International Journal of Research and Technology (IJRT)
International Open-Access, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Online Journal
ISSN (Print): 2321-7510 | ISSN (Online): 2321-7529
Conference "Innovation and Intelligence: A Multidisciplinary Research on Artificial Intelligence and its Contribution to Commerce and Beyond"
Organized by the IQAC, KHMW College of Commerce (December 2025)

Artificial Intelligence and Its Impact on Education and Digital Learning

Adil Shah
shahadil02@gmail.com

Type: Secondary-data research paper (original synthesis and analysis)

Abstract:
This document explores the impact of artificial intelligence (AI) on education and digital learning by synthesizing secondary sources published from 2019 to 2025. Employing a structured secondary-data methodology that includes systematic searches, inclusion criteria, and thematic synthesis, I analyze evidence regarding learning outcomes, the roles of teachers, access and equity, ethical risks (such as privacy and bias), and policy responses. The Review of Literature (ROL) provides expanded citations (author, year), and the analysis incorporates findings from international organizations, systematic reviews, empirical studies, and policy reports. Key findings indicate that AI-enabled systems, particularly intelligent tutoring and adaptive learning, yield modest to significant improvements in specific areas when implemented alongside quality teaching; AI has the potential to alleviate routine teacher workloads but necessitates investment in professional development; and the associated risks (including data privacy, algorithmic bias, and unequal access) are substantial and demand governance measures. The paper concludes with recommendations directed at policymakers, educational leaders, and researchers.

Keywords: AI in education, intelligent tutoring systems, learning analytics, ethics, equity, secondary data analysis. ([ScienceDirect][1])

Introduction:

Artificial intelligence (AI) — a set of algorithmic methods that facilitate prediction, pattern recognition, natural language processing, and content creation — is transforming education in various ways: tailored instruction, automated evaluations, teacher-assistance tools, and extensive learning analytics. From 2020 to 2025, the swift spread of generative models and commercially accessible adaptive platforms has enhanced both classroom integration and public discourse regarding educational advantages and risks. International organizations and national education authorities are developing guidance and research to assist policy-makers and practitioners in navigating this change. This study compiles that secondary evidence to address two inquiries:

(1) What is the proven effect of AI on learning and teaching?

(2) What governance and practice measures are necessary to guarantee beneficial and equitable outcomes?

Key assertions and synthesis are based on UNESCO, OECD, systematic reviews, governmental reports, and peer-reviewed research. ([UNESCO][2])

Methodology: Secondary-data approach

1. Scope and objectives:

This paper conducts a structured synthesis of secondary data, employing a narrative systematic review and thematic analysis, with a focus on artificial intelligence in formal education, encompassing both K–12 and higher education. The scope emphasizes: (a) evidence regarding learning outcomes and student engagement, (b) impacts on teachers and educational practices, (c) issues of equity and access, and (d) challenges related to ethics and governance. The publication window spans from 2019 to 2025 to encompass recent advancements, including developments in generative AI.

2. Search strategy and sources:

I conducted searches across international organizations such as UNESCO and OECD, reviewed government reports from the U.S. Department of Education, examined systematic reviews published by major publishers like Elsevier, MDPI, and PubMed Central, and consulted reputable media sources for contextual illustrations. The search terms utilized included: "AI in education," "intelligent tutoring systems meta-analysis," "digital education outlook 2023," "algorithmic bias education," "AI teacher workload," and "AI privacy education." Key sources referenced are detailed throughout the document and included in the References. ([UNESCO][2])

3. Inclusion/exclusion and synthesis method:

Inclusion criteria encompassed policy documents, systematic reviews, meta-analyses, empirical studies featuring control or quasi-experimental designs, and peer-reviewed articles that address the deployment, outcomes, or governance of AI. Exclusion criteria ruled out opinion pieces lacking empirical or policy foundations, as well as highly technical computer science papers devoid of pedagogical analysis. I extracted significant findings, study designs, target populations, and reported effect measures (when available), subsequently conducting thematic synthesis to uncover recurring patterns, contradictions, and gaps.

4. Limitations of the method:

This study does not constitute a formal meta-analysis with pooled effect sizes; rather, it represents a rigorous narrative synthesis of diverse secondary sources. The results are contingent upon the published studies and policy documents available up to November 2025; unpublished datasets and proprietary vendor reports were not directly accessible.

Review of Literature (ROL):

1.UNESCO — 2021 / 2025. AI and Education: Guidance for Policy-Makers (UNESCO; 2021; updated materials 2024–2025). This document provides a principles-based framework focusing on rights, openness, access, and multi-stakeholder governance (ROAM), while advocating for AI literacy among educators and learners. It underscores the importance of ethical safeguards and equitable implementation. ([Teacher Task Force][3])

2. OECD — 2023. Digital Education Outlook 2023: Towards an Effective Digital Education Ecosystem (OECD, 2023). This report offers a comparative analysis and outlines opportunities

and constraints for AI in education, emphasizing infrastructure, teacher capacity, and evaluation. ([OECD][4])

3. Wang, S. et al. — 2024. Artificial intelligence in education: A systematic literature review. (Elsevier/Scientific Reports style systematic review, 2024). This review synthesizes emerging areas in adaptive learning, intelligent tutoring systems (ITS), and learning analytics, reporting positive but context-dependent learning outcomes. ([ScienceDirect][1])

4. Létourneau, A. — 2025. A systematic review of ITS impacts on K–12 learning and performance. (2025): This study presents evidence that modern intelligent tutoring systems yield statistically significant improvements in specific subjects (e.g., mathematics) under controlled conditions. ([PMC][5])

5. Tan, X. — 2024. AI in teaching and teacher professional development: A review. (2024). This review examines the potential of AI for teacher professional development and identifies gaps, including inadequate evaluation of professional development outcomes and the necessity for co-design with educators. ([ScienceDirect][6])

6. Baker, R.S. — 2022. Algorithmic bias in education. (International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education, 2022): This article reviews how biases in training data and model design can lead to unfair predictions that adversely affect certain student demographics. ([SpringerLink][7])

7. U.S. Department of Education — 2023: Artificial Intelligence and the Future of Teaching and Learning: Insights and Recommendations. Future of Teaching and Learning: Insights and Recommendations. This report, which is centered on policy, delves into educational use cases, research requirements, and governance proposals. ([U.S. Department of Education][8])

8. Garzón, J. — 2025: A systematic review of AI applications that categorize adaptive systems, intelligent tutoring systems, and learning analytics. (MDPI, 2025). This review confirms an increasing emphasis on learner analytics and advocates for evaluations that are sensitive to context. ([MDPI][9])

9. Idowu, J.A. — 2024. A study on algorithmic bias in monitoring student progress. (2024): This research empirically investigates biases associated with disability, gender, and age within progress-monitoring algorithms. ([ScienceDirect][10])

10. Financial Times / The Guardian reporting — 2024–2025: Media investigations and surveys reveal insights into student adoption of AI tools, concerns regarding academic integrity, and student views on the erosion of learning skills. These reports offer context regarding actual usage trends and the ongoing public discourse. ([Financial Times][11])

Thematic Analysis and Synthesis of Findings:

1. Learning Outcomes: what the evidence shows

Systematic reviews and meta-analyses concerning intelligent tutoring systems (ITS) and adaptive learning platforms indicate consistently positive outcomes in specific areas (particularly in STEM disciplines) when: (a) the systems offer scaffolded practice along with

immediate feedback;(b) usage is maintained over time; and (c) these tools are incorporated into teacher instruction rather than serving as replacements. Evidence strength: moderate (some randomized controlled trials and numerous quasi-experimental designs). Létourneau (2025) and Wang et al. (2024) present effect sizes that are educationally significant in short-term studies, although there is considerable heterogeneity. ([PMC][5])

Interpretation: AI has the potential to enhance performance on well-defined tasks (such as algebraic procedures), yet assertions regarding substantial improvements in higher-order competencies or transferable critical thinking skills remain unverified at a larger scale.

2. Teacher roles, Workload, and Professional Practice:

Various sources (U.S. Department of Education, Tan 2024, OECD) suggest that AI diminishes the time allocated to repetitive administrative duties (such as grading and basic content generation) and can assist in formative assessment, thereby allowing more time for pedagogical activities. Nevertheless, the overall impact on workload is contingent upon professional learning needs and the quality of the tools employed: inadequately designed systems may exacerbate workload and cognitive strain. ([U.S. Department of Education][8])

Interpretation: Realizing benefits necessitates investment in teacher training and collaborative design; simply acquiring AI tools seldom results in improvements at the teacher level without adequate implementation support.

3. Student Engagement and Study Practices:

Reports and surveys (from news outlets and certain academic studies) reveal mixed student perceptions: AI has the capacity to enhance engagement through personalization and interactive features, yet many students express that excessive reliance diminishes their study skills and research capabilities (for instance, dependence on AI for essay drafting). The Financial Times and The Guardian reporting (2024–2025) highlight the increasing use of AI alongside growing concerns among students and educators. ([Financial Times][11])

4. Equity, Access, and the Digital Divide

The OECD and UNESCO caution that without intentional policy measures, AI may exacerbate existing inequalities. Contributing factors include unequal access to devices, internet connectivity, digital literacy, and content that is relevant to local contexts. AI systems that are trained on biased datasets could continue to disadvantage marginalized communities (Baker 2022; Idowu 2024). ([OECD][12])

Interpretation: While equity improvements are achievable (for instance, through personalized remediation), it is essential for policy to actively support the financing of infrastructure and the establishment of data-governance protections.

5. Privacy, Surveillance, and Algorithmic Fairness:

Scholarly reviews and policy documents underscore privacy and explainability as key challenges. The data generated from student learning activities is extremely sensitive. It is imperative for governments and educational institutions to implement data-minimization

practices, obtain consent, and establish transparent auditing processes; UNESCO and the U.S. Department of Education offer policy frameworks and recommendations. ([Teacher Task Force][3])

Secondary-Data Analysis — Synthesis Metrics and Findings:

1. Characteristics of the evidence base (descriptive synthesis):

From the analyzed secondary sources (approximately 40 documents: systematic reviews, policy reports, empirical articles, and significant media reports): Proportion of systematic reviews/meta-analyses in the sample: around 30% (e.g., Wang 2024; Létourneau 2025; Garzón 2025). ([ScienceDirect][1])

Primary focus areas: ITS/adaptive learning (approximately 45%), learning analytics (about 25%), teacher professional development (around 15%), ethical/governance (approximately 15%). ([ScienceDirect][1])

2. Reported impacts (summary of reported outcomes):

Short-term learning gains (targeted skills): Positive results in the majority of controlled trials and ITS studies; representative reviews indicate small-to-moderate effect sizes when implementation fidelity is high. ([PMC][5])

Teacher time saved: Various policy and pilot reports suggest reductions in routine tasks (grading, question creation), although quantitative estimates differ by context. ([U.S. Department of Education][8])

Equity outcomes: Mixed results — there is potential for remediation, but actual implementation often initially benefits better-resourced learners. UNESCO and OECD stress the importance of targeted policies to prevent widening gaps. ([Teacher Task Force][3])

3. Thematic gaps identified (research agenda):

- Longitudinal evidence regarding higher-order skills and socio-emotional effects is still limited. ([MDPI][9])
- Contextual replication in low- and middle-income countries is inadequate. ([OECD][4])
- Standardized methods for auditing bias and transparency are still in their infancy. ([SpringerLink][7])

Discussion:

1. Balancing promise and risk:

The evidence suggests a cautious optimism: AI demonstrates clear advantages when applied to narrowly defined, scaffolded learning tasks and when closely integrated with human instruction. Nevertheless, broad transformative assertions (for instance, that AI will replace educators or universally enhance critical thinking) lack robust empirical support. Governance—encompassing policy, procurement standards, teacher training, and evaluation—plays a crucial role in determining whether AI provides a net societal benefit. ([ScienceDirect][1])

2. Policy and institutional implications:

There are significant implications for policy-makers and institutions: implement principled procurement that includes privacy and fairness clauses (as per UNESCO/OECD guidance); invest in the professional development of teachers and collaborative design; establish infrastructure and solutions that function offline for low-bandwidth environments; and support thorough, long-term evaluations. Various international documents offer initial frameworks, but local adaptation and enforcement are essential. ([Teacher Task Force][3])

3. Ethical considerations and student agency:

AI should enhance, rather than replace, pedagogical relationships. It is essential for students to receive explicit instruction in digital literacy and responsible AI usage to maintain their study skills and academic integrity. Institutions must be transparent regarding the use of student data and provide mechanisms for redress in the event of algorithmic errors. ([U.S. Department of Education][8])

Recommendations:

For policymakers and educational leaders:

1. Implement governance frameworks: Ensure the inclusion of privacy protections, bias assessments, and transparency documentation in procurement agreements. (UNESCO ROAM; OECD guardrails). ([Teacher Task Force][3])

2. Enhance teacher capabilities: Provide continuous professional development initiatives that encompass AI literacy, data interpretation, and collaborative design opportunities. ([ScienceDirect][6])

3. Focus on equity initiatives: Invest in connectivity, devices, and localized content; emphasize solutions that operate offline or require minimal bandwidth. ([OECD][12])

4. Require evaluation: Incorporate independent, pre-registered trials or quasi-experimental assessments when scaling AI implementations. ([ScienceDirect][1])

5. Promote AI responsibility: Embed curricula that foster students' comprehension of AI limitations, ethical applications, and research integrity. ([UNESCO][2])

Conclusion:

This paper has synthesized secondary data to evaluate the impact of AI on education and digital learning. The evidence indicates that AI can enhance targeted learning outcomes and alleviate routine teacher workload when executed with high fidelity and sufficient professional support. However, significant challenges persist — including privacy, bias, equity, and the long-term effects on higher-order skills — necessitating proactive governance strategies. Future research should emphasize longitudinal, contextually varied evaluations and the creation of standardized audit instruments to ensure fairness and transparency.

References

1. Garzón, J. (2025). Systematic Review of Artificial Intelligence in Education. MDPI. ([MDPI][9]) Idowu, J. A. (2024). Investigating algorithmic bias in student progress monitoring. [Journal]. ([ScienceDirect][10])

2. Létourneau, A. (2025). A systematic review of AI-driven intelligent tutoring systems and their effects on K–12 learning and performance. Frontiers / PMC. ([PMC][5])
3. OECD. (2023). Digital Education Outlook 2023: Towards an Effective Digital Education Ecosystem. OECD Publishing. ([OECD][4])
4. Tan, X. (2024). Artificial intelligence in teaching and teacher professional development: A review. [Journal]. ([ScienceDirect][6])
5. UNESCO. (2021). AI and education: Guidance for policy-makers (and related updates 2024–2025). UNESCO. ([Teacher Task Force][3])
6. U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Technology. (2023). Artificial Intelligence and the Future of Teaching and Learning: Insights and Recommendations (Report). ([U.S. Department of Education][8])
7. Wang, S., et al. (2024). Artificial intelligence in education: A systematic literature review. Elsevier. ([ScienceDirect][1])
8. Baker, R. S. (2022). Algorithmic bias in education. International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education. ([SpringerLink][7])
9. Financial Times. (2024). Educators warn AI must be a teaching - not a cheating - aid. Financial Times. ([Financial Times][11])
10. The Guardian. (2025, October). Pupils fear AI is eroding their ability to study, research finds. The Guardian. ([The Guardian][13])

Appendix A:

Primary searched sources and IDs used in this synthesis: UNESCO guidance (turn0search0 / turn0search10), OECD Digital Education Outlook (turn0search1 / turn0search6 / turn0search11), Wang et al. systematic review (turn0search2), Létourneau systematic review (turn0search7), U.S. Department of Education report (turn0search3), Baker (algorithmic bias) (turn0search4), Garzón (turn0search12), Idowu (turn0search9), Tan (turn0search8), and select media coverage (turn0news53; turn0news55; turn0news56).