

A Survey Study on Some Artificial Intelligence (AI) Concerns at the University of Petra

By:

Prof. Rami A. Abdel-Rahem¹, Prof. Wael Hadi², Prof. Abdelraouf M. Ishtaiwi³, Prof. Mayyas Al-Remawi⁴ and Prof. Faisal Aburub⁵

Prof. R. A. Abdel-Rahem¹

Department of Chemistry, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, University of Petra, Amman 11196, Jordan

email: rabdelrahem@uop.edu.jo

Prof. W. Hadi²

Department of Information Security, Faculty of Information Technology, University of Petra, Amman 11196, Jordan

email: whadi@uop.edu.jo

Prof. A. Ishtaiwi³

Department of Data Science and Artificial Intelligence, Faculty of Information Technology, University of Petra, Amman 11196, Jordan

email: aishtaiwi@uop.edu.jo

Prof. Mayyas Al-Remawi⁴

Department of Pharmacy, Faculty of Pharmacy and Medical Sciences, University of Petra, Amman 11196, Jordan.

email: malremawi@uop.edu.jo

Prof. Faisal Aburub⁵

Department of Business Intelligence & Data Analytics, Faculty of Administrative and Financial Sciences, University of Petra, Amman 11196, Jordan.

email: faburub@uop.edu.jo

Send Article Date: 10 / 1 / 2026

Date of acceptance of the article: 4 / 3 / 2026

Abstract

The opinions of 191 instructors at the University of Petra (UOP) concerning some issues related to using artificial intelligence (AI) in the educational process are discussed in this survey. The survey included several statements related to using AI for grading exams and monitoring attendance, replacing instructors with AI robots, the AI background of UOP staff regarding the future of AI progress, the AI emotional influence in the classroom, AI limitations that have to be put forward to avoid AI negative impacts on humanity and the bias possibility of AI in addition to some other AI ethical issues. This study aims to understand the opinions and perspectives of faculty members at UOP regarding the uses of AI in the educational process. It is expected that the results of the current survey will serve as a cornerstone that will influence the improvement of the use of AI in education at the UOP and other universities.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, AI bias, AI background, AI ethics, AI in the education process.

1 Introduction

Nowadays, artificial intelligence (AI) affects every aspect of our lives, and the education sector is not exception. AI describes the ability of a computer or machine to perform tasks as humans do [1]. According to AI scientists, the human brain is considered a digital computer. Therefore, AI can be made, in a way, to have cognitive skills such as problem-solving, question-answering, synthesis, self-correction, etc. [1-4]. These AI capabilities are made possible using an algorithm, a set of rules that a computer or device follows to solve a particular problem. However, such algorithms should take into account ethical rules and concepts. Data mining (DM) is a form of AI where large data sets are used to find the configuration that can help solve a particular problem with the help of data analytics [5]. Machine learning (ML) technology is a form of AI that enables computers to use available data, make predictions, and make decisions [6]. Many educational tools for AI are available, including Personalized learning (PL), student assessment, content presentation, etc... [4,8,9]. Due to its several available applications, AI is expected to significantly reform the shape of teaching and learning styles in higher education institutions HEIs [5]. The educational applications of AI include but are not limited to the instructor's duties inside and outside the classroom [1,7,5,10]. After the new AI applications and progress in the education sector, AI may replace the instructor in HEIs [10, 11-13]. Such a process requires an excellent AI robot programmed with all the necessary algorithms to be developed by many actors, including system inventors, data experts, product designers, statisticians, linguists, cognitive experts, psychologists, education specialists, and many others to develop education systems [1].

AI as a tool should generally explore the knowledge, skills, and competencies that students should acquire while studying in HEIs [14]. Although many criticisms were directed toward AI in education, several advantages were reported [15]. It was described that AI is expected to elevate learning outcomes (LOs). Thus, AI can offer uniform teaching excellence to all countries and resolve the lack of educators [5]. Moreover, AI was made to communicate with people with disabilities, refugees, and people out of school [7,13]. Many AI techniques that focus on students' body language and emotions are being used nowadays to enhance the social sense of AI [16-17].

Some drawbacks related to employing AI in HEIs have also been reported. It has been written that replacing teachers with AI tools will affect human social relationships, reduce jobs, reduce salaries, and may lead to private database hacking [18-19]. Also, AI still does not resemble an outstanding lecturer, and many countries still face digital illiteracy. Some mental problems, such as autism, were reported to be due to the use of the technologies [18-19]. Another disadvantage of AI in the education sector is its limited leadership role in the classroom. AI robots still do not deliver human values or represent a model of life to follow [18-19]. Other ethical issues concerning data privacy and potential bias in AI systems remain important without definitive solutions [4].

It is still too early to determine whether AI is a successful experiment in HEIs. For financial reasons, however, it is highly possible that AI will be explored in the coming years, and hence, HEIs have to start preparing themselves for the AI educational revolution. In other words, the tsunami is coming [20].

The present study aims to examine the opinion of instructors at the University of Petra (UOP) about employing AI in the educational process.

The questionnaire was prepared to measure teachers' opinions regarding using AI as a supportive tool for grading exams and monitoring attendance (and not replacing instructors with robots), the background of UOP staff about AI progress, and the emotional influence of AI in the classroom. These limitations have to be put forward to avoid AI's negative impacts on humanity, the possibility of AI bias, and other AI ethical issues. The results of this questionnaire are presented and discussed.

3 Methodology

A survey was conducted for instructors at UOP departments in nine faculties, which include English language & literature, Arabic language & literature, modern languages, mathematics, chemistry, educational sciences, computer science, software engineering, data science & AI,

information security, virtual and augmented reality, civil engineering, interior design, architecture, graphic design, animation & multimedia, digital film design technology, pharmacy, nutrition, doctor of dental surgery, banking & finance, business administration, accounting, marketing, digital marketing, E-business & commerce, business intelligence & data analytics, financial technology, law, journalism and digital media, digital promotional media, and radio & television.

A total of 191 questionnaires were collected. Participant's gender was: 71 females and 120 males. Participants' age, teaching experience, academic rank and number from each department are shown in Tables 1, 2,3 and 4 respectively.

Table 1: The ages of the UOP instructors who participated in the survey.

Instructor Age (years)	Number of participants
Lower than 31	11
35-40	36
41-45	45
46-50	33
More than 50	66
Total	191

Table 2: The teaching experience of UOP instructors who participated in the survey.

The teaching experience (years)	Number of participants
Lower than 5	21
5-10	40
11-15	42
16-20	40
More than 20	48
Total	191

Table 3: The academic rank of UOP instructors who participated in the survey.

The Academic rank	Number of
Full Professors	21
Associate Professor	41
Assistant Professor	97
Lecturer	35
Total	191

Table 4: The number of participants from each department participated in the survey.

Faculty	Departments	Number of
Arts and Sciences	Chemistry	4
	Mathematics	8
	Modern languages	2
	English language	8
	Human basic sciences	12
	Educational Science	5
	Arabic language	3
Information Technology	Data science & (AI)	9
	Computer science	10
	Software engineering	7
	Information security	6
	Virtual and augmented reality,	2
Architecture & Design	Architecture	6
	Interior design	6
	Graphic design	5
	Animation & Multimedia	2
	Digital film design technology	2
Engineering	Civil engineering	3
Administrative sciences	Business administration	8
	Banking & finance sciences	5
	Marketing	5
	Digital Marketing	2
	Accounting	5
	E-business & commerce	7
	Business intelligence & data	8
	Financial technology	2
Law	Law	9
Pharmacy and Medical Sciences	Pharmacy	14
	Nutrition	7
Mass communication	Journalism and digital media.	5
	Digital promotional media	1
	Radio & television	6
Dentistry	Doctor of Dental Surgery	7
Total		191

The questionnaire's five statements were:

- 1 I prefer to use AI as a supportive tool for grading exams and monitoring attendance rather than to use it as a full-time teaching instructor.
- 2 I agree that AI enables the machine to learn by itself.
- 3 AI robots influence the emotions and feelings of students in the same way instructors do.
- 4 Limitations have to be put forward for AI due to its negative impacts on humanity.
- 5 I believe that AI programmers may be biased in favor of one party compared to another.

The surveys were created using the Google format and were distributed in July 2024. Statements in the survey were all given five options, allowing the participants to choose their agreement level through the scale: (1) Strongly disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Neutral, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly agree.

4 Results and Discussion

The instructors who responded strongly agreed (1) and agreed (2) on the scale were considered satisfied. In contrast, those who answered strongly disagree and disagree, (4) and (5) on the scale were considered unsatisfied. Neutral responses were number (3) on the scale. The results of the questioner five statements are presented and discussed below:

4.1. I prefer to use AI as a supportive tool for grading the exams and monitoring attendance and not to use it as a full-time teaching instructor

Table 6 shows the response of UOP instructors to statement 1. The results show good agreement on using AI as a supportive tool for grading exams and monitoring attendance and not using it as a full-time teaching instructor.

Table 6. The response of UOP instructors to the statement, “I prefer to use AI as a supportive tool for grading the exams and monitoring the attendance and not to use it as a full-time teaching instructor”.

Response	Number of Instructors	%
Agree	110	57.6
Neutral	42	22.0
Disagree	39	20.4

The UOP response averages are 57.6%, 22.0%, and 20.4% for agreement, neutrality, and disagreement responses. The feedback of UOP instructors to statement 1 indicates their understanding of AI's ability to help the instructor with some administrative tasks that require a long time to make manually, such as grading the exams and monitoring attendance.

Accordingly, the instructor will have more time to focus on every student. It was reported that AI could help the instructor in many other areas, such as measuring students' learning outcomes (LOs), developing curriculums and contents, suggesting teaching methods to every student, and recording students' learning patterns [1,7,5,10].

Some other administrative and teaching AI facilities are controlling student achievements, following communication between students and between teachers and students, analyzing body language, controlling campus safety, providing the students with answers on submitted assignments, and measuring the attention and distraction of students in the class [1,7,5,10].

On the other hand, AI's latest technologies are still not developed to provide human values and competencies and cannot properly handle emotions. Additionally, AI is not classified as an example of life to be followed [18]. Furthermore, it was suggested that more experienced UOP instructors, as indicated in Table 2, have gained some competitive teaching skills that enable them to handle the class emotionally and intellectually [21]. Table 2 indicates that among 191 UOP instructors, 48 (~25%) have teaching experience of more than twenty years and have already gotten used to a particular way of teaching style. Generally, the AI skills of young instructors are expected to be higher than those of old instructors.

4.2. I agree that AI enables the machine to learn by itself.

As indicated in Table 7, there was good agreement on the idea that AI enables the machine to learn by itself (~61.2%). The response averages for agreement, neutrality, and disagreement are 61.2%, 25.7%, and 13.1 %, respectively (Table 7).

Table 7. The response of UOP instructors to the statement “I agree that AI enables the machine to learn by itself”.

Response	Number of Instructors	%
Agree	117	61.2
Neutral	49	25.7
Disagree	25	13.1

The results in Table 7 indicate that UOP instructors generally have good knowledge about the progress of AI in life. We are still in the second phase of AI growth. In the third phase of AI, AI is expected to be more capable than humans [13]. It is evident nowadays that machines can learn from the available data and can make estimations and decisions using what is called Machine Learning (ML) and Deep Learning (DL) [6]. Furthermore, generative AI can produce

written texts depending on the patterns and information learned during ML. AI functions with an algorithm that permits machines to do tasks as humans do. It is expected that if such algorithms are made to resample all skills available in the human brain, the machine will behave as a human. AI makes Many applications visible, such as solving problems, answering questions, synthesizing, and self-correction ... etc. [1-4].

4.3. AI robots influence the emotions and feelings of students the same as instructors.

As revealed in Table 8, almost 42.4% of UOP instructors disagreed with the statement, “AI robots influence the emotions and feelings of students the same as instructors.” The response averages for agreement, neutrality, and disagreement are 39.8%, 17.8%, and 42.4 %, respectively.

Table 8. The response of UOP instructors to the statement “AI robots influence the emotions and feelings of students the same as **instructors**”.

Response	Number of Instructors	%
Agree	76	39.8
Neutral	34	17.8
Disagree	81	42.4

AI can emotionally react to people with the help of biometric features such as facial recognition [8, 11]. Additionally, several technologies focusing on body language, anger, fear, sadness, happiness, shame, surprise, and tone of voice were used to increase the social sense of AI [13, 18]. It was reported that AI can also detect psychological features, such as stress, anxiety, and depression, hence selecting a suitable algorithm to deal with the students depending on their emotional situation [17]. On the other hand, it was reported that AI robots do not offer human values, competencies, and emotions and are not classified as an example of life to be followed in life [18]. Also, it was reported that AI still needs the characteristics of an excellent lecturer who can inspire the students, create a positive education environment, resolve conflicts, generate a sense of belonging, mentoring and guidance [22].

4.4.Limitations have to be put forward for AI due to its negative impacts on humanity

The response of UOP instructors, as revealed in Table 8, showed a pronounced agreement on this statement (80.6%).

Table 8. The response of UOP instructors to the statement “Limitations have to be put forward for AI due to its negative impacts on humanity”.

Response	Number of Instructors	%
Agree	154	80.6
Neutral	26	13.6
Disagree	11	5.8

The agreement, neutrality, and disagreement response averages are 80.6%, 13.6%, and 5.8 %, respectively (Table 8).

Dissatisfaction with implementing AI in higher education institutions (HEIs) was reported [18-19]. Some of the disadvantages of AI are the possibility of uncontrolled intelligence technologies in education, lower human resources, lower salary payments, and the possibility of hacking into private databases [18-19]. Additionally, many countries still suffer from digital illiteracy when using AI in HEIs, and scholars need access to a computer. AI also needs certain infrastructure, which is usually linked to the internet. Hence, those who do not have these services will not benefit from the educational opportunities AI provides. Furthermore, it was reported that AI still lacks the characteristics of an outstanding lecturer who can inspire the students, create a positive education environment, resolve conflicts, generate a sense of belonging, mentoring, and guidance [22]. It was also reported that the main goal of employing AI in HEIs is cost-reduction by reducing the number of educators, as the instructors' salaries are the main expenses in the budget of HIEs [20]. Unhappily, some young Japanese people made an assembly called “Hikikomori-assembly” that aims to stay home for the rest of life to communicate through video games, computers, or mobile phones, assuring the influence of new AI and new technologies on autism [18]. Hallucinations are the incorrect outcomes that AI models create. These errors can be caused by some factors, including inadequate training data, wrong assumptions made by the model, or biases in the data used in the mode algorithm [18]. Currently, the available program “ChatGPT” has many disadvantages, and the data provided by this program cannot be trusted with certainty and, therefore, must be verified [20]. It is obvious that AI uses the available data on the internet; hence, the AI outputs depend on the accuracy of the internet data as input. The experience of UOP staff with some data related to their specializations, using some available free AI technologies such as ChatGPT, has also ensured that the information provided by AI has to be verified [16]. Due to the above AI disadvantages, most UOP instructors suggested putting forward some AI limitations due to its negative impacts on humanity.

4.5.AI programmers may be biased in favor of one party compared to another one.

68.6% of UOP instructors believe that AI programmers may be biased in favor of one party compared to another. The response of UOP instructors to this statement is shown in Table 9. The results indicate 68.6%, 26.7 %, and 4.7% for the instructor's agreement, neutrality, and disagreement.

Table 9. The response of UOP instructors to the statement, "I believe that AI programmers may be biased in favor of one party compared to another."

Response	Number of Instructors	%
Agree	131	68.6
Neutral	51	26.7
Disagree	9	4.7

A possible bias in AI systems remains a main challenge for spreading AI in HEIs [4]. It could be that such AI-bias instructor beliefs at UOP result from their previous experience with some available AI programs such as "ChatGPT". The "ChatGPT" outputs might gain the acceptance of one party but be rejected by another one, which could be due to some political and conflict situations in the Middle Eastern countries. AI works with an algorithm that people designed; hence, the algorithm designers must consider teamwork that maintains the rights of all parties. Many organizations discussed the ethical threats of AI in education. Three years ago (2021), the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) announced the standards for AI ethics, aiming to provide a global resource for users to find solutions to the most pressing challenges posed by AI [23]. UNESCO also put forward six aspects for having sustainable development of AI in education, including a comprehensive public policy, inclusion and equity in AI education, preparing teachers for AI-powered education, preparing AI to understand education, developing quality and inclusive data systems, making research on AI education significant, ensuring ethics and transparency in data collection, use, and dissemination. The seven ethical principles of AI in HEIs are reported to be related to governance and responsible stewardship, transparency and accountability, sustainability and proportionality, privacy, security and safety, inclusiveness in accessibility, and the principle of human-centered AI [23].

Furthermore, other ethical aspects of AI that have been reported include personal data collection, ownership responsibilities, and data-feeding algorithms [5-6]. It was reported that the goal of AI in higher education institutions should focus on enhancing human cognitive, social, and cultural skills while at the same time preserving freedom of choice and securing human control over AI-based work processes [23]. The Japanese Cabinet published in 2019 about the social principles for human-centered AI: human focus, education, confidentiality, security, fair competition, fairness, accountability, transparency, and innovation [24]. It was also reported that Google has already developed programs that enable the devices' cameras to

identify the place, time, context, and people everywhere 24 hours a day, putting people's privacy in danger [25].

In general, it is still too early to determine whether AI represents a successful experiment in higher education institutions that can improve work outcomes. There are still many reasons, including but not limited to economic and educational, that AI will explore in the coming years, and thus, higher education institutions must start preparing themselves for the new revolution in education. The tsunami is coming [20]. AI implantation in HEIs still needs to be developed to avoid bias, protect privacy, have transparent data policies, and keep the rights of personnel [20].

5. Research Implications

This study highlights the opinions of instructors in one of higher education institution in Jordan (University of Petra) which can be additional reference that could benefit researchers in the future and to bring attention of higher education institutions in Jordan to the importance and advantages of this study. Also, the study provides significant insights into the importance of using AI and its restrictions and challenges particularly in higher education sector in Jordan. For practical purposes, this research suggests some factors that influence using AI in higher education sector, these suggest that AI developers should pay more attentions to the design of AI tools so that the AI tools' interactivity with instructors and students are improved which lead to enhance the education process in higher education.

6. Conclusion

The UOP instructors have shown a positive response (~57.6%) on using AI as a supportive tool for grading the exams and monitoring attendance and not to be used as an instructor. Additionally, 61.2% of UOP instructors agree that AI enables the machine to learn independently. On the other hand, only 39.8% of UOP instructors have indicated that AI robots can influence the emotions and feelings of students the same way instructors do, indicating the lack of available AI programs to cover this humanistic aspect of students. 80.6% of UOP instructors believe that limitations must be put forward to avoid the negative impacts of AI on humanity. Furthermore, 68.6% of UOP instructors believe that AI programmers may be biased in favor of one party compared to another. The results indicate that it is still too early to determine whether AI represents a successful experiment in higher education.

Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge deanship of scientific research and graduate studies at the University of Petra (UOP) for supporting the researchers.

References

1. Chen L, Chen P, Lin Z (2020) Artificial intelligence in education: A review. Ieee Access, 8: 75264-75278. [10.1109/ACCESS.2020.2988510](https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2020.2988510)
2. Popenici S, Kerr S (2017) Exploring the impact of artificial intelligence on teaching and learning in higher education. Research and Practice in Technology Enhanced Learning. 12: 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41039-017-0062-8>
3. Al Braiki B, Harous S, Zaki N, Alnajjar F (2020) Artificial intelligence in education and assessment methods. Bulletin of Electrical Engineering and Informatics. 9:1998-2007. <https://doi.org/10.11591/eei.v9i5.1984>
4. Tapalova O, Zhiyenbayeva N (2022) Artificial intelligence in education: AIED for personalised learning pathways. Electronic Journal of e-Learning. 20:639-653. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1373006>
5. Huang J, Saleh S, Liu Y (2021). A review on artificial intelligence in education. Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies, 10(3). <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>
6. Luckin R, Holmes W (2016) Intelligence unleashed: An argument for AI in education. <https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/1475756>
7. Ahmad S, Rahmat M, Mubarik M, Alam M, Hyder S Artificial Intelligence and Its Role in Education. Sustainability (2021) 13:12902. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su132212902>
8. Chassignol M, Khoroshavin A, Klimova A, Bilyatdinova A (2018) Artificial Intelligence trends in education: a narrative overview. Procedia computer science.136:16-24. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2018.08.233>
9. Crompton H, Burke D (2023) Artificial intelligence in higher education: the state of the field. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 20:1-22. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00392-8>
10. Gocen A, Aydemir F (2020) Artificial intelligence in education and schools. Research on Education and Media. 12:13-21. [10.2478/rem-2020-0003](https://doi.org/10.2478/rem-2020-0003)
11. Jedvaj K, Skrbinjek V (2023) Artificial Intelligence in Everyday Life and Education. Economic, Social and Environmental Sustainability: The Role of Technology and Political Dialogue.457-465. <https://toknowpress.net/ISBN/978-961-6914-30-7/97.pdf>
12. Ocaña-Fernández Y, Valenzuela-Fernández L, Garro-Aburto L (2019) Artificial Intelligence and Its Implications in Higher Education. Journal of Educational Psychology-Propositosy Representaciones. 7:553-568. <http://dx.doi.org/10.20511/pyr2019.v7n2.274>
13. Dhawan S, Batra G (2020) Artificial intelligence in higher education: Promises, perils, and perspective. Expanding Knowledge Horizon. OJAS.11:11-22. <https://jaipuria.edu.in/media/Ojas-July-Dec-2020-Issue.pdf#page=15>
14. Felix C. (2020). The Role of the Teacher and AI in Education. Sengupta, E., Blessinger, P. and Makhanya, M.S. (Ed.) International Perspectives on the Role of Technology in Humanizing Higher Education (Innovations in Higher Education Teaching and Learning,), Emerald Publishing Limited. 33:33–48. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S2055-364120200000033003>

15. Haseski HI (2019) What do Turkish pre-service teachers think about artificial intelligence?. *International Journal of Computer Science Education in Schools*. 3:3-23. <https://doi.org/10.21585/ijcses.v3i2.55>
16. Klutka J, Ackerly N, Magda A (2018) Artificial intelligence in higher education: Current uses and future applications. Louisville: Learning house.
17. Tapalova O, Kuatbekov A (2021) The use of digital media resources educating the education managers. *pedagogy and psychology*. Pedagogy and Psychology, 47:129–137.
18. Tao B, Díaz V, Guerra Y (2019) Artificial intelligence and education, challenges and disadvantages for the teacher. *Arctic Journal*. 72:30-50.
19. Humble N, Mozeliuss P (2019) Artificial intelligence in education—A promise, a threat or a hype. In *Proceedings of the european conference on the impact of artificial intelligence and robotics* (pp. 149-156). <https://doi.org/10.34190>
20. Bates T, Cobo C, Mariño O, Wheeler S (2020) Can artificial intelligence transform higher education? *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*. 17:1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-020-00218-x>
21. Abdel-Rahem R, El-Khalili N (2023) E-Learning at the University of Petra During the COVID-19 Pandemic: Lessons and Recommendations. In: Badran, A., Baydoun, E., Hillman, S., Mesmar, J. (eds) *Higher Education in the Arab World*. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-33568-6_8.
22. Bryant J, Heitz C, Sanghvi S, Wagle, D (2020) Artificial intelligence in education: How will it impact K-12 teachers | McKinsey. Retrieved from <https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/education/ourinsights/how-artificial-intelligence-will-impact-k-12-teachers>
23. Nguyen A, Ngo H, Hong Y, Dang B, Nguyen B (2023) Ethical principles for artificial intelligence in education. *Education and Information Technologies*. 28:4221-4241. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-022-11316-w>
24. Mitchell A, Dokei T, Hickman T, Albagli D (2020) Regulation of Artificial Intelligence in Europe and Japan. *White & Case Technology Newsflash*. <https://www.mondaq.com/new-technology/1010204/regulation-of-artificial-intelligence-in-europe-and-japan>
25. Sidana M (2019) A review of the use of artificial intelligence in the field of education. *Int J Artif Intell Mach Learn*, 1:1-8. <https://www.ijaiml.com/volume-1-issue-3-paper-1/>