sustained impacts of AI tools remain scarce.
3. **Insufficient Cost–Benefit Analysis**: Financial constraints faced by smaller institutions or developing regions are underexplored.

6. Conclusion

This systematic review demonstrates that AI and LLMs can revolutionize learning experiences, streamline administrative tasks, and foster dynamic pedagogical innovations in higher education. Nonetheless, harnessing these advantages requires carefully balancing technical robustness with ethical oversight. We propose three foundational pillars for institutions:

1. **Adopt Institution-Specific AI Systems**: Enhance privacy protection and adapt solutions to local needs.
2. **Implement Evolving Guidelines**: Ensure academic integrity, legal compliance, and transparent governance structures.
3. **Invest in Professional Development**: Equip educators with the technical and ethical competencies necessary to implement AI responsibly.

Future research should include longitudinal studies to investigate the sustained efficacy of AI in higher education, deeper cost–benefit analyses, and more detailed strategies for mitigating bias. By employing these strategies, universities can cultivate an environment where AI technologies enrich teaching and learning while upholding fairness, transparency, and accountability—key elements in realizing a future guided by "Empowering Inclusion, Innovation and Ethical Growth."

References

Baker, R. S., & Hawn, A. (2022). Algorithmic bias in education. International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education, 31(4), 595–626.

Crompton, H., & Burke, D. (2023). Artificial intelligence in higher education: The state of the field. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 20, 22.

Drachsler, H., & Greller, W. (2016). Privacy and analytics: It's a DELICATE issue. In Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on Learning Analytics & Knowledge (pp. 89–98).

Holmes, W., Bialik, M., & Fadel, C. (2019). Artificial intelligence in education: Promises and implications for teaching and learning. Center for Curriculum Redesign.

Kasneci, E., Sessler, K., Kasneci, G., & Seidel, T. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. Learning and Individual Differences, 103, 102274.

Leitgeb, T., Maitz, K., Sitter, G., Matischek-Jauk, M., Mößlacher, C., et al. (2024). KI-Leitlinien für den PH-Verbund Süd-Ost – Leitlinien für die Nutzung von Künstlicher Intelligenz in der Hochschule. University College of Teacher Education Burgenland, Eisenstadt. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13638314

Mayring, P. (2015). Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse: Grundlagen und Techniken (12. Aufl.). Beltz.

Ng, C., & Fung, Y. (2024). Educational Personalized Learning Path Planning with Large Language Models. Retrieved from https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.11773

Omughelli, D., Gordon, N., & Al Jaber, T. (2024). Fairness, bias, and ethics in AI: Exploring the factors affecting student performance. Journal of Intelligent Communication, 4(1), 100–110.

PRISMA. (2020). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses. http://www.prisma-statement.org/

Suresh, S., & Misra, S. M. (2024). Large Language Models in Pediatric Education: Current Uses and Future Potential. Pediatrics, 154(3), e2023064683.

Vincent-Lancrin, S., & van der Vlies, R. (2020). Trustworthy artificial intelligence (AI) in education: Promises and challenges. OECD Education Working Papers, No. 218.

Wen, Q., Liang, J., Sierra, C., Luckin, R., Tong, R., Liu, Z., Cui, P., & Tang, J. (2024). AI for education (AI4EDU): Advancing personalized education with LLM and adaptive learning. https://doi.org/10.1145/3637528.3671498

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(1), 39.