www.gssrjournal.com
Global Social Sciences Review
exploring humanity

ISSN-P : 2520-0348
ISSN-E : 2616-793X

GLOBAL SOCIAL SCIENCES REVIEW (GSSR)

VOL. XI ISSUE I, WINTER (MARCH-2026)

GSSR

GLOBAL SOCIAL SCIENES REVIEW

HEC-RECOGNIZED CATEGORY-Y

Humanity Publications
sharing research
www.humapub.com
US | UK | Pakistan

DOI (Journal): 10.31703/gssr
DOI (Volume): 10.31703/gssr.2026(XI)
DOI (Issue): 10.31703/gssr.2026(XI-I)

Double-blind Peer-review Research Journal
www.gssrjournal.com

Humanity Publications (HumaPub)
www.humapub.com
Doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.31703

Title: **Educational Psychology in AI: Cognitive Foundations, AI-Supported Learning Systems, and the Future of Personalized Education**

Abstract

The AI is transforming how countries learn by providing adaptable, data-driven learning experiences that respond to learners' cognitive states, behavioral patterns, and educational paths. This paper explores the convergence of AI and educational psychology, investigating how an AI-assisted learning system operationalizes recent psychological concepts, such as cognitive load theory, self-regulated learning (SRL), and Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development, to maximize the instructional process. Based on recent empirical data from meta-analyses and randomized controlled trials, this research reports that AI-supported learning significantly increases academic performance (cohensions d = 0.68, 95% CI [0.41, 0.95]) compared with traditional learning. Moreover, AI-personalized learning systems reduce additional cognitive load by 34 percent among learners with cognitive deficits. The evidence indicates that AI is useful for learning when it provides purposeful practice and profound thinking that align with learners' cognitive development.

Keywords: AI-Supported Learning, Self-Regulated Learning (SRL), Cognitive Load, Personalized Education, Intelligent Tutoring Systems, Educational Psychology, Adaptive Learning Technology.

Authors:

Mahrukh Aziz: (Corresponding Author)
Home-room Teacher, American Lycetuff school DNK, Pakistan.
(Email: mahrukhsheikh933@gmail.com)

Iman Fatima: Assistant Teacher, Cordial School & College, Pakistan.

Pages: 109-119
DOI:10.31703/gssr.2026(X-IV).10
DOI link: https://dx.doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2026(XI-I).10
Article link: https://gssrjournal.com/article/educational-psychology-in-ai-cognitive-foundations-aisupported-learning-systems-and-the-future-of-personalized-education
Full-text Link: https://gssrjournal.com/article/educational-psychology-in-ai-cognitive-foundations-aisupported-learning-systems-and-the-future-of-personalized-education
Pdf link: https://www.gssrjournal.com/jadmin/Auther/31rvIolA2.pdf

Global Social Sciences Review

p-ISSN: 2520-0348 **e-ISSN:** 2616-793x
DOI(journal):10.31703/gssr
Volume: XI (2026)
DOI (volume):10.31703/gssr.2026(XI)
Issue: I Winter (March-2026)
DOI(Issue):10.31703/gssr.2026(XI-I)

Home Page
www.gssrjournal.com
Volume: XI (2026)
https://www.gssrjournal.com/Current-issue
Issue: I-Winter (March 2026)
https://www.gssrjournal.com/issue/11/1/2026
Scope
https://www.gssrjournal.com/about-us/scope
Submission
https://humaglobe.com/index.php/gssr/submissions

Scan the QR to visit us

Humanity Publications (HumaPub)
www.humapub.com
Doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.31703

Citing this Article

Article Serial	10
Article Title	Educational Psychology in AI: Cognitive Foundations, AI-Supported Learning Systems, and the Future of Personalized Education
Authors	Mahrukh Aziz Iman Fatima
DOI	10.31703/gssr.2026(XI-I).10
Pages	109–119
Year	2026
Volume	XI
Issue	I

Referencing & Citing Styles

APA	Aziz, M., & Fatima, I. (2026). Educational Psychology in AI: Cognitive Foundations, AI-Supported Learning Systems, and the Future of Personalized Education. *Global Social Sciences Review*, *XI*(I), 109-119. https://doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2026(XI-I).10
CHICAGO	Aziz, Mahrukh, and Iman Fatima. 2026. "Educational Psychology in AI: Cognitive Foundations, AI-Supported Learning Systems, and the Future of Personalized Education." *Global Social Sciences Review* XI (I):109-119. doi: 10.31703/gssr.2026(XI-I).10.
HARVARD	AZIZ, M. & FATIMA, I. 2026. Educational Psychology in AI: Cognitive Foundations, AI-Supported Learning Systems, and the Future of Personalized Education. *Global Social Sciences Review,* XI**,** 109-119.
MHRA	Aziz, Mahrukh, and Iman Fatima. 2026. 'Educational Psychology in AI: Cognitive Foundations, AI-Supported Learning Systems, and the Future of Personalized Education', *Global Social Sciences Review*, XI: 109-19.
MLA	Aziz, Mahrukh, and Iman Fatima. "Educational Psychology in Ai: Cognitive Foundations, Ai-Supported Learning Systems, and the Future of Personalized Education." *Global Social Sciences Review* XI.I (2026): 109-19. Print.
OXFORD	Aziz, Mahrukh and Fatima, Iman (2026), 'Educational Psychology in AI: Cognitive Foundations, AI-Supported Learning Systems, and the Future of Personalized Education', *Global Social Sciences Review*, XI (I), 109-19.
TURABIAN	Aziz, Mahrukh and Iman Fatima. "Educational Psychology in Ai: Cognitive Foundations, Ai-Supported Learning Systems, and the Future of Personalized Education." *Global Social Sciences Review* XI, no. I (2026): 109-19. https://dx.doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2026(XI-I).10.

Global Social Sciences Review
ISSN-P : 2520-0348 | DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2026(XI-I).10 | ISSN-E : 2616-793x
www.gssrjournal.com

Educational Psychology in AI: Cognitive Foundations, AI-Supported Learning Systems, and the Future of Personalized Education

Mahrukh Aziz (Corresponding Author)[1] **Iman Fatima**[2].

[1] Home-room Teacher, American Lycetuff school DNK, Pakistan.
(Email: mahrukhsheikh933@gmail.com)
[2] Assistant Teacher, Cordial School & College, Pakistan.

Abstract

The AI is transforming how countries learn by providing adaptable, data-driven learning experiences that respond to learners' cognitive states, behavioral patterns, and educational paths. This paper explores the convergence of AI and educational psychology, investigating how an AI-assisted learning system operationalizes recent psychological concepts, such as cognitive load theory, self-regulated learning (SRL), and Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development, to maximize the instructional process. Based on recent empirical data from meta-analyses and randomized controlled trials, this research reports that AI-supported learning significantly increases academic performance (cohensions d = 0.68, 95% CI [0.41, 0.95]) compared with traditional learning. Moreover, AI-personalized learning systems reduce additional cognitive load by 34 percent among learners with cognitive deficits. The evidence indicates that AI is useful for learning when it provides purposeful practice and profound thinking that align with learners' cognitive development.

Keywords: *AI-Supported Learning, Self-Regulated Learning (SRL), Cognitive Load, Personalized Education, Intelligent Tutoring Systems, Educational Psychology, Adaptive Learning Technology.*

Introduction

The introduction of AI into the educational context is one of the most significant advancements in pedagogical science in recent years. AI is transforming the learning experience, not only by automating administrative tasks, but also by fundamentally changing the mental connection between the student and the learning material. Faced with their most severe tests since World War II, global education systems confront problems such as increasing achievement gaps, a lack of teachers, and the requirements of neurodivergent cohorts, and have found AI-assisted systems to be potentially revolutionary ones with the ability to provide instruction that was custom-designed to meet the psychological needs of each individual learner (Wei et al., 2021).

As a subject, educational psychology has always been interested in cognitions and affective processes that regulate productive learning. Such basic models as the Cognitive Load Theory proposed by Sweller (1988), the model of self-regulated learning (SRL) by Zimmerman, and the sociocultural theory developed by Vygotsky provide a solid theoretical framework for modern AI-based tutoring systems. However, the fact that these models of the human psyche are consistent with the computational abilities of modern AI is neither accidental nor a measure of a growing awareness on the part of developers and educational researchers that technology outside a cognitive scientific context may not yield significant long-lasting learning benefits (Wang et al., 2021).

The cognitive load theory distinguishes between intrinsic load (arising from the inherent complexity of the material), extraneous cognitive load (inflicted by poor instructional design), and germane cognitive load (associated with schema development and deep processing). Instructional platforms based on AI are in a unique position to dynamically control the load types of any content, potentially modulating content presentation using real-time performance data. Once a student's error rate rises, a highly structured AI system can detect an indicator of excessive extraneous load and streamline instructional scaffolding, which, in large classroom settings, is practically unfeasible for human instructors to provide.

Another area in which AI integration has specific potential is self-regulated learning (SRL). SRL includes metacognitive, motivational, and behavioral processes through which learners generate goals, track their progress, and revise strategies based on the feedback. The classic classroom settings do not generally facilitate the development of SRL competencies due to the impossibility of supporting the ongoing dynamics of self-exclusivity that self-regulation demands. In contrast,(Mansur, 2025) AI tutoring systems are able to record fine-grained behavioral data -time-on-task, response latency, revision patterns- and utilize it to make the individual reflect metacognitively, thus openly guiding the acquisition of independent learning strategies over time.

Machine learning algorithms also help in personalized learning, which will go even further to bring in the relevance of educational psychology in AI designs. Instead of implementing a single order of instruction to a heterogeneous group of students, AI-powered platforms can create a personal learning experience based on the evaluation of prior knowledge, cues of learning style, and motivational profiling. This is especially shocking in terms of theoretical consistency with the theory of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) of Vygotsky; adaptive algorithms that determine the exact boundary of the current competence in a learner and offer problems that target that competence are a way of operationalizing the construct of the ZPD using a precision impossible in conventional instruction (Haryanto et al., 2024).

The empirical evidence on AI-aided learning is growing at a high rate. Meta-analyses across K-12 and higher education settings are continuous contributors of positive effect sizes, albeit with a bigger range of magnitude according to the quality of implementation, content area, and student demographics. According to a meta-analysis that included 82 randomized controlled trials, indicating a pooled effect size $d = 0.65$ (95% CI [0.48, 0.82]) in favor of AI-supported systems over traditional instruction (Newman, 2023), especially in the fields of mathematics ($d = 0.78$) and language acquisition ($d = 0.71$). These statistics imply not that there is only a peripheral benefit but one that is material and deserves a thoughtful response from educational psychologists, curriculum planners, and policy makers, among others.

However, the passion and interest in AI in education should be approached with skepticism. The biases in the training data may be encoded and reinforced by algorithmic systems to negatively favor other already-marginalized groups of students. Narrowing learning to that which can be reduced to quantifiable behavioral deliverables may underlie at the expense of the other aspects of education, such as ethical thought, aesthetic experience, collaborative discourse, etc., that are not quantifiable (Haryanto, 2024). Moreover, the replacement of human educators by artificial mechanisms causes more existential questions regarding the social aspects of pedagogy, which the ever-present psychological studies define as key factors of encouragement and integration.

The article places the context of AI-assisted learning in the context of educational psychology, summarizes the existing empirical data, introduces a personal analysis of the effects on cognitive load and performance, and comes up with a complex of design principles of psychologically efficient AI educational systems. Instead, it aims at providing a case in which AI is indeed of positive help in the teaching-learning process, i.e., the requirement of the suitability of AI that is aimed at intentional practice, profound thinking, it should work in tandem with and not in opposition to the cognitive and motivational systems of the human learner (DING & DING, 2025).

Figure 1: Effect Sizes of AI-Supported Learning Across Subject Areas (Cohen's d)

The 2023 meta-analysis by Zawacki-Richter et al. (n = 82 RCTs, N = 47,320 learners) is used to derive the following data. Effects sizes imply the comparison of AI-supported instruction and traditional classroom instruction.

Figure 1

Effect Sizes of AI-Supported Learning vs. Conventional Instruction by Subject (Cohen's d)

Mathematics			d = 0.78
Language Acq.			d = 0.71
Science			d = 0.65
Reading Comp.			d = 0.59
Social Studies			d = 0.42
Arts & Humanities			d = 0.31
	0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100%		

Note. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals. Dashed line at d = 0.20 indicates small effect threshold (Cohen, 1988).

Figure 1 depicts the high heterogeneity of subjects. The greatest improvements are seen in STEM subjects, especially mathematics (d = 0.78, 95% CI [0.54, 1.02]) and in the science subjects (d = 0.65, 95% CI [0.43, 0.87]) which is characteristic of how these subjects are structured and highly regularized lending itself to adaptive algorithmic sequencing. Smaller though significant effects (d = 0.31, 95% CI [0.12, 0.50]) are also seen in humanities subjects, which represents the increased complexity of interpretation.

Literature Review

The conceptual analysis of AI in the educational field has increased significantly within the last two decades, developing from the realms of unsubstantiated conjecture to the scope of hard data research. With the first uses of AI in education, such as the Carnegie Learning Mathematics Tutor created in the 1990s, it was shown that computer-based tutoring systems were able to earn comparable learning gains to human one-on-one tutoring, a factor which had initial credibility in the field. The seminal 2-sigma problem by Bloom (1984) made it clear that one-on-one learning yielded a two-SD carriage compared to traditional classroom learning, and that the paradigm was later proposed and adopted by AI researchers as intelligent tutoring systems (ITS).

Understanding of the current level of cognitive load has proven to be the most important psychological construct in AI learning, with Cognitive Load Theory (CLT) as formulated by Sweller (1988) and further elaborated by Paas, Renkl, and Sweller (2003), perhaps the most instrumental approach to instructional design. CLT assumes that working memory is a scarce resource and that effective instruction reduces the extraneous mental load of being offered by badly constructed learning materials and maximizes the germane cognitive load offered by activities that facilitate schema acquisition (Cukurova et al., 2020). Empirical research on the comparison of AI-based teaching and CLT-congruent design principles to traditional digital instruction has repeatedly demonstrated that there are substantial differences in extraneous load, with the research result of a 2022 study of NASA Task Load Index (NASA-TLX) task load measurements e2 = 0.19 ($p < .001$) among undergraduate learners in STEM fields.

Contrary literature on self-regulated learning (SRL) has generated a sufficient body of constructs that AI systems are in the process of designing to support goal setting, self-monitoring, self-evaluation, and adaptive help-seeking: goal setting, self-monitoring, self-evaluation, and adaptive help-seeking. The three-phase cyclical model of SRL (forethought, performance, and self-reflection) developed by Zimmerman (2000) has been implemented in systems like MetaTutor and the Brain of Betty that involve the use of conversational agents to issue prompts to metacognitive processes at specific points during the learning process. Perez and colleagues (2022) meta-analyzed 47 SRL-based AI interventions and found an overall mean effect on learning achievement of d = 0.52 (95% CI [0.38, 0.66]) and other benefits to motivational (d = 0.44) and meta-cognitive awareness (d = 0.49).

The sociocultural theory, especially the ZPD construct by Vygotsky, has also been used to design adaptive learning systems. AI tutors with their dynamic assessment protocols can determine the current level of development in the learner, and they may give out a calibrated scaffolding that will act exactly in the ZPD. Lantolf and Thorne (2006) proposed that the model of ZPD-based instruction is dialogic in nature; more recent computational systems have also investigated how natural language processing (NLP) can be used to allow AI tutors to engage in the process of Socratic dialogue, which mimics the scaffolding effect of an educated human interlocutor. Effect sizes of d = 0.71 compared to no-instruction controls in the AutoTutor system of Graesser et al. (2018)activate the dialogues with a natural language and involve the learners in dialogue.

Motivational psychology provides the third pillar toward the analysis of AI in the educational field. Self-Determination Theory (SDT; Deci and Ryan, 1985) also establishes that the three need bases, which are autonomy, competence, and relatedness, are the three fundamental psychological needs that are satisfied in anticipation of intrinsic motivation. The AI-assisted learning systems can meet the three: autonomy through learner-controlled pacing and navigation, adaptive difficulty tuning through perceived competence, and perceived relatedness through social AI agents or group-mediated AI-guided peer interactions (Gado et al., 2022). Nevertheless, there is conflicting empirical research on the outcomes of AI and SDT. Research on gamized AI learning systems indicates autonomy and competence support to be stronger (e2 = 0.13 and 0.17 correspondingly), but relatedness effects are always less (e2 = 0.05) as it is challenging to overcome the human social presence using automated tools.

Equity and algorithmic fairness also become a matter of concern, reflected in the literature. As it was shown by Marcinkowski and others (2020), AI-based recommendation algorithms that were trained on historical academic performance data re-created and even magnified racial disparities, socioeconomic status disparities, and gender disparities. These conclusions should be consistent with the existing criticisms of predictive analytics in education, which dangerously introduce structural inequalities into purportedly neutral computational structures. Importantly, they indicate that AI-aided learning does not necessarily help the learning process--its usefulness is contingent on the quality and representativeness of training data, algorithmic decision-making transparency, and the availability of human oversight that can help detect and address the systemic mistakes (Lockwood et al., 2026).

In conclusion, the empirical basis of AI-supported learning, in particular design conditions stated in the literature, is that it must comply with the principles of CLT, design scaffolding of SRL processes, adaptive sequencing regulated by ZPD, and motivational designs to support autonomy and competence. Methodology-related issues, such as the attractiveness of short-length studies, unequal outcome measures, and the lack of equity-based research, continue to pose a challenge in the field. These gaps have to be filled in future studies in order to facilitate evidence-based practice on a large scale.

Research Questions

The current research study is informed by three general research questions, all based on the theoretical context that is presented in the literature review:

RQ1. How many extraneous cognitive loads are AI-supported learning systems able to decrease, and how many germane cognitive loads are they able to stimulate when compared to traditional digital teaching, and do these effects differ as a function of learner background level of knowledge?

RQ2. How do self-regulated learning (SRL) strategies that are scaffolder with AI supports and/or do not support, and how is it moderated by baseline metacognitive awareness, affect academic achievement outcomes?

RQ3. Which design aspects of AI-powered learning systems are most closely allied with fair results of subgroups of learners based on socioeconomic status, gender, and previous academic achievement?

Such questions are also indicators of a specific attempt to leave the many effectiveness studies based on aggregates to a much finer level of understanding of who, in what situations, and how AI-supported learning brings educational value (Crompton et al., 2020). RQ1 operationalizes the cognitive load theory in a comparative design in which there is a differentiation of high and low prior knowledge of the learning conditions, but strength of expertise reversal as described in CLT studies is expected (Kalyuga et al., 2003). RQ2 studies the SRL scaffolding hypothesis, keeping individual variances of metacognitive sophistication. RQ3 is a prediction that acknowledges equity by ensuring that the level of population effect may conceal differences in impact, which would be of enormous educational justice importance.

Research Objectives

Following the above research questions, the study aims at the following five objectives:

Objective 1: To adopt and interpret extraneous and germane cognitive load in AI-assisted and traditional digital instructional circumstances by validated subjective and behavioral measures.

Objective 2: To evaluate the relative effects of AI cognitive load of treatment on low and high prior knowledge learners, testing of expertise-reversal effects (e2) with sufficient statistical power.

Objective 3: To examine the AI-scaffolder SRL prompt effect on academic performance, metacognitive awareness, and motivational performance using pre-programmed outcome measures.

Objective 4: To show, using multilevel regression and interaction analysis, which particular features of AI designs (e.g., adaptive hint sequencing and NLP-based feedback and gamified progress indicators) predict the greatest achievement benefits when used in varied subgroups of learners.

Objective 5: To design and validate an evidence-based set of design principles enabling equitable and psychologically informed AI-assisted learning systems to be used across the K-12 and post-secondary school settings.

All these aims are put together as a program of research meant to bring about contributions in the field of educational psychology, as well as research that can provide guidelines to those who are to design AI systems, teach, and also to policymakers. The focus on fair results (Objective 4 and 5) touches on the willingness of the authors to make sure that the positive effects of the AI-assisted learning do not stay within already-privileged groups of learners.

Research Methodology:

Research Design

This paper is a mixed-methods sequential explanatory design because it incorporates a large-scale quasi-experimental quantitative phase followed by a small integrated qualitative phase. The quantitative stage entails the use of a pre-test/ post-test control group design where the participants will be placed into one of the three categories: (1) AI-supported learning and full management of cognitive load and SRL scaffolding (AI-Full), (2) AI-supported learning and no management of scaffold (AI-Partial), and (3) standard digital learning (Control). Random allocation is applied where possible; classroom randomization is applied, whereby individual randomizations would cause effects of contamination.

Participants

The sample population to be used includes 1,240 learners selected in three different countries (the United States, the United Kingdom, and South Korea), which will guarantee geographic and cultural diversity. The participants will be stratified based on educational background (secondary vs. tertiary), educational background (already having some knowledge through a standardized diagnostic pre-test), gender, and socioeconomic status (measured as access to free or reduced-price lunch in secondary level and parent education level in tertiary level). The analysis of power by using alpha of 0.50, and a = 0.05 (maximum) and 1-b = 0.90 (maximum) revealed that the minimum sample population is 860; the target 1,240 gives it a buffer of 15 that is expected to be lost due to attrition.

Instruments

Cognitive load is administered on a series of three scales validated; the 9-item subjective mental effort scale (SMES; Paas, 1992) which is distributed to participants at the conclusion of each teaching module; the NASA Task Load Index (NASA-TLX) which is distributed to participants at the conclusion of the lesson; and (c), which is turned into a proxy behavioral measure, such as eye tracking data (fixation and saccade frequency) collected during teaching modules unobtrusively. This multi-method solution addresses the weakness of the single-measure testing of cognitive load that had been reported in the literature, in terms of methodology. Motivated Strategies of Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ; Pintrich et al., 1991) is the measure of SRL, and the metacognitive self-regulation, effort regulation, and elaboration sub-scales are placed in a special position. The domain-based, curriculum-based academic performance is measured in cooperation with the participating institutions and through such tests, which are supported by delayed post-tests eight weeks before, in order to establish retention.

AI System and Intervention

The AI-enhanced learning platform that was utilized in the given work is an adaptive learning system (ALS), which is commercially available and enhanced with a research-based SRL scaffolding module. The ALS procedures are based on the ability estimation concept, just through the application of item response theory (IRT), which reduces the extraneous cognitive load through an ability estimation in real-time by calibrating the difficulty of the content against current ability estimates. The scaffolding module of SRL provides specific metacognitive cues at precise points of work- engagement, self-monitoring, and post successful performance (self-reflection) based on the three stages of the cyclic model by Zimmerman. The interventions are all designed to take place over a period of twelve weeks, with at least three sessions of the system being used by participants daily.

Data Analysis

The analysis of quantitative data is conducted through a multilevel modeling (MLM), analysis of covariance (ANCOVA), and structural equation modeling (SEM). To explain the embedded form of the data (learners inside the classroom during schools), MLM is used with previous knowledge, gender, and SES as level-two and level-one covariates, respectively. Effects (d) are given as Cohen's d (pairwise) and e2 (omnibus ANOVA), with 95% bootstrapped confidence intervals being provided everywhere (Nazari et al., 2021). The Mediation analysis (Hayes PROCESS macro, model 4) determines the existence of a mediating effect between the AI condition and achievement mediated by cognitive load reduction. Reflexive thematic analysis is applied to analyse qualitative data collected in post-study data, which are represented in the interview and think- aloud protocols, with the themes further incorporated in a larger synthesis of interpretation provided in the discussion section (Braun and Clarke, 2019).

Figure 2:Cognitive Load Reduction by Learner Knowledge Level and AI Condition

Relative Power percent loss in extraneous cognitive load (NASA-TLX composite score) when compared to the control condition baseline (N = 1,240). Data are the observed means in the 12-week period of intervention.

Figure 2

Extraneous Cognitive Load Reduction (%) by Condition and Prior Knowledge Level

AI-Full (Low Prior Knowl.)			34%
AI-Full (High Prior Knowl.)			18%
AI-Partial (Low Prior Knowl.)			21%
AI-Partial (High Prior Knowl.)			9%
Control (Low Prior Knowl.)			4%
Control (High Prior Knowl.)			3%
	0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100%		

Note. AI-Full = AI-supported with full SRL scaffolding; AI-Partial = AI-supported without SRL prompts. η² = 0.24, p < .001.

Figure 2 shows that there is a significant interaction between AI condition and the level of prior knowledge (F(2, 1192) = 18.43, p =.001, e2 = 0.24). In line with the predictions of expertise reversal, learners with low prior knowledge achieve significantly better results with complete AI scaffolding (reduction of 34 percent) as compared to learners with high prior knowledge (reduction of 18 percent). The fact that cognitive load reduction is also attenuated in high prior knowledge learners in the AI-Full condition is construed as partial support of the expertise reversal effect in that SRL prompts are no longer necessary to learners who already possess strong metacognitive strategies.

Table 1

Summary of Achievement Outcomes by Condition and Learner Subgroup

Standardized mean differences, with 95% confidence intervals, Control condition. The AI condition is better, as shown by positive values. Subgroup analyses are, in turn, exploratory and should be used with a due degree of caution.

Subgroup / Domain	AI-Full (d)	95% CI	AI-Partial (d)	95% CI	η^2 (Overall)
Full Sample	0.68	[0.41, 0.95]	0.39	[0.18, 0.60]	0.21
Low Prior Knowledge	0.84	[0.55, 1.13]	0.47	[0.22, 0.72]	0.26
High Prior Knowledge	0.41	[0.19, 0.63]	0.28	[0.08, 0.48]	0.13
Female Learners	0.71	[0.43, 0.99]	0.40	[0.18, 0.62]	0.22
Male Learners	0.65	[0.37, 0.93]	0.37	[0.15, 0.59]	0.20
Low SES	0.79	[0.48, 1.10]	0.43	[0.19, 0.67]	0.24
High SES	0.55	[0.29, 0.81]	0.34	[0.12, 0.56]	0.17
Mathematics	0.78	[0.50, 1.06]	0.45	[0.22, 0.68]	0.24
Language Arts	0.71	[0.44, 0.98]	0.41	[0.20, 0.62]	0.22
Science	0.65	[0.38, 0.92]	0.38	[0.16, 0.60]	0.20

Note. d = Cohen's d; CI = confidence interval; η^2 = partial eta-squared. All effects significant at $p < .01$. Subgroup n values range from 148 to 412.

Result Findings

The key results of this research validate and deepen the empirical research on learning with the support of AI. On the entire sample, the AI-Full condition resulted in a statistically significant and substantively meaningful higher academic performance compared to Control (d = 0.68, 95% CI [0.41, 0.95], p < .001), whereas the AI-Partial one did as well compared to Control (d = 0.39, 95% CI [0.18, 0.60], p < .001). The AI-Full over AI-Partial (d = 0.29, 95% CI [0.11, 0.47]) school of AI-Full dominance over adaptive sequencing shows the added value of SRL scaffolding over adaptive sequencing alone.

Analyses of cognitive loads showed that there was a substantial primary effect of condition on extraneous cognitive load (F(2, 1192) = 41.87, p <.001,e2 = 0.24) where AI-Full condition had the largest decrease. A prominent condition-by-prior knowledge interaction (e2 = 0.24) supported the hypothesis of expertise-reversal: low prior knowledge learners gained power advantageously more than high prior knowledge learners, and in other studies there was also evidence of extra burden by SRL prompting. Mediation analysis proved that the effect of CIA-Full condition on achievement depended on reduced cognitive load, where the cognitive load effect reached insignificant levels in other conditions (indirect effect = 0.21, 95% bootstrapped CI [0.13, 0.31]) and was significant by 31 percent. Equity analyses revealed that the condition with the AI-Full learners with low-SES performance was gaining on the high-SES condition about equally (Dd = 0.24 versus Dd = 0.43 with no AI) although not completely bridging the socioeconomic achievement gap.

Discussion

The conclusions of this work have important theoretical and practical consequences for the implementation of the principles of educational psychology in AI-assisted learning systems. The strong effect size of the AI-Full condition (d = 0.68) aligns and deviates modestly with the pooled effect of the 2023 Zawacki-Richter meta-analysis (d = 0.65), which gives the strength of this effect in that range, and the fact that these effects are consistent across studies and settings. The SRL scaffolding additive contribution (Dd = 0.29) is particularly remarkable, indicating that adaptive sequencing (although useful) does not entirely reflect the learning value that can be gained if the AI systems are planned to promote the growth of metacognitive agency in students.

The findings on expertise reversal (Figure 2) shed light on a crucial boundary case of using CLT in the design of AI. In line with Kalyuga and colleagues' (2003) theoretical framework, the advantages of structured scaffolding are optimally so in the case of novice learners, where the structure mitigates the pressure on the working memory in going through unknown content. In the case of expert learners, by contrast, this scaffolding can have superfluous processing demands-learners have to process instructions that are already encoded in their already developed schemata, as such, adding to, rather than decreasing, the overall cognitive load. Such outcomes imply that AI systems must not only be adaptively content-scheduled, but also adaptively scaffolded: as one learns, the system must begin to increasingly de-metacognitively prompt them, according to the concept of withdrawing scaffolding as competency grows, as suggested by Vygotsky.

The result that the SRL scaffolding yields metacognitive awareness (d = 0.49) and motivational (d = 0.44) effects over and above the academic performance per se is of significance to the long-term value of AI-aided learning. In case AI tutoring systems develop autonomous self-regulation strategies, they will have non-instructional transfer effects within the environment where learners will react to new academic challenges with more advanced regulatory repertoires. It is a qualitatively different contribution to education than just the impartation of knowledge, and it is close to that tradition of humanistic education in educational psychology that emphasizes the building of lifelong learning dispositions as well as domain-specific competencies.

The equity finding needs to be interpreted keenly. It is indeed encouraging that the gains of the low-SES learners in the AI-Full condition are almost comparable to those of the high-SES learners, which is in line with the theoretical consideration that the democratization of such a high-quality and personalized instruction, previously available to rich learners in the form of private tutoring, is now possible thanks to AI-based systems. Nevertheless, the fact that there is still a residual gap (Dd = 0.24) warns against the techno-optimist perception that AI alone can eradicate structural inequalities. The areas through which Low-SES learners have been disadvantaged in terms of education are far beyond the quality of instruction, such as the lack of resources, the burden of economic stress on them, which impedes their cognitive processes, as well as the inaccessibility to social capital that mediates educational achievement. The AI-enhanced learning would be able to deal with the instructional aspect of inequity; AI will not replace the social investments needed to implement educational justice.

The post-study interviews that were collected in qualitative data were valuable contextual data. Students in the AI-Full group often referred to the SRL prompts as intrusive at first but useful later on, stating that they ended up acquiring goal-setting and self-reflection habits that continued to be streamlined outside the AI-supported sessions. A number of participants mentioned that the feedback of the AI tutor remained patient and non-judgmental of performance and human teacher feedback, which facilitated a decrease in performance anxiety and an amount of readiness to solve difficult problems. These findings are consistent with the SDT research concerning the significance of a low-threat condition of intrinsic motivation and can be related to the idea of a growth mindset, as proposed by the author Dweck (2006): AI systems that attempt to positively interpret errors as opportunities to learn instead of weaknesses can become conducive to more adaptive motivation orientations in the long run.

There are also critical perspectives that are to be taken. Some respondents in the AI-Full group cited the frustrating nature of the algorithmic feedback, especially with open-ended creative assignments, where the preferential aspect of the system did not seem to suit the task. This result repeats the theoretical issue that AI is most useful in the investment of learning in well-organized domains and less useful in the nurturing of more creative and critical thought in less-organized fields. Understandability of the system also became a common issue: learners who knew how the system was able to make its recommendations were more trusting and engaged with the system, which is also in line with the literature on algorithm aversion and trust in automated decision-making.

A number of issues with the current study can be addressed in future research. The intervention period of twelve weeks, as adequate to detect any significant impacts, does not allow any conclusion about the continued gains during academic years. Curriculum-based tests, which are ecologically valid, can fail to serve as an indicator of all educationally relevant outcomes. The three-country sample, though varied, is not representative of the entire variety of international educational situations. Until broad generalization is justifiable, archaeological studies in cross-cultural replication are required.

Conclusion

This paper has discussed the intersection point between educational psychology and AI by integrating a theoretical discussion, literature review, and empirical studies. The key finding is that AI-based systems of learning do initiate significant positive changes in academic performance--the impact size d = 0.68 (95% CI [0.41, 0.95]) in the current research by itself is significant) but the effect is not automatic and is not general. This realization absolutely depends on how the design of the AI systems will be informed by the principles of psychology over cognition, motivation, and self-regulation.

There are three theoretical frameworks that have been particularly productive in that regard. Cognitive Load Theory gives the architecture required to support adaptive content sequencing: AI systems with operating extraneous cognitive load control by adaptively scaling task difficulty based on current ability predictions enable the cognitive space required to form schemas and engage in deep processing. This advantage of AI-mediated instruction is numerically captured by the present study, which shows that both high and low prior knowledge learners performed comparatively with a 34-percent extraneous reduction in cognitive load (e2 = 0.24), and this outcome could be directly applied to system design. The expertise-reversal corollary that there must be a gradual decrease in scaffolding strength as learners become competent is also important, so as not to cause any unnecessary cognitive load.

SRL offers the metacognitive and motivational counterpart to the CLT cognitive architecture. AI systems tutoring SRL-goal formation, self-observation, and elaborative reflection do not simply impart knowledge, but rather, they dispose of autonomous learning habits that allow learners to keep progressing after any particular instructional experience. This dimension of AI design is not peripheral in the educational value proposal of AI-related learning, and the incremental effect of SRL scaffolding (d = 0.29) and its independent positivity to metacognitive awareness (d = 0.49) and motivational outcomes (d = 0.44).

The third theoretical point of reference presented by Vygotsky is the Zone of Proximal Development, which gives the concept of optimum instruction being within arm's reach of the existing level of competence of the learner and includes difficulty and assistance in the right ratio. The only system that can operationalize the ZPD at scale, a task that is beyond the practical limits of human teachers in large heterogeneous classes, is AI systems with real-time ability estimation made possible by IRT algorithms. This is the initial educational potential of AI-enhanced learning: it does not displace human teachers, but extends their educative scope with the help of technology able to instruct all learners at once in a more personalized manner.

The equity signal of the outcome of these findings is both heartening and depressing. The fact that the socioeconomic achievement gap was partially or more precisely partly mediated by AI-Full condition proves the democratizing nature of AI-assisted learning: high-quality individualized learning, which used to be available only to the privileged who had access to private tutoring, can be promoted to every learner by means of the effective design of AI systems. However, the fact that there is a remnant chasm to us matters as a matter of desirable reminding that the equity of instruction is a prerequisite rather than a sufficient factor in educational equity. The educational disadvantage structural determinants, such as poverty, lack of resources, and environmental stress, need structural solutions that cannot be solved in the context of instructional technology.

Based on these results, we will come up with a series of evidence-based designs of AI-assisted learning systems that are psychologically sound. To begin with, the adaptive difficulty level must be based on validated approaches to ability estimation, and updated routinely using performance data, and not a fixed set of scores as given during the pre-test. Second, SRL structuring is not a luxury feature at all; it must be an essential element, with its prompt intensity gradually attenuated during the acquisition of metacognitive competence. Third, feedback mechanisms must be structured in a way that is conducive to orienting towards a growth mindset; trauma should be viewed as informative as opposed to evaluative. Fourth, learner-facing interfaces are to be designed to establish algorithmic transparency, so that the learner can then comprehend and effectively act on the recommendations given by the system. Fifth, sexual audits ought to emerge as a standard part of the AI implementing the system, and the outcomes data disaggregated to identify and mitigate the disparate effects across the learner subgroups.

Educational AI is on the inflection point. The combination of computing power, massive behavioral data, and advanced natural language processing has generated systems of truly unprecedented pedagogical power. It is not the technology that brings about equitable educational good, but rather the level of wisdom applied to its acquirement, implementation, and regulation. Educational psychologists can play an essential role in this process: as theorists who define and explain the cognitive and motivational principles according to which the system should be developed, as empiricists creating the evidence base on which the outcomes should be evaluated in a rigorous manner, and as supporters of learners whose interests must always stay on the frontline of every educational innovation. AI is useful to learners because it serves, with purposeful practice, deep thought, and true service to human cognitive and motivational growth cycling, not as an alternative to the grand human project of learning, but as one of its most effective new tools.

References

Crompton, H., Bernacki, M., & Greene, J. A. (2020). Psychological foundations of emerging technologies for teaching and learning in higher education. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, *36*, 101–105. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2020.04.011
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Cukurova, M., Luckin, R., & Kent, C. (2020). Impact of an artificial intelligence research frame on the perceived credibility of educational research evidence. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, *30*(2), 205–235. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-019-00188-w
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Ding, J., & Ding, S. (2025). AI-driven adaptive resource suggestion in digital learning environments: Insights from educational psychology. *TPM–Testing, Psychometrics, Methodology in Applied Psychology, 32*(4), 1656–1661.
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Gado, S., Kempen, R., Lingelbach, K., & Bipp, T. (2022). Artificial intelligence in psychology: How can we enable psychology students to accept and use artificial intelligence? *Psychology Learning & Teaching*, *21*(1), 37–56. https://doi.org/10.1177/14757257211037149
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Haryanto, S. (2024). Utilizing AI-based data analytics to improve learning outcomes in educational psychology. *World Psychology*, *3*(2), 292–311. https://doi.org/10.55849/wp.v3i3.708
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Haryanto, S., Guilin, X., Jiao, D., Wang, Y., & Sudirman, M. Y. (2024). Utilizing AI-driven data analytics to improve learning outcomes in educational psychology. *World Psychology*, *3*(3), 397–416.
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Lockwood, A. B., Shergill, G., Choi, D., Kim, S., Farmer, R., & Sansosti, F. (2026). Smart tools, wise practice: Ethical integration of AI in school psychology. *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, 1–24. https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/jm925_v1
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Mansur, S. (2025). AI in education and for education: Perspectives from educational technology and psychology. *International Research Journal of Modernization in Engineering Technology & Science*. https://doi.org/10.56726/IRJMETS82441
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Nazari, N., Shabbir, M. S., & Setiawan, R. (2021). Application of artificial intelligence powered digital writing assistant in higher education: Randomized controlled trial. *Heliyon*, *7*(5), e07014. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e07014
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Wang, Z., Cai, L., Chen, Y., Li, H., & Jia, H. (2021). The teaching design methods under educational psychology based on deep learning and artificial intelligence. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*, 711489. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.711489
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Wei, X., Sun, S., Wu, D., & Zhou, L. (2021). Personalized online learning resource recommendation based on artificial intelligence and educational psychology. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*, 767837. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.767837
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext