Journal of Systemics, Cybernetics and Informatics (2025) 23(7), 176-182
https://doi.org/10.54808/JSCI.23.07.176

The Promise and Peril of Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education

James LIPUMA
Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, New Jersey Institute of Technology
Newark, NJ, 07102-1982, U.S.A.

Cristo LEON
Office of Research & Development, New Jersey Institute of Technology
Newark, NJ, 07102-1982, U.S.A.

ABSTRACT

Artificial Intelligence (AI) presents higher education with both transformative potential and profound risk. While AI-tools can personalize learning and enhance collaboration, they also threaten to erode critical thinking, intellectual independence, and the reflective depth of human inquiry. This conceptual analysis applies transdisciplinary communication (TDC) and educational psychology frameworks to examine how AI integration influences learning, teaching, and institutional practices. Findings highlight that AI-tools can strengthen collaboration, automate administrative tasks, and promote inclusivity across languages and disciplines. However, overreliance on automation risks reducing empathy, ethical reasoning, and creativity. The study identifies interpretation, judgment, and contextual understanding as human dimensions that remain non-delegable in AI-supported education. Higher education must move from viewing AI as a replacement for cognition to treating it as a catalyst for transformative learning. Embedding human-in-the-loop practices and metacognitive reflection ensures that AI amplifies inquiry rather than undermines it. The enduring task is to balance innovation with discernment, preserving education's human purpose while guiding AI's integration ethically and intelligently.

Keywords: artificial intelligence, higher education, metacognition, ethics, transdisciplinary communication, transformative learning.

1. INTRODUCTION

Artificial Intelligence (AI) presents a perplexing conundrum of potentially mutually exclusive outcomes related to its use in higher education. The single greatest peril of Artificial Intelligence tools (AI-tools) in higher education is their potential to erode students' critical thinking and intellectual independence by enabling them to bypass the foundational learning process and substitute AI-produced answers for personally developed work products. This over-reliance threatens the development of analytical skills, reasoning, and judgment that are essential for deep learning, innovation, and the development of vital solutions; capacities long understood as the core of cognitive development and meaningful learning [1], [2], [3].

At the same time, the single most significant potential of AI for higher education is enabling massively personalized learning at scale, fundamentally transforming the one-size-fits-all model into an individualized educational journey. By leveraging AI, institutions can customize the content, pace, and style of instruction for each student, leading to deeper engagement, greater success, and a more equitable learning environment [4], [5]. Ironically, these two ends mean that students must be taught to value the process of learning and understand the limitations of the tools they use as they substitute quick answers from AI for actual learning. Human learning, unlike algorithmic processing, relies on the active reorganization of cognitive structures and the reflective transformation of understanding through experience [6], [7]. This transformation is not mechanical but dialogical; it unfolds through struggle, contradiction, and reflection, where meaning emerges from the learner's negotiation between prior understanding and new information [8].

If everyone were already a self-directed learner or aware of the value inherent in completing the work of learning, the enhancements provided by AI-tools would be shifted towards the benefits discussed in this paper. Unfortunately, it is this type of expertise, developed through reflection, self-regulation, and iterative struggle, that allows seasoned learners to understand how to leverage the power of AI to enhance efficiency, boost productivity, and serve as a force multiplier [9], [10]. It is in this transitional phase that we find ourselves, where the contrasts of peril and promise may be most clearly seen. This is what this keynote presents and hopes to clarify for those in higher education at the forefront of transdisciplinary communication (TDC) and cutting-edge work. Nearly four decades ago, when one of the authors was studying to become a Chemical Engineer at Stanford, one of his first professors made an important distinction that remains relevant to this emerging issue. He challenged each of the incoming engineers to envision their role as something more than that of a technician, encouraging them to fully embrace the identity and responsibility of being practicing engineers. At the heart of the distinction being made is that engineers design and solve problems, using higher-level knowledge paired with expertise and experience to research, develop, and innovate.

On the other hand, technicians focus on applying and implementing existing solutions and using existing technologies to resolve issues. Engineers are responsible for the conceptualization and design of new systems or products, whereas technicians focus on the practical tasks of building, installing, and repairing them. This same distinction can be applied to many fields and can be seen as generating innovation versus applying known solutions [11]. As AI emerges, many of the current students see a way to reduce the burden of thinking by abdicating intellectual effort and relying on AI tools that produce quality answers for them. When this happens, they move closer to the role of technicians, no longer seeking to solve problems, understand complex situations, and innovate towards breakthroughs and advancing the field. In doing so, they abdicate the interpretive agency that defines higher learning itself; AI can simulate production but not the reasoning that makes innovation meaningful.

The authors understand that this is not a new challenge or novel argument. For many decades, the shift from sorting students out to encouraging everyone to learn and succeed has encouraged students to attain degrees. Too often, the students lack the maturity and circumspection that would allow them to see the

value in the process of learning. Instead, they seek an end or an answer easily obtained and sufficient to earn credit with minimal effort and the highest return on investment [8]. Within this environment, AI-tools present both tremendous promise to empower the work at the edge of transdisciplinary learning while at the same time posing huge concerns and perils for the system of higher education.

For TDC in higher education, especially, AI offers powerful new ways to bridge disciplines while introducing new risks related to bias, critical thinking, and equitable access. The ultimate impact depends on how institutions navigate these challenges through thoughtful integration and clear ethical guidelines [12], [13].

2. AI-TOOLS FOR TRANSDISCIPLINARY COMMUNICATION

AI can significantly enhance communication and collaboration between different academic fields by offering tools that break down barriers and foster a more integrated research and learning environment [14]. Information aggregation can be augmented by AI-tools that can search through vast amounts of academic literature from diverse fields, summarize complex texts, and present evidence-based findings. This capability allows researchers to grasp the key themes and trends of adjacent disciplines quickly. By analyzing large, eclectic datasets, AI can uncover connections and patterns between seemingly unrelated disciplines that a human researcher might overlook. This synthesis can spark new research questions and foster genuinely innovative, transdisciplinary thinking.

AI-tools can also bridge the gap across language barriers and learning levels to open new areas for investigation and collaboration. AI-TOOLS can act as a translator between and among a set of different languages and dialects. For collaborating, it can also be a neutral medium or mediator, facilitating the exchange of ideas by summarizing or translating complex disciplinary jargon into more accessible language [15]. This can help align understanding and improve collaboration among parties from different academic backgrounds. In this collaborative space, AI-tools can help manage group projects by assigning tasks based on member strengths and monitoring progress, ensuring fair workload distribution and improved collaboration. At the same time, AI tools have the potential to reduce conflicts or help mediate and resolve them. By analyzing communication patterns, AI can anticipate potential conflicts within a transdisciplinary team and suggest resolution strategies. This mediation helps maintain focus and improve decision-making.

In higher education, AI-tools provide real-time, individualized support to students working in transdisciplinary teams, tailoring feedback and resources to each member's needs [13]. Faculty and administrative staff can use AI to automate routine tasks, such as generating course materials, summarizing meetings, and managing student communications. This frees up time for higher-level work like research, mentorship, and curriculum innovation. All of this will aid in the creation of a more inclusive learning environment by offering translation services, summarizing complex material, and adapting content to different learning styles.

At the same time, there are many potential problems, especially for students who are not seeking to learn but to complete a degree. While the potential for AI is immense, several risks threaten to undermine its benefits if not adequately addressed, especially in contexts requiring nuanced, interdisciplinary communication. Students who become overly dependent on AI for tasks like writing or analysis risk diminishing their critical and analytical thinking skills. If AI is viewed as a shortcut rather than a learning aid, it can foster intellectual laziness. Even more concerning is the power of AI-tools to allow for easier generation of plagiarized content or cheating on assessments. This poses a serious threat to academic integrity and requires higher education institutions to develop new assessment formats and clear policies.

As students see how AI-TOOLS can automatically answer prompts or assigned work, they run the risk of being given false or inaccurate information. As the AI gives the most probable answer, most easily accessible from the internet or the training set, discipline-specific and nuanced information will often not be included. Moreover, fabricated answers by the AI-TOOLS may lead to students building a completely false understanding if they even look at the work being submitted.

This leads to a larger concern about ethical and equity challenges posed by the integration and use of AI-tools. AI models trained on biased data can perpetuate and amplify societal inequalities and stereotypes. For TDC, this can lead to discriminatory outcomes that disadvantage certain groups and undermine the principles of fairness and inclusivity. Even if everything is transparent and bias is eliminated in the design, development, and use of AI-tools, class disparities still exist. Robust AI tools can be costly, creating a digital divide where well-funded institutions and wealthier students have an advantage over their less-resourced peers. This can reinforce existing resource inequities in education. At the same time, many students and higher education instructors use AI-tools without fully appreciating what data is being collected and how it might be used and shared, raising significant concerns about privacy and data security. Institutions must ensure transparent policies and robust safeguards to protect sensitive information (see Table 1).

A heavy reliance on AI for communication could reduce human-to-human interaction, potentially hindering the development of crucial interpersonal skills such as empathy, collaboration, and social intelligence. While AI can facilitate communication and streamline knowledge exchange, it cannot fully grasp the emotional and cognitive nuances embedded in complex human interactions. Over-automating communication may therefore lead to less empathetic, less responsive, and more mechanized forms of engagement, eroding the relational depth necessary for effective learning and research. This risk becomes even more pronounced in transdisciplinary contexts, where meaning-making depends on dialogue across diverse epistemological and cultural frameworks. For students who lack academic maturity or whose focus leans toward task completion rather than reflective learning, an excessive dependence on AI-mediated communication can further diminish opportunities to cultivate interpersonal awareness, intellectual humility, and the capacity for collaborative sense-making, all of which are foundational to transdisciplinary inquiry and the human dimension of scholarship.

3. NEWLY EMERGING ROLES

In the age of AI-tools, students need a blend of technical and uniquely human skills to gain expertise by mastering AI as a tool. Key skills include AI literacy, which involves understanding how to use and interact with AI, and critical thinking to evaluate AI outputs [16]. They also need strong soft skills like communication, emotional intelligence, and creativity, along with domain-specific knowledge to apply AI effectively in their chosen field. In particular, students will need to understand the

capabilities and limitations of AI tools, including how to ask practical questions (prompt engineering) and critically evaluate AI-generated content. They will need to develop the ability to work with data, including analysis, interpretation, and understanding how AI models use data.

Thinking becomes more vital for an effective expert in order to use human judgment to assess, verify, and improve the outputs of AI, as AI can still make mistakes or be biased.

Beyond what is needed to use AI-tools, students must focus on complex, creative problem-solving that AI cannot replicate, such as designing new algorithms or creative content. As the foundational repetitive tasks are taken over by AI-tools, the differentiation for effective workers will be pushed more towards being able to effectively explain complex ideas, work in teams, and bridge the gap between human and AI-generated work. To excel at this, students must develop interpersonal skills to navigate human-AI collaboration and lead teams in a way that AI cannot. Also, they should cultivate a mindset of continuous learning to stay relevant as AI technology rapidly changes.

4. THE NEW WORKFORCE AND ROLE OF HIGHER EDUCATION

The future of work will not be defined solely by technical competence but by the capacity to collaborate meaningfully with intelligent systems while sustaining human creativity, ethics, and discernment. As AI becomes a pervasive force across disciplines, the distinction between human and machine expertise must evolve from competition to complementarity. The question is no longer how to prepare students for the workforce, but how to prepare them for human readiness—to act with wisdom, empathy, and responsibility in an AI-augmented world.

AI tools will automate repetitive tasks, generate data-driven insights, and optimize decision-making, enabling professionals to focus on higher-order functions: problem framing, ethical reasoning, and creative synthesis. However, this transformation demands that workers learn to interpret, question, and contextualize AI outputs rather than accept them as authoritative. The most valuable skill will not be prompt engineering or tool proficiency alone, but the ability to sustain interpretive agency—the uniquely human capacity to see meaning where machines see data.

Institutions of higher education, therefore, face a dual responsibility: to provide learners with technical literacy and to cultivate the moral, cultural, and social intelligence that ensures technology serves the common good. This requires rethinking curricula to emphasize collaboration, communication, and reflection alongside computational fluency. Classrooms must become laboratories of ethical experimentation, where students learn not only how to use AI, but how to be human with AI—to balance automation with empathy, speed with discernment, and innovation with accountability.

Ultimately, the challenge of human readiness lies in transforming education from a pipeline of employment to a crucible of purpose. Universities must nurture graduates who are not simply employable but interpretable: capable of reading, questioning, and shaping the systems in which they live and work. In doing so, higher education fulfills its enduring role as both the incubator of innovation and the guardian of humanity's reflective horizon.

5. THE HUMAN FULCRUM: TRANSDISCIPLINARY LOGIC IN THE AGE OF AI

The contrast between the promise and the peril of AI in higher education becomes clearest when framed through Aristotelian logic and dialectical reasoning, yet presented here as an integrated narrative rather than a set of headings. In TDC, the central categorical claim is simple: learning, research, and collaboration require active human interpretation, contextual understanding, and ethical judgment, while AI can only synthesize and present data. From this, it follows that AI may extend our analytic reach but cannot replace the human interpretive foundation that gives analysis meaning. This is not nostalgic rhetoric. It is a boundary condition that defines what remains non-delegable in TDC: interpretation, responsibility, and contextual reasoning.

The dialectical movement reinforces the same boundary. Education aims to cultivate critical thinking, creativity, and autonomous judgment. AI can simulate the products of thinking without the experience of thought, tempting learners to bypass the intellectual struggle that produces expertise [17]. The synthesis is practical: we must teach learners to collaborate with AI as a partner in inquiry while reserving interpretation and value judgments for humans. In other words, use AI to increase the field of view, not to outsource the act of seeing.

A corollary follows from the physics of leverage. Leverage without expertise multiplies nothing. AI supplies the leverage; only human interpretation supplies the where and the when to apply force. Without a human in the loop, AI amplifies error, bias, and superficiality rather than insight. This is why novice use of AI often diverges sharply from expert use. Novices can reproduce the surface features of expert work, but without the formative struggle that grounds expertise, they achieve an illusion of mastery. Mechanical precision without interpretive mastery produces efficient ignorance.

The same point can be seen through a maritime analogy. Education is the vessel that carries learners across the ocean of ignorance toward understanding. In pursuit of speed, some now abandon or even destroy the vessel, assuming that AI will carry them across by itself. However, AI is not a vessel. It is the current. Without the hull of education and the compass of human judgment, the current moves the learner but does not deliver them. Movement is mistaken for mastery. TDC reframes the scene: let AI fill the sails, but keep hands on the tiller.

For audiences beyond our field, the argument translates into a compact enthymeme. If education aims at autonomous judgment, and AI cannot provide autonomous judgment, then AI must remain a tool under human interpretation rather than a substitute for it. The warning that follows is brief and operational: adopt AI to extend inquiry, not to outsource intellectual struggle or ethical judgment. In TDC, the human interpreter is the load-bearing element. Remove it, and AI magnifies ignorance instead of understanding.

To embed this stance in collaborative practice, make the non-delegables explicit in every workflow. Draw a clear boundary between tasks that AI performs well and tasks that require human expertise. Require human verification and ethical accountability at each consequential decision. Close the interpretive loop by pairing every AI output with a short human rationale that documents context, sources, and foreseeable risks. Use plain metaphors to communicate across disciplines: the lever, the boat, the wind. Each point leads to the same conclusion: AI should accelerate the voyage, not replace the voyage, and never replace the navigator.

6. CULTIVATING HUMAN-AI COLLABORATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

The philosophical and dialectical reflection on AI's role in higher education leads inevitably to a practical question: how do institutions operationalize the human-in-the-loop principle that defines TDC? To preserve the integrity of learning while embracing innovation, higher education must transform its systems, not by resisting automation, but by redesigning the spaces where human and machine intelligence converge. The goal is not to slow the integration of AI but to ensure that its integration sustains intellectual development, ethical reasoning, and collaborative creativity.

Pedagogical design becomes the first site of transformation. The process of learning has always depended on struggle—on the friction between uncertainty and discovery. In an age when AI offers immediate answers, that friction must be intentionally cultivated. Educational programs should create assignments that require reflection on how AI was used, what assumptions it introduced, and how human judgment refined or contested its outputs. Instructors can embed reflective journals or project logs that trace the interpretive decisions made by the learner, ensuring that AI functions as an amplifier of inquiry rather than a substitute for it. In this sense, the process of learning becomes the object of learning itself.

Faculty development represents the second axis of reform. Educators are no longer only transmitters of disciplinary content; they are mediators between the human and the artificial. To guide students effectively, faculty must become literate in both AI functionality and its ethical implications. This literacy goes beyond tool proficiency. It requires a capacity to recognize bias, interpret outputs, and translate them across disciplinary languages—a skill central to TDC. Institutions can promote this through collaborative studios, faculty institutes, and joint research initiatives where human–AI teams model the interpretive dialogue expected from students. Such efforts build a shared culture of critical collaboration, positioning faculty as mentors in the art of contextual reasoning.

Institutional policy completes the transformation. Universities must design policies that preserve transparency, accountability, and equity in every AI-supported process. This includes human-in-the-loop protocols for grading, authorship, data use, and decision-making. Assessment systems should reward not just the final output but the reflective reasoning that shaped it. Likewise, equity considerations must be integral: institutions must ensure that access to robust AI systems does not reinforce existing disparities between disciplines, institutions, or socioeconomic groups. The ethics of inclusion and the logic of transdisciplinarity must remain inseparable.

These reforms transform the philosophical warning into a framework for institutional renewal. To cultivate a generation of learners who can navigate the new landscape, universities must design curricula, policies, and cultures that embody the Aristotelian balance between means and ends. The objective is not to master AI but to master collaboration with it—to make AI an extension of human curiosity, not a replacement for human cognition.

6.1 Operationalizing Human-in-the-Loop learning

Translating the principles of human-AI collaboration into institutional practice requires intentional design across curricula, pedagogy, and governance. The goal is not merely to include humans in the process but to cultivate a reflective relationship between human judgment and algorithmic support, a relationship that keeps interpretation, context, and ethics at the core of all learning processes.

First, curriculum design must explicitly integrate AI-use reflection into learning activities. Assignments should document how students employ AI tools, what assumptions they uncover, and how human reasoning shaped or contested AI-generated results. Such reflective artifacts help distinguish engagement from automation, ensuring that AI serves as a cognitive amplifier rather than a substitute for thought.

Second, faculty development must prioritize AI literacy as both a technical and an ethical practice. Educators need to recognize bias, interpret outputs across disciplinary languages, and model critical collaboration with AI systems. Interdisciplinary studios and joint inquiry projects can help faculty internalize the interpretive balance expected of students, transforming teaching into a shared human–AI dialogue.

Third, institutional policy must codify human-in-the-loop principles. Clear guidelines should define when AI assistance is acceptable, how attribution and authorship are recognized, and what human verification is required at key stages of assessment and decision-making. Equity and transparency must be central to these policies, preventing the concentration of AI advantages among privileged institutions or individuals.

Embedding these practices across institutional layers operationalizes the philosophical argument of this paper: that AI should augment inquiry, not replace it. When universities make the human-in-the-loop principle visible in their curricula, professional development, and governance, they ensure that technological innovation deepens rather than diminishes the interpretive, ethical, and creative essence of education. This multi-level approach to implementation is summarized in Table 2, which outlines practical strategies for embedding the human-in-the-loop principle across curricular, pedagogical, and institutional domains.

The discussion now returns to its starting paradox: the same technology that threatens to erode human intellect also has the capacity to elevate it. The distinction rests on how institutions, educators, and learners define their relationship with AI. If education is the vessel and AI the current, then the conclusion must address not whether we sail with the machine, but how. The future of higher education depends on our ability to preserve the compass of judgment while embracing the winds of automation.

7. REDEFINING LEARNING IN THE AGE OF AI: FROM ACQUISITION TO TRANSFORMATION

AI forces higher education to confront a profound epistemological shift: the meaning of *learning itself* is changing. Traditionally, learning has been defined as the acquisition of knowledge, skills, and behaviors through study or experience [18]. Yet, as machine systems begin to perform these functions: storing, retrieving, and recombining information more efficiently than any human, the distinctive character of human learning must be rearticulated. The question is no longer *how much* we can learn, but *what kind of learning remains uniquely human.*

Human learning, understood through cognitive, behavioral, and ontogenetic perspectives, is not merely the accumulation of information but the transformation of understanding through contradiction, reflection, and adaptation [19]. Ontogenetically, learning represents the developmental unfolding of cognitive, emotional, and ethical capacities over time: a dynamic process through which individuals construct identity, autonomy, and judgment. When AI intervenes too early or too comprehensively in this process, it risks compressing the formative tension that

drives intellectual maturity. By resolving uncertainty prematurely, AI may reduce the developmental struggle that fosters persistence, metacognition, and epistemic humility.

As recent research on neuroplasticity demonstrates, learning is a dynamic process of reorganizing neural pathways in response to challenge and novelty, not repetition or automation. This plasticity reflects the principle that growth requires tension: a discrepancy between what is known and what must still be discovered [13]. In educational terms, AI reduces this tension by offering instant resolution, thereby undermining the cognitive dissonance that drives conceptual change. Ontogenetically, this means that learners risk stunting the development of higher-order capacities such as ethical reasoning and reflective autonomy, the very traits that distinguish human expertise from algorithmic proficiency.

To sustain meaningful learning in this context, higher education must shift from a transmission model to a *transformative* one. This transformation aligns with TDC, where learning is conceived as negotiation among perspectives rather than linear mastery of content. Students must be trained not only to use AI outputs but to interrogate them, to identify contradictions, biases, and assumptions embedded within them. The emphasis should move from "what" students learn to "how" they integrate, critique, and recontextualize information across disciplinary boundaries. In this sense, learning becomes an act of ethical reasoning and interpretive agency.

The neuroscientific evidence for this shift is compelling. Studies on human cognition reveal that metacognition, the ability to monitor and regulate one's own thought processes, is central to adaptive expertise [20], [21]. Machines can simulate association and inference but lack metacognition; they do not *know that they know*. Thus, the new educational imperative is to cultivate metacognitive awareness: teaching learners to reflect on their relationship with AI, their methods of inquiry, and their evolving sense of responsibility. This shift mirrors the transition from behaviorism to constructivism in the twentieth century, but under far higher technological stakes.

Ultimately, redefining learning in the age of AI means returning to its human roots. Learning is not the efficient absorption of content but the reflective resolution of contradictions that lead to transformation—cognitive, ethical, and social. This redefinition restores the learner as an active participant in meaning-making, situating AI as a tool for extending thought rather than replacing it. The institutions that recognize this distinction will not only preserve the purpose of education but also renew it, preparing learners to navigate uncertainty with curiosity, empathy, and judgment.

The following conclusion reflects on this imperative—how higher education can steer toward a future where AI serves not as a substitute for thought but as a catalyst for deeper understanding and collaboration.

8. CONCLUSION: STEERING TOWARD THE HUMAN HORIZON

AI has emerged as both the lever and the current of modern higher education. It magnifies human potential while simultaneously revealing the fragility of our dependence on technology. The paradox is no longer whether AI will transform education, but whether education can transform itself to guide that transformation ethically, inclusively, and intelligently. Within this evolving landscape, TDC offers a compass—a framework through which diverse disciplines can collaborate to ensure that the promise of AI does not eclipse the purpose of learning.

The challenge for higher education is not to choose between adoption and resistance but to cultivate discernment: knowing when to let AI accelerate inquiry and when to slow the process to preserve reflection. The act of learning is an act of becoming, and becoming cannot be automated. The interpretive, ethical, and relational dimensions of human thought must remain central, even as algorithms expand our reach. To lose that center is to destroy the very vessel of education, mistaking efficiency for insight and movement for mastery.

AI will continue to reshape how we learn, teach, and collaborate, but it cannot determine why we do so. That responsibility remains human. The future of education, therefore, depends on reaffirming the role of the learner and the educator as interpreters—those who can see beyond outputs to meaning, beyond synthesis to understanding. When institutions design systems that preserve human interpretation, foster intellectual struggle, and promote ethical reflection, they transform AI from a perilous sea to an ocean of possibilities.

As we find ourselves within this transition toward an AI-driven workforce and educational system, we must be circumspect. Having collectively experienced the technological and pedagogical shifts of past decades, we encourage educators and institutions to understand AI as both a tool and a disruptive innovation. At the foundation of any transformation, systems must anticipate future challenges and plan for inevitable disruptions. AI will continue to reshape our academic landscape, though its full scope may never be fully described; its impact is already being felt. Addressing only the symptoms of academic disengagement or avoiding AI in hopes of preserving isolated islands of stagnation will not resolve the systemic issues at hand. Instead, we must embrace the challenge that AI has revealed: the persistent and pervasive disengagement within higher education. Students must come to recognize the intrinsic value of the learning process itself, rather than viewing the degree as the finish line. We must adopt AI thoughtfully to enhance and augment our practices so that education may instill a lasting desire to learn, the capacity for self-direction and self-correction, and an openness to collaboration across cultures, disciplines, and technologies worldwide.

The task ahead is both philosophical and practical: to align technological innovation with the enduring aims of education. If we succeed, AI will not diminish our humanity but reveal its depth. The promise of higher education in the age of AI is not merely to teach with new tools but to remind society that knowledge remains a human enterprise. The horizon before us is vast, but the compass is still in our hands. The challenge before higher education, therefore, is not whether to adopt AI but how to guide its use through discernment, integrating its power while protecting the reflective, ethical, and interpretive essence of learning.

The future of higher education depends on our capacity to evolve with integrity and imagination. Higher education serves as both the incubator of innovation and the crucible in which our collective future is cast. This responsibility cannot be abdicated to systems controlled by a select few or shaped solely by the interests of a privileged minority. Our challenge is to cultivate an educational ecosystem that nurtures the problem solvers, critical thinkers, and ethical innovators of tomorrow, individuals capable of addressing global challenges with wisdom, creativity, and a commitment to the common good.

9. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Special thanks to the blind reviewers, whomever you may be, for your notes and observations that improved the final version.

Disclosure statement

No conflict of interest pertains to the research presented above.

ORCID

James Lipuma https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9778-3843
Cristo Leon https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0930-0179

10. REFERENCES

[1] D. P. Ausubel, J. D. Novak, and H. Hanesian, *Educational Psychology: A Cognitive View*, 2nd edition. New York, N.Y.: Holt McDougal, 1978.

[2] J. D. Houwer, "Why the Cognitive Approach in Psychology Would Profit From a Functional Approach and Vice Versa," *Perspect Psychol Sci*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 202–209, Mar. 2011, doi: 10.1177/1745691611400238.

[3] S. J. Lachman, "Learning is a Process: Toward an Improved Definition of Learning," *The Journal of Psychology*, vol. 131, no. 5, pp. 477–480, Sep. 1997, doi: 10.1080/00223989709603535.

[4] *How People Learn II: Learners, Contexts, and Cultures*. Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press, 2018. doi: 10.17226/24783.

[5] National Research Council, Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education, Board on Behavioral, Cognitive, and Sensory Sciences, Committee on Developments in the Science of Learning, and Committee on Learning Research and Educational Practice, *How People Learn: Brain, Mind, Experience, and School: Expanded Edition*. Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press, 2000. doi: 10.17226/9853.

[6] M. T. H. Chi, "Three Types of Conceptual Change: Belief Revision, Mental Model Transformation, and Categorical Shift," in *International Handbook of Research on Conceptual Change*, 1st Edition., New York: Routledge, 2009, pp. 61–82.

[7] J. Mezirow, *Transformative Dimensions of Adult Learning*, First Edition. San Francisco, Calif: Jossey-Bass, 1991.

[8] J. Nussbaum and S. Novick, "Alternative Frameworks, Conceptual Conflict and Accommodation: Toward a Principled Teaching Strategy," *Instr Sci*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 183–200, Dec. 1982, doi: 10.1007/BF00414279.

[9] A. Bandura, *Teoría del Aprendizaje Social*. Espasa-Calpe, 1987.

[10] A. Efklides, "The Role of Metacognitive Experiences in the Learning Process," *Psicothema*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 76–82, Feb. 2009.

[11] J. De Houwer, D. Barnes-Holmes, and A. Moors, "What Is Learning? On the Nature and Merits of a Functional Definition of Learning," *Psychon Bull Rev*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 631–642, Aug. 2013, doi: 10.3758/s13423-013-0386-3.

[12] M. Cole, *Cultural Psychology: A Once and Future Discipline*. Cambridge, Mass., 1996.

[13] Y. Engeström and A. Sannino, "From Mediated Actions to Heterogenous Coalitions: Four Generations of Activity-Theoretical Studies of Work and Learning," *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 4–23, Jan. 2021, doi: 10.1080/10749039.2020.1806328.

[14] M. P. Domjan, *The Principles of Learning and Behavior*, 7th edition; First hardcover edition, 2006. Stamford, CT: Cengage Learning, 2014.

[15] S. Cacciamani, D. Cesareni, F. Martini, T. Ferrini, and N. Fujita, "Influence of Participation, Facilitator Styles, and Metacognitive Reflection on Knowledge Building In Online University Courses," *Computers & Education*, vol. 58, no. 3, pp. 874–884, Apr. 2012, doi: 10.1016/j.compedu.2011.10.019.

[16] J. Cowin, B. Oberer, and C. León, "A Brave New World: AI as a Nascent Regime? [Presentation]," presented at the Proceedings of the 27th World Multi-Conference on Systemics, Cybernetics and Informatics: WMSCI 2023, Online, Sep. 11, 2023. [Online]. Available: https://www.iiis2023.org/wmsci/website/keynotespeakers.asp?vc=1

[17] B. Chang, "Culture as a Tool: Facilitating Knowledge Construction in the Context of a Learning Community," *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, vol. 29, no. 6, pp. 705–722, Nov. 2010, doi: 10.1080/02601370.2010.523947.

[18] S. Granville and L. Dison, "Thinking About Thinking: Integrating Self-Reflection Into an Academic Literacy Course," *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 99–118, Apr. 2005, doi: 10.1016/j.jeap.2004.07.009.

[19] J. N. Giedd and J. L. Rapoport, "Structural MRI of Pediatric Brain Development: What Have We Learned and Where Are We Going?," *Neuron*, vol. 67, no. 5, pp. 728–734, Sep. 2010, doi: 10.1016/j.neuron.2010.08.040.

[20] J. H. Flavell, "Metacognition and Cognitive Monitoring: A New Area of Cognitive–Developmental Inquiry," *American Psychologist*, vol. 34, no. 10, pp. 906–911, 1979, doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.34.10.906.

[21] N. Lacon de De Lucia and S. Ortega de Hocevar, "Cognición, metacognición y escritura," *Revista signos*, vol. 41, no. 67, pp. 231–255, 2008, doi: 10.4067/S0718-09342008000200009.

Table 1. *Promise and Peril of AI in Higher Education*

Dimension	Promise	Peril	Human-in-the-Loop Mitigation
Learning Process	Personalized instruction, adaptive feedback, scalable mentorship	Erosion of critical thinking, intellectual dependency	Embed reflective AI-use journals and metacognitive evaluation
Collaboration	Cross-linguistic and interdisciplinary connection	Reduced empathy, mechanized interaction	Maintain direct dialogue and interpretive mediation
Equity	Broader access to tools and resources	Digital divide and unequal AI literacy	Institutional training and equitable access policies
Ethics & Integrity	Transparent data practices and ethical modeling	Plagiarism, bias, and privacy breaches	Human oversight and policy on attribution and bias auditing
Cognitive Development	Support for conceptual synthesis	Compression of ontogenetic growth and reflective struggle	Design assignments requiring human interpretation and critique

Note. Authors' elaboration based on the conceptual synthesis of transdisciplinary communication (TDC) frameworks and educational psychology literature. The table summarizes how the potential benefits ("Promise") and risks ("Peril") of AI in higher education can be balanced through intentional human-in-the-loop design.

Table 2. *Framework for Operationalizing Human-in-the-Loop Learning*

Institutional Level	Implementation Strategy	Intended Learning Outcome	TDC Connection
Curriculum Design	Require reflection logs on AI use; differentiate engagement from automation.	Metacognitive awareness; ethical inquiry	Reflective integration across disciplines
Faculty Development	Cross-disciplinary AI studios and mentorship training	Critical interpretation and responsible modeling	Faculty as mediators of human–AI dialogue
Policy and Governance	Define acceptable AI use, attribution, and verification standards	Accountability, transparency, equity	Institutional ethics for collaboration
Assessment Systems	Evaluate process and reasoning, not only output	Reinforcement of interpretive agency	Human validation loop in evaluation
Infrastructure Equity	Ensure access parity across students and programs	Inclusive participation and opportunity	Equity as the foundation of TDC practice

Note. Authors' elaboration derived from the application of TDC principles to institutional, pedagogical, and governance contexts. The table outlines practical strategies for embedding human judgment, reflection, and ethical accountability at multiple levels of higher education.