AT-TATHBĪQ
JOURNAL OF EDUCATION AND LEARNING

Volume 2 Issue 1 (2026), Pages 1-9
E-ISSN 3109-709X
https://jurnal.kayaswara.com/index.php/jel

Integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Adaptive Learning: A Personalized Analysis of Student Learning Experience in the Digital Era

Sofwan Manaf[1], Ahsanul Mufid[2]
[1]Universitas Darunnajah, Indonesia[2], Universitas Islam Madinah, Saudi Arabia.

sofwan.manaf@darunnajah.ac.id (coresponden)

Article Info:

Received: 07-02-2026
Revised: 12-03-2026
Accepted: 21-05-2026
Published: 25-05-2026

Keywords:

Artificial Intelligence; Adaptive Learning; Personalized Learning; Higher Education; Digital Era

ABSTRACT (Garamond 10, Single Spacing)

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in adaptive learning has become a strategic approach to personalizing student learning experiences in the digital era. This study aims to analyze the implementation of AI-based adaptive learning systems in personalizing learning experiences for university students. Using a qualitative approach and a systematic literature review (SLR), this research analyzed 35 peer-reviewed articles published between 2015 and 2025, sourced from Scopus, Web of Science, and ERIC databases, following the PRISMA guidelines. Data analysis was conducted through thematic coding and narrative synthesis. The findings reveal three key themes: (1) AI-driven adaptive learning systems significantly enhance personalized content delivery through machine learning algorithms, intelligent tutoring systems, and learning analytics; (2) the integration of AI in learning personalization positively impacts student engagement, academic performance, and self-regulated learning; and (3) critical challenges persist including digital infrastructure gaps, data privacy concerns, algorithmic bias, and the need for educator readiness. This study contributes to the existing literature by providing a comprehensive analysis of how AI technologies can be strategically integrated into higher education to create inclusive, responsive, and learner-centered educational ecosystems in the digital era.

To cite this article: Manaf, Sofwan & Ahsanul Mufid, (2026). Integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Adaptive Learning: A Personalized Analysis of Student Learning Experience in the Digital Era. *2*(1), 1-9. https://doi.org/10.65097/jel.v2i1

A. Introduction

Digital transformation has fundamentally changed the global higher education landscape in the last decade. The rapid development *of Artificial Intelligence* (AI) technology creates new opportunities to create a more personalized, adaptive, and responsive learning experience tailored to individual student needs. Data from UNESCO shows that more than 70% of the world's higher education institutions have adopted or plan to adopt AI-based technologies in their learning processes by 2025 (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2024). In Indonesia, the adoption of AI in education is on the rise, with learning platforms such as Ruangguru and Zenius integrating AI to offer more targeted learning recommendations (Fauziddin et al., 2025). This phenomenon confirms that the integration of AI in education is no longer just a futuristic discourse but an urgent need that must be responded to by all education stakeholders.

A number of previous studies have explored the various dimensions of AI in education. A systematic review by Essa et al. (2023) found that machine learning-based adaptive learning technology can automatically identify students' learning styles and adjust learning content to individual needs. Another study by Gligorea et al. (2023) showed that an AI-powered adaptive *e-learning* system can improve student academic performance by up to 23.5% compared to conventional learning. Furthermore, Sajja et al. (2024) developed an AI-based intelligent assistant that can provide personalized feedback and adaptive learning paths for higher education students. Meanwhile, a study by Khosravi et al. (2022) emphasized the importance of *explainable AI* in education, enabling systems to be understood and trusted by users. However, research that comprehensively examines how AI integrates various components of adaptive learning to create a holistic, personalized learning experience remains limited, especially in higher education in the digital age.

The gaps identified from previous literature reviews include several important aspects. First, most research focuses on a single aspect of AI technology (such as machine learning or natural language processing) without analyzing the synergistic integration of multiple AI technologies to create a comprehensive adaptive learning ecosystem (Bozkurt et al., 2021). Second, studies on the impact of AI-based learning personalization on students' non-cognitive dimensions, such as intrinsic motivation, *self-regulated learning*, and psychological well-being, are still inadequate (Laak & Aru, 2025). Third, a critical analysis of the challenges of AI implementation in the context of higher education in developing countries, including Indonesia, that takes into account digital infrastructure, regulatory policies, and human resource readiness still needs further deepening (Haetami, 2025). Fourth, there is no conceptual framework that integrates technological, pedagogical, and contextual perspectives to understand AI's role as a collaborative partner in personalizing learning.

Given these gaps, this study aims to comprehensively analyze the integration of AI into *adaptive learning* to personalize student learning experiences in the digital era. Specifically, this research focuses on three aspects: (1) identifying and analyzing AI technology used in *adaptive learning systems* for learning personalization; (2) evaluating the impact of AI integration on student learning experiences that include cognitive, affective, and metacognitive dimensions; and (3) analyzing the challenges and opportunities for the implementation of AI in *adaptive learning* in higher education. The focus of this research complements the shortcomings of previous studies that tend to be partial and do not integrate technological, pedagogical, and contextual perspectives simultaneously.

The main argument that wants to be tested in this study is that the integration of AI in *adaptive learning*, if designed with the right pedagogical principles in mind and equipped with adequate supporting infrastructure, is able to create a learning experience that is truly personalized, adaptive, and has a positive impact on student learning outcomes holistically. This hypothesis is built on the basis that AI is not just a technological tool, but a pedagogical partner that can facilitate the transformation of the learning paradigm from a *teacher-centered* approach to *a true learner-centered*. This proposition is tested through a synthesis of empirical evidence from recent international and national literature reviews.

This article is structured as follows: after this introduction, the methods section explains the *systematic literature review procedure* and the inclusion and exclusion criteria for articles. The results section presents the main findings of the research, organized around three key themes. The discussion section interprets the findings in the context of previous theories and research, identifies new contributions through the conceptual framework *of Human-AI Collaborative Learning* (HACL), and formulates theoretical and practical implications for the development of education management science. The article concludes with a summary of the main contributions and future research directions.

B. Methods

This study uses a qualitative approach and the Systematic Literature Review (SLR) method, following the PRISMA 2020 guidelines (Page et al., 2021). The SLR approach was chosen because it can provide a systematic, transparent, and replicable synthesis of available research evidence on the integration of AI into adaptive learning for personalization in higher education. This method allows researchers to identify, evaluate, and synthesize all relevant research evidence in a rigorous and structured manner. The literature search was carried out comprehensively across three main academic databases: Scopus, Web of Science, and ERIC (*Education Resources Information Center*). The selection of these three databases is based on the extensive coverage of reputable scientific publications in the fields of education, educational technology, and artificial intelligence. The search strategy uses a combination of keywords with the following Boolean operators: ("artificial intelligence" OR "AI" OR "machine learning" OR "deep learning") AND ("adaptive learning" OR "personalized learning" OR "personalised learning") AND ("higher education" OR "university" OR "college") AND ("student experience" OR "learning experience" OR "engagement" OR "performance"). Searches are limited to articles published between January 2015 and June 2025 to ensure relevance to the latest technological developments while meeting the reference requirements of the last ten years.

The inclusion criteria applied include: *peer-reviewed* articles published in reputable scientific journals; articles that focus on the application of AI in *adaptive learning* in the context of higher education; articles that present empirical data, whether quantitative, qualitative, or mixed; articles that discuss the impact of AI-based learning personalization on the student learning experience; and articles that are available in English or other languages in Indonesia. Exclusion criteria include: articles that are not directly related to AI in learning personalization; theoretical articles without empirical support; conference proceedings, editorials, and opinions; articles focused on primary or secondary education; and articles whose *full text* is not accessible.

The article selection process follows the PRISMA procedure, which consists of four stages. The identification stage yielded 847 articles across all three *databases*. After removing duplicates (n=213), 634 articles entered the screening stage based on title and abstract. From this stage, 128 articles passed the eligibility criteria after full-text review. In the final stage, 35 articles met all inclusion criteria and were included in the analysis. The selection process was conducted independently by two researchers, with an inter-rater agreement rate (Cohen's kappa) of 0.87, indicating excellent reliability. Data extraction from 35 selected articles was carried out using a pre-designed extraction form that included bibliographic information (author, year, journal), research design, context, participants, type of AI technology used, variables measured, key findings, and study limitations. Data analysis uses *the thematic analysis* method (Braun & Clarke, 2006), which consists of six stages: data familiarization, initial coding, theme search, theme review, theme definition and naming, and report preparation. The *coding process* is inductive, identifying patterns and themes that emerge from the data. In addition, *narrative synthesis* integrates findings from multiple studies to generate a coherent understanding of the phenomenon under study.

The methodological quality of the included articles was assessed using the 2018 version of *the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool* (MMAT) (Hong et al., 2018). Quality assessments showed that 25 articles (71.4%) received a high-quality score, 8 articles (22.9%) received a medium-quality score, and 2 articles (5.7%) received a low-quality score but were still included because they provided a unique perspective relevant to the research question. The entire research process was validated through triangulation of data sources, *peer debriefing* with two experts in educational technology, and *a fully documented trail audit* to ensure the credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability of the research findings.

C. Result and Discussion

AI Technology in Adaptive Learning Systems

The analysis identified four main categories of AI technologies used in adaptive learning systems in higher education, as presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Categories AI Technology in Adaptive Learning Systems

No.	Category Technology	Number of Studies	Percentage
1	Machine Learning (supervised & unsupervised)	28	80,0%
2	Natural Language Processing (NLP)	18	51,4%
3	Intelligent Tutoring Systems (ITS)	22	62,9%
4	Learning Analytics & Educational Data Mining	24	68,6%

Note: Some studies used more than one category of technology

From Table 1, it can be seen that *machine learning* is the most dominant technology used (80.0%), followed by *learning analytics* and *educational data mining* (68.6%), *intelligent tutoring systems* (62.9%), and *natural language processing* (51.4%). These findings show that data-driven approaches are the main foundation in the development of *adaptive learning* systems. In the *machine learning* category, the most commonly used algorithms include *k-nearest neighbors* (K-NN) for learning style classification, *decision trees* and *random forests* for predicting academic performance, and *neural networks* for modeling complex learner profiles. A total of 15 studies (42.9%) used *deep learning* approaches, particularly convolutional neural networks (CNNs) and recurrent neural networks (RNNs), to analyze students' interactions with learning platforms and predict learning needs in real time. *The Intelligent Tutoring Systems* (ITS) identified in this study show the evolution from a *rule-based* system to a more adaptive system based on generative AI. A total of 12 studies (34.3%) reported using large language models (LLMs), such as the GPT series, as intelligent tutoring components that can provide contextual explanations, naturally answer student questions, and deliver personalized formative feedback. The integration of NLP into ITS enables the system to understand student questions in natural language and provide explanations tailored to each student's level of understanding.

The Impact of AI-Based Learning Personalization

Thematic analysis reveals that the impact of AI-based learning personalization on student learning experiences can be categorized into three main dimensions: cognitive, affective, and metacognitive. A summary of the impact on each dimension is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. The Impact of AI-Based Learning Personalization on the Learning Experience Dimension

Dimensions	Indicator	Key Findings	Number of Studies
Cognitive	Academic performance	Average score increase of 15-23.5%	21
Cognitive	Concept understanding	Significant improvements to complex concepts	16
Affective	Engagement	25-40% increase in active learning time	18
Affective	Intrinsic motivation	Results are mixed; Increase in 70% of studies	14
Metacognitive	Self-regulated learning	Improvement in 60% of studies; decrease at 15%	11
Metacognitive	Critical thinking	Contradictory results between studies	8

In the cognitive dimension, 21 studies (60.0%) reported a positive impact on student academic performance. The average improvement in academic scores ranged from 15% to 23.5% compared with the control group using conventional learning. These studies show that AI's ability to identify *knowledge gaps* and provide targeted remediation materials is a key factor in improving performance. In addition, 16 studies (45.7%) specifically noted a significant increase in understanding complex concepts, especially in STEM courses, as AI can break down difficult material into more structured learning units tailored to students' readiness levels. On the affective dimension, 18 studies (51.4%) reported an increase in student involvement in the learning process. Students who use AI-based adaptive learning platforms increase active learning time by 25-40% and interact more frequently with learning materials. However, findings on intrinsic motivation are more diverse. While 70% of studies measuring motivation report improvement, some studies identify a phenomenon called "cognitive offloading," in which students become so reliant on AI recommendations that their motivation to explore material independently decreases.

The most interesting and contradictory findings appear in the metacognitive dimension. Although 60% of studies measuring *self-regulated learning* (SRL) reported improvement, 15% showed a decrease in students' SRL skills after long-term use of AI-based adaptive learning systems. This phenomenon has been explained by several studies as a result of a system design that is too "prescriptive," in which AI takes over the function of regulating learning that should be carried out by students themselves. Findings related to critical thinking also show contradictory results: some studies report an increase, while others report a decrease, especially when college students use generative AI in place of independent thinking.

Implementation Challenges and Opportunities

The analysis identifies five main categories of challenges in implementing AI for *adaptive learning* in higher education. First, the digital infrastructure gap remains a significant barrier, especially in developing countries, where 19 studies (54.3%) highlighted the inequality in access to technology and internet connectivity as a factor with the potential to widen the education gap. Second, the privacy and security of student data were a serious concern in 22 studies (62.9%), given that adaptive learning systems require extensive collection and analysis of personal data. Third, algorithmic biases that can reinforce pre-existing inequalities were identified in 14 studies (40.0%). Fourth, educators' readiness to integrate AI into their pedagogical practices is still limited, with 17 studies (48.6%) emphasizing the need for comprehensive professional development programs. Fifth, 15 studies (42.9%) highlighted the absence of a clear regulatory and policy framework for the use of AI in education.

On the other hand, four strategic opportunities were identified. First, the potential of AI to create truly inclusive learning by accommodating students' diverse learning styles, abilities, and special needs. Second, the ability of AI to provide *immediate*, specific, and constructive formative feedback on an ongoing basis. Third, optimizing lecturers' roles from knowledge transmitters to facilitators and mentors by automating administrative tasks and routine assessments. Fourth, the opportunity to develop *a hybrid* learning model that combines the advantages of AI with irreplaceable human interaction.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study provide a more comprehensive understanding of how integrating AI into adaptive learning can create meaningful, personalized student learning experiences in the digital age. This discussion interprets the findings in the context of previous theories and research and identifies new contributions to the development of education management science. The first findings regarding the dominance of *machine learning* and *learning analytics* as foundational technologies in *adaptive learning systems* confirm and expand on previous research. These results align with a *systematic review* by Essa et al. (2023), which found that machine learning is the most effective approach for identifying learning styles and personalizing learning content. However, this study reveals a new dimension that has not been explicitly identified in previous studies: an evolutionary trend from the single use of a single type of AI technology to multimodal integration that combines machine learning, NLP, and learning analytics within a coherent ecosystem. These findings support the proposition advanced by recent research in *Discover Education* (2025), which emphasizes that the effectiveness of *adaptive learning systems* increases significantly when various AI technologies are synergistically integrated. From the perspective of connectivity theory (Siemens, 2005), this multimodal integration reflects the complexity of knowledge networks in the digital age, where learning occurs through multiple nodes and connections that interact with one another.

The second finding regarding the positive impact of AI-based personalization on the cognitive and affective dimensions of students confirms the results of previous research. The 15-23.5% increase in academic performance is consistent with the findings of Ezzaim et al. (2024), who reported a similar increase in experiments with *multifactorial adaptive e-learning* systems. The increase in student engagement by 25-40% is also in line with the findings of Matazu (2024), which show that blended learning approaches integrated with AI result in the greatest improvements in student learning outcomes and attitudes. In line with that, Eltahir and Babiker (2024) found, in their quasi-experimental study at Ajman University, that the AI group significantly outperformed the control group in academic achievement, critical thinking, and knowledge retention. These findings can be interpreted through Vygotsky's (1978) Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), in which AI serves as a digital "scaffolding" that dynamically adjusts the level of learning challenges to students' actual abilities and potential.

However, contradictory findings on the metacognitive dimension, particularly regarding the decline in self-regulated learning skills among some students, constitute an important contribution of this study that warrants serious attention. These findings reinforce the warnings of Laak and Aru (2025) about the phenomenon of "cognitive offloading," in which excessive AI use can reduce students' cognitive effort and weaken metacognitive processes. Deng et al. (2024) also found, in their meta-analysis, that although the use of generative

AI improved performance, there was a decrease in mental effort, which raises questions about its long-term impact on deep learning. In the context of *self-determination theory* (Ryan & Deci, 2000), these findings suggest that adaptive learning system design should balance AI support and student autonomy. An overly *prescriptive system* that dictates learning paths without allowing for choice and self-exploration can erode students' intrinsic motivation and self-regulation skills. Williamson (2024) corroborates this argument by highlighting the importance of understanding the social life of AI in education, rather than focusing solely on its technical dimensions.

The theoretical modification proposed by this study concerns the concept of "Human-AI Collaborative Learning" (HACL) as a more appropriate framework for understanding the role of AI in learning personalization. In contrast to the paradigm that positions AI as a *substitute* or just a learning *tool*, the HACL framework views AI as a collaborative partner that interacts reciprocally with students and lecturers in the learning ecosystem. This framework is built on three principles. The first principle is complementarity, where AI and humans complement each other's strengths. AI excels at large-scale data analysis and content personalization, while lecturers excel at empathy, motivation, and the development of critical thinking. The second principle is graduated *agency*, where the level of AI control over the learning process is dynamically adjusted based on the student's SRL skill level. The third principle is algorithmic transparency, in which students understand how and why AI makes certain recommendations, in line with the concept of *explainable AI* advocated by Khosravi et al. (2022).

The third finding on implementation challenges makes a significant contribution to the context of higher education in developing countries, including Indonesia. The digital infrastructure gap highlighted by most studies reflects the reality of the "digital divide," which remains a crucial issue. Research by Haetami (2025) specifically identified that in Indonesia, regional inequalities in access to technology and internet connectivity limit the scalability and effectiveness of AI applications in education. These findings align with Bulathwela et al. (2024), who argue that artificial intelligence alone will not democratize education without efforts to address structural inequalities. Fauziddin et al. (2025) in their study on the impact of AI on the future of education in Indonesia found that although AI has the potential to support *adaptive learning* and provide accurate assessments, infrastructure limitations, data privacy concerns, and digital gaps remain major challenges.

The study's findings have practical implications, including several strategic recommendations. For higher education institutions, it is necessary to develop *an AI integration roadmap* that accounts for infrastructure readiness, human resource capacity, and an ethical policy framework for AI use. Professional development programs for lecturers need to be systematically designed to build pedagogical digital competencies that encompass not only technical skills in AI use but also a critical understanding of the technology's pedagogical, ethical, and social implications (Er-Rafyg et al., 2024). For educational technology developers, adaptive learning system design needs to adopt a "*human-centered AI"* approach that ensures students retain agency in the learning process. For policymakers in Indonesia, a regulatory framework is needed that balances technological innovation with the protection of students' rights, particularly regarding data privacy and algorithmic transparency.

The main contribution of this research to the development of educational management science lies in three things. First, presenting a comprehensive map of the AI technology landscape in adaptive learning can serve as a reference for strategic decision-making at the institutional level. Second, the identification of the multidimensional impact of AI-based personalization that includes cognitive, affective, and metacognitive dimensions provides a more *nuanced* understanding of the effectiveness of these technologies. Third, the submission *of a Human-AI Collaborative Learning* conceptual framework that offers a new perspective on the design and management of AI integration in a human-centered higher education ecosystem.

D. CONCLUSION

Based on a systematic literature review of 35 peer-reviewed articles, this study concludes that integrating AI into *adaptive learning* has significant potential to transform the personalization of student learning experiences in the digital era. Machine *learning, intelligent tutoring systems, natural language processing, and learning analytics synergistically enable the creation of an adaptive, responsive learning system that meets* individual student needs. Positive impacts were identified on the cognitive dimension through improved academic performance and concept understanding, and on the affective dimension through increased engagement and learning motivation.

However, contradictory findings on the metacognitive dimension, particularly the potential decline *in self-regulated learning* skills, underscore the importance of system design that balances AI support with student autonomy. Implementation challenges that include infrastructure gaps, data privacy, algorithmic bias, and educator readiness require a holistic and collaborative approach from all stakeholders. This study recommends developing the *Human-AI Collaborative Learning* (HACL) framework as a more appropriate paradigm to guide the integration of AI in inclusive, ethical, and human-centered higher education. Further research is recommended to conduct a longitudinal empirical study that examines the effectiveness of the HACL framework in the specific context of higher education in Indonesia, and explores the long-term impact of generative AI on students' metacognitive skills and self-regulation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bozkurt, A., Karadeniz, A., Baneres, D., Guerrero-Roldán, A. E., & Rodríguez, M. E. (2021). Artificial intelligence and reflections from the educational landscape: A review of AI studies in half a century. Sustainability, 13(2), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13020800

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Bulathwela, S., Pérez-Ortiz, M., Holloway, C., Cukurova, M., & Shawe-Taylor, J. (2024). Artificial intelligence alone will not democratise education: On educational inequality, techno-solutionism and inclusive tools. Sustainability, 16(2), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.3390/su16020781

Deng, R., Benckendorff, P., & Gannaway, D. (2024). A meta-analysis of empirical studies on ChatGPT impact on learning. Education and Information Technologies, 29(15), 20065–20091. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-12697-4

Eltahir, M. E., & Babiker, A. (2024). Impact of AI tools on pre-service teacher training: A quasi-experimental study. Education and Information Technologies, 29(12), 15233–15258.

Er-Rafyg, A., Zankadi, H., & Idrissi, A. (2024). AI in adaptive learning: Challenges and opportunities. Dalam Modern Artificial Intelligence and Data Science 2024 (hlm. 329–342). Springer.

Essa, S. G., Celik, T., & Human-Hendricks, N. E. (2023). Personalized adaptive learning technologies based on machine learning techniques to identify learning styles: A systematic literature review. IEEE Access, 11, 48392–48409. https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2023.3276439

Ezzaim, A., Dahbi, A., Haidine, A., & Aqqal, A. (2024). Multi-factor adaptive e-learning system for personalized learning. Computers & Education: Artificial Intelligence, 6, 100198.

Fauziddin, M., Adha, T. R., Arifiyanti, N., Indriyani, F., Rizki, L. M., Wulandary, V., & Reddy, V. (2025). The impact of AI on the future of education in Indonesia. Educative: Scientific Journal of Education, 3(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.70437/educative.v3i1.828

Gligorea, I., Cioca, M., Oancea, R., Gorski, A.-T., Gorski, H., & Tudorache, P. (2023). Adaptive learning using artificial intelligence in e-learning: A literature review. Education Sciences, 13(12), 1216. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13121216

Haetami, H. (2025). AI-driven educational transformation in Indonesia: From learning personalization to institutional management. AL-ISHLAH: Jurnal Pendidikan, 17(2), 1819–1832.

Hong, Q. N., Fàbregues, S., Bartlett, G., Boardman, F., Cargo, M., Dagenais, P., ... & Pluye, P. (2018). The Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) version 2018 for information professionals and researchers. Education for Information, 34(4), 285–291. https://doi.org/10.3233/EFI-180221

Khosravi, H., Shum, S. B., Chen, G., Conati, C., Tsai, Y.-S., Kay, J., ... & Gašević, D. (2022). Explainable artificial intelligence in education. Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 3, 100074. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2022.100074

Laak, T., & Aru, J. (2025). AI and personalized learning: Bridging the gap with modern educational goals. arXiv preprint, arXiv:2404.02798v2.

Matazu, S. S. (2024). Effects of AI-blended learning on learning outcomes and student attitudes. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 33(4), 512–528.

Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., ... & Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ, 372, n71. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. American Psychologist, 55(1), 68–78. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68

Sajja, R., Sermet, Y., Cikmaz, M., Cwiertny, D., & Demir, I. (2024). Artificial intelligence-enabled intelligent assistant for personalized and adaptive learning in higher education. Information, 15(10), 596. https://doi.org/10.3390/info15100596

Siemens, G. (2005). Connectivism: A learning theory for the digital age. International Journal of Instructional Technology and Distance Learning, 2(1), 3–10.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Harvard University Press.

Williamson, B. (2024). The social life of AI in education. International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education, 34(1), 97–104. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-023-00342-5

Zawacki-Richter, O., Bai, J. Y., Lee, K., Slagter van Tryon, P. J., & Prinsloo, P. (2024). New advances in artificial intelligence applications in higher education. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 21(1), 32. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00464-3