

Mechanisms for Integrating Artificial Intelligence into Futures Studies

Ahmed Elhamza¹, Amine Elbar²

¹ Echahid Cheikh Larbi Tebessi university, ahmed.elhamza@univ-tebessa.dz

² Echahid Cheikh Larbi Tebessi university, amine.elbar@univ-tebessa.dz

Received: 02/04/2026

Accepted: 07/06/2026

Published: 10/06/2026

Abstract:

This article examines the mechanisms for integrating artificial intelligence into futures studies, within the context of a paradigm shift from relying on foresight methodologies based on traditional qualitative and quantitative approaches to adopting hybrid systems that combine human and artificial intelligence. The article aims to provide a theoretical and applied framework that enables researchers and decision-makers to employ AI tools—specifically large language models and machine learning—in enhancing foresight analysis processes, ranging from weak signal detection to scenario evaluation (United Nations DESA, 2025). The paper adopts a critical analytical methodology that reviews contemporary literature and pioneering experiments, concluding that effective integration requires a delicate balance between the efficiency of artificial systems and the authority of human expertise, along with the development of ethical and normative frameworks that ensure transparency and accountability.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Futures Studies, Strategic Foresight, Scenarios, Morphological Analysis, Hybrid Systems

Corresponding author: Ahmed Elhamza, *e-mail:* ahmed.elhamza@univ-tebessa.dz.

1. Introduction

In the mid-third decade of the twenty-first century, futures studies are undergoing a foundational transformation that redefines their tools and methodologies (McIntosh, 2026). Foresight is no longer merely an elitist practice relying on limited expertise; it has evolved into a field of knowledge that requires processing vast amounts of data, analyzing complex interactions among variables, and exploring broad solution spaces that were previously inaccessible to traditional methodologies. Here, the role of artificial intelligence emerges as an enabler, not a substitute, as it can process complexity, discover hidden patterns, and generate multiple scenarios at speeds far exceeding human capabilities.

1.1 Research Problem and Core Questions

This study departs from a central problem: “How can artificial intelligence be integrated into futures studies in a way that enhances the accuracy of foresight analyses and expands their horizons, without compromising academic and ethical standards?”.

The following sub-questions branch from this:

- What are the most important traditional foresight methodologies that are most compatible with AI tools?
- How can large language models (LLMs) be employed in analyzing and evaluating scenarios?
- What ethical and epistemological challenges are imposed by reliance on artificial systems in foresight?
- What institutional and procedural mechanisms are necessary to ensure responsible and effective integration?

The central hypothesis of this article is that integrating AI into futures studies is not merely a technical option but a methodological necessity in an era characterized by technological acceleration and geopolitical and climatic uncertainty .

However, this integration raises fundamental challenges related to academic integrity, algorithmic transparency, and preserving human epistemic authority in decision-making processes.

2. Theoretical Foundations of the Intersection of AI and Futures Studies

In an era of accelerating technological and social transformations, the intersection of AI and futures studies emerges as a vital framework for understanding and shaping potential societal trajectories (Rudzinska et al., 2026). This intersection combines AI's capabilities in analyzing massive data and modeling patterns with futures studies' tools for building strategic scenarios and exploring uncertainty. The result is an integrative approach that enables policymakers and institutions to foresee more alert and ethical future alternatives, while remaining aware of model limitations and risks of bias and loss of legitimacy. (ASTM International, 2026)

2.1 Evolution of Futures Studies Methodologies: From Morphological Analysis to Hybrid Systems

Futures studies have witnessed remarkable methodological development since the mid-twentieth century. Among the established methodologies that have gained renewed attention in the AI era is “Morphological Analysis (MA)”, pioneered by astrophysicist Fritz Zwicky in the 1940s. This methodology relies on analyzing the solution space by identifying the key parameters of the problem and the possible options for each parameter, then exploring all logically possible combinations (Álvarez, & Ritchey, 2015, pp. 01-40)

The importance of morphological analysis in the AI context lies in its production of an organized solution space that artificial systems can process and evaluate with high efficiency. Instead of relying on manual human evaluation of all combinations—impractical when the number of parameters is large—AI can perform rapid horizontal and vertical analysis of combinations and classify them according to specific criteria . (McIntosh, 2026)

The pioneering experiment conducted by McIntosh (2026) using ChatGPT-4o to evaluate the Hudson Institute's report "The Next 200 Years" (1976) represents an early model of this integration. The model was able to perform vertical analysis to determine which of the four scenarios—from pessimistic to optimistic—most closely matched current reality, then horizontal analysis to evaluate the accuracy of each scenario across ten different issues. Results showed that the second most pessimistic scenario was the most consistent at 88%, while the most optimistic scenario was the

least consistent at only 40% .

What is striking about this experiment is not only the accuracy of the results but also the speed of completion. What would have required a research team weeks of work was accomplished in hours .

This suggests the possibility of transforming foresight evaluation—a relatively underdeveloped subfield within futures studies—into a semi-automated process, provided that original studies are structured in a way compatible with artificial systems' processing capabilities . (McIntosh, 2026)

2.2 Dialectical AI: Towards Interactive Foresight

If morphological analysis provides a structural framework suitable for automated processing, the "Dialectical AI" model introduced by Rudzinska and colleagues (2026) represents a qualitative shift in the nature of human-machine interaction in the foresight process.

This model is based on the concept of "Futures' Fingerprints" as an interactive boundary object bringing together human experts and the artificial system in a collective scenario evaluation session . (Rudzinska, , Klöckner, Mueller, & Schierding, 2026) What distinguishes this approach is its shift from the traditional "human-in-the-loop" model to an "AI-in-the-loop" model, where AI becomes a dialectical partner providing personalized feedback to participants, challenging their assumptions, and pushing them to adopt multiple perspectives. (Rudzinska, , Klöckner, Mueller, & Schierding, 2026)

The experimental results presented by the researchers, applied to an international student sample, were significant. The AI-enhanced process demonstrated the ability to :

- Accelerate consensus on scenario probability assessments.
 - Enhance collective critical thinking through targeted algorithmic challenges.
 - Measure tangible improvement in "Futures Literacy" among participants.
- (Rudzinska, , Klöckner, Mueller, & Schierding, 2026)

This model redefines the role of the human expert: instead of being the sole source of analysis, the expert becomes an "arbiter" of AI outputs, a guide for the exploration process, and responsible for integrating multiple insights into a coherent knowledge synthesis. (Rudzinska, , Klöckner, Mueller, & Schierding, 2026) This aligns with modern academic guidelines emphasizing the necessity of transforming professors from "knowledge

transmitters" to "learning designers" and "intelligent mentors". (Fudan University, 2026)

2.3 From Theoretical Framework to Applied Mechanisms: The Dialectic of Opportunities and Risks

Before moving to detailed applied mechanisms, a fundamental dialectic must be acknowledged: while AI opens vast horizons for developing futures studies, it carries inherent methodological and ethical risks that cannot be ignored. (ASTM International, 2026)

In terms of opportunities , the literature points to three main enhancements :

- **Super-complexity processing:** Artificial systems can analyze thousands of variables and their interactions in a short time, allowing exploration of solution spaces that were intractable for traditional methodologies . (McIntosh, 2026)

- **Reducing cognitive biases:** Humans are prone to certain bias patterns such as confirmation bias and anchoring. Artificial systems, if carefully designed, can reveal these biases and offer relatively neutral alternatives. (Rudzinska, , Klöckner, Mueller, & Schierding, 2026)

- **Continuous updating and real-time monitoring:** AI can monitor weak signals in real-time through automated horizon scanning, continuously updating its analyses and forecasts (United Nations Department of Economic, 2025)

- **In terms of risks:** they include (

- **Algorithmic hallucinations:** Large language models sometimes generate incorrect information with high confidence, posing a significant risk in foresight contexts where immediate verification of forecast accuracy is difficult. (Gaddipati, & et al, 2026)

- **Transparency and explainability:** Many machine learning models operate as "black boxes," making it difficult to understand the reasons for generating a particular scenario or evaluation. This conflicts with principles of academic accountability . (ASTM International, 2026)

- **Over-reliance and cognitive stagnation:** Uncritical use of AI may erode human analytical skills, as researchers become dependent on automated outputs without developing their own foresight capabilities . (Fudan

University, 2026)

This dialectic confirms that the goal is not to replace human intelligence with artificial intelligence, but to build hybrid systems that leverage each other's strengths to compensate for weaknesses. This leads us to the core of the article: the specific mechanisms through which this integration can be achieved.

3. Applied Integration Mechanisms

Applied integration mechanisms transform theoretical possibilities into practical practices that integrate AI tools and models with futures studies methodologies . (Gaddipati, & et al, 2026) This includes collecting and processing big data for trend analysis, using machine learning models to predict potential trajectories, and employing text generators and descriptive modeling to produce multiple scenarios Simulation techniques and agent-based models are used to explore complex system dynamics, while data mining and network analysis methods support identifying transition hubs and hidden correlations . (United Nations Department of Economic, 2025) At the methodological level, quantitative model outputs are combined with qualitative approaches such as workshops, participatory roadmaps, and critical thinking exercises to enrich scenarios and ensure their legitimacy . Mechanisms for transparency and bias assessment (e.g., model interpretation and data source auditing) are also applied to ensure reliability and ethical soundness of results . (ASTM International, 2026) These mechanisms aim to produce practical foresight applicable to policy-making and strategic planning while acknowledging model limitations and the necessity of involving diverse stakeholders . (United Nations Department of Economic, 2025)

3.1 Procedural Classification of Integration Mechanisms

Based on analysis of the literature and pioneering experiments, mechanisms for integrating AI into futures studies can be classified according to three main procedural levels: scenario generation mechanisms, scenario evaluation and analysis mechanisms, and monitoring and continuous updating mechanisms. The following table provides a comparative summary of these mechanisms (prepared by the authors based on cited sources):

Mechanism	Main Function	Technologies Used	Level of Human Intervention	Main Challenges
Gen AI-Enhanced Morphological Analysis	Generating and exploring solution space	LLMs, automated horizontal and vertical analysis	Low (oversight of initial parameters)	Need for prior problem structuring
Dialectical AI	Interactive scenario evaluation	Personalized feedback, opinion divergence analysis	High (facilitated group sessions)	Facilitation complexity, long preparation time
Automated Horizon Scanning	Monitoring weak signals and emerging trends	Web crawling, NLP, sentiment analysis	Low (keyword and filter design)	Information noise, difficulty distinguishing signal from noise
Retrospective Scenario Evaluation	Analyzing accuracy of past foresight studies	Automated comparative analysis, consistency measurement	Very low	Scarcity of studies structured for automated evaluation
Digital Twins	Simulating future dynamics in virtual environment	Machine learning, agent-based modeling	Medium (parameter and relationship identification)	

Source: Prepared by the authors based on McIntosh (2026); Rudzinska et al. (2026); United Nations DESA (2025)

3.2 Mechanism One: Morphological Analysis Enhanced by Generative AI

This mechanism represents the most mature form of integration in terms of empirical documentation. It is based on a fundamental idea: morphological analysis naturally produces a matrix of possible combinations, and this matrix can be efficiently processed by AI . (Álvarez, & Ritchey, 2015)

3.2.1 Application Steps:

- **Human identification of parameters and options:** The expert team identifies the key parameters of the future phenomenon under study (e.g., economic growth, technological development, geopolitical stability) and possible options for each parameter (low/medium/high) .
- **Solution space generation:** AI automatically generates all possible combinations (morphological matrix) and organizes them (McIntosh, 2026).
- **Automated evaluation:** A large language model (e.g., GPT-4o or Claude) is directed to evaluate each combination according to specific criteria (logical coherence, probability, impact) .
- **Horizontal and vertical analysis:** AI performs vertical analysis (comparing combinations across one parameter) and horizontal analysis (comparing the performance of a specific combination across all parameters) . (McIntosh, 2026)
- **Human auditing:** The expert team reviews the results, focusing on unexpected combinations or those that appear contradictory to intuitions . (Rudzinska, , Klöckner, Mueller, & Schierding, 2026)

Applied Case Study: As previously mentioned, McIntosh (2026) successfully applied this mechanism to evaluate the Hudson Institute report. Notably, the AI not only provided a classification of scenarios but also offered detailed explanations of the reasons why a particular scenario was more consistent than others, allowing researchers the opportunity to understand the logic of the evaluation and object if necessary . (McIntosh, 2026)

3.3 Mechanism Two: Automated Horizon Scanning and Proactive Monitoring

In the age of information overload, monitoring weak signals—early indicators of potentially significant future changes—has become a major challenge for futures studies researchers. Here, Automated Horizon Scanning emerges as a pivotal integration mechanism.

This mechanism relies on employing Natural Language Processing (NLP) and machine learning techniques to analyze vast amounts of text—including government reports, scientific articles, media, and social media posts—and extract signals indicative of emerging changes.

The United Nations DESA Policy Brief No. 174 provides an

integrated framework for this mechanism, recommending the use of tools such as the "Futures Wheel" and "Futures Triangle" in an automated or semi-automated manner. AI can perform (United Nations DESA, 2025):

- Classification of emerging threats and opportunities by sector.
- Analysis of the evolution of debates on a particular issue over time.
- Detection of unexpected intellectual alliances and conflicts among actors.

The greatest challenge in this mechanism is distinguishing genuine signal from noise. (United Nations Department of Economic, 2025) Not every emerging trend warrants follow-up, and AI—given its training on historical data—may tend to amplify dominant patterns rather than detect genuine disruptions. Therefore, regular human review remains necessary to filter outputs and prioritize signals worthy of deeper investigation. (Rudzinska, Klöckner, Mueller, & Schierding, 2026)

3.4 Mechanism Three: Retrospective Scenario Evaluation as Cumulative Learning

One of the underdeveloped areas in futures studies is "foresight evaluation"—analyzing the accuracy of past foresight studies to improve future methodologies. The main reason for this lag is that manual evaluation requires significant time and effort, as past predictions (possibly decades old) must be compared with actual reality. (McIntosh, 2026)

Here, AI offers a promising solution. As McIntosh's (2026) study showed, a large language model can perform a retrospective evaluation of a 50-year-old foresight report within hours. This opens the door to building a cumulative "body of knowledge for evaluators," where dozens or hundreds of past foresight studies can be analyzed to extract patterns regarding:

- Types of scenarios that tend to be accurate versus those that tend to be erroneous.
- Time horizons for which predictions are most accurate.
- Recurring methodological biases within particular intellectual schools

This mechanism transforms foresight evaluation from a rare and costly activity into a routine practice that can be applied. (McIntosh, 2026) The desired outcome is cumulative improvement in the accuracy of foresight studies, as practitioners can systematically and automatically learn from the mistakes and successes of their predecessors. (McIntosh, 2026)

4. Ethical, Epistemological, and Normative Challenges

With the deployment of AI in foresight, a set of intertwined challenges emerges (ASTM International, 2026). Ethically, reliance on multiple models and databases raises issues of privacy, fairness, and decision-making responsibility—from the potential for deepening biases to the risk of using results in policies that restrict freedoms (United Nations Department of Economic, 2025). Epistemologically, practices face difficulties in knowledge representation and assumption integrity; AI models may produce spurious predictions or oversimplify complex social systems, while transparency and explainability remain limited (Gaddipati, & et al, 2026). Normatively and methodologically, there is an urgent need to unify standards for data quality, risk assessment, and scenario validity, along with professional codes for governing AI use in designing the future. (ASTM International, 2026) Addressing these challenges requires interdisciplinary frameworks, stakeholder participation, auditing and review mechanisms, and a clear commitment to ethical values and responsible governance to ensure that AI-supported foresight serves the public good without harming vulnerable groups or undermining public trust. (Fudan University, 2026)

4.1 Challenges of Epistemic Authority and Expertise

Integrating AI into futures studies poses an existential challenge to the concept of the "expert". (Rudzinska, , Klöckner, Mueller, & Schierding, 2026) In the traditional model, the expert possesses cumulative specialized knowledge allowing them to issue respectable foresight judgments. But when AI provides analyses identical to—or even more accurate than—the expert's analysis, what remains for the expert?

This question is not theoretical. In Rudzinska and colleagues' (2026) experiment using Dialectical AI, results showed that participants increasingly relied on the artificial system's feedback, raising questions about whether epistemic authority is gradually shifting from human experts to algorithms. (Rudzinska, , Klöckner, Mueller, & Schierding, 2026)

The way out of this dilemma, according to the literature, lies in redefining expertise not as an absolute epistemic advantage, but as the ability to direct the artificial system, judge its outputs, and integrate them into broader contexts. As stated in Fudan University's guidelines (2026), professors must

transform from "knowledge transmitters" to "learning designers and intelligent mentors" (Fudan University, 2026). Similarly, the futures studies expert must transform from a "forecaster" to a "foresight guide" and "critical evaluator of artificial system outputs. (Rudzinska, , Klöckner, Mueller, & Schierding, 2026)

4.2 Challenges of Algorithmic Transparency and Accountability

How can a decision made with AI assistance be held accountable? If a particular scenario adopted based on an artificial system's recommendation turns out to be wrong, who is responsible? Designers? Developers? Users? The system itself?

These questions are not new in AI ethics, but they acquire special dimensions in futures studies because "error" is difficult to define here (ASTM International, 2026). Future predictions cannot be verified until it is too late, making traditional accountability mechanisms (based on verifiability) inappropriate . (ASTM International, 2026)

The ASCET report (2026) indicates that standardization criteria in AI are still in their early stages, with significant gaps in "factuality and trustworthiness benchmarks". This means that futures studies researchers currently operate in an incomplete normative environment, necessitating the development of field-specific "codes of conduct" that specify . (Fudan University, 2026)

- When and how AI use in foresight research should be disclosed.
- What types of decisions can never be delegated to artificial systems under any circumstances.
- How human intervention processes in AI outputs should be documented.

4.3 Challenges of Bias and Representation

Large language models are trained on vast amounts of human texts, and thus inherit the biases of these texts—including cultural, geographical, and political biases, In the context of futures studies, this means that future scenarios generated by these models may be systematically biased toward (ASTM International, 2026)

- Western or Northern perspectives.
- Technologically deterministic interpretations of social change.
- Unwarranted optimism or pessimism reflecting historical data biases.

Addressing this challenge requires more than just technical "cleaning" of data. It requires diversity in design and evaluation teams, and the inclusion of multiple perspectives—including from the Global South and non-Western cultures—in the validation processes of AI outputs

It may also necessitate developing specialized open-source language models trained on foresight datasets from diverse sources, rather than relying solely on the general commercial models currently dominating the market . (Gaddipati, & et al, 2026)

5. Towards an Institutional and Regulatory Framework for Responsible Integration

Institutional and regulatory frameworks for integration can be enhanced as follows:

5.1 Requirements for Institutional Capacity Building

Effective integration of AI into futures studies cannot be achieved without parallel investment in institutional and human capacity building (. The literature points to three main requirements:

- **First:** Developing "Algorithmic Literacy" among futures studies practitioners. It is not enough for the researcher to be expert in traditional foresight methodologies; they also need a basic understanding of how AI models work, their strengths and weaknesses, and when to trust them versus when to question them . (Fudan University, 2026) This requires redesigning training curricula in futures studies to include units on machine learning basics and natural language processing.
- **Second:** Establishing appropriate data infrastructure. The effectiveness of AI depends on the quality and quantity of available data. Institutions practicing futures studies need to develop strategies for collecting, organizing, and storing foresight-relevant data, while ensuring compliance with privacy and security standards . (United Nations Department of Economic, 2025)
- **Third:** Adopting hybrid governance models. Decisions on AI integration cannot be left to individual researchers alone, nor to technical experts alone. There is a need for governance models that combine. (ASTM International, 2026)
- Specialized ethics committees for AI and foresight.
- Periodic review mechanisms for methodologies and tools used.

- Channels for reporting incidents or errors associated with AI use.

5.2 A Proposed Framework for Responsible Integration

Based on the preceding analysis, we propose the following framework for integrating AI into futures studies, which we call the Discern-Direct-Integrate (DDI) Framework (Rudzinska, , Klöckner, Mueller, & Schierding, 2026) (Fudan University, 2026)

Phase	Main Activity	Role of AI	Role of Human Expert	Phase Outputs
Discern	Defining study scope and key parameters	Preliminary literature analysis, proposing initial parameters	Review proposals, add qualitative parameters, set priorities	Initial problem structure
Generate	Exploring solution space and generating scenarios	Conducting automated morphological analysis, generating multiple scenarios	Defining evaluation criteria, selecting promising scenarios for deepening	Initial scenario set
Evaluate	Analyzing scenarios and assessing probabilities	Automated coherence and probability assessment, sensitivity analysis	Critical review of automated assessment, adding contextual judgment	Ranked and weighted scenarios
Direct	Identifying implications and possible responses	Automated analysis of cascading effects (Futures Wheel)	Formulating policy recommendations, identifying intervention options	Initial strategic recommendations
Integrate	Building foresight narratives and communication	Generating reports and visualizations, interdisciplinary translation	Building coherent narratives, presenting to stakeholders, documenting	Final foresight product

			limitations and uncertainties	
--	--	--	-------------------------------	--

What distinguishes this framework is that it maintains the "human expert as final decision-maker" at every stage, while using AI as a tool for expansion, acceleration, and verification (Rudzinska, , Klöckner, Mueller, & Schierding, 2026). It also explicitly integrates a "Discern" phase as a first step, where it is determined whether the problem at hand is even suitable for AI engagement (not every foresight problem needs or benefits from AI) (McIntosh, 2026)

5.3 Recommendations for Research and Practice

We conclude this article with recommendations directed to three stakeholder groups:

For academic researchers:

- 1- Conduct comparative experimental studies evaluating the accuracy of foresight studies produced by different methods (human-only, hybrid, automated-only) to build an evidence base on relative effectiveness
- 2- Develop unified standards for disclosing AI use in futures studies publications, similar to what some universities have begun implementing in academic theses.
3. Explore the potential of open-source and specialized AI models, rather than relying exclusively on general commercial models, to ensure auditability and adaptation to specific contexts

For policymakers and institutions:

1. Invest in building employee capacities in algorithmic literacy and hybrid foresight .
2. Develop governance frameworks specifying when AI use in foresight studies is permitted and when it is prohibited (especially in security-sensitive or strategic contexts)
3. Establish national or regional observatories for AI-enhanced foresight studies to evaluate the quality of produced studies and disseminate best practices .

For futures studies practitioners:

1. Begin with limited, low-risk applications (e.g., generating preliminary literature reviews or classifying weak signals) before moving to more

ambitious applications (e.g., generating complete scenarios).

2. Document experiences and lessons learned and share them with the professional community to build collective institutional memory.

3. Develop a continuous critical habit of questioning AI outputs, specifically through techniques such as "adversarial prompting" to test the robustness of conclusions.

6. Conclusion

Integrating AI into futures studies represents a structural transformation that redefines the tools, methodologies, and practices of this field of knowledge. But it is neither a magic solution nor an existential threat as some pessimists see it. Rather, it is an enabler whose value and effectiveness depend on how it is designed, employed, and governed.

Experimental studies have shown that the three mechanisms we analyzed—enhanced morphological analysis, automated horizon scanning, and retrospective evaluation—can make a significant difference in the speed and accuracy of foresight analyses. Yet at the same time, they have shown that success depends on maintaining a delicate balance between the efficiency of artificial systems and the authority of human expertise.

The real challenge is not purely technical; it is epistemological, ethical, and institutional. How do we build hybrid systems that respect the uniqueness of human judgment while leveraging massive computational capabilities? How do we ensure that AI expands our horizons rather than confines them to biased historical patterns? How do we create a professional culture that embraces innovation without abandoning standards of accuracy and accountability?

These questions have no definitive answers and will evolve as technology itself evolves. But it is certain that the knowledge fields that will flourish in the coming decades are those that learn to dance with machines, not stand against them or dissolve into them. Futures studies, whose core subject is change and adaptation, are uniquely positioned to lead this dance. The future, as always, awaits those who create it.

7. Bibliography List :

1. Journal article :

- Álvarez, , A., & Ritchey, T. (2015). Applications of General Morphological Analysis: From Engineering Design to Policy Analysis. *Acta Morphologica Generalis*, 04(01), 01-40.
- McIntosh, A. (2026). . Linking generative AI and morphological analysis to conduct foresight evaluation. *Foresight, ahead-of-print*. Récupéré sur <https://doi.org/10.1108/FS-02-2025-0027>
- Gaddipati, S., & et al. (2026). AISSISTANT: Human-AI Collaborative Review and Perspective Research Workflows in Data Science. *arXiv preprint, arXiv:2509.12282v2*.

2. Seminar article:

- Rudzinska, , C., Klöckner, H., Mueller, R., & Schierding, ,. (2026). .. *Dialectical AI in Foresight: Advancing Futures Literacy with the Futures*.
- ASTM International. (2026). • *ASCET Releases First-of-Its-Kind Scan on AI Standardization*. [Press release].
- Fudan University. (2026). *Guidelines on the Application of Generative Artificial Intelligence in Education*. China Daily.
- United Nations Department of Economic, a. (2025). *Leveraging strategic foresight to mitigate artificial intelligence (AI) risk in public sectors*. UN DESA.