


**CONFLUENCE**
**Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies**

**e-ISSN:** 3085-5411
**Journal Homepage**: https://journals.imist.ma/index.php/confluence/index

## Editorial

# Artificial Intelligence in Education

*Special Issue, Volume 2, Issue 4, October 2026*

Generative AI reached schools and universities before most institutions had decided what it was for. Teachers met it in student essays and administrators in integrity cases; researchers met it halfway through projects designed for older technologies. This special issue of *Confluence Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies* takes stock of that arrival. It brings together eleven contributions: eight articles, one interview, and two book reviews. They move from theory and policy analysis to a systematic review, classroom studies, and tools that teachers built themselves, and their settings run from corporate learning to a Grade 8 English class in a Moroccan middle school. Read together, they chiefly return one answer: what AI does to learning depends less on the tool than on the conditions in which people use it.

The issue opens with theory. Oumaima Alyassini, Fatima Zahra Touzani, and Rachid Iseksioui reject the instrumental account in which AI simply makes education faster and more personal. In their reading, AI changes the conditions under which knowledge is produced, the way learners are defined, the place of pedagogical authority, and the governance of institutions. Adopted without criticism, it risks hardening technocratic models of schooling, widening algorithmic inequality, and leaving students dependent on machines for what they know. The principles they propose at the end come from critical pedagogy and ethical reflexivity, and they defend education as a space of intellectual and social formation instead of a site of performance optimization.

Videhi Bhamidi, Divya Joseph, and Maathangi Mohan take the question to the workplace, where adults increasingly learn with AI in the flow of their work. Their conceptual paper, written from a scholar-practitioner position, describes a depth-speed tension. AI speeds up access to information and the completion of tasks, yet under some conditions it compresses the productive struggle, reflection, and human relationships through which lasting skills develop. Learner expertise, AI literacy, task complexity, organizational culture, and performance pressure decide which way the balance tips. The authors set out five propositions for empirical testing and close on a principle that schools could borrow as easily as companies: “get the human learning conditions right before reaching for the technology.”

Elhadj Moussa BenMoussa reads ten public documents from six universities in the United Kingdom, continental Europe, and North America to see how they turn academic integrity into rules for writing with generative AI. He finds no uniform march toward automated surveillance. Several of the documents explicitly reject AI detectors, while keeping disclosure requirements, authorship interviews, and instructors’ judgments about writing. His concept of algorithmic

compliance pedagogy names what can go wrong there: suspicion may migrate from a detector score to judgments about style, or about how convincingly a student performs a writing process. BenMoussa presents this as a policy risk, not an observed effect on students, and he asks universities to account for the grounds of their suspicion just as they ask students to account for their work.

Fadoua Er-rakraky and Nafiaa Bouanani turn to the evidence. Their systematic review covers 29 empirical studies, published between 2024 and 2026 and indexed in Scopus, Web of Science, and ERIC, on how AI-powered adaptive tools affect vocabulary acquisition among EFL and ESL university students. Research on the subject is growing quickly, much of it in Asian countries, and ChatGPT is the tool studied most often. The studies report gains through personalized learning, immediate feedback, and contextualized content. The authors' quality appraisal, however, finds methodological weaknesses across the evidence base, and the review concludes that students still need a teacher's guidance to use these tools well.

Salma Habiballah, Khawla Tadist, and Karima Azaimi start from a choice that higher education now faces, between resisting AI-mediated writing and teaching students to use AI responsibly. They choose the second. Drawing on the CALL principle that learning outcomes depend on interaction design, mediation, and learner agency, they treat prompting competence as a communicative skill in its own right. Their Prompting Competence Framework defines six assessable dimensions, from intent and contextual grounding to the verification of output, iteration and repair, and ethical responsibility. A three-phase classroom model (Model, Prompt Studio, Transfer) makes the skill visible enough to teach and assess. They present both as proposals that now need testing across language skills and contexts.

Ibrahim Ben Khajjou, Ibrahim Belmir, and Ahmed Ibrahimi ask whether teachers in resource-constrained institutions can use generative AI to keep course design and assessment aligned. With 150 post-secondary learners in a blended Professional French course for engineering communication, they tested a domain-specialized language model, HorizaEdu, running locally through Ollama with retrieval-augmented generation, and an examination web application that the instructors built on a no-code prototyping platform. The local system reached a mean alignment index of 0.88 against a target of 0.80, with 92 percent faithfulness and 96 percent answer relevance. The examination platform stayed online throughout full-load use and scored 74.5 on the System Usability Scale. As the authors acknowledge, the evidence comes from a single cohort in a single domain. The study still shows that a teacher working with modest means can build constructive alignment into AI-assisted course design as an automated constraint.

Ouidad Infi treats AI as a resource for the teacher. In an eleven-week ESP course for 48 fourth-year civil engineering students, she used it to explore professional situations in the field and to design task-based activities, which the course combined with textbook-based ones. At the end of the course, students rated their behavioral, emotional, and social engagement higher for the AI-supported tasks, while cognitive engagement received similar ratings for both kinds of activity; observations, focus groups, and student work pointed to different forms of cognitive engagement in each. The sustainability results were mixed. Most items were rated higher for the AI-supported tasks, but the largest difference, in perceived professional responsibility for sustainability, was not tied to the activities in the focus-group accounts. Infi does not claim causal effects, and she states that her design cannot isolate what AI contributed. What the study offers is a practical model of teacher-mediated task design for ESP.

Mohamed Chahbi and Imane Bakkali report a quasi-experiment with 60 Grade 8 learners, aged 12 to 16, in two intact classes of a Moroccan middle school. For four weeks one class followed the national curriculum with its textbook, while the other followed the same

curriculum supplemented with augmented-reality materials. AI tools helped only with scripting and preparing content; the teacher reviewed every item, and no AI feedback, grading, or instructional decision entered the classroom. Both classes improved. The experimental class gained more in vocabulary, reading comprehension, and writing, with large effect sizes (Hedges' *g* of 1.67, 1.97, and 1.26). Given the intact classes, the teacher-made tests, the single school, and the short intervention, the authors read these results as associative, and they place the weight on pedagogical design and teacher mediation.

The interview takes the issue beyond the classroom. Imane Derrazi talks with Matthew N. Hannah of the University of Wisconsin–Madison, a digital humanist who studies online conspiracy movements and builds digital scholarship spaces in university libraries. Hannah describes how platforms, conspiracy narratives, and generative AI are changing the ways knowledge is produced, circulated, and trusted. He also discusses access, multilingual scholarship, international collaboration, and the teaching of difficult subjects. His position is clear: computational methods extend humanistic thinking and do not replace it, and the future of the field depends on interdisciplinary community.

Two book reviews close the issue. Khaoula El Khalfi reviews Dana J. Gavin's *Generative AI and the Future of the Humanities: Reading, Writing, Teaching, Labor* (2025). Gavin treats generative AI as the accelerator of a "mass illiteracy event" that has been under way for decades, and she builds her argument around two figures, pollution and the Luddite. El Khalfi credits the book for rejecting AI and classroom surveillance with equal force, and she singles out its most usable proposal, to make students' metacommentary, not the final draft, the main object of assessment. She also finds the theory thin. Gavin argues against the solitary author without engaging Barthes, Foucault, or the composition scholars who challenged that figure decades ago, and she grounds her claim that AI is untrustworthy in a theory of authorial intention that she never defends.

Bouchra Chougrani reviews Sarah Chardonnens's *Intelligence artificielle et apprentissage: Fondements, concepts et applications* (2026), a French-language book for teachers built around the SYNAPSE model. The model divides learning into four phases (reception and activation, adaptation and adjustment, observation and self-regulation, consolidation and storage) with motivation at the center, and the book turns it into classroom routines such as "think first, compare afterward." Chougrani values its decision to begin with the learner's internal trajectory and not with the technology. She is less persuaded by its empirical base, three exploratory studies reported without sample sizes, and she notes that its survey of legal frameworks leaves out Africa.

Some threads run through the whole collection. The empirical studies are careful about what they claim and state their limits plainly, whether a single cohort, intact classes, retrospective ratings, or a short intervention. Er-rakraky and Bouanani find similar weaknesses across a whole body of research, and BenMoussa keeps a policy risk apart from an observed effect. This caution is part of what the issue contributes, and so is its evidence from Morocco. The vocabulary review shows that research on the topic has concentrated in Asian countries; the studies by Infi and by Chahbi and Bakkali add Moroccan engineering and middle-school classrooms that this literature seldom reaches. Across the issue, teacher mediation and human judgment keep returning as the conditions that decide whether AI supports learning or takes its place.

We thank the contributors for their work and for their patience through revision, and the peer reviewers for their detailed and demanding reports. Special thanks go to the guest editors of this issue, Bouchra Chougrani, Nafiaa Bouanani, Fadoua Er-rakraky, and Ibrahim Ben Khajjou, and to the editorial team of *Confluence Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*. We are grateful, as

always, to the LLCIS research laboratory at Abdelmalek Essaadi University, whose support makes this journal possible.

The tools discussed in these pages will change faster than any journal can publish. The questions their authors ask will last longer: what students actually learn when AI is in the room, and who decides, on what evidence, how it should be used.

**Brahim Barhoun**
*Editor-in-Chief*
*Confluence Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*
*Abdelmalek Essaadi University*
*October 2026*

## Disclaimer and Conflict of Interest Statement

The views expressed in the articles published in *Confluence Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies* are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the editorial board or affiliated institutions.

This special issue includes contributions from members of the editorial team and of the LLCIS Research Lab. Three of the guest editors are authors in the issue: Fadoua Er-rakraky and Nafiaa Bouanani co-wrote one article, and Ibrahim Ben Khajjou co-wrote another with the journal's Co-Editor-in-Chief, Ibrahim Belmir, and Ahmed Ibrahimi. A fourth guest editor, Bouchra Chougrani, contributed a book review. All such submissions were subject to the journal's standard double-blind peer-review process and evaluated independently to ensure fairness, objectivity, and the highest standards of scholarly integrity.

The authors have declared no conflicts of interest.