Multidisciplinary Journal of Academic Publications
ISSN (Online): 3107-538X
Vol. 02, Issue 02, March – April 2026

AI-POWERED EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS AND THEIR INFLUENCE ON PERSONALIZED LEARNING AND STUDENT INVOLVEMENT

Manoj Kumar[1], Dr. Renu Singh[2]

Research Scholar, Department of Education, Sai Nath University[1]

Assistant Professor, Department of Education, Sai Nath University[2]

Abstract

This paper examines AI-powered educational systems and their influence on personalized learning and student involvement. The rapid integration of artificial intelligence in educational environments has created transformative possibilities for tailoring instruction to individual learner profiles. The primary objective is to analyze how AI-driven tools including intelligent tutoring systems and adaptive learning platforms affect student engagement and personalized learning outcomes across higher and secondary education. Employing a descriptive-analytical research design, this study synthesizes secondary data from peer-reviewed literature published between 2016 and 2024. The hypothesis posits that AI-powered systems significantly enhance student engagement and personalized learning outcomes compared to conventional pedagogical approaches. Results indicate that students in AI-enhanced environments demonstrate up to 54% higher test scores, 30% improved learning outcomes, and 75% higher motivation levels than peers in traditional classrooms. Discussion confirms that adaptive feedback loops, real-time analytics, and individualized content delivery are the primary mechanisms through which AI drives learner engagement. The paper concludes that AI, when ethically and strategically implemented, holds strong potential to democratize quality education globally, including within India's vast and diverse educational ecosystem.

Keywords: *Artificial Intelligence in Education[1], Personalized Learning[2], Student Engagement[3], Adaptive Learning Systems[4], Intelligent Tutoring Systems[5].*

1. Introduction

The twenty-first century has witnessed an unprecedented convergence of technology and education, fundamentally altering the manner in which knowledge is imparted and assimilated. Among the most disruptive forces reshaping contemporary classrooms is artificial intelligence, whose applications now extend from automated grading and content recommendation to real-time adaptive assessment and intelligent tutoring. Unlike one-size-fits-all instructional models that have historically dominated formal education, AI-powered systems possess the capacity to respond dynamically to the unique cognitive profiles, learning speeds, and academic preferences of individual students. This represents a marked departure from traditional pedagogical paradigms and introduces a new era of genuinely personalized learning at scale. In India and globally, challenges of learner heterogeneity within large classroom settings have long undermined educational equity and effectiveness. A student struggling with foundational mathematical concepts while a peer grasps advanced topics simultaneously is a structural problem that conventional teaching cannot adequately address. AI offers a

credible solution. Adaptive learning platforms continuously analyze learner responses to adjust content difficulty, pacing, and instructional modality in real time (Hwang et al., 2020). These systems employ machine learning algorithms, natural language processing, and learning analytics to detect knowledge gaps and prescribe targeted interventions, rendering the learning process genuinely responsive to the individual.

Student involvement—encompassing behavioral, cognitive, and emotional dimensions—is widely acknowledged as one of the strongest predictors of academic achievement, retention, and long-term educational success. Conventional instruction has struggled to sustain engagement across diverse learner groups, particularly in contexts where class sizes are large, instructional resources are limited, or student motivation is inconsistent. AI-based educational tools have demonstrated robust potential to counter these challenges. Research confirms that AI-powered tutoring systems enhance engagement by offering immediate, corrective feedback and creating interactive, immersive learning pathways that maintain student interest and stimulate cognitive investment (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019). The global AI in education market, valued at approximately $3.6 billion in 2023, is projected to surge to $73.7 billion by 2033 at a compound annual growth rate of 35.10%, illustrating the scale of institutional investment in this domain. Despite growing adoption, significant research gaps remain regarding the precise mechanisms through which AI enhances personalization and how sustained engagement is maintained beyond the initial novelty effect of AI exposure (Chan & Hu, 2023). Furthermore, concerns related to equity, data privacy, over-dependence, and the diminishing role of human educators necessitate rigorous scholarly examination. This paper addresses these dimensions by analyzing secondary empirical data and synthesizing evidence from peer-reviewed studies published between 2016 and 2024, contributing to the growing scholarly discourse on AI in education and providing evidence-based insights for educators, policymakers, and educational technologists in India and beyond.

2. Literature Review

Scholarship on AI in education has grown exponentially since 2019, reflecting widespread recognition of its transformative potential. Luckin et al. (2016) laid foundational groundwork by arguing that AI could act as a scaffold for human intelligence in learning, enabling adaptive, learner-centered educational experiences. Building on this, Zawacki-Richter et al. (2019) conducted a systematic review of 146 publications and identified intelligent tutoring systems, adaptive learning, and learning analytics as the three dominant AI applications in higher education, each demonstrating measurable impacts on learner outcomes. Their findings established that AI systems outperform conventional methods in supporting individualized learning trajectories. The personalization dimension of AI in education has attracted particular scholarly attention. Hwang et al. (2020) proposed a comprehensive vision for AI in education, emphasizing real-time adaptation of instructional content based on learner behavior data. Their framework highlighted AI's capacity to reduce cognitive overload and increase engagement by aligning content complexity with the learner's current proficiency. Demartini et al. (2024) supported this empirically through a case study demonstrating that adaptive AI learning environments resulted in improved student self-regulation and academic performance, validating AI's role as a personalized academic mentor rather than a mere information delivery mechanism.

Student engagement encompassing behavioral participation, cognitive investment, and emotional connection to learning has emerged as a central theme in AI education research. Bognar et al. (2024) conducted an empirical study re-evaluating classical educational theories in AI-enhanced classrooms and found that AI-supported environments positively influenced student engagement across all three dimensions, with emotional engagement showing the most marked improvement. Similarly, Sajja et al. (2024) demonstrated through a deployment case study that an AI-enabled intelligent assistant significantly improved personalized learning pathways, with measurable gains in academic performance in higher education contexts. The role of intelligent tutoring systems has been extensively documented. Wang et al. (2024) conducted a meta-analysis of adaptive AI learning

systems from 2010 to 2022 and found consistent learner outcome improvements across disciplines, age groups, and geographies, particularly in STEM disciplines where immediate feedback on problem-solving has the highest pedagogical impact. Chan and Hu (2023) extended this discourse by capturing students' first-person perspectives on generative AI, finding that while students valued AI's personalization capacity, concerns about critical thinking erosion and academic integrity were prominent, signaling the need for balanced AI integration policies.

Ethical dimensions have equally occupied the literature. Gallent-Torres et al. (2023) critiqued the uncritical adoption of generative AI in higher education, identifying academic dishonesty and equity concerns as major structural risks. Swargiary (2024) further examined the digital divide inherent in AI-driven personalized learning, arguing that without proactive institutional intervention, AI tools risk exacerbating existing inequalities between well-resourced and under-resourced educational settings. Rahiman and Kodikal (2024) offered a counterpoint by demonstrating that when properly deployed, AI empowered even students from resource-constrained backgrounds to achieve competitive academic results, suggesting that equitable access not the technology itself is the central equity variable (Adiguzel et al., 2023; Eltahir & Babiker, 2024).

3. Objectives

1. To examine the extent to which AI-powered educational systems influence personalized learning outcomes among higher secondary and university-level students.
2. To assess the impact of AI-driven tools on the behavioral, cognitive, and emotional dimensions of student engagement across diverse educational contexts.

4. Methodology

This study adopts a descriptive-analytical research design grounded in secondary data synthesis. The research draws upon peer-reviewed empirical studies, systematic reviews, meta-analyses, and institutional survey reports published between 2016 and 2024, sourced from Google Scholar, Scopus, PubMed, ScienceDirect, and MDPI. Inclusion criteria required studies to be peer-reviewed, empirically grounded, published in English, and directly focused on AI applications in personalized learning or student engagement. Studies relying exclusively on theoretical frameworks without empirical data were excluded. A total of 45 primary studies and 12 systematic reviews were examined during the literature search phase. Data were extracted and organized thematically under key constructs: AI tool typology, learning outcome variables, engagement dimensions, and contextual moderators such as subject discipline, learner level, and institutional setting. Quantitative data reported in original studies including percentage improvements in test scores, engagement indices, and adoption statistics were compiled into comparative tables to facilitate cross-study analysis. The hypothesis posits that AI-powered educational systems produce statistically significant improvements in both personalized learning outcomes and student engagement levels compared to conventional instructional methods. Reliability was ensured by triangulating findings across multiple independent studies reporting on overlapping constructs. Where conflicting findings were identified, both positions were acknowledged and contextual moderators were examined to explain divergence. The study's Indian educational context is acknowledged as a framing perspective, though data reported here draw from international literature, reflecting a recognized gap for future domestic empirical research at comparable scale.

5. Results

Table 1: AI Adoption Rates in Education by Student Level (2023–2024)

Student Level	AI Usage Rate 2023 (%)	AI Usage Rate 2024 (%)	Change (%)
University / Higher Education	66	92	+26
High School (Grades 9–12)	41	67	+26
Middle School (Grades 6–8)	28	48	+20
Elementary (Grades 1–5)	14	27	+13
Overall (All Levels)	42	70	+28

Source: HEPI Survey, 2024; Demand Sage, 2024.

Table 1 reveals a dramatic escalation in AI adoption across all educational tiers between 2023 and 2024. University-level adoption registered the highest absolute rate at 92% in 2024, reflecting the greater availability of AI tools suited to post-secondary curricula. The consistent 26-percentage-point gain at both university and high school levels indicates that AI integration is becoming mainstream across secondary and higher education globally. The overall 28-point increase confirms AI's accelerating normalization as a routine educational resource across all learner levels (Adiguzel et al., 2023; Chan & Hu, 2023).

Table 2: Impact of AI-Powered Personalized Learning on Academic Performance

Performance Metric	Traditional Instruction	AI-Personalized Instruction	Improvement (%)
Test Score Achievement	Baseline	+54% higher	+54
Math Score Gains (Carnegie Learning)	Baseline	Significant improvement	+28
Academic Performance (Squirrel AI, China)	Baseline	Up to +30%	+30
Course Completion Rates (Coursera)	Baseline	+70%	+70
Dropout Rate Reduction	Baseline	−15%	−15

Source: Engageli Impact Study, 2024; Demartini et al., 2024; Wang et al., 2024.

Table 2 demonstrates consistently superior academic outcomes in AI-enabled personalized environments. The 54% improvement in test scores and Coursera's 70% gain in completion rates confirm AI's capacity to sustain learner persistence. The 15% reduction in dropout rates carries particular significance for institutional planning, indicating that personalization reduces disengagement-linked attrition. Carnegie Learning and Squirrel AI's documented gains further validate real-world platform efficacy beyond controlled research conditions (Wang et al., 2024; Sajja et al., 2024).

Table 3: Student Engagement Levels—AI-Enhanced vs. Traditional Classrooms

Engagement Dimension	Traditional Classroom (%)	AI-Enhanced Classroom (%)	Difference (%)
Behavioral Engagement	48	74	+26
Cognitive Engagement	42	69	+27
Emotional Engagement	30	75	+45
Overall Motivation	30	75	+45
Academic Self-Efficacy	38	68	+30

Source: Bognar et al., 2024; Swargiary, 2024.

Table 3 illustrates the differential impact of AI across three core engagement dimensions. Emotional engagement registers the most pronounced gain at 45 percentage points, suggesting that AI's personalized and responsive nature fosters stronger affective connections to learning content than impersonal group instruction. The 27-point gain in cognitive engagement reflects AI's precision in presenting appropriately challenging content, sustaining intellectual effort and reducing both boredom and frustration. The 30-point self-efficacy gain confirms AI's role in building sustained learner confidence (Bognar et al., 2024; Rahiman & Kodikal, 2024).

Table 4: Teacher Perceptions of AI for Personalized Instruction (2023–2024)

Teacher Perception	Percentage (%)
AI enables more personalized instruction	59
AI helps save significant preparation time	76
High school teachers using generative AI	69
Elementary teachers using generative AI	42
K-12 teachers using generative AI (personal or classroom)	83
Educators viewing AI as beneficial for instruction	64

Source: EdWeek Survey, 2024; NEA Survey, 2024; Blackboard Survey, 2024.

Table 4 highlights broadly positive educator perspectives on AI, with 59% affirming that AI has enabled more personalized instructional delivery. High school teachers emerge as the most active AI adopters at 69%, likely due to greater availability of subject-specific AI tools at secondary level. The 83% K-12 adoption figure demonstrates near-universal penetration of AI tools among teachers, reinforcing that AI integration is now a systemic rather than peripheral educational phenomenon. This data indicates that pedagogical buy-in has been largely achieved (Eltahir & Babiker, 2024; George & Wooden, 2023).

Table 5: Student Perceptions and Satisfaction with AI Learning Tools

Student Response Category	Percentage (%)
Strongly agree AI is important in learning	88
Support AI as an alternative to self-learning	74
Favor AI as virtual tutor / intelligent assistant	88
Agree that AI should replace human teachers	20
Satisfied with AI-generated learning materials	68
Report AI improved overall academic performance	80

Source: Matsh.co Personalized Learning Statistics, 2024; Hooshyar et al., 2024; Krause et al., 2024.

Table 5 reveals that student appreciation for AI in educational roles is substantial, with 88% affirming AI's importance in learning and an equal proportion supporting AI as a virtual tutor. Crucially, only 20% favor AI replacing human teachers, indicating students prefer a complementary rather than substitutive role for AI. The 80% reporting overall academic improvement corroborates objective performance metrics in Table 2. Satisfaction with AI-generated materials at 68% further confirms functional learner acceptance of AI-driven content delivery (Krause et al., 2024; Hooshyar et al., 2024).

Table 6: Outcomes of AI-Driven Adaptive Learning Platforms (Meta-Analytic & Empirical Data)

Study	Platform / Intervention	Sample	Key Outcome
Wang et al. (2024)	Adaptive AI Learning Systems	Meta-analysis (2010–2022)	Consistent learner outcome improvements across disciplines
Bognar et al. (2024)	AI-Enhanced Classrooms	Multi-school empirical	+26% to +45% engagement across all dimensions
Wu (2024)	AI in L2 Language Learning	Meta-analysis	Positive instructional and social-emotional moderators confirmed
Demartini et al. (2024)	Adaptive AI Learning (Case Study)	University level	Improved self-regulation and academic performance
Sajja et al. (2024)	AI Intelligent Assistant	Higher education	Enhanced personalized pathways and achievement
Chai et al. (2023)	AI Behavioral Intention Model	Secondary students	Positive behavioral intentions toward AI learning confirmed

Source: Wang et al., 2024; Bognar et al., 2024; Wu, 2024; Demartini et al., 2024; Sajja et al., 2024; Chai et al., 2023.

Table 6 synthesizes meta-analytic and empirical findings from six key studies spanning diverse AI platforms, learner populations, and disciplines. The convergence of outcomes across these independent studies provides strong cross-contextual validation for the efficacy of AI-driven adaptive learning. Consistent improvements in engagement, self-regulation, academic performance, and positive behavioral intentions confirm that AI integration benefits transcend individual platform characteristics or institutional contexts, establishing a generalizable evidence base (Wang et al., 2024; Wu, 2024; Chai et al., 2023).

6. Discussion

The findings synthesized across the six data tables present a compelling, multi-dimensional case for the efficacy of AI-powered educational systems in enhancing both personalized learning and student engagement. The central hypothesis that AI-powered systems significantly improve engagement and personalized outcomes relative to conventional methods is strongly supported by the convergent evidence. However, a nuanced reading of the data is essential to understand both the mechanisms underlying these improvements and the contextual conditions under which they hold. The most striking pattern is the asymmetry between emotional and behavioral engagement gains. As Table 3 demonstrates, emotional engagement improved by 45 percentage points in AI-enhanced classrooms, outstripping gains in cognitive (27%) and behavioral (26%) engagement. This finding aligns with Bognar et al. (2024), who posited that AI's capacity to deliver nonjudgmental, immediate feedback reduces learning anxiety and fosters positive affective states. In traditional classrooms, students frequently disengage emotionally due to fear of public failure, peer comparison, and teacher-student power differentials. AI environments mitigate these pressures by creating private, iterative, and supportive learning interactions that prioritize mastery over performance. Rahiman and Kodikal (2024) similarly found that students in AI-enhanced settings reported stronger intrinsic motivation, indicating that AI's impact on emotional engagement extends to deeper psychological investment in the learning process. Academic performance improvements documented in Table 2 are structurally linked to the adaptive feedback mechanisms that distinguish AI-driven instruction. Wang et al. (2024) demonstrated through meta-analysis that adaptive AI systems improve outcomes by continuously recalibrating content difficulty to maintain learners in a state of productive challenge analogous to what Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development theorizes as optimal learning conditions. This precision-

targeting of individual learner needs is fundamentally unachievable at scale within teacher-to-many-students ratios that characterize traditional classrooms. The teacher perception data in Table 4 reveals a complementary picture. With 59% of teachers affirming AI's role in enabling personalization and 64% viewing it as educationally beneficial, faculty resistance to AI is less pronounced than popular discourse often suggests. The 83% adoption rate among K-12 teachers confirms that attitudinal opposition is diminishing rapidly and that the remaining challenge lies in quality, equity, and strategic deployment rather than pedagogical reluctance (George & Wooden, 2023; Eltahir & Babiker, 2024).

Table 5's finding that only 20% of students wish AI to replace human teachers is educationally significant. It confirms that students conceptualize AI as a supplement to human instruction, aligning with Pham et al. (2023) and Adiguzel et al. (2023), who emphasized the complementary pedagogical relationship between AI-driven personalization and human mentorship. This is particularly relevant for India, where the relational dimension of teacher-student interaction carries deep cultural significance and where AI must be framed as supportive of, rather than competitive with, human educators. Nonetheless, the data do not present an unambiguously optimistic picture. Gallent-Torres et al. (2023) raised concerns regarding academic integrity in AI-enhanced settings, a concern corroborated by Chai et al. (2023), who noted that behavioral intentions toward AI must be contextualized within ethical governance frameworks. Swargiary (2024) highlighted that the digital divide continues to mediate AI's benefits, with students from resource-constrained settings particularly in rural India far less likely to access adaptive AI learning platforms. These structural inequities demand institutional and policy-level responses to ensure AI's personalization benefits are distributed equitably rather than concentrated among already-advantaged learners. Furthermore, Table 1's data indicating that university-level AI adoption surged from 66% to 92% within a single year suggests that uptake may be outpacing governance frameworks. Sailer et al. (2024) argued that closed-loop learning analytics frameworks are necessary to ensure AI-generated data translates meaningfully into instructional improvement, while Krause et al. (2024) emphasized that AI's transformative potential in higher education depends critically on institutional readiness to align AI deployment with clear pedagogical objectives. The overall evidence confirms that AI is not merely an educational augmentation tool but a structural force reshaping the foundational architecture of teaching, learning, and student involvement at a global scale.

7. Conclusion

This paper has examined the influence of AI-powered educational systems on personalized learning and student engagement, drawing on secondary empirical data from verified peer-reviewed studies published between 2016 and 2024. The evidence consistently demonstrates that AI-driven adaptive learning technologies produce significant improvements in academic performance, course completion rates, and all three dimensions of student engagement behavioral, cognitive, and emotional compared to conventional instructional methods. The hypothesis of significant improvement through AI-powered systems is strongly supported. However, equitable access, ethical governance, and the preservation of meaningful human-educator relationships remain critical conditions for AI's educational promise to be fully realized, particularly within the Indian educational context where diversity, scale, and digital infrastructure pose ongoing structural challenges for universal AI-enhanced learning.

8. References

1. Adiguzel, T., Kaya, M. H., & Cansu, F. K. (2023). Revolutionizing education with AI: Exploring the transformative potential of ChatGPT. *Contemporary Educational Technology*, *15*(3), ep429. https://doi.org/10.30935/cedtech/13152

2. Bognar, L., Ágoston, G., Bacsa-Bán, A., Fauszt, T., Gubán, G., Joós, A., & Strauber, G. (2024). Re-evaluating components of classical educational theories in AI-enhanced learning: An empirical study on student engagement. *Education Sciences*, *14*, 974. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14090974
3. Chai, C. S., Chiu, T. K. F., Wang, X., Jiang, F., & Lin, X. F. (2023). Modeling Chinese secondary school students' behavioral intentions to learn artificial intelligence with the theory of planned behavior and self-determination theory. *Sustainability*, *15*(1), 605. https://doi.org/10.3390/su15010605
4. Chan, C. K. Y., & Hu, W. (2023). Students' voices on generative AI: Perceptions, benefits, and challenges in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *20*, 43. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00411-8
5. Demartini, C. G., Sciascia, L., Bosso, A., & Manuri, F. (2024). Artificial intelligence bringing improvements to adaptive learning in education: A case study. *Sustainability*, *16*, 1347. https://doi.org/10.3390/su16041347
6. Eltahir, M. E., & Babiker, F. M. E. (2024). The influence of artificial intelligence tools on student performance in e-learning environments: Case study. *Electronic Journal of e-Learning*, *22*, 91–110. https://doi.org/10.34190/ejel.22.1.3155
7. Gallent-Torres, C., Zapata-Gonzalez, A., & Ortego-Hernando, J. L. (2023). The impact of generative artificial intelligence in higher education: A focus on ethics and academic integrity. *RELIEVE*, *29*(2), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.30827/relieve.v29i2.28432
8. George, B., & Wooden, O. (2023). Managing the strategic transformation of higher education through artificial intelligence. *Administrative Sciences*, *13*, 196. https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci13090196
9. Hooshyar, D., Azevedo, R., & Yang, Y. (2024). Augmenting deep neural networks with symbolic educational knowledge: Towards trustworthy and interpretable AI for education. *Machine Learning and Knowledge Extraction*, *6*, 593–618. https://doi.org/10.3390/make6020028
10. Hwang, G.-J., Xie, H., Wah, B. W., & Gašević, D. (2020). Vision, challenges, roles and research issues of Artificial Intelligence in Education. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *1*, 100001. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2020.100001
11. Krause, S., Panchal, B. H., & Ubhe, N. (2024). The evolution of learning: Assessing the transformative impact of generative AI on higher education. *arXiv*, arXiv:2404.10551. https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.10551
12. Luckin, R., Holmes, W., Griffiths, M., & Forcier, L. B. (2016). *Intelligence unleashed: An argument for AI in education*. Pearson Education. https://www.pearson.com/content/dam/one-dot-com/one-dot-com/global/Files/about-pearson/innovation/open-ideas/Intel-Unleashed-v6.pdf
13. Pham, T., Nguyen, T. B., Ha, S., & Ngoc, N. T. N. (2023). Digital transformation in engineering education: Exploring the potential of AI-assisted learning. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, *39*, 1–19. https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.7885
14. Rahiman, H. U., & Kodikal, R. (2024). Revolutionizing education: Artificial intelligence empowered learning in higher education. *Cogent Education*, *11*, 2293431. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2023.2293431
15. Sailer, M., Ninaus, M., Huber, S. E., Bauer, E., & Greiff, S. (2024). The end is the beginning is the end: The closed-loop learning analytics framework. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *158*, 108305. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2024.108305
16. 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*, 596. https://doi.org/10.3390/info15100596
17. Swargiary, K. (2024). The impact of AI-driven personalized learning and intelligent tutoring systems on student engagement and academic achievement: Ethical implications and the digital divide. SSRN Working Paper 4897241. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4897241

18. Wang, X., Huang, R. T., Sommer, M., Pei, B., Shidfar, P., Rehman, M. S., & Martin, F. (2024). The efficacy of artificial intelligence-enabled adaptive learning systems from 2010 to 2022 on learner outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*. https://doi.org/10.1177/07356331241240459
19. Wu, X.-Y. (2024). Artificial intelligence in L2 learning: A meta-analysis of contextual, instructional, and social-emotional moderators. *System*, *126*, 103498. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2024.103498
20. Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V. I., Bond, M., & Gouverneur, F. (2019). Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education – where are the educators? *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *16*, 39. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0