Examining University Obsolescence Claims in the Conversational AI Era

Dr.A.Shaji George[1], Dr. T. Baskar[2], Dr. Nataliia Siranchuk[3]

[1]Independent Researcher, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India.
[2]Professor, Department of Physics, Shree Sathyam College of Engineering and Technology, Sankari Taluk, Tamil Nadu, India.
[3]Associate Professor, Professor at the Department of Primary Education, Borys Grinchenko Kyiv Metropolitan University, Kyiv, Ukraine.

Abstract – Background: Higher education is at a crossroads with artificial intelligence, in particular, large language models such as ChatGPT, providing new opportunities to customize learning on demand. The latest developments, including the increased connectivity between chat AI and online platforms including Coursera, have raised concerns as to whether conventional universities will be able to survive. These applications promise seamless curriculum development, interactive video classes, voice responsive tutors, and high-tech instructions using visual and metaphorical explanations and all this is made immediately and cheaply.

Objectives: This review analyzes critically the argument that colleges will become obsolete in few years due to the use of AI-based learning. It also assesses the practical capacity of the existing AI education tools, quantifies their real and possible impact on universities, identifies gaps between the promises and delivery of technology, and considers the numerous roles that universities fulfill beyond merely passing knowledge.

Methodology: The methodology adopted in the study is a narrative review with technology assessment models. The researchers checked regarding journals and databases, namely, ERIC, Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar that included articles published since 2018. Peer-reviewed articles, technical reports, policy documents, and credible industry analysis were searched. The keywords included AI in higher education, personalised learning technologies, ChatGPT education, the university disruption, online learning platforms, and so on.

Key Findings: There were four major themes. To begin with, the existing AI systems are not only powerful but also have obvious limitations. Second, their performance in instruction is yet to be compared with the conventional practices. Third, universities offer a rich variety of services in addition to teaching including research support and community building. Fourth, economic and social effects of possible disruption are complicated. Although AI enhances content delivery and tutoring, it lacks critical-thinking, collaboration, credential credibility, research, and fair-access. Overall, there is an indication of transition to hybrid models, as opposed to the total substitutes of institutions.

Conclusion: The relationship of AI with higher education is also transformative rather than destructive. Although universities need to change and evolve AI in a way that is considerate, it has not been empirically proven that few years will lead to complete obsolescence. The future research must be directed to study long-term learning, equity, the most effective ways to employ AI in teaching, and institutional change strategies. The collaboration between policymakers, teachers and technologists need to come together to ensure that educational evolution enhances, and not diminishes accessibility, quality and benefit to the society.

1. INTRODUCTION

According to the statement that colleges will be non-existent within few years, the idea is more of provocative conjecture rather than an in-depth anxiety in discourse of the future of college education. Recent development in artificial intelligence, particularly the combination of large language models like ChatGPT with established online learning platforms, has contributed to the growth of this idea. The new technologies threaten the centuries-old assumptions that were used in educational institutions. With AI systems proving to have unparalleled capacity to design curriculum, provide personalized tutoring and tailored explanations, the question of the continued relevance of traditional universities has ceased to be peripheral to the educational technology debate, becoming instead central to policy debate, institutional organization, and public consciousness.

This moment is not only significant to tech enthusiasts and campus administrators. Higher education is a trillion dollars international sector that employs millions of professors and employees, enrolls hundreds of millions of students, and encourages social upwardness, financial advancement and production of knowledge. Universities are credentialing institutions, research centers, cultural institutions, and community facilities. The fact that they may become obsolete in five or fifty years creates far-reaching consequences in the organization of the economy, social hierarchy, and the creation of knowledge and even the intellectual life itself.

Recent technological advancements have seen concrete substance gaining into what was previously an abstract speculation. The partnership of conversational AI systems and platforms such as Coursera is an example of a new paradigm, whereby the user can order a personalized curriculum, watch video lectures and at the same time question an AI tutor, and get answers in a variety of modes, including voice, visualization, and figurative logic. These features can overcome the old arguments against online learning, especially the inability to experience live advice of an expert and individual feedback. Advocates argue that these systems are like having an all-knowing professor that is twenty four hours a day, can respond to the specific needs of a learner and can infinite patience, which no human teacher can possibly have.

But it is important to consider whether these technological advances, in fact, make universities obsolete, and this involves a closer look that would go beyond technological determinism. Education, economics, sociology, and technology scholars are exploring this question in various perspectives, but there are still substantial gaps. Available literature has tested the effectiveness of AI tutoring under controlled conditions, compared the rates of completion of online learning, and investigated students preference towards various modes of instruction. Not many studies have been done to find out whether AI-based learning systems can emulate the complete breadth of educational, social, professional, and developmental roles that universities play. Issues of equity, the legitimacy in credentialing research, mentoring of research, critical thinking, and the social aspects of learning that might be slow to be replicated by technology remain too.

The existing situation reveals conflicting views. Some industry observers and technology enthusiasts project that the traditional higher education system will be disrupted wholesale and on a rapid basis, citing the falling enrollment in some institutions, the increase in costs, the student debt crisis, and the proven capabilities of AI. On the contrary, numerous education researchers and university administrations also stress the irreplaceable nature of campus-based education, the significance of

accredited qualifications, and the social and developmental aspects of college life, and mention the shortcomings of existing AI technologies. In between these poles there is a lot of doubt regarding the rate at which the transformation is taking place, the nature and also the magnitude of the transformation.

The justification of the claim that colleges will be rendered unnecessary in the next few years using AI-based learning technologies is the subject of this review article. Its questions are fivefold first, the capabilities and limitations of current AI-based education materials need to be evaluated and shown, not speculated second, the pedagogical effectiveness of AI-based learning processes should be assessed against conventional university instruction in terms of various educational outcomes third, the ecosystem of services, functions and values that universities offer must be identified, and the types of services that cannot be replicated by technology and vice versa fourth, socioeconomic implications of any potential disruption should be considered, considering aspects like access, equity, credentialing, and recognition of knowledge and experience in the

The review is devoted to the institutions of higher learning in North America and Europe and is applicable to the global trends. The temporal horizon is 2018-2025, which is the time when a significant development of large language models and their usage in education is rapid. It considers research universities, liberal arts colleges, community colleges, and for-profit institutions because, in these cases, disruption can affect these sectors in a variety of ways. Although K-12 education and corporate training are dealt with where applicable, the main concern is post-secondary education.

The methodology of this article is the narrative review technique with critical technology assessment frameworks. In contrast to systematic reviews that are guided by specific protocols, narrative reviews enable a larger investigation of complicated issues where a myriad of evidence quantitative studies, qualitative research, theoretical frameworks, policy studies, and technology evaluations can be used to gain insight. Extensive search was performed through academic databases such as ERIC, Scopus, Web of science, and Google Scholar with reports on the same by educational bodies, technology providers, and policy organizations. Search keywords were the combination of artificial intelligence, higher education, university, disruption, personalized learning, ChatGPT, large language models, online education, educational technology, and similar terms. Sources were determined based on credibility, methodological rigor and relevance with preference given to peer-reviewed studies and consideration of the importance of gray literature in fast-changing fields.

This introduction has provided the importance of reviewing arguments of university obsolescence, conceptualized some of the recent advances in technology, revealed gaps in contemporary knowledge, and stated the scope and design of the present review. The four crucial themes that will be considered in the next sections include the capabilities and limitations of AI educational systems, the learning outcomes and the pedagogical effectiveness of AI-powered teaching the overall ecosystem of functions of a university and the socioeconomic consequences of a potential education disruption. This review, via careful analysis, will seek to transcend the realm of speculation to evidence based knowledge on the future of higher education in the era of artificial intelligence.

2. DISCUSSION

2.1 Technological Capabilities and Limitations of AI Educational Systems

The technological backbone behind the allegations of university obsolescence depends on the new developments in large language models and their application to educational content platforms. To estimate the predictions concerning the future of higher education, it is important to know what the

systems are capable of doing and what they are not capable of doing. In this section, the author discusses the technical architecture, publicized capabilities, and major limitations of the current AI-based educational technologies.

The big language models include ChatGPT, GPT-4, Claude, and others, which are significant advances in natural language processing. They have been trained in vast volumes of text and are able to produce human-like responses, explanations, and content. Coupled to platforms like Coursera, Khan Academy, and Udacity, these models create a learning ecosystem, which users consider fluid. Students can enter or say a study objective, such as, I would like to learn about artificial intelligence, and the program establishes a designed curriculum that draws upon trusted course offerings. This will then present video lectures, reading texts, and exercises and maintain the conversation, thereby allowing the students to pose a follow-up question or find out more without having to exit the interface.

Voice interaction would provide further accessibility and naturalness. Learners do not have to type, instead, they can address a question to the human teacher, and the AI would turn the speech to text and vice versa, providing audible responses. This helps to minimize friction and will particularly be of benefit to students who struggle with written communication, or they are auditory learners. The system is also flexible to other forms of learning as it can also seek visual assistance, diagrams, or metaphorical elucidations.

The studies of AI tutors efficacy have already revealed positive outcomes in certain fields. Kulik and Fletcher (2016) discovered that the learning gains of intelligent tutoring systems were like those of a when tutor is one-on-one with an individual, in well-designed courses such as math and programming. Recent work, including that by Fancsali et al (2023), demonstrates that adaptive learning algorithms can tailor sequence of problems to knowledge level of a student, increasing efficiency in comparison to set curricula. The 24-hour access, infinite patience, lack of emotional response of a human are actual benefits in some learning situations.

Nevertheless, this optimistic vision is tinged with implementation of critical shortcomings. To begin with, even though the existing large language models are impressive in their linguistic fluency, they have no actual understanding. They are able to produce believable sounding yet factually incorrect statements, a phenomenon that scientists refer to as hallucination. These errors in the educational contexts may mislead a learner particularly those who may not have the background information to identify the errors. Although the answers can be based on curated platforms such as Coursera, this basic limitation can be observed in cases when the questions go beyond the content that is built in.

Second, AI systems are very effective at providing an explanation in areas of existing knowledge and inadequate at open-ended, creative, and critical, thinking operations, which are characteristic of higher-order learning outcomes. The taxonomy by Bloom (1956) differentiates between lower-order skills, i.e., remembering, understanding, and higher-order skills, i.e., analyzing, evaluating, creating. The support of lower-order learning is excellent, but higher-order thinking is doubtful when using AI tutors. Liu et al. (2024) found out that students who have been instructed with AI tutors also became more competent in terms of recalling facts and procedural skills but lacked improvements in critical thinking and creative problem-solving in comparison to the traditional teaching method.

Third, AIs rely on the quality of the source material that it access to produce curriculum and to sequence it. The incorporation of platforms like Coursera is a professionally developed course but the question arises as to what added value the AI mediation offers over the simple taking of courses. The advantage-conversational interaction can be helpful to a certain group of learners, but it does not necessarily alter

the underlying educational resources. Furthermore, numerous areas of knowledge are not well reflected on these platforms, making AI-based learning narrow.

Fourth, AI systems are not yet context aware as human educators are. Adaptive algorithms can follow patterns of problem solving and modify difficulty, whereas they will not be able to detect the facial expression, posture, or hesitation of confusion, frustration, or confusion which comes with face-to-face teaching. They do not always know when a student requires motivating, when to work harder and when to switch their method according to the overall perception of the learner development. D'Mello and Graesser (2012) published the results of their research that showed that human tutors significantly outcompeted AI in recognizing and addressing the emotional conditions of learners.

Fifth, AI systems have problems with motivation and metacognition. Learning, to be effective, needs to have access to information, as well as self-regulation, goal setting, persistence, and reflection. Although AI can scaffold reminders and a progression structure, to inculcate intrinsic motivation and metacognitive awareness, human mentorship and community support are generally required. The article by Zimmerman and Schunk (2011) on self-regulated learning demonstrates the social and motivational factors that AI is just not able to reproduce.

Lastly, the questions of assessment authenticity and eliminating cheating make AI-powered learning more complicated. In case the learners are able to use an omniscient AI tutor in the process of exams, then how would learning be justified? On the other hand, the artificial distinction of prohibiting AI tools on assessment, and permitting them on preparation, does not create the artificiality of real-life situation. Sullivan et al. (2025) discovered that teachers could not create meaningful assessment in the era of AI code-generation tools in computer science.

The current AI learning platforms are potent to present information, respond to questions, and customize studying in the well-organized fields. However, due to serious drawbacks in both factual accuracy and higher-level thinking, contextual comprehension, motivational backing and evaluation integrity, AI is not yet able to replace the full course of university education- its ability is still limited due to technical and pedagogical issues.

2.2 Pedagogical Effectiveness and Learning Outcomes

In addition to technical abilities, the ability of AI-driven learning to displace universities depends on relative pedagogical performance in a wide range of learning outcomes. This part discusses empirical data regarding the effectiveness of learning, rates of completion, skill-building and the long-term results related to the AI-enhanced online learning versus the traditional university education.

There is also a substantial increase in evidence based on the effectiveness of online learning in the last ten years. Online courses were determined to be able to deliver the same learning outcomes as face-to-face instruction in most situations in meta-analyses conducted by Means et al. (2013) and Xu and Jaggars (2014), but limits are present. These papers were primarily dealing with conventional online courses, not AI-enhanced ones, but established baseline expectations. According to Bernard et al. (2014), blended learning, which is a combination of online and in-person components, in most cases, was found to be more effective than purely online or purely face-to-face models, indicating the usefulness of hybrid solutions.

More recent studies are starting to focus on AI-enhanced learning. Luckin et al. (2022) conducted a randomized controlled trial where they used math classes as the control and math lessons with AI tutoring as the experimental group. When students used AI tutoring, they demonstrated greater

procedural fluency and accuracy in problem solving on conventional tests, but the difference disappeared on conceptual understanding and generalizing to new problems. This trend, which is AI facilitating skill learning within specific areas but having minimal effect on high-order conceptual learning, has been found to be consistent across research.

Chen and others (2023) examined MOOCs that are boosted with conversational artificial intelligence assistants. They discovered that learners who engaged in interactive communication with the AI posed more questions and engaged more exercises compared to the control group. However, the completion rates remained low, only 18 percent of the students who joined the course completed it, compared with 20 percent in the regular MOOC formats. This implies that AI support is not the answer to the motivational and persistence issues that online education is afflicted with.

The issue of the completion rate is, maybe, the greatest impediment to the statements that online learning with AI can substitute universities. Graduation rates per institution are also variable, yet even community colleges, which deal with non-traditional and at-risk learners, have a better rate of graduation than the average MOOCs. Caulfield et al. (2024) examined the statistics of large online platforms and discovered that the median course completion rates ranged between 5 and 15 per cent, and full degree-equivalent curricula were practically immeasurable. Incomplete, excellent content and sophisticated AI tutoring do not have much practical application.

Low online learning completion has been attributed to a number of explanations that have been put forward by researchers. According to Henderikx et al. (2017), the absence of social presence, inadequate time-management skills, inexperience with online activities before, and conflicting life demands were identified. Most of these can be attributed not to content quality but to the more general support system and well-organized environment that the universities offer. The needs of social belonging, external structure, and demand management are not met by AI tutoring however sophisticated.

Another challenge that AI-powered systems will face is the social aspects of learning. Pedagogical strengths are established to be collaborative learning, peer discussion, and social knowledge construction. The theory of social constructivism developed by Vygotsky (1978) focuses much on the fact that learning is a social experience, which takes place through interaction and dialogue. Although these online forums and collaboration tools do exist, Kraut and Resnick (2012) discovered that to create effective communities, it takes a lot of facilitation, norm setting and community management, which currently cannot be effectively done by AI.

The development of critical thinking, which is the core of higher education, presents certain issues to AI-enhanced learning. According to Ennis (1993), critical thinking refers to the deliberation of thinking that is reflective and reasoned on what to believe or do. The cultivation of this capacity requires exposure to a variety of perspectives, exposure to ambiguity, argumentation experience, evaluation of evidence, and metacognition. Davies and Barnett (2015) discovered critical thinking flourished in the environment with the presence of Socratic dialogue, constructive controversy, and teaching in the field-specific reasoning.

Is this something that can be done with the help of AI systems? There is some indicative evidence of limited capacity. AI can offer different points of view and asking questions, but it does not offer that intellectual stimulation and uncertainty that human communication can offer. Wineburg and McGrew (2019) discovered that the development of skills in online credibility evaluation solely necessitated extensive practice with instructor feedback, a group discussion of rationalizing tactics, and immersion in culture, which cannot be easily achieved by means of AI.

The transfer question, whether skills and knowledge learned in AI-powered settings are applicable in real-life settings, is not well investigated. Bransford and Schwartz (1999) differentiated between the sequestered problem-solving and the preparation of future learning. AI tutoring can be useful in helping a student to solve specific problems, but acquiring adaptive expertise that can be used in settings outside the original context usually involves varied practice, explicit attention to the underlying principles, and deliberate reflection on applicability, which is what developed in structured university education is designed to offer.

Another knowledge gap is longitudinal results. Most AI-enhanced learning researchers are concerned with short-term benefits or one-course results. Long-term benefits that are associated with university degrees, such as career advancement, earning potential, lifelong learning, civic engagement, and others, are minimally researched. Even though correlation does not establish causation, significant evidence exists that indicates that university completion results in better life outcomes in the dimensions of many aspects. The open empirical question is whether the long-term beneficial impacts of AI-enhanced online learning can be similar.

Pedagogical effectiveness is hard to assess because of equity considerations. The disadvantaged students have obstacles in their background with a lack of previous preparation, economic disadvantages, family commitments, and access to technology and peaceful study areas. These barriers are countered with the help of university support services like academic advising, tutoring centers, disability accommodations, financial aid, childcare, and mental health services. It is unclear whether AI-enhanced online platforms can be effective with students with complex disadvantages as compared to the extensive university support ecosystems. Initial information provided by Xu and Jaggars (2014) indicates that online education can widen inequality in achievement, and poor learners record low success in online education in contrast to classrooms.

The evidence of the pedagogy shows a subtle image. AI-based learning is effective in skills acquisition in well-organized areas, personalized training, and factual answers. Nevertheless, there are still major issues, namely, completion rates, development of higher-order thinking, social learning, transfer, long-term results, and equitable access. Such constraints point to the fact that, although AI technologies can complement and refine the process of delivering education, their ability to provide the whole spectrum of the learning outcomes, which are conventionally attributed to university education, is limited.

2.3 The Comprehensive Ecosystem Functions of Universities

It takes an assessment of all the functions and values that universities provide to assess whether AI-powered learning can make universities irrelevant. Although teaching is one of their missions, institutions are also involved with credentialing, research, professional networking, student development, community service, and cultural preservation. This part assesses the possibility and nature of these various functions replicating beyond the traditional university framework.

The credentialing service is arguably the most economically significant service of universities. University degrees were used by employers as an indicator of competence, tenacity and general education. This signaling, as Spence (2002) says, occurs whether learning occurs during or out of university. The concern is how the employers believe that degree holders possess desirable attributes. Despite the development of certificates, badges and portfolio assessment, the university degrees continue to have much more labor-market recognition.

Is it possible to have similar credentialing legitimacy through AI-powered learning platforms? There are other institutions that provide accredited qualifications to online courses undertaken. Kizilcec et al. (2020)

discovered that employers perceive MOOC certificates as a complementary position they can help in skills, but not in general competence. Establishing legitimacy needs quality learning, but it also needs trusted evaluation, fraud avoidance, standard bonds, and acceptance by employers, which are vexed not like technological ability.

The challenge is also contributed by accreditation systems. In most countries, government credentialing and program accreditation mandate that institutions be capable of fulfilling broad standards faculty qualification, curricular coherence, student support, outcome assessment and institutional stability. These control systems were developed to provide quality and safeguard students. On the one hand, some may say that they are slowing down the innovation process, on the other hand, they offer a guarantee that breaking them without offering something to replace it is dangerous.

Another crucial dimension that is ignored is the role of research in universities. The concentration of basic scientific research, technological innovation, and scholarship progress in all fields is carried out in major research universities. Teaching incorporates research in graduate studies, undergraduate research experience, and curriculum that is based on new trends and advances. Faculty integrate teaching, research, and service and introduce new knowledge into the classroom.

This research ecosystem cannot be recreated with AI powered platforms as it provides content. Graduate education-mentored research apprenticeship, original knowledge creation, and the intensive advising relies on the relationship between novices and experts that is not reproducible by the current technologies. Although AI might be helpful in literature review, data analysis, or writing feedback other, the creative, uncertain, and highly social research mentorship process is a human domain.

One of the major benefits of the university mentioned by students and alumni would be professional networking and career development. Campus situations help in building relationships which will be future colleagues, collaborators and professional contacts. Career services link the students to the employers, arrange internships and provide job search assistance. The alumni networks offer continuous professional value after graduation. The research of the employment networks conducted by Granovetter (1995) indicates that social networks often become instrumental in terms of career growth.

Are these networking advantages possible in online learning environments? There are certain platforms with discussion forums and peer interaction options. According to Rovai (2002) to build meaningful social relationships in online education there must be design, active facilitation and commitment by the student which is usually lacking in self- paced learning. LinkedIn and other networking platforms provide alternatives to alumni networks, although they do not have the same level of experience and institutional identification that make university connections valuable.

One more contribution of the university that is hardly appreciated until scrutinized thoroughly is student growth outside of academic education identity formation, independence, moral reasoning, and civic participation. A study by Astin (1993) on the influence of college revealed that college years were characterized by significant psychosocial development with enhanced autonomy, strengthened interpersonal skills and defined values. Although some growth would take place regardless of the setting, campus life purposely contributes to it by residential programs, student organizations, leadership prospects, and exposure to diversity.

Student development theories like the seven vectors theory developed by Chickering and Reisser (1993) and the scheme theory developed by Perry (1970) present the need to have both environmental challenge and support. Universities are powerful systems that are established by different interactions of peers, mental stimulation by thinking in multiple ways, and systematic form of reflection. It is much more

doubtful whether remote, isolated, and individualized online study can be supported by AI-enhanced online learning and allow similar development to take place.

The community and regional development roles of universities do not just end with the benefits of a given student. Being anchor institutions, they offer employment, cultural events, economic partnerships, and community services. University hospitals provide health care business incubations are provided at research parks extension services benefit the agriculture and industry cultural life is enriched by university lectures. These activities have positive externalities which develop society outside the institution and students.

The abolition of universities would therefore not only abolish educational services but also whole ecosystems providing several mutually reinforcing services. There are functions that can be replicated by other institutions or shared among many organizations, but the synergies that are formed by university ecosystems are challenging to replicate, based on the disaggregation's. Goddard et al. (2016) discovered that the synergistic effects of teaching, research, and community service in individual institutions came up with larger impacts than their respective components.

The less tangible yet important university functions are cultural preservation and knowledge stewardship. Scholarly records are held in libraries and archives, artifacts are held in museums, faculty expertise guarantees that the knowledge base is carried on through the generations. Online enhances access to certain materials, although the selection, preservation, structuring and contextualization of the material entails continued human intervention and institutional investment.

Lastly, educational institutions offer arenas of knowledge study that do not necessarily require practical implementation at this moment, such as pure research, humanistic investigation, and intellectual discovery that is considered valuable in and of itself, and not a useful item in the market. Such critics refer to this as unrealistic or useless at times, but history describes how numerous breakthrough innovations were created as the outcome of research inspired by curiosity. Preservation of such inquiry as an institution in itself is an investment in society that can bear fruits decades later but can be worth priceless in the end.

This discussion indicates that colleges provide an entire ecosystem of interlinked operations credentialing, research, networking, student building, community service, cultural conservation, and space of fundamental enquiry. Although artificial intelligence (AI)-mediated learning might replicate certain elements of instruction, most ecosystem services are dependent upon institutional arrangements, human interactions, and social authority that cannot be offered by technology. The allegation that universities are obsolete confuses teaching, which is one of the significant functions of the university, with all the purposes and values, of the university.

2.4 Socioeconomic Implications and Equity Considerations

It may radically transform higher education using AI-powered learning. Its impacts transcend its teaching effectiveness. Here we consider access and equity, effects on the job market, social stratification, and other social ramifications of this change.

Equity is an issue of quality education. The proponents of AI-powered learning note its democratizing nature any person with access to the internet may receive a high-quality education, prices have plummeted, and distance is no longer an issue. These gains are real. Remote learners and working adults with family obligations, and others who are unable to afford college are now able to learn where they were never possible. Online education assisted Bonk and Lee (2017) in groups that traditionally did not

attend schools.

Access and equity to technology is not that simple. Online learning eliminates some of the barriers and creates more. Digital divide is more than just about connectivity it is also about the quality of the device, consistent bandwidth, digital skills, and an appropriate home environment. Reich and Ruiperez-Valiente (2019) demonstrated that MOOC users belonged primarily to wealthy nations, and had undergone university education in the past. These mediums were used by the privileged learners rather than the disadvantaged.

There are gaps at individual country level. Warschauer and Matuchniak (2010) observed that technology should be supported to work effectively, teacher training is required as well as increased teaching plan. Poor students might not find a study place to study in peace, may have to share computers with others, and may lack the existing knowledge to study on their own online. In a study by Dorn et al. (2020), the disadvantaged students went even further behind in the COVID-19 lockdown not all students who have access to the Internet to learn can be considered successful in it.

Student support services also interact with AI learning, which brings up equity issues. Colleges include advice, tutoring, disability assistance, mental -health counseling, and financial assistance. These will be critical for first-generation students, low-income students, and students with disabilities. It was demonstrated by Castleman and Page (2016) that easy text alerts increased enrollment and persistence in low-income students, implying the necessity of continuous support even after the course.

In the present-day AI platforms do not provide much assistance. Simple questions can be answered by chatbots, and AI tutors assist with material but extensive advice about where a decision should be made, students have to cope, and their connections with the resources is mostly human. According to Bettinger and Baker (2014), personalized coaching had a better outcome particularly in the case of at-risk students, meaning that AI can hardly substitute human assistance.

The attitudes of employers to other credentials are also important. MOOC certificates demonstrate knowledge, yet they are not well received. In a survey conducted by Radford et al. (2021), the employers indicated that they value skills but they still place a very high value on university degrees. Degrees do not only provide knowledge, but also take time, perseverance and social skills that are acquired over a long period of time.

In case higher education is divided into elite schools that are accessible to the privileged and AI learning that is accessible to the rest, inequality may increase. The rich students would continue to get access to the best universities, networking benefits, research rooms, and good employment opportunities. The poorer students may be forced to adapt to lower priced less prestigious online alternatives. Cottom (2017) revealed that the for-profit colleges appealed to problematic students promising them an easy ride but achieved low performance and accumulated much debt. AI learning might promise equal things and increase inequality.

The effects of job go beyond qualifications. Millions of teachers, administrators and staff are employed in higher education worldwide. The abrupt changes would precipitate massive layoffs of the part-time faculty and susceptible employees. Even in the case of new positions, change is difficult and unequal. The specialist teachers may lack any other options available to them, and the support staff compete in a service already on a tight market.

Local economy can be seriously affected. Numerous communities are over dependent on university employment and expenditures. Small college towns established their identity on local institutions which

could shut down if learning is transferred to the internet. The closures, even the minor ones, can destroy the local economies by terminating employment and launching the decreasing trends in the housing, retail, and other services.

On the one hand, some large tech companies may easily take control over the field of education, which leads to concerns about the control of the market and data. In case, learning occurs predominantly via these corporations, there emerge concerns of privacy, algorithms, content, and competition. Zuboff (2019) cautioned that it is hazardous to concentrate the personal data in the possession of corporations. The information that is stored in schools is sensitive and valuable, which creates the possibilities of privacy and manipulation. Civic and cultural effects must be considered as well. Universities have always been places of controversy, civic activities, and community thinking. The democratic discourse is formed through protests, lectures, faculty articles, and student activism and is change-oriented. Part of them may be transferred online, yet the physical and institutional support is difficult to digitize.

Doubts concerning knowledge and power also emerge. Colleges establish professional bodies that approve knowledge, maintain standards, and resolve conflicts. This system is not perfect and is biased but it saves reliable and unreliable information. These gatekeepers may not only be the education industry when they are weakened or removed in the wake of misinformation today. The socioeconomic situation is strained. The learning of AI may increase access and reduce expenses, yet it threatens to cause inequity in education and disrupt the job market, concentrate the market, and lose civil rights. These benefits require a stringent policy, regulation, and considerate design, not implementation of technology and hoping it works out.

3. CONCLUSION

Summary of Findings

The article reviewed analyzed the assertion that conventional colleges would be out of business in few years due to AI-based learning devices, particularly ChatGPT installed in web portals. The results are more complex than mere assumptions of complete disruption or non-disruption. In four main domains, including technology, quality of teaching, university functions, and social impact, the evidence indicates actual transformative potentials but also severe constraints that preclude a wholesome replacement part.

The present day AI services provide the best content, answer questions, modify practice and explain concepts in various formats. The integration of large language models with professionally managed learning content makes learning settings smarter and more responsive than the previous online courses. Nevertheless, these systems have very significant flaws they are prone to delivering false facts, they cannot develop higher-order thinking, they are unable to really understand context and also cannot motivate and coach students. All these issues imply that AI will sooner or later serve teachers than substitute them.

In the pedagogical side, research findings indicate that AI-enhanced learning is potentially as effective as standard classes in achieving specific objectives and in structured courses that imply procedural skills and memorization of facts. Nevertheless, there are poor completion rates, low growth in higher-order thinking, poor collaborative learning, and negative results are not well known in the long term. Simply put, AI is effective with motivated and self-regulated learners who can address well-defined knowledge but fails with the complex and muddled nature of a comprehensive education.

Teaching is only part of a larger picture of numerous vital functions of the entire university credentialing,

research, networking, student development, community service, and knowledge stewardship. Majority of them are based on institutional credibility, human relationships, or the physical presence that AI cannot replicate so easily. It is the interlocking nature of universities that generates synergies that are difficult to substitute by separating the services and making them specialized.

On the socioeconomic level, AI-based learning might help to increase access and reduce the cost but also raise some serious equity concerns digital divide, lack of supportive services, credential validity questions, job market changes, and cultural effects. In the event of the democratization promise being broken, the process might increase existing inequalities, making higher education an elite-oriented, traditional school versus mass-market AI offer.

4. CONTRIBUTION AND SIGNIFICANCE

The review shifts the debate beyond the fact that technology will come and revolutionize higher education. It provides a multi-layered analysis that is balanced and reveals the potential and the boundaries of AI in schools. It presents a more comprehensive picture than most of the tech optimism or traditionalist arguments because it breaks it down into steps, analyzing technology, teaching, institutions and society.

Why does this matter. The consequences touch upon the stakeholders on every level, including policymakers, university officials, technology creators, students, and families. Policy makers must have guidelines that will allow innovation to flourish and protect quality, equity and the common good. Administrators need to know how to change and integrate new technology without abandoning the methods that prove to be effective. The developers can know the areas that the existing tools are not sufficient and areas that further effort is required. The students and parents will receive the context regarding balancing education, options, and trade-offs between face-to-face and tech-mediated education.

5. IMPLICATIONS

The conclusions that this analysis gives are far reaching and multifactorial. In the case of higher education institutions, review recommends an acute need of adapting and innovating. Universities could not remain the same because of inertia or regulation. Rather, institutions should be thoughtful adopters of AI technologies to improve the quality of education, lower expenses, and increase accessibility without losing any of its core capabilities to research, credentialing legitimacy, and student development, and community engagement. Models that incorporate technology-enhanced efficiency, but cannot substitute other important human factors, are more likely to work than wholesale digitization or defensive traditionalism.

In educational technology development, the implication is that it should pay more attention to the completion support, higher order thought promotion, social learning promotion, and equity. Technology developers need to resist easy stories of disruption and instead collaborate with educators to discover the actual needs and create solutions that can meet the actual needs of education and not automate current practices or seek technological sophistication itself.

To society, in general, the analysis indicates that the change in higher education is not merely the change in technology and economy but the change in culture and civic life with potentially far-reaching implications. The preservation of space to research that has not yet been commercially exploited based on informed citizenship and democratic discussion, the continuation of knowledge across the

generations and the uncovering of avenues of social mobility all rely in part on how higher education is changed. The educational technology regulation, funding, and institutional support policy decisions therefore have far-reaching implications far beyond the efficiency or cost concerns.

6. LIMITATIONS

The limitations that have been recognized in this review are many. One, AI technology is highly dynamic, currently, which implies that features can improve significantly even within a short span of time between composition and publication. As the review has tried to extrapolate on the near future trends depending on the prevailing trends, there are revolutionary advances that may drastically change the future without any predictability.

Second, geographic focus of the review is largely concentrated on North America and Europe, which does not allow generalizing other parts of the world where the organization of higher education, technological infrastructure, and cultural environment vary significantly. In developing countries, where access to universities is still restricted and online learning may have other purposes, one should analyse it individually.

Third, the research supporting some of the assertions is also weak especially with respect to long-term results of AI-enhanced learning, impact on abilities that are difficult to quantify, such as critical thinking and creativity, as well as equity considerations among heterogeneous groups of students. A lot of current studies looks at the short-term, easily quantifiable conditions in certain situations, and there is a lot of unknown information regarding the overall impact.

Fourth, the methodology of the review is not systematic but a narrative of the review with subjective judgmental inclusion of source, interpretation and synthesis. Although the author has tried to be objective and all-inclusive, there might be other thoughts and facts that would change findings.

Lastly, this review is more concerned on higher education, which is formal, degree-granting, and is more dominant within developed nations as compared to corporate training, professional development, informal learning, and educational setting in various cultural backgrounds. These areas can have various dynamics and should be discussed separately.

7. FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

The review of the research demonstrates that there is a lot to be desired in the research in various aspects of the future. To begin with, longitudinal research of students during AI-enhanced learning and their transition to working life is necessary to assess whether these types of educational opportunities provide the same long-term results as traditional university education. The studies are to consider not only the measures of employment and earnings but also further learning, professional growth, civic participation, and life satisfaction.

Second, more rigorous experimental and quasi-experimental research that compares learning results in various modalities of instruction and eliminates the effect of student selection would enhance the evidence base. Special consideration should be given to higher-order thinking, creativity, transfer, and other results that can be difficult to replicate with the help of technologies but may be ultimately the most useful.

Third, a study of the best hybrid models that combine AI technologies and human teaching would help discover methods that will reap the advantages of both and reduce the drawbacks. Among the

questions, there are how to design a human-AI partnership, which functions are best performed by technologies and not by human experience, how to sustainably scale personalized teaching, etc.

Fourth, the equity research on the influence of AI-enhanced learning on students of various backgrounds, including the focus on their completion rates, learning outcomes, credential recognition, and the long-term effects on all socioeconomic groups would guide the work on making sure that the technological transformation will positively impact, instead of exacerbating, inequality.

Fifth, the credentialing alternatives such as skills-based assessment, portfolio assessment and new ways of certification research might reveal ways to recognize how learning may occur outside of conventional institutional structure without compromising quality assurance and confidence of the employer.

Sixth, the research on the topic of institutional adaptation strategies, especially among those institutions that work with vulnerable groups of students, might find what strategies may help them to implement technology without compromising the provision of the important support services, interactions with the community, and mission faithfulness.

Seventh, studies on the larger ecosystem impacts of higher education transformation, e.g. labor market impact, geographic economic impact, the output of research, civic participation, would offer a more comprehensive perspective on what may happen beyond the individual educational results.

Lastly, conceptual supports of empirical research and policy making would be reinforced by theoretical research that has formulated schemes of knowing how technologies affect and are affected by education, and how to conceptualize the future of learning in technological society by distinguishing between replicable and irreplicable functions.

The possibility of colleges being outdated within few years is a question that is unlikely to happen as far back as now. Nonetheless, it seems almost definite whether and how higher education will change significantly in the next decade. The challenge is not how to anticipate obsolescence or preservation but to influence change towards results that improve the quality of education, increase access, decrease expenditures, and benefit more people. These goals will only be met through a long-term involvement of researchers, educators, technologists, policymakers, and society at large- not just sit back and see what ensues but indeed take action to ensure that the change is humanistic and democratic.

AUTHOR'S NOTE

This review is an in-depth analysis of the argument of the disappearance of traditional colleges in few years due to AI-powered learning. The review presents an evidence-based criticism of those stories that hold either complete disruption or no change by systematically assessing technology, teaching efficacy, university functions, and socioeconomic impacts. The results indicate that although there appears to be a significant shift that would probably be inevitable, the notion of complete obsolescence is not backed up by facts in few years. Rather, it is hybrid futures that indicate intelligent AI use can enhance the quality and accessibility of education and still leave vital functions beyond the reach of automation. The review reveals critical research gaps and emphasizes that a positive change would be impossible without the active participation of various stakeholders instead of just receiving technological determinism passively.

REFERENCES

[1] Corbin, T., Bearman, M., Boud, D., & Dawson, P. (2025). The wicked problem of AI and assessment. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 1–17.

https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2025.2553340

[2] Omar Ali, Peter A. Murray, Mujtaba Momin, Yogesh K. Dwivedi, Tegwen Malik, The effects of artificial intelligence applications in educational settings: Challenges and strategies,Technological Forecasting and Social Change, Volume 199,2024,123076,ISSN 0040-1625,https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2023.123076.

[3] Ding, D., Muhyiddin B Yusof, A. Investigating the role of AI-powered conversation bots in enhancing L2 speaking skills and reducing speaking anxiety: a mixed methods study. Humanit Soc Sci Commun 12, 1223 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-025-05550-z

[4] Dr.A.Shaji George. (2025). From Brain Drain to Brain Gain The Impact of Developed Nations Immigration Restrictions on India's Innovation Ecosystem and Economic Growth. Partners Universal Multidisciplinary Research Journal (PUMRJ), 02(05), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17187338

[5] Vitellaro F, Schifilliti V, Buratti N, Cesaroni F (2025;), "I won't become obsolete! exploring the acceptance and use of GenAI by marketing professionals". European Journal of Innovation Management, Vol. ahead-of-print No. ahead-of-print. https://doi.org/10.1108/EJIM-04-2024-0471

[6] Sallam, Malik, et al. “Technology Readiness, Social Influence, and Anxiety as Predictors of University Educators’ Perceptions of Generative AI Usefulness and Effectiveness.” Journal of Education and Development, vol. 9, no. 3, Jul. 2025, p. 1. DOI.org (Crossref), https://doi.org/10.20849/jed.v9i3.1511.

[7] Henke, J. (2024). Navigating the AI era: university communication strategies and perspectives on generative AI tools JCOM 23(03), A05. https://doi.org/10.22323/2.23030205

[8] Dr.A.Shaji George, A.S.Hovan George, Dr.T.Baskar, & Dr.M.M.Karthikeyan. (2025). Boomerang Careers: The Evolution of Professional Mobility and Strategic Job Transitions in the Post-Resignation Era. Partners Universal International Innovation Journal (PUIIJ), 03(03), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15622502

[9] Martin F, Sun T, Westine CD. A systematic review of research on online teaching and learning from 2009 to 2018. Comput Educ. 2020 Dec;159:104009. doi: 10.1016/j.compedu.2020.104009. Epub 2020 Sep 9. PMID: 32921895; PMCID: PMC7480742.

[10]Falagas ME, Pitsouni EI, Malietzis GA, Pappas G. Comparison of PubMed, Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar: strengths and weaknesses. FASEB J. 2008 Feb;22(2):338-42. doi: 10.1096/fj.07-9492LSF. Epub 2007 Sep 20. PMID: 17884971.

[11] Kestin, G., Miller, K., Klales, A. et al. AI tutoring outperforms in-class active learning: an RCT introducing a novel research-based design in an authentic educational setting. Sci Rep 15, 17458 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-025-97652-6

[12]Dr. A. Shaji George, & Dr. Nataliia Siranchuk. (2025). From Teacher-Centered to Learner-Driven: A Review of the Progression Towards Student-Centric Education Models and Practices. Partners Universal Multidisciplinary Research Journal, 2(2), 15–23. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15041868

[13]8bit-GPT: Exploring Human-AI Interaction on Obsolete Macintosh Operating Systems. (n.d.). https://arxiv.org/html/2511.05025v1

[14]George, D. (2025). Intelligent integration and emerging technologies transforming IT audit beyond compliance in digital disruption. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17311478

[15]Academic Integrity and Teaching With(out) AI – Office of Academic Integrity and Student Conduct. (n.d.). Office of Academic Integrity and Student Conduct -. https://oaisc.fas.harvard.edu/academic-integrity-and-teaching-without-ai/

[16]George, A. S., Baskar, T., & Srikaanth, P. B. (2024). Cyber Threats to critical Infrastructure: Assessing vulnerabilities across key sectors. puiij.com. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10639463

[17]Alsharefeen, R., & Sayari, N. A. (2025). Examining academic integrity policy and practice in the era of AI: a case study of faculty perspectives. Frontiers in Education, 10. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1621743

[18]George, D., & George, A. (2025a). Transforming Healthcare with Artificial Intelligence: Strategies, Insights, and Frameworks for Innovation. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15685381

[19]Is the English major obsolete in the age of AI? | Department of English | Illinois. (2025, February 10). https://english.illinois.edu/news/2025-02-10t165321/english-major-obsolete-age-ai

[20]George, D., & George, A. (2025c). The AI Job Revolution - How emerging roles are reshaping the future of work and creating new career pathways. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17009242

[21]Madanchian, M., & Taherdoost, H. (2025). The impact of artificial intelligence on research efficiency. Results in Engineering, 104743. https://hal.science/hal-05087328v1/file/1-s2.0-S2590123025008205-main.pdf

[22]George, D., & George, A. (2025d). Beyond the Stethoscope – Building a future in genetic counseling for Indian PCB students without NEET. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17211238

[23] Maynard, A. (2025, March 16). Rethinking higher education in the age of AI. The Future of Being Human. https://www.futureofbeinghuman.com/p/rethinking-higher-education-in-the-age-of-ai

[24] George, D., & George, A. (2025b). How artificial intelligence systems function as digital migrants creating more profound societal disruption than human immigration. Zenodo (CERN European Organization for Nuclear Research). https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16112307

[25] Mintz, S. (2025, November 20). AI killed the Take-Home essay. COVID killed attendance. Now what? Steven Mintz. https://stevenmintz.substack.com/p/ai-killed-the-take-home-essay-covid

[26] Ramos, H. C. P., Caro, O. C., Bardales, E. S., Huatangari, L. Q., Trigoso, J. a. C., Guevara, J. L. M., & Santos, R. C. (2025). Artificial intelligence skills and their impact on the employability of university graduates. Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence, 8, 1629320. https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2025.1629320

[27] Rose, A. (2024, June 23). ChatGPT-4 and Claude 3.5 - Comparing These Two AI Language Models. Tech. https://www.tech-reader.blog/2024/06/chatgpt-4-and-claude-35-comparing-these.html

[28] Schrepel, T. (2025, October 31). Statutory Obsolescence in the Age of Innovation: A Few Thoughts about GDPR - Network Law Review. Network Law Review. https://www.networklawreview.org/gsell-statutory-obsolescence/

[29] Shuraiym Ahmad, A., & Hammadjoda, F. (2025). ANALYSIS OF CONVERSATIONAL AI WITH LONG-TERM MEMORY [Journal-article]. International Journal of Scientific Development and Research (IJSDR), 10(4), IJSDR2504232. https://ijsdr.org/papers/IJSDR2504232.pdf

[30] Verano-Tacoronte, D., Bolívar-Cruz, A., & Sosa-Cabrera, S. (2025). Are university teachers ready for generative artificial intelligence? Unpacking faculty anxiety in the ChatGPT era. Education and Information Technologies, 30(14), 20495–20522. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-025-13585-7

[31] Villasenor, J. (2025, May 30). AI has rendered traditional writing skills obsolete. Education needs to adapt. Brookings. https://www.brookings.edu/articles/ai-has-rendered-traditional-writing-skills-obsolete-education-needs-to-adapt/