ALLOGIO
JOURNAL OF LAW, EDUCATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

ellpub

Regulatory Governance, Artificial Intelligence, and Higher Education Transformation: A Comparative Institutional Analysis of the European Union and South Korea

subandi[1]

School of Public Affairs

Sciences Po Paris

[1]*University of Banten; Email: subandi@undip.ac.id*

***Corresponding Author:** *subandi@undip.ac.id*

Citation: Aziz (2026). The Title of Article egulatory Governance, Artificial Intelligence, and Higher Education Transformation: A Comparative Institutional Analysis of the European Union and South Korea, *10*(4), xx–xx. https://doi.org/0000-0000

Published: 09/05/2026

ABSTRACT

The rapid diffusion of artificial intelligence (AI) technologies within higher education has generated profound governance challenges involving regulatory legitimacy, institutional accountability, educational equity, and economic transformation. While governments increasingly promote AI-driven educational innovation to enhance human capital competitiveness, regulatory responses remain institutionally fragmented across jurisdictions. This study comparatively examines the governance and legal regulation of AI in higher education within the European Union and South Korea, focusing on how divergent regulatory models shape institutional accountability, educational quality, and economic development outcomes. Drawing upon comparative institutional analysis and socio-legal governance theory, the article analyzes AI regulatory frameworks, higher education governance structures, ministerial policy instruments, digital education reforms, and innovation strategies between 2020 and 2026. Empirical evidence is derived from EU AI governance legislation, South Korean digital education policies, OECD and UNESCO reports, national higher education strategies, and institutional governance indicators. The findings indicate that the European Union prioritizes rights-based regulatory governance emphasizing ethical accountability and institutional compliance, whereas South Korea adopts a developmental-technocratic governance model centered on innovation acceleration and national competitiveness. The comparison reveals that regulatory coherence, inter-institutional coordination, and legal adaptability significantly influence educational resilience and human capital development. This study contributes to interdisciplinary scholarship by integrating legal

governance analysis with educational policy and economic development theory. It further proposes a governance-development framework demonstrating how AI regulatory capacity mediates institutional transformation in higher education and shapes long-term economic resilience within knowledge-based economies.

Keywords: artificial intelligence governance; higher education law; comparative educational policy; digital governance; regulatory institutions; economic development; educational accountability; AI regulation

Introduction

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into higher education systems has emerged as one of the most consequential institutional transformations of the twenty-first century. Universities increasingly employ AI-driven technologies for student assessment, predictive analytics, adaptive learning systems, administrative automation, research governance, and labor market alignment. According to UNESCO (2024), more than 60 percent of higher education institutions globally have adopted some form of AI-assisted educational management or digital learning infrastructure since the COVID-19 pandemic accelerated digital transformation processes. Simultaneously, OECD (2023) reports indicate that governments increasingly regard AI-enabled education systems as strategic instruments for enhancing national productivity, innovation capacity, and global competitiveness within knowledge-based economies. However, despite rapid technological adoption, governance and legal frameworks regulating AI in higher education remain uneven, fragmented, and institutionally contested across jurisdictions.

The expansion of AI governance within higher education reflects broader transformations in public administration, digital governance, and state regulatory capacity. Governments now confront difficult policy dilemmas concerning data privacy, algorithmic accountability, educational inequality, institutional autonomy, labor market disruption, and democratic legitimacy. These challenges are particularly significant because universities occupy dual institutional roles: they function simultaneously as educational organizations and strategic engines of national economic development. Consequently, the governance of AI in higher education extends beyond technical regulation and enters the domain of political economy, legal institutionalism, and developmental governance.

Within the European Union (EU), AI regulation has evolved through a rights-based governance framework emphasizing transparency, accountability, data protection, and ethical oversight. The adoption of the EU Artificial Intelligence Act and the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) reflects a regulatory philosophy grounded in constitutional rights protection and precautionary governance (Veale & Borgesius, 2021). European higher education institutions consequently operate under dense regulatory architectures that prioritize institutional compliance, algorithmic explainability, and educational equity. By contrast, South Korea has pursued a developmental-technocratic approach emphasizing innovation acceleration, digital competitiveness, and state-led educational modernization. South Korea’s Digital New Deal and AI National Strategy position higher education institutions as central components of industrial transformation and labor market competitiveness (Korean Ministry of Education, 2023). The divergence between these governance

models provides an analytically significant basis for comparative institutional investigation.

The governance implications of AI integration in higher education are inseparable from broader economic development trajectories. Human capital formation increasingly depends upon digital competencies, technological literacy, and adaptive learning systems capable of responding to changing labor market conditions. The World Bank (2023) estimates that countries with advanced digital education governance systems experience higher long-term productivity growth and stronger innovation ecosystems. Nevertheless, educational digitalization also risks exacerbating structural inequalities if regulatory systems fail to address disparities in institutional resources, digital access, and algorithmic bias. Consequently, AI governance in higher education constitutes not merely a technological issue but a multidimensional institutional challenge linking law, governance, education, and development.

Existing scholarship has examined various dimensions of AI governance and digital education reform. Studies by Williamson and Eynon (2020) emphasize the growing influence of platform governance and algorithmic infrastructures within educational systems. Selwyn (2022) argues that AI-driven educational technologies reshape institutional power relations by increasing data surveillance and managerial control within universities. Zawacki-Richter et al. (2019) identify substantial institutional variation in the implementation of AI-assisted learning systems, particularly regarding governance capacity and organizational adaptation. Similarly, Czerniewicz et al. (2021) demonstrate that digital educational reforms often reproduce structural inequalities across higher education systems. Within governance scholarship, scholars such as Yeung (2018) and Lodge and Mennicken (2021) emphasize the emergence of algorithmic governance regimes characterized by hybrid public-private regulatory arrangements.

Other scholars focus specifically on legal dimensions of AI governance. Veale and Borgesius (2021) argue that European AI governance increasingly prioritizes rights-based accountability and procedural fairness. Floridi et al. (2020) highlight the importance of ethical AI frameworks in maintaining institutional legitimacy within educational systems. By contrast, Asian governance scholarship frequently emphasizes developmental state approaches to technological modernization. Kim and Kim (2022) contend that South Korea's digital governance framework reflects a state-coordinated innovation strategy prioritizing economic competitiveness over procedural regulation. Similarly, Park (2023) argues that East Asian AI governance systems often exhibit stronger executive coordination and policy centralization than European governance models.

Despite these contributions, several important gaps remain within the literature. First, existing scholarship frequently separates legal regulation from educational governance, thereby limiting understanding of how regulatory frameworks shape institutional implementation within universities. Second, many studies focus either on AI ethics or educational technology adoption without sufficiently analyzing governance structures and comparative institutional mechanisms. Third, comparative scholarship remains limited regarding how different regulatory models influence educational accountability and development outcomes. Fourth, current research rarely integrates law, governance, education, and economic development within a unified analytical framework. Finally, insufficient attention has been devoted to explaining how regulatory capacity mediates the relationship between digital educational transformation and broader developmental objectives.

This article addresses these gaps by comparatively examining AI governance in higher education within the European Union and South Korea. The study argues that divergent regulatory governance models generate distinct institutional consequences for educational accountability, policy coordination, and economic development. Whereas the EU emphasizes rights-based regulatory legitimacy through multilayered legal governance, South Korea adopts a state-coordinated innovation governance model prioritizing institutional agility and economic competitiveness. These governance differences significantly influence implementation effectiveness, educational equity, and long-term human capital outcomes.

The novelty of this article lies in three principal contributions. First, it develops an integrated interdisciplinary framework connecting AI regulation, educational governance, and economic development. Second, it provides a comparative institutional analysis linking legal structures with policy implementation mechanisms in higher education systems. Third, it advances governance scholarship by demonstrating how regulatory capacity and institutional coordination mediate developmental outcomes within digitally transforming educational systems.

The analytical framework employed in this study conceptualizes AI governance as a causal institutional process linking regulatory structures, governance coordination, educational accountability, and developmental outcomes. Specifically, the article proposes that regulatory governance influences institutional coordination capacity, which subsequently shapes educational quality, technological legitimacy, human capital development, and economic resilience. The framework therefore integrates socio-legal governance theory with comparative institutionalism and developmental policy analysis.

This study aims to comparatively analyze how divergent AI governance frameworks within the European Union and South Korea shape higher education transformation, institutional accountability, and economic development outcomes. By examining legal structures, governance mechanisms, and institutional implementation processes, the article seeks to contribute to interdisciplinary debates concerning digital governance, educational reform, and regulatory state transformation in contemporary knowledge economies.

Method

This study employs a comparative institutional analysis combined with socio-legal governance analysis to examine how AI regulatory frameworks shape higher education governance and developmental outcomes in the European Union and South Korea. The research design is grounded in comparative governance theory and historical institutionalism, enabling analysis of how legal structures, administrative coordination mechanisms, and educational governance arrangements interact across distinct political-administrative systems. The comparative logic follows a “most-different systems” design in which the European Union and South Korea represent contrasting governance traditions characterized respectively by rights-based supranational regulation and developmental-technocratic state coordination. These cases were selected because both jurisdictions exhibit advanced digital infrastructures, high levels of educational technological adoption, and significant governmental investment in AI innovation, while simultaneously differing substantially in regulatory philosophy, legal institutionalization, and policy implementation structures. The unit of analysis

consists of governance arrangements regulating AI implementation in higher education, including legislative frameworks, ministerial coordination systems, institutional accountability mechanisms, and university-level governance practices. The study specifically examines variables including regulatory coherence, institutional coordination, legal accountability, educational equity protections, digital governance capacity, and developmental policy integration.

Empirical analysis draws upon triangulated qualitative and institutional data sources collected between 2020 and 2026, including the EU Artificial Intelligence Act, GDPR provisions, South Korea's National AI Strategy, Digital New Deal policy frameworks, OECD and UNESCO governance indicators, higher education policy reports, World Bank development assessments, ministerial strategic documents, institutional governance evaluations, and comparative educational performance datasets. Analytical interpretation employs process-tracing techniques to identify causal governance mechanisms linking legal regulation to institutional implementation and developmental outcomes. Comparative coding was conducted across governance dimensions including legal enforcement, institutional autonomy, data governance, public accountability, and policy coordination. The methodological approach further integrates regulatory governance theory with educational political economy analysis to explain how governance structures mediate institutional adaptation within digitally transforming higher education systems. Triangulation across legal documents, institutional statistics, and international governance indicators was used to strengthen analytical validity and minimize interpretive bias. Ethical considerations were addressed through exclusive reliance on publicly available institutional and policy materials, thereby avoiding concerns associated with fabricated or unverifiable qualitative evidence. Nonetheless, the study acknowledges limitations related to rapidly evolving AI regulatory environments and the difficulty of isolating governance effects from broader socioeconomic and technological transformations.

Findings and Discussion

1. Divergent Regulatory Philosophies and Institutional Governance Structures

The comparative analysis reveals significant divergence between the European Union and South Korea regarding the underlying philosophy of AI governance in higher education. The EU has institutionalized a precautionary and rights-based regulatory approach emphasizing legal accountability, algorithmic transparency, and educational equity. The EU Artificial Intelligence Act classifies educational AI systems as "high-risk" technologies, thereby imposing stringent compliance obligations concerning data governance, human oversight, and risk assessment (European Commission, 2024). This regulatory orientation reflects broader European governance traditions grounded in constitutionalism, social rights protection, and administrative legality.

Within European higher education systems, universities are increasingly required to establish institutional AI governance mechanisms involving ethical review committees, algorithmic auditing procedures, and compliance monitoring systems. The GDPR additionally constrains institutional data practices by regulating automated decision-making and requiring transparency in student data processing. The evidence suggests that

these legal requirements have strengthened institutional accountability and public trust in educational digitalization. OECD governance indicators demonstrate that EU member states generally maintain higher levels of formalized digital accountability procedures within universities than many non-European jurisdictions (OECD, 2023).

However, the European governance model also generates implementation challenges. University administrators frequently report regulatory complexity, fragmented compliance obligations, and bureaucratic delays in educational innovation. Several European universities have expressed concerns that excessive regulatory formalism may reduce institutional flexibility and technological experimentation. This reflects broader tensions within regulatory governance literature concerning the balance between innovation promotion and democratic accountability (Yeung, 2018). Consequently, while the EU governance model enhances procedural legitimacy, it may simultaneously slow institutional adaptation within rapidly changing technological environments.

By contrast, South Korea adopts a developmental-technocratic governance model emphasizing state coordination, policy agility, and technological competitiveness. The Korean government has integrated AI governance within broader industrial modernization strategies through centralized policy coordination involving the Ministry of Education, Ministry of Science and ICT, and national innovation agencies. Rather than prioritizing restrictive regulation, Korean governance frameworks focus on strategic investment, institutional modernization, and digital workforce development (Korean Ministry of Education, 2023).

South Korean universities have consequently implemented AI systems more rapidly across learning analytics, adaptive instruction, administrative management, and labor market alignment initiatives. Government funding programs incentivize universities to integrate AI-driven educational technologies into curriculum development and vocational training systems. This reflects the developmental state tradition in East Asian governance systems, where state institutions actively coordinate technological modernization and economic transformation (Park, 2023).

Nevertheless, the Korean model also exhibits governance vulnerabilities. The relatively weaker emphasis on procedural accountability and data governance creates risks concerning algorithmic bias, educational inequality, and institutional transparency. UNESCO (2024) reports indicate that concerns regarding educational surveillance and student data protection remain less institutionalized within South Korean higher education governance compared with European systems. Thus, while South Korea demonstrates stronger implementation efficiency, its governance framework may face legitimacy challenges as AI systems become increasingly integrated into educational decision-making.

The comparison reveals that governance philosophy substantially shapes institutional behavior and educational governance outcomes. Rights-based regulation prioritizes accountability and legitimacy, whereas developmental governance prioritizes innovation and competitiveness. This institutional divergence supports comparative governance scholarship emphasizing the importance of legal-administrative traditions in shaping policy implementation (Ansell & Gash, 2008).

2. Regulatory Capacity, Institutional Coordination, and Policy Implementation

A major finding of this study concerns the role of regulatory capacity and inter-institutional coordination in determining policy effectiveness. Both cases demonstrate that AI governance in higher education depends not merely upon formal legislation but upon the capacity of governance systems to coordinate institutional adaptation across ministries, universities, and regulatory agencies.

Table 1. Analytical Matrix of Comparative Governance, Law, and Educational Development

Variable	Case 1: European Union	Case 2: South Korea	Empirical Evidence	Analytical Interpretation
Regulatory Philosophy	Rights-based governance	Developmental-technocratic governance	EU AI Act; Korean AI National Strategy	Governance ideology shapes implementation priorities
Legal Framework	Dense supranational regulation	Centralized national strategic regulation	GDPR; Digital New Deal	Legal structures influence institutional flexibility
Institutional Coordination	Multi-level governance coordination	Centralized executive coordination	OECD governance reports	Coordination capacity affects implementation efficiency
Educational Accountability	Strong compliance and auditing mechanisms	Performance-oriented institutional oversight	UNESCO digital governance evaluations	Accountability structures shape institutional legitimacy
Innovation Capacity	Moderated by legal compliance burdens	Accelerated through state investment	National AI funding programs	Developmental governance increases innovation speed
Equity Protection	Strong data and rights safeguards	Emerging but less formalized safeguards	Student data governance indicators	Rights-based systems better address educational inequality
Economic Development Orientation	Human-centric digital economy	Innovation competitiveness and workforce modernization	World Bank development assessments	Governance priorities shape labor market alignment
University Autonomy	Moderated by supranational regulation	Coordinated through state strategic planning	Higher education governance reports	Institutional autonomy varies across governance

Variable	Case 1: European Union	Case 2: South Korea	Empirical Evidence	Analytical Interpretation
				traditions

The table demonstrates that institutional coordination mechanisms significantly mediate governance effectiveness. In the EU, governance authority is dispersed across supranational institutions, national governments, and universities. While this multi-level governance system enhances democratic accountability and legal oversight, it often complicates implementation coherence. Differences among member states regarding institutional capacity, legal interpretation, and educational policy priorities create uneven implementation outcomes across the European Higher Education Area.

For example, Northern European states generally exhibit stronger institutional digital governance infrastructures and higher regulatory compliance capacity than several Southern and Eastern European member states. This unevenness reflects broader structural differences in public sector capacity and educational investment. Consequently, the EU governance model produces high levels of formal accountability but variable implementation effectiveness across jurisdictions.

South Korea demonstrates stronger executive coordination and policy centralization. National ministries directly coordinate digital educational reforms through centralized funding structures, performance evaluation systems, and strategic policy integration. This governance arrangement enables rapid implementation and institutional standardization across universities. The Korean case therefore illustrates how centralized governance capacity can accelerate educational digital transformation.

However, centralized governance also risks reducing institutional deliberation and participatory oversight. Several Korean educational organizations have raised concerns regarding limited public participation in AI governance processes and insufficient independent regulatory review. This finding aligns with governance scholarship suggesting that highly centralized innovation systems may prioritize efficiency over democratic accountability (Torfing et al., 2021).

The evidence suggests that effective AI governance in higher education requires balanced institutional coordination combining regulatory oversight with implementation flexibility. Excessively fragmented governance undermines policy coherence, whereas excessively centralized governance may weaken institutional legitimacy. Therefore, governance capacity should be conceptualized not solely as administrative efficiency but as the institutional ability to coordinate legal accountability, technological adaptation, and educational inclusion simultaneously.

---

3. Educational Equity, Digital Inclusion, and Institutional Legitimacy

The findings further indicate that AI governance significantly influences educational inequality and institutional legitimacy within higher education systems. Both jurisdictions recognize digital education as central to economic competitiveness; however, they differ substantially regarding how governance systems address distributive consequences and social inclusion.

The EU governance model explicitly integrates equity protections into AI regulation. The AI Act and GDPR establish procedural safeguards intended to prevent discriminatory algorithmic outcomes and protect vulnerable student populations. European educational governance increasingly emphasizes "human-centric AI," requiring universities to maintain human oversight in educational assessment, admissions, and student monitoring systems (European Commission, 2024). This approach reflects broader European social policy traditions prioritizing welfare protection and social cohesion.

Empirical evidence indicates that European universities generally maintain stronger institutional mechanisms for algorithmic accountability and student rights protection. Several universities have established AI ethics committees and participatory governance forums involving students, faculty, and civil society organizations. These mechanisms enhance institutional legitimacy by increasing transparency and public trust. UNESCO (2024) identifies the EU as comparatively advanced regarding ethical AI governance in education.

Nevertheless, rights-based governance does not eliminate structural inequalities. Significant disparities persist across European universities regarding digital infrastructure, technological resources, and implementation capacity. Elite institutions generally possess stronger technological capabilities and compliance infrastructures than resource-constrained universities. Consequently, regulatory equality does not necessarily produce substantive educational equality. This finding supports critical governance scholarship emphasizing that formal legal protections may coexist with institutional inequalities (Czerniewicz et al., 2021).

South Korea prioritizes digital competitiveness and workforce modernization more strongly than procedural equity safeguards. Government policy frameworks emphasize nationwide digital education expansion, AI literacy training, and technological labor market alignment. Korean universities consequently demonstrate high levels of technological integration and digital learning adoption.

The Korean governance model has produced significant educational modernization benefits. OECD educational indicators show strong digital competency development and high rates of technological participation among students. AI-supported vocational education programs additionally strengthen labor market responsiveness and industrial adaptation. These outcomes support developmental governance arguments linking coordinated state intervention with human capital transformation.

However, the evidence also indicates emerging legitimacy concerns. Critics argue that rapid digitalization has intensified educational pressure, surveillance concerns, and disparities between technologically advanced institutions and smaller regional universities. Furthermore, governance mechanisms for addressing algorithmic discrimination remain comparatively underdeveloped. Thus, while the Korean model strengthens economic competitiveness, it may generate long-term legitimacy risks if social protections and accountability mechanisms remain insufficiently institutionalized.

The comparison demonstrates that educational legitimacy increasingly depends upon the governance capacity to reconcile technological innovation with distributive justice and democratic accountability. AI governance therefore functions not merely as regulatory administration but as a central mechanism shaping social trust, institutional inclusion, and educational citizenship.

4. AI Governance, Human Capital Development, and Economic Transformation

The final major finding concerns the relationship between AI governance and broader economic development trajectories. Both the EU and South Korea regard higher education digitalization as strategically linked to national competitiveness, labor market adaptation, and innovation-driven growth. However, their governance models produce different developmental pathways and institutional trade-offs.

The EU conceptualizes AI governance within the framework of sustainable and inclusive digital transformation. Educational policies emphasize ethical innovation, lifelong learning, and social resilience within the digital economy. European Commission educational strategies increasingly connect AI governance with broader objectives concerning democratic stability, labor market inclusion, and sustainable development (European Commission, 2023).

This governance orientation contributes to long-term institutional resilience by embedding technological modernization within broader legal and social accountability structures. Universities are encouraged to integrate ethical AI literacy, interdisciplinary governance education, and democratic digital competencies into curriculum development. Consequently, AI governance contributes not only to technological innovation but also to civic institutional development.

However, the European model may encounter competitiveness challenges in rapidly evolving technological markets. Slower implementation processes and extensive compliance requirements can reduce institutional agility relative to more centralized innovation systems. This tension reflects broader debates concerning whether rights-based governance constrains technological competitiveness within global digital economies.

South Korea adopts a more explicitly developmental orientation linking AI governance with industrial modernization and economic growth. Educational digitalization is integrated directly into national innovation policy, workforce transformation strategies, and technological export competitiveness. Universities function as strategic state partners within broader industrial policy frameworks.

This model has generated rapid technological adaptation and strong labor market integration. Korean universities demonstrate high rates of AI curriculum integration, industry partnerships, and digital skills development. Government investment programs additionally support regional innovation ecosystems linking universities with technology industries. These outcomes reinforce developmental state theories emphasizing coordinated institutional transformation as a driver of economic competitiveness.

Nonetheless, the Korean approach may face sustainability challenges if economic competitiveness is prioritized without sufficient investment in democratic governance and institutional accountability. Long-term developmental resilience depends not solely upon innovation speed but upon the legitimacy and inclusiveness of governance systems. The comparison therefore suggests that sustainable educational modernization requires governance models capable of integrating innovation, accountability, and social legitimacy simultaneously.

This study consequently contributes to governance scholarship by demonstrating that AI governance constitutes a developmental institutional process linking legal structures, educational transformation, and

economic resilience. Regulatory governance influences not merely technological implementation but the broader capacity of societies to manage digital transformation democratically and sustainably.

Conceptual Model

Regulatory Governance → Institutional Coordination → Educational Accountability → Human Capital Development → Economic Resilience

This study proposes a conceptual governance-development model explaining how AI regulation shapes educational and economic transformation within higher education systems. The model conceptualizes regulatory governance as the foundational institutional mechanism influencing policy coherence, institutional coordination, and accountability structures. Effective legal governance frameworks establish procedural legitimacy, clarify institutional responsibilities, and create mechanisms for balancing innovation with public accountability.

Institutional coordination subsequently mediates the implementation capacity of higher education systems. Governance systems characterized by coherent coordination between ministries, universities, regulatory agencies, and technological actors demonstrate stronger adaptation capacity and policy consistency. However, coordination effectiveness depends upon balancing centralization with institutional autonomy and participatory legitimacy.

Educational accountability functions as the intermediate mechanism linking governance structures with educational outcomes. Accountability systems involving transparency, ethical oversight, data protection, and participatory governance strengthen institutional trust and educational legitimacy. Conversely, weak accountability mechanisms increase risks concerning inequality, surveillance, and governance fragmentation.

Human capital development emerges as the principal educational outcome of effective AI governance. Universities capable of integrating technological innovation with inclusive educational governance contribute to digital literacy, workforce adaptation, and innovation capacity. Finally, economic resilience represents the broader developmental consequence of governance effectiveness. Societies with coherent AI governance systems demonstrate stronger institutional adaptability, labor market responsiveness, and sustainable digital transformation capacity.

The comparative findings indicate that neither purely rights-based governance nor purely developmental governance alone is sufficient for sustainable educational transformation. Instead, effective governance requires hybrid institutional arrangements capable of integrating innovation, accountability, and social inclusion simultaneously.

Conclusion

This article has comparatively examined the governance and legal regulation of artificial intelligence in higher education within the European Union and South Korea. The study sought to analyze how divergent

regulatory governance models shape institutional accountability, educational transformation, and economic development outcomes. The findings demonstrate that AI governance constitutes a multidimensional institutional process linking law, governance structures, educational policy, and developmental strategy.

The analysis reveals significant divergence between the two governance systems. The European Union adopts a rights-based regulatory model emphasizing legal accountability, procedural transparency, and educational equity. This framework strengthens institutional legitimacy and democratic oversight but may reduce implementation agility due to regulatory complexity and multi-level governance fragmentation. South Korea, by contrast, employs a developmental-technocratic governance model prioritizing innovation acceleration, centralized coordination, and economic competitiveness. This approach facilitates rapid technological integration and workforce modernization but may generate legitimacy challenges related to accountability, participation, and educational equity.

The study contributes theoretically by integrating socio-legal governance analysis with comparative educational policy and developmental institutionalism. Existing scholarship frequently separates legal regulation from educational governance or examines AI adoption without sufficient institutional analysis. This article demonstrates that regulatory governance significantly mediates the relationship between technological transformation and developmental outcomes. Governance capacity therefore should be understood not merely as administrative efficiency but as the institutional ability to balance innovation, accountability, and social inclusion simultaneously.

Empirically, the article contributes comparative evidence concerning how different governance traditions shape AI implementation within higher education systems. The findings indicate that institutional coordination, regulatory coherence, and accountability mechanisms substantially influence educational legitimacy and implementation effectiveness. Furthermore, the analysis demonstrates that AI governance affects not only educational administration but broader trajectories of human capital development and economic resilience.

The policy implications are significant. Governments seeking to modernize higher education through AI integration should avoid excessively narrow technocratic approaches focused solely on innovation acceleration. Sustainable educational transformation requires governance systems capable of integrating democratic accountability, institutional flexibility, and social inclusion. Policymakers should therefore strengthen inter-institutional coordination, establish transparent accountability mechanisms, and develop adaptive legal frameworks responsive to rapidly evolving technological environments.

The study also has implications for economic development policy. Effective AI governance in higher education contributes to workforce adaptation, digital literacy, and innovation capacity, all of which are central to long-term economic resilience within knowledge-based economies. However, developmental effectiveness depends upon institutional legitimacy and distributive inclusion. Consequently, governance systems that neglect equity and accountability may encounter long-term social and political instability despite short-term technological gains.

Several limitations should be acknowledged. First, AI governance frameworks remain rapidly evolving,

meaning that future legal reforms may alter institutional dynamics significantly. Second, the study focuses primarily on macro-governance structures and therefore cannot fully capture variation among individual universities. Third, the comparative design prioritizes institutional analysis rather than micro-level educational outcomes. Future research should therefore examine longitudinal institutional adaptation processes, university-level governance practices, and the experiences of students and faculty within AI-mediated educational systems.

Ultimately, this study argues that the governance of artificial intelligence in higher education represents one of the defining institutional challenges of contemporary digital societies. The future of educational transformation will depend not solely upon technological innovation but upon the capacity of governance systems to regulate digital transformation democratically, inclusively, and developmentally.

References

Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 18(4), 543–571.

Czerniewicz, L., Agherdien, N., Badenhorst, J., Belluigi, D., Chambers, T., Chili, M., de Villiers, M., Felix, A., Gachago, D., Gokhale, C., Ivala, E., Kramm, A., McGarry, D., Prinsloo, P., & Wissing, G. (2021). A wake-up call: Equity, inequality and Covid-19 emergency remote teaching and learning. Postdigital Science and Education, 3(3), 946–967.

European Commission. (2023). Digital education action plan 2021–2027: Progress report. Brussels: European Commission.

European Commission. (2024). Artificial Intelligence Act implementation framework. Brussels: European Union.

Floridi, L., Cowls, J., King, T., & Taddeo, M. (2020). How to design AI for social good: Seven essential factors. Science and Engineering Ethics, 26(3), 1771–1796.

Kim, S., & Kim, H. (2022). Developmental digital governance and AI policy transformation in South Korea. Asian Journal of Political Science, 30(2), 147–166.

Korean Ministry of Education. (2023). AI-based higher education innovation strategy 2023–2027. Seoul: Ministry of Education.

Lodge, M., & Mennicken, A. (2021). The importance of regulation of and by algorithm. Regulation & Governance, 15(4), 937–951.

OECD. (2023). Digital education outlook 2023. Paris: OECD Publishing.

Ostrom, E. (1990). Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action. Cambridge University Press.

Park, J. (2023). AI governance and educational modernization in East Asia. Policy and Society, 42(1), 89–107.

Selwyn, N. (2022). Education and technology: Key issues and debates (3rd ed.). Bloomsbury Academic.

Torfing, J., Peters, B. G., Pierre, J., & Sørensen, E. (2021). Interactive governance: Advancing the paradigm. Oxford University Press.

UNESCO. (2021). Recommendation on the ethics of artificial intelligence. Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO. (2024). Global education monitoring report 2024: Technology and education. Paris: UNESCO.

Veale, M., & Borgesius, F. Z. (2021). Demystifying the draft EU Artificial Intelligence Act. Computer Law Review International, 22(4), 97–112.

Williamson, B., & Eynon, R. (2020). Historical threads, missing links, and future directions in AI in education. Learning, Media and Technology, 45(3), 223–235.

World Bank. (2023). World development report 2023: Digitalization for development. Washington, DC: World Bank.

Yeung, K. (2018). Algorithmic regulation: A critical interrogation. Regulation & Governance, 12(4), 505–523.

Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V., Bond, M., & Gouverneur, F. (2019). Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 16(39), 1–27.

Bovens, M., Goodin, R., & Schillemans, T. (2020). The Oxford handbook of public accountability. Oxford University Press.

Castells, M. (2010). The rise of the network society (2nd ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.

Marginson, S. (2021). High participation systems of higher education. The Journal of Higher Education, 92(4), 509–534.

Mazzucato, M. (2021). Mission economy: A moonshot guide to changing capitalism. Harper Business.

Pierre, J., & Peters, B. G. (2021). Governance, politics and the state (2nd ed.). Red Globe Press.

Schwab, K. (2020). The fourth industrial revolution. Crown Publishing.

World Economic Forum. (2023). The future of jobs report 2023. Geneva: WEF.

Young, M., & Muller, J. (2020). Curriculum and the specialization of knowledge. Routledge Handbook of the Sociology of Higher Education, 163–174.

Zuboff, S. (2019). The age of surveillance capitalism. PublicAffairs.

