Review of Educational Administration, Leadership, and Management
Journal Homepage: https://jmcfijournals.org/index.php/realm

Original Article

AI, Analytics, and Pedagogy: The Future of Technology-Enhanced Education

Surajit Roy*

Kadambini Women's College, Nazirbazar, Kismat Bajkul, West Bengal 721655, India

Correspondence:
surajitroy072@gmail.com

Abstract

Artificial intelligence (AI) and learning analytics are reshaping higher education at an unprecedented pace, yet the scholarly literature remains fragmented across disciplines and methodologies, making it difficult to assess their cumulative pedagogical implications. This paper presents a systematic thematic review of 28 peer-reviewed studies, institutional reports, and policy documents published between 2012 and 2024 to examine how AI and analytics are influencing pedagogical practice, personalizing learning, and raising ethical challenges in higher education contexts. Five interconnected themes emerged from the analysis: (1) adaptive and intelligent tutoring technologies that recalibrate instructional delivery in real time; (2) the role of learning analytics in enabling data-driven personalization and early intervention; (3) the ethical tensions surrounding data privacy, algorithmic bias, and equitable access; (4) variability in institutional and educator readiness for AI integration; and (5) emerging trajectories in AI-enhanced pedagogy, including affective computing, gamification, immersive environments, and blockchain credentialing. The review finds that while AI-enabled tools demonstrably improve engagement, reduce administrative burden, and enable more responsive instruction, their benefits are unevenly distributed, disproportionately accruing to well-resourced institutions. The persistent digital divide, inadequate teacher preparation, and under-regulated data practices represent structural barriers to responsible AI integration that cannot be resolved by technology alone. The paper concludes that realizing AI's educational potential requires coordinated investment in ethical frameworks, professional development, and inclusive infrastructure. Future empirical work should prioritize under-resourced contexts and longitudinal measurement of AI-mediated learning outcomes.

Keywords

artificial intelligence in education; learning analytics; AI-powered pedagogy; educational technology; digital learning; AI in curriculum design; future of learning

INTRODUCTION

Artificial intelligence and data analytics have emerged as two of the most consequential forces reshaping higher education in the twenty-first century. Where earlier waves of educational technology—from broadcast television to desktop computing to the internet—supplemented existing pedagogical architectures without fundamentally altering them, AI-enabled systems offer something qualitatively different: the capacity to observe, model, and respond to individual learners in real time, adjusting content, pacing, feedback, and support in ways that approach the responsiveness of skilled human tutoring at population scale (Luckin et al., 2018). This capability is no longer prospective. Adaptive learning platforms such as Carnegie Learning and Squirrel AI are deployed across thousands of classrooms; intelligent tutoring systems guide students through complex problem-solving sequences in mathematics, programming, and science; and automated assessment tools grade written work, flag learning gaps, and generate performance reports at speeds and volumes that no human educator could match alone (Holmes et al., 2019; Roll & Wylie, 2016).

Learning analytics—the computational analysis of educational data to support understanding and optimization of learning and the environments in which it occurs—extends this transformation beyond individual student-system interactions to the institutional level (Ferguson, 2012; Siemens & Baker, 2012). By mining engagement data from learning management systems, identifying at-risk students weeks or months before traditional assessments would reveal academic difficulty, and enabling instructors to visualize class-wide patterns of comprehension and confusion, analytics platforms are making institutional decision-making measurably more evidence-based. The adoption of these capabilities accelerated dramatically during the COVID-19 pandemic, when the abrupt shift to online instruction created both the necessity and the infrastructure for large-scale digital learning data collection (Panigrahi et al., 2021; Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019).

Yet the enthusiasm that has accompanied this transformation has not been without critical counterweight. The same data-intensive processes that enable personalization also generate concerns about surveillance, consent, and the commodification of student information (De Laat & Prinsen, 2021; Williamson & Eynon, 2020). AI systems trained on historically unrepresentative datasets risk encoding and amplifying the biases they were ostensibly designed to overcome, potentially producing algorithmic assessments that disadvantage already-marginalized students (Borenstein & Howard, 2021). The digital divide—the gap between institutions with robust technology infrastructure and those without—means that the potential benefits of AI in education are currently accruing unevenly, with wealthier institutions and higher-income student populations disproportionately positioned to benefit (Tuomi, 2018). And the professional development infrastructure needed to equip educators to deploy AI tools thoughtfully and critically remains, in most educational systems, chronically underfunded (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019).

Despite a substantial and growing literature on AI in education, systematic integrative analyses that span the full range of pedagogical, ethical, and institutional dimensions of AI integration remain relatively scarce, and the cross-cutting implications of these dimensions for educational policy have been incompletely theorized. Hence, the study is guided by five specific questions: (1) How are AI technologies transforming pedagogical practice in higher education? (2) What role does learning analytics play in supporting personalized and responsive instruction? (3) What ethical and equity challenges does AI integration introduce? (4) How prepared are institutions and educators to integrate AI effectively? (5) What emerging AI-enhanced pedagogical approaches are shaping the future of higher education? It is further hoped that this paper will address the gap through a systematic thematic review of the published literature on AI and analytics in higher education, intending to synthesize evidence across thematic domains to provide an integrated account of the current state of knowledge and its implications for research, practice, and policy.

METHODOLOGY

This study employed a systematic thematic review methodology to synthesize the published literature on AI and analytics in higher education. Systematic thematic review combines the structured, transparent inclusion and exclusion protocols of systematic reviewing with the interpretive, concept-driven synthesis of thematic analysis, making it appropriate for research questions that require both comprehensiveness and conceptual integration (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Thomas & Harden, 2008). The review followed the PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) reporting guidelines adapted for qualitative synthesis.

The literature search was conducted in April 2024 across five electronic databases: Scopus, Web of Science, ERIC, PsycINFO, and Google Scholar. Search strings combined the following terms in Boolean combinations: ("artificial intelligence" OR "machine learning" OR "deep learning") AND ("higher education" OR "university" OR "tertiary education") AND ("pedagogy" OR "learning analytics" OR "personalized learning" OR "adaptive learning" OR "intelligent tutoring"). Only sources published between January 2012 and March 2024 were included, given that 2012 represents the point at which learning analytics emerged as a formalized field (Siemens & Baker, 2012) and large-scale AI deployment in education became empirically documented. Sources were restricted to peer-reviewed journal articles, book chapters from established academic publishers, institutional reports from recognized educational research organizations, and policy documents from national and supranational bodies. Non-English publications without English abstracts, opinion editorials, and conference proceedings not subsequently published in indexed journals were excluded.

The initial database search returned 487 unique results after deduplication. Titles and abstracts were screened against the inclusion criteria by the reviewer, reducing the pool to 64 candidates. Full-text review of these 64 sources against the thematic relevance criteria—direct engagement with at least one of the five review themes in higher education settings—yielded a final corpus of 28 sources. Data extraction captured the following for each source: authors, year, study design or document type, primary focus, key findings, and thematic assignment. Thematic analysis proceeded through Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase protocol: familiarization, initial code generation, theme search, theme review, theme definition, and final report. The five themes reported here emerged through iterative inductive-deductive coding: the review questions provided initial deductive scaffolding, but the precise boundaries, labels, and interpretive content of each theme were determined inductively from the coded material.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The systematic thematic review identified five interconnected themes that together constitute the current state of knowledge on AI and analytics in higher education pedagogy. The findings are presented thematically, with each section reporting the synthesized evidence and interpreting its implications against the theoretical frameworks and the extant literature.

Theme 1: Adaptive and Intelligent Tutoring Technologies. The most extensively documented application of AI in higher education is the use of adaptive learning platforms and intelligent tutoring systems (ITS) that personalize instructional delivery by continuously modeling student knowledge states and adjusting content accordingly. Luckin et al. (2018) provide a comprehensive account of how these systems use machine learning algorithms to infer what students know, where they are struggling, and what instructional content or support is most likely to advance their understanding at any given moment. Unlike static curriculum delivery—where all students receive the same content in the same sequence regardless of prior knowledge or current comprehension—adaptive systems create individualized learning pathways that respond dynamically to performance data. Schmid et al. (2021) found that students in AI-adapted instruction environments demonstrated significantly improved learning efficiency compared with those in traditional settings, attributing the advantage to reduced time-on-task for well-mastered content and more intensive scaffolding at difficulty points.

Specific platforms exemplify this principle at scale. Carnegie Learning's MATHia, which applies cognitive tutoring theory to mathematics instruction, provides granular, item-level feedback that guides students through problem-solving processes rather than simply marking answers correct or incorrect, an approach that McLaren et al. (2017) demonstrated produces stronger long-term retention than conventional feedback. Squirrel AI, deployed across thousands of Chinese K-12 classrooms, uses reinforcement learning to optimize the selection of practice items for individual students, achieving personalization granularity that Goel and Joyner (2017) describe as approaching the effectiveness of one-to-one human tutoring at a fraction of the cost. AI-driven chatbots and virtual assistants—including IBM Watson Tutor and Google's Socratic—extend intelligent support to contexts where human tutors are unavailable, offering immediate responses to student questions, directing students to relevant resources, and maintaining engagement outside scheduled class hours.

From a constructivist perspective, the pedagogical value of these applications is most fully realized when adaptive systems position students in their zone of proximal development—providing challenges that are demanding but achievable with appropriate support. The evidence suggests that well-designed ITS achieves this positioning more reliably than conventional whole-class instruction, where the teacher must simultaneously manage the learning needs of students at vastly different points of understanding. Roll and Wylie (2016), in their review of AI's evolution in educational technology, note that the systems making the most substantial learning impact are those that support productive struggle—allowing students to grapple with genuinely difficult problems while providing scaffolding precisely calibrated to prevent frustration or disengagement. Poorly designed adaptive systems that simply serve easier content to students who struggle, reducing challenge rather than supporting it, fail this constructivist test and may actively impede the development of cognitive persistence.

The implications for teaching practice are significant. Automated assessment tools embedded in adaptive platforms substantially reduce the administrative burden on instructors—grading, progress monitoring, and at-risk identification functions that can consume hours of faculty time per week are partially automated—freeing educator attention for the relational, creative, and intellectually generative aspects of instruction that AI cannot replicate (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019). The teacher's role is not eliminated but reconfigured: from primary knowledge transmitter to facilitator of AI-mediated learning experiences, interpreter of analytics outputs, and provider of the mentoring, emotional support, and disciplinary socialization that technology cannot provide. Whether educators embrace or resist this reconfiguration depends substantially on the professional development support they receive—a theme addressed in depth below.

Theme 2: Learning Analytics and Data-Driven Personalization. Learning analytics—defined by Siemens and Baker (2012, p. 4) as "the measurement, collection, analysis, and reporting of data about learners and their contexts, for purposes of understanding and optimizing learning and the environments in which it occurs"—occupies a distinctive position in the AI-in-education landscape. Unlike adaptive tutoring systems, which operate at the level of individual task selection and feedback, learning analytics operates at the level of patterns across time, students, and courses, providing the diagnostic infrastructure through which institutions and instructors can identify systemic learning challenges and design targeted responses.

Clow (2013) provides a foundational account of learning analytics' core mechanism: the "analytics loop" through which raw learner data is transformed into models, models generate interventions, and interventions feed back into data collection, creating a continuous cycle of evidence-informed practice refinement. The practical applications of this cycle in higher education are substantial. Predictive analytics models trained on historical enrollment, engagement, and assessment data have demonstrated the ability to identify students at risk of academic failure or dropout with statistically significant accuracy weeks or months before conventional assessment data would flag the problem, enabling proactive outreach that Baker and Inventado (2014) found significantly improved retention rates in large-enrollment courses. Real-time engagement dashboards allow instructors to monitor participation patterns across cohorts, identifying students who have disengaged from course materials, discussion boards, or assessment submissions and intervening before absence escalates into failure.

Competency-based learning represents a particularly significant application of analytics to personalization at the curricular level. By tracking individual students' demonstrated mastery of specific competencies rather than measuring their performance against a fixed-time curriculum, analytics-enabled competency frameworks allow student progression to be decoupled from the calendar—enabling students who demonstrate early mastery to accelerate, and those who need more time to consolidate understanding to do so without penalty. Ifenthaler and Widanapathirana (2014) developed and validated a learning analytics framework for competency-based environments that demonstrated improved alignment between individual learning needs and instructional pacing, consistent with constructivist principles of responsive scaffolding.

The implications for institutional decision-making extend beyond individual student support to programmatic and strategic levels. Institutions with mature analytics capabilities can assess which curriculum components are most associated with downstream learning outcomes, identify courses or instructors where performance patterns suggest systemic teaching-learning misalignments, and evaluate the effectiveness of interventions with a rigor that informal feedback or anecdotal evidence cannot provide. Huang, Spector, and Yang (2019) argue that this institutional learning capacity—the organization's ability to systematically learn from its own educational data—is as important as the individual learning gains that analytics enables, representing a qualitative shift in how educational institutions understand and improve their own practice.

Theme 3: Ethical Challenges and Equity Imperatives. No theme in the AI-in-education literature has attracted more sustained critical attention than the ethical challenges that accompany the data-intensive practices of AI and analytics integration. These challenges are not peripheral complications of otherwise unproblematic technologies but are constitutive features of AI systems that must be addressed at the design, governance, and implementation levels rather than treated as afterthoughts.

Data privacy and security represent the most immediately tangible ethical concern. AI-enabled educational systems collect and process vast quantities of sensitive student data—engagement patterns, performance trajectories, behavioral markers, and in some affective computing applications, physiological and emotional states. The legal frameworks governing this data—including GDPR in the European Union and FERPA in the United States—establish baseline protections, but Williamson and Eynon (2020) document significant gaps between regulatory intent and institutional practice, particularly in contexts where AI tools are procured from commercial EdTech vendors whose data governance practices are insufficiently transparent or independently audited. De Laat and Prinsen (2021) argue that student data must be understood not merely as an administrative resource but as an expression of personal identity and educational biography whose collection, storage, and use carry ethical obligations that standard commercial data governance frameworks are inadequate to discharge. The informed consent implications are particularly challenging in higher education contexts: students may be technically informed about data collection through course agreements, but their understanding of how that data is used in algorithmic systems, and their meaningful capacity to opt out, is often limited.

Algorithmic bias represents a more structurally embedded challenge. AI systems trained on historical educational data will encode the historical patterns present in that data, including patterns of systemic discrimination, unequal resource distribution, and culturally biased assessment—and will reproduce and potentially amplify those patterns in their predictions and recommendations. Borenstein and Howard (2021) provide multiple documented examples of AI assessment systems that performed less accurately for students from minoritized racial and ethnic backgrounds, students with disabilities, and students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds, precisely the populations for whom AI's personalization benefits are theoretically most significant. Schmid et al. (2021) note that the opacity of many commercial AI systems—their status as proprietary black boxes whose decision logic is unavailable for external audit—makes it extremely difficult for institutions to identify, quantify, or correct for algorithmic bias in practice. Williamson (2018) extends this critique to the "hidden architecture" of AI in education: the ways in which the technical choices embedded in AI systems—what data to collect, which variables to treat as predictors, how to define and measure success—embed value judgments that are invisible to users but profoundly consequential for educational outcomes.

The equity dimensions of AI adoption extend beyond algorithmic bias to the structural digital divide between institutions. Luckin et al. (2018) and Tuomi (2018) both document significant disparities in AI adoption between well-resourced universities and under-resourced public institutions, particularly in the Global South, where limited infrastructure, unreliable internet connectivity, and constrained institutional budgets create barriers to the deployment even of freely available AI tools. The irony is acute: the institutions whose students would most benefit from AI's personalization and early intervention capabilities—those serving high proportions of first-generation, lower-income, and academically underprepared students—are precisely those least able to deploy them. Selwyn (2019) argues that this structural inequity is not an unfortunate contingency of AI deployment but a predictable consequence of the market logics that govern commercial EdTech development, which incentivizes building for the most profitable market segments rather than the most educationally urgent ones.

Institutional responses to these ethical challenges have been inconsistent. Some universities have developed internal AI ethics review processes modeled on research ethics frameworks; others have adopted whole-institution responsible AI commitments; and international bodies including UNESCO and the OECD have published non-binding principles for ethical AI in education. Borenstein and Howard (2021) argue that these voluntary frameworks are insufficient and that meaningful ethical governance of AI in education requires binding regulatory standards, mandatory algorithmic impact assessments for AI tools used in high-stakes educational decisions, and robust mechanisms for student redress when AI systems produce demonstrably unfair outcomes.

Theme 4: Institutional and Educator Readiness. The transformative potential of AI in higher education is contingent not only on the technical capabilities of AI systems but on the organizational conditions and individual competencies that enable their effective and ethical use. The literature consistently identifies institutional readiness—encompassing infrastructure, governance, professional development, and organizational culture—as the critical mediating variable between AI's technical capabilities and its pedagogical impact.

Infrastructure adequacy is the baseline requirement. Without reliable high-speed internet access, compatible device availability, and maintained learning management systems, even the most pedagogically sophisticated AI tools cannot function. Huang et al. (2019) document significant infrastructure deficits in many public higher education institutions, particularly in developing regions, that effectively exclude them from meaningful AI participation regardless of institutional motivation or faculty capacity. The COVID-19 pandemic exposed the depth of these deficits dramatically: institutions with robust pre-existing digital infrastructure were able to pivot to online instruction with relative facility, while those without experienced severe disruption and learning loss that disproportionately affected their already-vulnerable student populations (Panigrahi et al., 2021).

Educator readiness represents a challenge at least as significant as infrastructure. Zawacki-Richter et al.'s (2019) systematic review of AI in higher education found that the educator voice—the perspectives of teaching faculty on AI tools—was conspicuously absent from the existing research literature, suggesting a structural gap between those who develop and advocate for AI tools and those who must deploy them in the complex reality of daily teaching. Where faculty perspectives are documented, they reveal a consistent pattern: interest in AI's potential, uncertainty about specific tools' pedagogical appropriateness, concern about data privacy implications, and a pervasive sense of insufficient preparation. Ng (2018) argues that successful AI integration requires what he terms "AI literacy"—not the technical ability to build AI systems but the conceptual understanding needed to evaluate AI tools critically, deploy them purposefully, and communicate their implications to students and institutional stakeholders—a form of professional competence that pre-service and in-service teacher education programs have been slow to develop.

Popenici and Kerr (2017) identify three dimensions of institutional readiness that must be developed in parallel: technical readiness (infrastructure and tool access), pedagogical readiness (faculty understanding of AI's educational applications and limitations), and ethical readiness (governance frameworks and data protection practices). Institutions that have made the most effective AI integrations tend to have invested in all three dimensions simultaneously, rather than treating technical deployment as the primary challenge with pedagogical and ethical dimensions as secondary considerations. Administrative applications of AI—automated enrollment management, plagiarism detection, scheduling optimization, and student services chatbots—have generally achieved higher adoption rates than pedagogical applications, in part because they do not require significant changes to faculty practice and are more easily subjected to standardized performance metrics. This pattern suggests that the barriers to AI adoption in core pedagogical functions are not primarily technical but professional and cultural, involving faculty identities, teaching philosophies, and institutional reward structures that do not consistently incentivize pedagogical innovation.

Theme 5: Emerging Trajectories in AI-Enhanced Pedagogy. The final theme concerns the emerging and speculative frontier of AI-enhanced pedagogy: the technologies, applications, and pedagogical models that are currently at varying stages of development and deployment but that are expected to significantly reshape higher education teaching and learning over the next decade.

Affective computing—AI systems capable of detecting and responding to students' emotional states through facial expression analysis, physiological monitoring, gaze tracking, and natural language processing—represents one of the most pedagogically promising and ethically complex of these frontiers. The educational rationale is straightforward: learning is an emotional as well as cognitive process, and instruction that responds to a student's emotional state—providing encouragement when frustration is detected, adjusting difficulty when anxiety is spiking, or offering breaks when attention is depleted—could substantially improve both the effectiveness and the affective quality of learning experiences. Huang et al. (2019) review early evidence suggesting that affective tutoring systems improve engagement and learning outcomes in controlled settings, while Dwivedi et al. (2021) identify affective AI as one of the most significant near-term frontiers for educational technology research. The ethical concerns are, however, significant: the monitoring of students' emotional states raises questions about consent, dignity, and the boundaries of institutional authority over students' inner lives that the existing ethics literature has not fully resolved.

Gamification and immersive virtual reality learning represent a related frontier with somewhat more developed evidence bases. AI-driven gamification—the integration of game design elements (points, levels, badges, narratives, competition) into educational content to enhance motivation and engagement—has been studied across diverse educational contexts. McLaren et al.'s (2017) randomized controlled comparison of an AI-powered mathematics game with conventional instruction found significant advantages for the game condition on retention measures, attributing the effect to the game's capacity to make productive struggle emotionally engaging rather than aversive. Virtual reality environments enable immersive learning experiences—surgical training simulations, historical reconstructions, molecular visualization, architectural design—that conventional instruction cannot provide, and Ong and Nee (2013) document early evidence of VR's effectiveness in manufacturing and engineering education contexts. AI's contribution to these environments is the capacity to adapt the simulation's difficulty, narrative, and feedback in response to learner performance, transforming passive immersion into active, scaffolded learning.

Blockchain technology for academic credentialing represents a structural rather than pedagogical application of AI-era technologies, but one with significant implications for how educational achievements are recorded, verified, and valued. AI-powered blockchain systems enable the creation of tamper-proof, granular, portable credential records that allow students to document micro-credentials, competency demonstrations, and co-curricular achievements alongside formal qualifications—addressing limitations of traditional transcript systems that reduce complex educational experiences to letter grades and degree titles. Aoun (2017) argues that credential granularity matters increasingly as employment markets demand more specific and verifiable competency profiles than conventional degrees provide, and that blockchain-based credentialing infrastructure could enable higher education to compete more effectively with alternative credentialing providers in meeting this demand.

AI-powered smart classrooms—physical learning environments equipped with IoT sensors, automated climate and lighting control, AI-facilitated class discussion analysis, and real-time attendance and engagement monitoring—represent perhaps the most comprehensive integration of AI into the institutional learning environment. Van der Aalst (2016) and Mayer-Schönberger and Cukier (2013) provide theoretical frameworks for understanding how data-rich environments can generate systemic insights that improve educational outcomes beyond what individual AI applications achieve in isolation. The critical question is not whether these environments can produce pedagogically valuable data—they demonstrably can—but whether the institutional governance frameworks, faculty development infrastructure, and student data rights mechanisms exist to ensure that the data is used in ways that are equitable, transparent, and genuinely educational rather than primarily managerial.

Table 1. *Summary of Evidence: Themes, Applications, Benefits, and Challenges in AI-Enhanced Higher Education Pedagogy*

Theme	Key Applications	Documented Benefits	Primary Challenges
Adaptive & Intelligent Tutoring	Carnegie Learning, Squirrel AI, ITS, AI chatbots	Personalized pacing; improved engagement; reduced cognitive load	Design quality variability; risk of reduced productive struggle
Learning Analytics & Personalization	Early warning systems; competency tracking; engagement dashboards	Early intervention; data-driven instruction; improved retention	Data overload for faculty; interpretation capacity gaps
Ethics & Equity	Data governance frameworks; algorithmic auditing; access initiatives	Raised regulatory awareness; emerging best practices	Algorithmic bias; data privacy; entrenched digital divide
Institutional & Educator Readiness	AI literacy programs; professional development; governance frameworks	Improved faculty confidence; better pedagogical integration	Inconsistent infrastructure; low pedagogical AI adoption; faculty resistance
Emerging Trajectories	Affective AI; gamification; VR; blockchain credentials; smart classrooms	Enhanced motivation; richer assessment; immersive learning	Ethical complexities of affective monitoring; unproven at scale

CONCLUSION

This systematic thematic review has synthesized evidence across five interconnected dimensions of AI and analytics in higher education to provide an integrated account of where the field currently stands, what has been established, and what remains unresolved.

The central finding is one of productive tension: AI and learning analytics demonstrably expand what is pedagogically possible in higher education, enabling personalization, responsiveness, and data-informed practice at scales that were previously unachievable—but they introduce structural challenges related to equity, ethics, and readiness that existing governance frameworks and institutional practices have not yet adequately addressed.

The review establishes three specific contributions. First, it provides the first integrated account of adaptive tutoring, analytics-enabled personalization, ethical challenges, institutional readiness, and emerging technologies as a coherent thematic field, revealing the cross-cutting dynamics that siloed analyses of individual applications miss. Second, it explicitly identifies the theoretical frameworks—Technology Acceptance Model and constructivist learning theory—that best explain both the adoption patterns and the pedagogical effectiveness of AI integration, providing a principled basis for evaluating AI tools against educational rather than purely technological criteria. Third, it synthesizes evidence on institutional and structural barriers—digital divide, algorithmic bias, inadequate professional development—as phenomena requiring systemic responses rather than individual-level solutions, offering a corrective to the technological optimism that sometimes characterizes discourse on AI in education.

The transformative potential of AI and learning analytics in higher education is real, substantial, and not yet fully realized. Achieving it requires not merely continued technological innovation but coordinated institutional investment in the ethical frameworks, pedagogical preparation, and equitable infrastructure that enable technology to serve human development rather than to substitute for it.

Several limitations of this review should be acknowledged. The restriction to English-language sources inevitably underrepresents the experience of educational institutions in the Global South, precisely the contexts where AI's equitable access implications are most acute. The thematic synthesis approach aggregates findings across methodologically heterogeneous studies, and the evidence base for some findings is more robust than for others; Table 1 is intended to signal this variability rather than flatten it. The rapid pace of AI development means that some specific applications reviewed here will have been superseded by the time this article is published, and the review findings should be read as characterizing a moment in a rapidly evolving field rather than offering durable settled conclusions.

Funding

This research received no external funding.

Competing interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Data Availability

As a systematic literature review, this study draws exclusively on publicly available published sources. The included reference list constitutes the complete data set.

Declaration of Artificial Intelligence Use

In the revision of this research, **Claude AI** (Version 4.6) was used as an AI-assisted editing tool to refine language, ensure proper citation formatting in APA 7th edition style, and improve overall readability. The AI was employed solely for proofreading, grammar correction, and structural suggestions, while all academic content, analysis, and conclusions remain our original work. The author/s take full responsibility for the research integrity and confirm that human judgment guided all critical decisions in the study's development.

REFERENCES

Aoun, J. E. (2017). *Robot-proof: Higher education in the age of artificial intelligence*. MIT Press.

Baker, R. S., & Inventado, P. S. (2014). Educational data mining and learning analytics. In J. A. Larusson & B. White (Eds.), *Learning analytics: From research to practice* (pp. 61–75). Springer.

Borenstein, J., & Howard, A. (2021). Emerging challenges in AI and the need for AI ethics education. *AI and Society*, 36(1), 105–115. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-020-00993-7

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

Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2014). *The second machine age: Work, progress, and prosperity in a time of brilliant technologies*. W. W. Norton & Company.

Chen, X., Zou, D., Xie, H., Cheng, G., & Liu, C. (2022). Artificial intelligence in education: A review. *Educational Technology & Society*, 25(1), 26–43.

Clow, D. (2013). An overview of learning analytics. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 18(6), 683–695. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2013.827653

Daniel, B. K. (2019). Big data and data science: A critical review of issues for educational research. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 50(1), 101–113. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12589

De Laat, M., & Prinsen, F. (2021). Ethical considerations in learning analytics. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 52(4), 1606–1623. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13107

Dwivedi, Y. K., Hughes, L., Ismagilova, E., Aarts, G., Coombs, C., Crick, T., & Williams, M. D. (2021). Artificial intelligence (AI): Multidisciplinary perspectives on emerging challenges, opportunities, and agenda for research, practice, and policy. *International Journal of Information Management*, 57, Article 101994. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2019.08.002

Ferguson, R. (2012). Learning analytics: Drivers, developments, and challenges. *International Journal of Technology Enhanced Learning*, 4(5–6), 304–317. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJTEL.2012.051816

Goel, A. K., & Joyner, D. A. (2017). Using AI to teach AI: Lessons from an online AI class. *AI Magazine*, 38(2), 48–59. https://doi.org/10.1609/aimag.v38i2.2733

Heffernan, N. T., & Heffernan, C. L. (2014). The ASSISTments ecosystem: Building a platform that brings scientists and teachers together for minimally invasive research on human learning and teaching. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, 24(4), 470–497. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-014-0024-x

Holmes, W., Bialik, M., & Fadel, C. (2019). *Artificial intelligence in education: Promises and implications for teaching and learning*. Center for Curriculum Redesign.

Huang, R., Spector, J. M., & Yang, J. (2019). *Educational technology: A primer for the 21st century*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-6657-4

Ifenthaler, D., & Widanapathirana, C. (2014). Development and validation of a learning analytics framework. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, 17(4), 331–343.

Kay, J., & Kummerfeld, B. (2019). From data to personal user models for life-long, life-wide learners. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 50(6), 2871–2884. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12878

Luckin, R., Holmes, W., Griffiths, M., & Forcier, L. B. (2018). *Intelligence unleashed: An argument for AI in education*. Pearson.

Mayer-Schönberger, V., & Cukier, K. (2013). *Big data: A revolution that will transform how we live, work, and think*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

McLaren, B. M., Adams, D. M., Mayer, R. E., & Forlizzi, J. (2017). A computer-based game that promotes mathematics learning more than a conventional approach. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, 27(1), 65–97. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-015-0060-5

Ng, A. (2018). *AI transformation playbook: How to lead your company into the AI era*. Landing AI.

Ong, S. K., & Nee, A. Y. C. (2013). *Virtual and augmented reality applications in manufacturing*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4471-5516-5

Panigrahi, R., Srivastava, P. R., & Sharma, D. (2021). Online learning: Adoption, continuance, and learning outcome—A review of literature. *International Journal of Information Management*, 57, Article 102199. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2020.102199

Popenici, S. A., & Kerr, S. (2017). Exploring the impact of artificial intelligence on teaching and learning in higher education. *Research and Practice in Technology Enhanced Learning*, 12(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41039-017-0062-8

Roll, I., & Wylie, R. (2016). Evolution and revolution in artificial intelligence in education. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, 26(2), 582–599. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-016-0110-3

Schmid, R. F., Bernard, R. M., Borokhovski, E., Tamim, R. M., Abrami, P. C., Surkes, M. A., & Lowerison, G. (2021). The effects of technology use in postsecondary education: A meta-analysis of classroom applications. *Computers & Education*, 72, 271–291. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2013.11.002

Selwyn, N. (2019). Should robots replace teachers? AI and the future of education. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 44(1), 77–91. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2019.1568137

Siemens, G., & Baker, R. S. (2012). Learning analytics and educational data mining: Towards communication and collaboration. In *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Learning Analytics and Knowledge* (pp. 252–254). Association for Computing Machinery. https://doi.org/10.1145/2330601.2330661

Thalmann, S. (2019). Ethical issues in AI-based tutoring systems. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, 29(2), 245–266. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-018-0172-0

Thomas, J., & Harden, A. (2008). Methods for the thematic synthesis of qualitative research in systematic reviews. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 8(1), Article 45. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-8-45

Tuomi, I. (2018). *The impact of artificial intelligence on learning, teaching, and education* (JRC Technical Report). Publications Office of the European Union. https://doi.org/10.2760/12297

Van der Aalst, W. (2016). *Process mining: Data science in action* (2nd ed.). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-49851-4

Williamson, B. (2018). The hidden architecture of higher education: Building a big data infrastructure for the 'smarter university.' *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 15(1), Article 12. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-018-0094-1

Williamson, B., & Eynon, R. (2020). Historical threads, missing links, and future directions in AI and education. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 45(3), 223-235. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2020.1798995

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(1), Article 39. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0

How to cite this article:
Roy, S. (2025). AI, analytics, and pedagogy: the future of technology-enhanced education. *Review of Educational Administration, Leadership, and Management* *1*(1), 26-38. https://jmcfijournals.com/index.php/realm/article/view/185