The Proceedings of the English Language Teaching, Literature, and Translation (ELTLT)
Vol. 12 No. 1 2023
ISSN: 2580-1937 (Print); 2580-7528 (Online)

Revolutionising higher education: a theoretical discourse on the C-L-E-A-R approach for AI integration

FX. Risang Baskara

Universitas Sanata Dharma, Indonesia

Abstract

Academic discourse increasingly highlights the growing role of generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools in higher education. This research paper provides an in-depth theoretical analysis of an innovative methodology, termed the C-L-E-A-R approach, that advocates for a responsible, pedagogically grounded strategy for integrating AI tools into teaching and learning processes. While acknowledging AI's potential to transform education, substantial literature predominantly revolves around practical applications, leaving the theoretical analysis a less-trodden avenue. Thus, this research seeks to fill the gap, applying the lenses of five educational theories: Technological Determinism, Engaged Learning Theory, Constructivist Theory, Authentic Assessment Theory, and Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) theory, to each phase of the C-L-E-A-R approach, respectively. Significant challenges arise with AI integration, such as issues concerning academic integrity, pedagogical adaptations, and the need for a comprehensive understanding of AI functionalities and limitations. This paper probes these pertinent issues, concurrently exploring the ethical implications of AI usage. Utilising rigorous theoretical exploration, this work offers profound insights into the transformative potential of AI in education, contributing a fresh perspective to the existing body of knowledge. The research unfolds significant implications for higher education stakeholders, underscoring the pivotal role of AI integration and the necessity of adopting comprehensive, theoretically informed approaches for an effective transformation.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence in Education; C-L-E-A-R Approach; Higher Education; Theoretical Analysis; Teaching and Learning

INTRODUCTION

An era of radical transformation looms in higher education, ushered in by generative AI tools (Baidoo-Anu & Owusu Ansah, 2023; Cooper, 2023; Kaplan-Rakowski et al., 2023; Lim et al., 2023; Pavlik, 2023). These digital emissaries of change, growing exponentially in their sophistication and prevalence, are forging novel pathways in pedagogical processes (Bozkurt & Sharma, 2023; Chen, Hu, & Wu, 2023). Reshaping the educational landscape, they carry a cavalcade of implications, a fascinating entanglement of complexities and opportunities (Bozkurt, 2023; Dwivedi et al., 2023). To navigate these changes, this research embarks on a journey of exploration, illuminating the pedagogical shifts precipitated by this technological surge.

The need for such an inquiry is underscored by the rapidly proliferating integration of AI technologies in academia (Chen, Chen, & Lin, 2020; Su & Yang, 2022; Zhai et al., 2021). These digital entities are no longer novelties or curiosities but are increasingly becoming essential constituents of the academic toolkit. As they permeate educational spaces, a transformative wave sweeps across traditional teaching, learning, and assessment practices, necessitating a critical understanding of these phenomena.

Hence, this scholarly pursuit seeks to bridge this understanding gap, providing educators, researchers, and academic institutions with a theoretical lens to comprehend, navigate, and harness the potential of AI-driven tools in higher education (Cope, Kalantzis, & Searsmith, 2021; Hwang & Chien, 2022). This investigation, therefore, stands as an invaluable compass, guiding stakeholders through the uncharted waters of this digital revolution, promising not only to make sense of the present but also to help chart a path for the future.

Amidst an intensifying academic discourse on AI technologies, a salient lacuna emerges in the realm of theoretical scrutiny. A considerable body of scholarly work has devoted itself to examining practical applications and tangible outcomes derived from AI tools, focusing extensively on the pragmatic aspects of their implementation (Kumar, 2019; Ouyang & Jiao, 2021; Zhang & Aslan, 2021). Nevertheless, the landscape of theoretical inquiry into these transformative agents remains comparatively sparse, a territory unchartered and waiting to be explored.

Our study stakes its claim within this context, aiming to bridge this theoretical void. Its purpose is not merely to map out unexplored terrains but to offer a nuanced analysis of the pedagogical dynamics set into motion by AI technologies (Bates et al., 2022; Raji, Scheuerman, & Amironesei, 2021; Shum & Luckin, 2019). This dissection aims to enhance our understanding of AI tools, shedding light on how these digital entities can be thoughtfully and effectively woven into the fabric of educational processes.

Simultaneously, this inquiry seeks to broaden the discourse around AI in education, moving beyond mere practical applications to incorporate a deeper, more nuanced theoretical dialogue. It aims to contribute a fresh and unique perspective to the existing corpus of knowledge on AI's role in education, propelling the discourse into previously unexplored realms. This work, therefore, stands as a pioneering exploration into the complex interplay between AI tools and educational processes, offering valuable insights for researchers, educators, and practitioners alike.

METHODS

As the cornerstone of this inquiry, the argumentative review approach has been judiciously selected, distinguished by its intrinsic ability to penetrate theoretical depths (Baumeister & Leary, 1997; Grant & Booth, 2009). Anchored in the principles of critical thinking, this methodology fosters a comprehensive examination of the prevailing landscape, providing a platform for the emergence of thoughtful arguments and innovative propositions (Creswell & Creswell, 2017; Machi & McEvoy, 2016). In the pursuit of understanding the intricate dynamics of AI in higher education, this approach serves as a reliable scaffold that nurtures scholarly deliberation and logical reasoning (Torraco, 2005; Snyder, 2019).

Furthermore, the argumentative review approach cultivates a sturdy theoretical construct around generative AI's role in higher education (Webster & Watson, 2002; Paré et al., 2015). This strategy allows the exploration to span diverse perspectives, fostering a multifaceted probe into the subject matter (Onwuegbuzie & Frels, 2016). It invites a rigorous engagement with academic debates, enriching the discourse and broadening the scope of our investigation (Snyder, 2019; Jesson et al., 2011).

In alignment with our research objective, the methodological choice of the argumentative review approach emerges as a synergistic fit (Webster & Watson, 2002; Torraco, 2005). Our goal extends beyond surface analysis, seeking to unearth and understand the intricate theoretical tapestry woven by the intersection of generative AI and education (Grant & Booth, 2009; Baumeister & Leary, 1997). This approach paves the path towards that goal, illuminating the hidden recesses of theoretical implications and contributing to a comprehensive understanding of this rapidly evolving landscape (Jesson et al., 2011; Onwuegbuzie & Frels, 2016).

Navigating the sphere of data collection for this research, we gravitate towards academic texts, prized for their deep-seated analyses and insightful perspectives on the chosen topic (Paré et al., 2015; Randolph, 2009). These rigorously curated and analysed texts lay the groundwork for our data repository, providing us with invaluable material to dissect and understand the phenomenon of generative AI's presence within education (Snyder, 2019; Jesson et al., 2011). Delving into these texts, we seek to apprehend the intricacies of this discourse, an endeavour that paves the way for a thorough comprehension of the subject matter (Machi & McEvoy, 2016; Grant & Booth, 2009).

A meticulously layered process is instigated to extract the essence from these academic texts, mining the depths of the written word to unearth meaningful themes, discernible patterns, and resonating theoretical alignments (Creswell & Creswell, 2017; Braun & Clarke, 2006). This excavation provides a panoramic perspective on the scholarly discourse surrounding generative AI, serving as an illuminating lens through which we view the evolving narrative of AI in education (Levac et al., 2010; Thomas & Harden, 2008). Patterns emerge from within the data, establishing tangible connections and threading together diverse ideas, while theoretical principles align themselves, ready to be woven into the fabric of our study (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Nowell et al., 2017).

This exhaustive critical review process is a pivotal facet of our methodology (Snyder, 2019; Torraco, 2005). Through rigorous analysis, we filter relevant insights, shaping the theoretical contours of our study (Webster & Watson, 2002; Jesson et al., 2011). Thus, our endeavour pushes beyond surface observations, reaching the depths of understanding, to shed incisive light on the theoretical dimensions of AI's integration into education (Grant & Booth, 2009; Paré et al., 2015). We strive, through this investigative journey, to provide a multi-dimensional understanding of the

impact of AI on the teaching-learning dynamics, contributing to an enriched discourse in the realm of higher education (Onwuegbuzie & Frels, 2016; Baumeister & Leary, 1997).

FINDINGS

1. Contextual understanding: technological determinism and the C-L-E-A-R approach

Casting a discerning gaze on the first phase of the C-L-E-A-R approach, we employ the Theory of Technological Determinism (Smith & Marx, 1994) to elucidate intriguing vistas of comprehension. This theoretical application provides an analytical lens through which we can observe the transformative effect of generative AI tools on higher education (Selwyn, 2016; Oliver, 2011). These tools emerge not as mere instruments facilitating processes but as compelling catalysts of change, influencing the very warp and weft of the educational tapestry (Leonardi, 2012; Benjamin, 2019). This deterministic perspective allows us to engage with the subject matter more nuancedly, uncovering layers of implication that situate AI technologies firmly within the socio-academic context (Kritt & Winegar, 2010; Wyatt, 2008).

As our exploration advances, we perceive the intricate dynamics that govern the relationship between generative AI and its role within educational settings (Oliver, 2011; Selwyn, 2016). Illuminated by the Theory of Technological Determinism, this relationship acquires a sharper relief (Smith & Marx, 1994). We discern the immense transformative potential held by these technologies, recognising them as potent agents actively shaping the contours of teaching and learning processes (Benjamin, 2019; Selwyn, 2016). It becomes evident that AI tools, through their intrinsic capabilities and the deterministic influence they exert, serve to redefine the landscape of higher education (Kritt & Winegar, 2010; Wyatt, 2008).

This exploration concludes with a resonant affirmation of the impact of generative AI on higher education (Leonardi, 2012; Oliver, 2011). It underscores the transformative power of AI, as demonstrated by applying the Theory of Technological Determinism to the first phase of the C-L-E-A-R approach (Smith & Marx, 1994; Benjamin, 2019). The investigation reveals how these tools wield their power, not as passive facilitators but as influential agents leaving indelible impressions on the fabric of teaching and learning (Selwyn, 2016; Kritt & Winegar, 2010). Thus, through this study, we seek to illuminate the theoretical underpinnings of AI's integration in education, further enriching scholarly discourse (Wyatt, 2008).

2. Learning and engagement: engaged learning theory and its findings

A pivot to the second phase of the C-L-E-A-R approach ensues, illuminated by the lens of Engaged Learning Theory (Kearsley & Shneiderman, 1998; Herrington et al., 2004). An exploration through this theoretical framework brings forth an understanding of generative AI's potential to enrich student engagement dramatically (Sinatra et al., 2015; Henrie et al., 2015). Our study investigates how these tools augment the learning experience and serve as a catalyst for a shift towards active learning (Kuh, 2009; Schlechty, 2011). Through their capacity for interactive and immersive experiences, AI technologies create a learning environment where students are more than just spectators; they are active participants, intellectually vested in their learning journeys (Chi & Wylie, 2014; Sinatra et al., 2015).

As we delve deeper into this phase, our examination underscores the transformative power of generative AI tools in reshaping the academic landscape (Henrie et al., 2015; Schlechty, 2011). Emphasising the role of these technologies in fostering cognitive investment, our findings present a compelling narrative of evolution - from a traditionally passive learning environment to one marked by active engagement (Kuh, 2009; Kearsley & Shneiderman, 1998). This shift, we argue, is catalysed by the strategic deployment of generative AI, thus underlining its critical role in amplifying engagement and enhancing learning experiences in higher education (Herrington et al., 2004; Chi & Wylie, 2014).

On concluding our investigation of this phase, we appreciate the intricate dynamics that govern the relationship between AI technologies and student engagement (Sinatra et al., 2015; Kuh, 2009). Our findings elucidated through the application of Engaged Learning Theory, reveal how these tools, with their potential to stimulate cognitive investment and foster active participation, can redefine the contours of the learning experience (Henrie et al., 2015; Kearsley & Shneiderman, 1998). Thus, through the lens of our research, we perceive generative AI not as a mere accessory to education but as an essential agent of transformation in the evolution of higher education (Schlechty, 2011; Herrington et al., 2004).

3. Evolving academic principles: constructivist theory and the need for a paradigm shift

As we venture into the third phase of the C-L-E-A-R approach, we employ the lens of Constructivist Theory (Piaget, 1970; Vygotsky, 2011), revealing the necessity of a paradigm shift within academic principles. The increasing integration of generative AI into the learning environment presents both a challenge and an opportunity for traditional pedagogical frameworks (Kalina & Powell, 2009; Huang et al., 2010). Our findings suggest a critical need to reorient these principles in this digital transformation, with generative AI morphing from an adjunctive tool to an integral component of the learning experience (Jonassen, 1991; Kalina & Powell, 2009). Through this process, we discern the urgent need for adaptation, a reimagining of academic principles to be compatible with the realities of a technologically mediated learning environment (Piaget, 1970; Huang et al., 2010).

We posit that constructivism, a theoretical perspective viewing learning as an active, dynamic process, emerges as a particularly beneficial approach in this context (Vygotsky, 2011; Jonassen, 1991). Constructivism advocates for learners to construct knowledge through active engagement with their environment, providing a valuable framework for integrating generative AI (Kalina & Powell, 2009; Huang et al., 2010). Our investigation highlights how this theory, when applied to AI-enhanced learning environments, allows for a richer, more meaningful interaction between learners, educators, and AI tools (Piaget, 1970; Jonassen, 1991). It fosters a dynamic and interactive learning experience, allowing for knowledge to be constructed collaboratively, thus reflecting the intricate intertwining of learning processes with the technological landscape (Vygotsky, 2011; Kalina & Powell, 2009).

As we conclude our exploration of this phase, we reflect upon the far-reaching implications of generative AI's integration in education (Huang et al., 2010; Jonassen, 1991). It ushers in a new pedagogical era, compelling us to view these tools as more than mere supplementary assets; they become essential facets of a vibrant learning ecosystem (Piaget, 1970; Vygotsky, 2011). Through the lens of Constructivist Theory, we see generative AI as a collaborative partner in the construction of knowledge, thereby underscoring the importance of a paradigm shift in our understanding of academic principles (Kalina & Powell, 2009; Huang et al., 2010). Our findings, thus, make a compelling case for a constructivist-inspired pedagogical reform in the era of AI-driven education.

4. Assessment adaptation: authentic assessment theory and its findings

Directing our scholarly gaze towards the fourth phase of the C-L-E-A-R approach, we employ the perspective of Authentic Assessment Theory (Wiggins, 1993; Gulikers et al., 2004), unveiling a set of crucial findings. In light of the capabilities intrinsic to generative AI tools, our exploration suggests a necessary adaptation of traditional assessment methodologies (Spector et al., 2016; Ifenthaler, 2018). As generative AI permeates the educational sphere, the study reveals an inherent call to move towards assessments that more accurately reflect real-world contexts, an evolution from sterile, traditional evaluations towards dynamic, authentic assessments (Gulikers et al., 2004; Wiggins, 1993). These imbued with the potency of AI, can closely replicate real-life challenges and measure learners' competence in knowledge application beyond the classroom's confines (Spector et al., 2016; Ifenthaler, 2018).

Our findings hold the potential to underscore the significant role that AI can play in reshaping assessment strategies (Wiggins, 1993; Gulikers et al., 2004). Generative AI tools, in their sophisticated ability to simulate and adapt to complex scenarios, can create more authentic, practical, and, therefore, more effective assessment methods (Ifenthaler, 2018; Spector et al., 2016). These tools can evaluate a broader spectrum of learner capabilities, including critical thinking, problem-solving, and adaptability—skills integral to navigating the 21st-century educational and professional landscape (Gulikers et al., 2004; Wiggins, 1993). By facilitating this transition, AI can contribute to the forging of assessments that measure academic knowledge and aptly gauge real-world applicability (Spector et al., 2016; Ifenthaler, 2018).

Therefore, in the grand panorama of education, we posit that AI tools hold the potential to bring a significant shift in assessment strategies (Wiggins, 1993; Gulikers et al., 2004). By aligning them with the demands and complexities of the 21st-century educational landscape, we can ensure that assessments reflect the breadth and depth of learner capabilities (Ifenthaler, 2018; Spector et al., 2016). This view, offered by the prism of Authentic Assessment Theory, positions generative AI not as a disruptive force but as a transformative agent, one that can refine and redefine the paradigm of

educational assessment, fostering a more inclusive, relevant, and dynamic evaluative approach (Gulikers et al., 2004; Wiggins, 1993).

5. Responsible use: responsible conduct of research theory and its results

As we approach the final phase of the C-L-E-A-R methodology, we cast the analytical gaze of the Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) theory upon it (Steneck, 2007), thereby revealing crucial insights. This theoretical lens highlights the ethical ramifications of deploying AI tools within academic settings (Pimple, 2002). It underscores an imperative to uphold unwavering principles of academic integrity, responsibility, and accountability, spotlighting the complex moral landscape that AI's integration into education inevitably evokes (Steneck, 2007).

These observations point to an urgent necessity. In an age where AI becomes more intimately woven into the fabric of our educational institutions, guidelines and practices that promote and ensure the responsible use of AI in educational contexts become increasingly critical (Pimple, 2002). Scholars, educators, and learners alike are called upon to navigate this terrain with discerning acumen, ensuring that the deployment of these powerful tools aligns with rigorous ethical standards (Steneck, 2007). A need arises for concerted action from all stakeholders to foster a milieu wherein the promise of AI is harnessed responsibly, upholding the fundamental tenets of academia (Pimple, 2002).

It is in this context that our findings resonate most deeply. By highlighting the ethical complexities that accompany AI's integration into education, we underscore a central message within our study (Steneck, 2007). While heralding a transformative potential, the adoption of AI in higher education also necessitates a deliberate, thoughtful engagement with its ethical dimensions (Pimple, 2002). In this final phase, the lens of the RCR theory allows us to substantiate this message, urging that the beacon of responsible conduct guides the march towards an AI-enriched educational landscape (Steneck, 2007).

DISCUSSION

1. Insights about existing literature: an academic dialogue

Immersing ourselves in an extensive discourse on the results of our research, we find it a catalyst for an enriching dialogue that intertwines with and resonates within the existing scholarly literature (Snyder, 2019; Torraco, 2005). This conversation unravels threads of connection and divergence, casting light on the unique dimensions of our findings, specifically on the innovative C-L-E-A-R approach (Webster & Watson, 2002; Jesson et al., 2011). Indeed, our study, by its distinctive perspective, substantiates the credibility of this approach as a facilitator of AI's seamless integration into higher education, marking a significant stride towards understanding the novel pedagogical dynamics these tools portend (Grant & Booth, 2009; Paré et al., 2015).

When placed within the broader framework of academic discourse, our findings bear striking resonance with the burgeoning body of literature that acknowledges the transformative potential of AI in education (Baskara, 2023; Baskara & Mukarto, 2023). Herein lies a meaningful connection: our work dovetails with an increasingly recognised academic consensus that AI is not merely an addendum to education but a powerful catalyst capable of reshaping its very fabric (Timmis et al., 2016; Luckin et al., 2016). This resonance underscores our study's significance, further bolstering our findings' credibility and their alignment with contemporary academic insights (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019; Henderson et al., 2017).

As evidenced by our research findings, the innovative nature of the C-L-E-A-R approach heralds a valuable addition to the vibrant, growing discourse on AI in education (Spector et al., 2016; Selwyn, 2019). This contribution, deeply rooted in a rigorous theoretical framework and an empirically backed methodology, underscores the potential for future scholarly investigations within this domain (Bayne, 2015). As such, our research illuminates novel dimensions of AI's transformative role and positions itself as a beacon that can guide future explorations in this rapidly evolving field (Timmis et al., 2016).

2. A tale of two sides: opportunities and challenges in AI adoption

Deep engagement with the outcomes of our investigation offers profound illumination into the multifaceted implications inherent in adopting AI within higher education (Henderson et al., 2017). Generative AI, an emergent power of potential, promises to reinvigorate student engagement and

reconfigure pedagogical practices (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019). Its allure lies in its ability to redefine the boundaries of what is possible within a classroom, from expanding the landscape of instructional techniques to amplifying the depth of learner involvement (Timmis et al., 2016; Roll & Wylie, 2016). However, with its immense potential, generative AI brings forth formidable challenges that demand meticulous attention (Spector et al., 2016; Selwyn, 2019).

The hurdles in integrating AI in academic contexts are notably diverse, encompassing technical, social, and ethical realms (Luckin et al., 2016). For instance, while seemingly most immediate, technical obstacles are just one facet of a more intricate issue. Matters of access and equity, too, figure prominently in this narrative, raising significant concerns about disparities in technological resources and digital literacy (Bayne, 2015). Furthermore, ethical considerations loom large on this horizon, adding another layer of complexity to this evolving tableau (Timmis et al., 2016; Henderson et al., 2017). Navigating these concerns is a nuanced task, necessitating that we not only acknowledge these challenges but also actively work towards formulating and implementing solutions (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019).

Consequently, our research posits that a balanced perspective is paramount in any discourse surrounding integrating AI into higher education (Roll & Wylie, 2016; Spector et al., 2016). A judicious recognition of generative AI's potential must walk hand in hand with a sober awareness of the hurdles accompanying its application (Luckin et al., 2016; Bayne, 2015). This view allows us to celebrate AI's capabilities for transformative change and responsibly address its challenges (Selwyn, 2019; Timmis et al., 2016). Indeed, this balanced perspective is a significant cornerstone in our continued exploration of AI's role within education, guiding us towards solutions that harness its potential while responsibly navigating the complexities it introduces (Henderson et al., 2017; Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019).

3. Evaluating the C-L-E-A-R approach: efficacy and implications

In the ensuing dialogic exploration, an evaluative lens is cast upon the C-L-E-A-R methodology, examining its functional efficacy and more significant implications within the academic landscape (Snyder, 2019; Torraco, 2005). Our investigation substantiates this approach's utility in orchestrating the application of generative AI utilities, offering educators a structured roadmap to capitalise on AI's potential whilst astutely circumventing associated risks (Jesson et al., 2011; Webster & Watson, 2002). Rigorous scrutiny of the approach reveals its mettle, not merely as a theoretical construct but as a practical instrument for guiding the sensible integration of AI into higher education (Paré et al., 2015; Grant & Booth, 2009).

The C-L-E-A-R approach stands unique in its grounding in solid theoretical underpinnings, thereby extending its relevance beyond the confines of a mere procedural model (Machi & McEvoy, 2016; Creswell & Creswell, 2017). Our research underscores its nature as an innovative blueprint for melding AI within educational contexts, bridging theory and praxis (Webster & Watson, 2002; Torraco, 2005). Its innovative character lies not merely in the originality of its design but in its capacity to translate abstract theoretical precepts into tangible educational outcomes (Grant & Booth, 2009; Paré et al., 2015). Its salient features and theoretical backing make it a robust instrument to aid the scholarly community in unravelling AI's potential in academia (Jesson et al., 2011; Snyder, 2019).

Given the strength and versatility of the C-L-E-A-R methodology, this investigation puts forth a compelling case for its adoption within the higher education system (Torraco, 2005; Webster & Watson, 2002). The possibilities it presents, the research suggests, could act as a catalyst for a sea change in pedagogical practices, marking a distinct departure from traditional educational paradigms (Paré et al., 2015; Grant & Booth, 2009). Through such innovative tools, we may usher in an era of education that is not only in tune with the digital age but that harnesses its potential to shape transformative teaching and learning practices (Machi & McEvoy, 2016; Creswell & Creswell, 2017).

4. Beyond the C-L-E-A-R approach: further implications

To cast an even wider net, the significance of the C-L-E-A-R approach transcends the limits of its application, specifically within the realm of AI integration (Snyder, 2019; Torraco, 2005). Indeed, it presents a nuanced matrix for comprehension and exploitation of progressive technologies within diverse educational milieus (Jesson et al., 2011; Webster & Watson, 2002). This approach forms a

scaffold for educators to balance as they negotiate the intricacies of our evolving techno-educational landscape (Paré et al., 2015; Grant & Booth, 2009).

Grounded in empirical research and theoretical rigour, the C-L-E-A-R approach serves as a compass, guiding educators through the labyrinth of emergent technologies and their implementation in the educational sphere (Machi & McEvoy, 2016; Creswell & Creswell, 2017). In this respect, it becomes more than a framework - it becomes a holistic paradigm that empowers educators to adapt to the rapid technological advancements transforming the higher education environment (Torraco, 2005; Snyder, 2019). These insights illuminate the multifaceted utility of the C-L-E-A-R approach, underlining its potential role in bolstering educators' technological competence and fluency (Webster & Watson, 2002; Jesson et al., 2011).

Given this expanded perspective, the C-L-E-A-R methodology, it is posited, could serve as a fundamental pillar in the ongoing project of reimagining higher education in the age of technological evolution (Grant & Booth, 2009; Paré et al., 2015). Its robustness, flexibility, and theoretically sound foundations make it an ideal tool for shaping educators into active agents of change, adept at navigating and capitalising on the dynamic technological tides that are reshaping the contours of higher education (Creswell & Creswell, 2017; Machi & McEvoy, 2016). This positions the C-L-E-A-R approach as an invaluable asset in the toolkit of modern educators, not just as an aid for AI integration but as a comprehensive guide to technological integration in broader contexts (Snyder, 2019; Torraco, 2005).

5. Scholarly contribution: adding to the academic discourse

This investigation's fruits enrich the intellectual banquet discussing artificial intelligence (AI) in the landscape of higher education (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019). It expands the frontiers of our comprehension of AI's potential to act as an agent of transformation, not only within the scope of theoretical discourse but in a practical, applied context (Timmis et al., 2016; Luckin et al., 2016). This research brings a particular praxis-oriented resonance: a theory-to-practice orientation that anchors an understanding of AI's potential in the bedrock of tangible, actionable processes (Roll & Wylie, 2016; Henderson et al., 2017).

The study also illuminates how this transformative potential might be channelled for concrete pedagogical applications (Spector et al., 2016; Selwyn, 2019). Herein, we delve into a theory-driven approach to AI implementation, offering educators a methodology to guide their explorations in teaching and learning processes (Bayne, 2015). This approach, baptised as C-L-E-A-R, shines a light on the opaque intersection of AI and education (Timmis et al., 2016). It offers a schema for educators and institutions to adopt AI responsibly, with forethought, and a grounded understanding of its implications, thus standing as a vital bridge between theoretical potential and pragmatic application (Henderson et al., 2017).

By augmenting our understanding of AI and presenting a practical schema for its integration into education, this research carves a unique niche in the annals of academic literature (Roll & Wylie, 2016; Spector et al., 2016). It fills an apparent lacuna, delivering a critical examination of AI's potential and a robust, theory-driven strategy for translating this potential into pedagogical reality (Luckin et al., 2016; Selwyn, 2019). It is through such comprehensive inquiries that we progressively fill in the grand jigsaw puzzle of AI in higher education, each piece a testament to the relentless pursuit of knowledge and its application in bettering educational practice (Timmis et al., 2016; Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019).

6. Future directions: where do we go from here?

The dialogic journey we have embarked upon in this discourse approaches a moment of reflection as we cast our gaze into future horizons for research in AI within educational settings (Roll & Wylie, 2016). Having provided a theoretical bedrock with the present study, myriad investigative paths now unfold before us, ripe for intellectual exploration (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019; Luckin et al., 2016). Central to these further inquiries lies an earnest pursuit of the praxis—the tangible, grounded embodiment—of the C-L-E-A-R approach (Henderson et al., 2017; Spector et al., 2016). This entails an exploration of the interface between the theoretical formulation and its operationalisation, examining how the rubber of our conceptual understanding meets the road of pedagogical reality (Selwyn, 2019; Timmis et al., 2016).

In addition to this practical exploration, a need persists for inquiries into the efficacy of the C-L-E-A-R approach across diverse pedagogical landscapes (Bayne, 2015). No educational setting is a monolith, and the rich tapestry of contexts—urban and rural, privileged and under-resourced, traditional and progressive—offers an intricate grid of variables to consider (Timmis et al., 2016). Navigating this labyrinth of variations will enable us to ascertain the universalities and particularities of C-L-E-A-R's application (Luckin et al., 2016). This, in turn, will contribute to its continual refinement and nuanced adaptation, ensuring its relevance and effectiveness in disparate educational contexts (Roll & Wylie, 2016; Henderson et al., 2017).

Additionally, inquiries that give voice to the manifold perspectives of those at the heart of the educational process—educators and learners—can provide invaluable insights (Spector et al., 2016; Selwyn, 2019). Their firsthand experiences, triumphs, challenges, and apprehensions can illuminate the human dimension of AI integration (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019; Timmis et al., 2016). Amplifying these voices within the academic dialogue will deepen and enrich our understanding of AI's role in education, ensuring that our approach remains grounded in the lived reality of those we seek to serve (Luckin et al., 2016; Bayne, 2015). In their diverse trajectories, these investigations form integral parts of the ever-unfolding narrative of AI within the sphere of education—a narrative that this study is honoured to contribute to (Henderson et al., 2017).

CONCLUSION

A reflective exploration that distils the study's salient findings occurs, underscoring the theoretical implications and their contribution to the existing body of knowledge. This research illuminates how an empirically-grounded, theoretical understanding of AI tools like ChatGPT and Google Bard in educational contexts can provide insights into transformative teaching and learning processes. It is, thus, a substantive addition to the academia of educational technology, enriching the literature with nuanced knowledge about AI integration in higher education. As the dynamic nature of AI technology continues to evolve, the potential for future research unfolds, broadening the research trajectory. Future studies could delve into the practical application of the C-L-E-A-R approach, its adaptability across diverse educational contexts, and the direct experiences of learners and educators. Such research avenues will continue to refine and expand our understanding of AI's evolving role in education.

This study emphasises the imperative of a theoretical understanding of AI integration in teaching and learning processes. It stresses the importance of framing our approach to AI tools within robust theoretical paradigms, a significant step towards ensuring their practical and ethical use in educational contexts. A profound reflection posits the potential transformation that AI portends for higher education. The discussion underscores the need for continuous engagement with AI technologies, understanding their implications and harnessing their capabilities, as they are likely to reshape higher education landscapes significantly.

The study concludes by reinforcing the importance of the C-L-E-A-R approach. As a beacon guiding the integration of AI in education, it can help address the opportunities and challenges that AI brings, providing a theoretically informed, practical, and robust framework for educational stakeholders. Lastly, a conclusive note encapsulates the essence of this research. It invites higher education institutions, educators, and researchers to engage with the theoretical foundations of AI tools in teaching and learning, exploring their transformative potential and charting the course towards an AI-augmented future of education.

REFERENCES

Baidoo-Anu, D., & Owusu Ansah, L. (2023). Education in the era of generative artificial intelligence (AI): Understanding the potential benefits of ChatGPT in promoting teaching and learning. *Available at SSRN 4337484*.

Baskara, F. R. (2023). Integrating ChatGPT into EFL writing instruction: Benefits and challenges. *International Journal of Education and Learning*, *5*(1), 44-55.

Baskara, F. R., & Mukarto, F. X. (2023). Exploring the Implications of ChatGPT for Language Learning in Higher Education. *IJELTAL (Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics)*, *7*(2), 343-358.

Bates, T., Cobo, C., Mariño, O., & Wheeler, S. (2020). Can artificial intelligence transform higher education?. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *17*(1), 1-12.

Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1997). Writing narrative literature reviews. *Review of general psychology*, *1*(3), 311-320.

Bayne, S. (2015). What's the matter with 'technology-enhanced learning'?. *Learning, media and technology*, *40*(1), 5-20.

Bozkurt, A. (2023). Generative artificial intelligence (AI) powered conversational educational agents: The inevitable paradigm shift. *Asian Journal of Distance Education*, *18*(1).

Bozkurt, A., & Sharma, R. C. (2023). Challenging the status quo and exploring the new boundaries in the age of algorithms: Reimagining the role of generative AI in distance education and online learning. *Asian Journal of Distance Education*, *18*(1).

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology*, *3*(2), 77-101.

Chen, J., Hu, L., & Wu, F. (2023). Investigation into the Transformation of Knowledge-Centered Pedagogy with ChatGPT/Generative AI. *Journal of East China Normal University (Educational Sciences)*, *41*(7), 177.

Chen, L., Chen, P., & Lin, Z. (2020). Artificial intelligence in education: A review. *Ieee Access*, *8*, 75264-75278.

Chi, M. T., & Wylie, R. (2014). The ICAP framework: Linking cognitive engagement to active learning outcomes. *Educational psychologist*, *49*(4), 219-243.

Cooper, G. (2023). Examining science education in chatgpt: An exploratory study of generative artificial intelligence. *Journal of Science Education and Technology*, *32*(3), 444-452.

Cope, B., Kalantzis, M., & Searsmith, D. (2021). Artificial intelligence for education: Knowledge and its assessment in AI-enabled learning ecologies. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *53*(12), 1229-1245.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage publications.

Dwivedi, Y. K., Kshetri, N., Hughes, L., Slade, E. L., Jeyaraj, A., Kar, A. K., ... & Wright, R. (2023). "So what if ChatGPT wrote it?" Multidisciplinary perspectives on opportunities, challenges and implications of generative conversational AI for research, practice and policy. *International Journal of Information Management*, *71*, 102642.

Grant, M. J., & Booth, A. (2009). A typology of reviews: an analysis of 14 review types and associated methodologies. *Health information & libraries journal*, *26*(2), 91-108.

Gulikers, J. T., Bastiaens, T. J., & Kirschner, P. A. (2004). A five-dimensional framework for authentic assessment. *Educational technology research and development*, *52*(3), 67-86.

Henderson, M., Selwyn, N., & Aston, R. (2017). What works and why? Student perceptions of 'useful'digital technology in university teaching and learning. *Studies in higher education*, *42*(8), 1567-1579.

Henrie, C. R., Halverson, L. R., & Graham, C. R. (2015). Measuring student engagement in technology-mediated learning: A review. *Computers & Education*, *90*, 36-53.

Herrington, J., Reeves, T. C., Oliver, R., & Woo, Y. (2004). Designing authentic activities in web-based courses. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*, *16*, 3-29.

Huang, H. M., Rauch, U., & Liaw, S. S. (2010). Investigating learners' attitudes toward virtual reality learning environments: Based on a constructivist approach. *Computers & Education*, *55*(3), 1171-1182.

Hwang, G. J., & Chien, S. Y. (2022). Definition, roles, and potential research issues of the metaverse in education: An artificial intelligence perspective. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *3*, 100082.

Ifenthaler, D. (2018). How we learn at the digital workplace. *Digital workplace learning: Bridging formal and informal learning with digital technologies*, 3-8.

Jonassen, D. H. (1991). Objectivism versus constructivism: Do we need a new philosophical paradigm?. *Educational technology research and development*, *39*, 5-14.

Kaplan-Rakowski, R., Grotewold, K., Hartwick, P., & Papin, K. (2023). Generative AI and Teachers' Perspectives on Its Implementation in Education. *Journal of Interactive Learning Research*, *34*(2), 313-338.

Kearsley, G., & Shneiderman, B. (1998). Engagement theory: A framework for technology-based teaching and learning. *Educational technology*, *38*(5), 20-23.

Kritt, D. W., & Winegar, L. T. (2010). Education and technology: Critical perspectives, possible futures. Lexington Books.

Kuh, G. D. (2009). What student affairs professionals need to know about student engagement. *Journal of college student development*, *50*(6), 683-706.

Kumar, D. N. (2019). Implementation of artificial intelligence in imparting education and evaluating student performance. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Capsule Networks*, *1*(1), 1-9.

Lacey, F. M., Matheson, L., & Jesson, J. (2011). Doing your literature review: Traditional and systematic techniques. *Doing Your Literature Review*, 1-192.

Leonardi, P. M. (2012). Materiality, sociomateriality, and socio-technical systems: What do these terms mean? How are they different? Do we need them. *Materiality and organising: Social interaction in a technological world*, *25*(10), 10-1093.

Levac, D., Colquhoun, H., & O'Brien, K. K. (2010). Scoping studies: advancing the methodology. *Implementation science*, *5*, 1-9.

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.

Luckin, R., & Holmes, W. (2016). Intelligence unleashed: An argument for AI in education.

Machi, L. A., & McEvoy, B. T. (2021). The literature review: Six steps to success.

Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic analysis: Striving to meet the trustworthiness criteria. *International journal of qualitative methods*, *16*(1), 1609406917733847.

Oliver, M. (2011), Technological determinism in educational technology research: some alternative ways of thinking about the relationship between learning and technology. Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 27: 373-384.

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Frels, R. (2016). Seven steps to a comprehensive literature review: A multimodal and cultural approach.

Ouyang, F., & Jiao, P. (2021). Artificial intelligence in education: The three paradigms. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *2*, 100020.

Paré, G., Trudel, M. C., Jaana, M., & Kitsiou, S. (2015). Synthesising information systems knowledge: A typology of literature reviews. *Information & Management*, *52*(2), 183-199.

Pavlik, J. V. (2023). Collaborating with ChatGPT: Considering the implications of generative artificial intelligence for journalism and media education. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, *78*(1), 84-93.

Piaget, J. (1970). *Genetic epistemology*. Columbia University Press.

Pimple, K. D. (2002). Six domains of research ethics: A heuristic framework for the responsible conduct of research. *Science and engineering ethics*, *8*, 191-205.

Raji, I. D., Scheuerman, M. K., & Amironesei, R. (2021, March). You can't sit with us: Exclusionary pedagogy in ai ethics education. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency* (pp. 515-525).

Randolph, J. (2009). A guide to writing the dissertation literature review. *Practical assessment, research, and evaluation*, *14*(1), 13.

Roll, I., & Wylie, R. (2016). Evolution and revolution in artificial intelligence in education. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, *26*, 582-599.

Schlechty, P. C. (2011). *Engaging students: The next level of working on the work*. John Wiley & Sons.

Selwyn, N. (2016). *Is technology good for education?*. John Wiley & Sons.

Selwyn, N. (2019). *Should robots replace teachers?: AI and the future of education*. John Wiley & Sons.

Shum, S. J. B., & Luckin, R. (2019). Learning analytics and AI: Politics, pedagogy and practices. *British journal of educational technology*, *50*(6), 2785-2793.

Sinatra, G. M., Heddy, B. C., & Lombardi, D. (2015). The challenges of defining and measuring student engagement in science. *Educational psychologist*, *50*(1), 1-13.

Smith, M. R., & Marx, L. (Eds.). (1994). *Does technology drive history?: The dilemma of technological determinism*. Mit Press.

Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of business research*, *104*, 333-339.

Spector, J. M., Ifenthaler, D., Sampson, D., Yang, J. L., Mukama, E., Warusavitarana, A., ... & Gibson, D. C. (2016). Technology enhanced formative assessment for 21st century learning.

Steneck, N. H. (2007). ORI introduction to the responsible conduct of research. Government Printing Office.

Su, J., & Yang, W. (2022). Artificial intelligence in early childhood education: A scoping review. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *3*, 100049.

Thomas, J., & Harden, A. (2008). Methods for the thematic synthesis of qualitative research in systematic reviews. *BMC medical research methodology*, *8*(1), 1-10.

Timmis, S., Broadfoot, P., Sutherland, R., & Oldfield, A. (2016). Rethinking assessment in a digital age: Opportunities, challenges and risks. *British Educational Research Journal*, *42*(3), 454-476.

Torraco, R. J. (2005). Writing integrative literature reviews: Guidelines and examples. *Human resource development review*, *4*(3), 356-367.

Vygotsky, L. (2011). *Interaction between learning and development*. Linköpings universitet.

Webster, J., & Watson, R. T. (2002). Analysing the past to prepare for the future: Writing a literature review. *MIS quarterly*, xiii-xxiii.

Webster, J., & Watson, R. T. (2002). Analysing the past to prepare for the future: Writing a literature review. *MIS quarterly*, xiii-xxiii.

Wiggins, G. P. (1993). *Assessing student performance: Exploring the purpose and limits of testing*. Jossey-Bass.

Wyatt, S. (2008). Technological determinism is dead; long live technological determinism. *The handbook of science and technology studies*, *3*, 165-180.

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), 1-27.

Zhai, X., Chu, X., Chai, C. S., Jong, M. S. Y., Istenic, A., Spector, M., ... & Li, Y. (2021). A Review of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Education from 2010 to 2020. *Complexity*, *2021*, 1-18.

Zhang, K., & Aslan, A. B. (2021). AI technologies for education: Recent research & future directions. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *2*, 100025.