Int. J. Sci. R. Tech., 2026 3(11)
A Multidisciplinary peer-reviewed Journal
www.ijsrtjournal.com [ISSN: 2394-7063]

Original Article

The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Personalized Learning and Student Learning Outcomes: A Critical Review

Er. Sukhwinder Kaur*

Faculty of Computing, Guru Kashi University, Talwandi Sabo, Punjab, India.

ABSTRACT

Artificial intelligence (AI) is increasingly being used to personalize learning through adaptive instructional systems, intelligent tutoring, automated feedback, learning analytics, and generative AI. These technologies offer opportunities to accommodate differences in students' prior knowledge, learning pace, and educational needs. However, technological personalization does not necessarily lead to improved learning outcomes. This critical review examines the relationship between AI-enabled personalized learning and academic achievement, knowledge retention, engagement, motivation, self-regulation, and higher-order thinking. Drawing on research on intelligent tutoring systems, adaptive learning, AI in education, and recent systematic reviews and meta-analyses, the article evaluates the potential benefits and limitations of AI-supported instruction. Existing evidence indicates that AI can improve selected learning outcomes, although effects vary according to instructional design, educational context, intervention duration, and assessment methods [1]–[7]. The review also identifies concerns involving algorithmic bias, privacy, unreliable AI-generated content, learner dependency, and unequal access. An evidence-to-design framework is proposed to connect learner information, AI adaptation mechanisms, instructional actions, and measurable outcomes. The review distinguishes direct educational evidence from transferable AI methods developed in other domains and provides an evaluation matrix for future studies. The article argues that AI should complement effective pedagogy and teacher expertise rather than replace them. Future research should prioritize longitudinal evaluation, transparent reporting, equitable implementation, and independent assessments of retention and knowledge transfer.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Personalized Learning, Adaptive Learning, Generative AI, Intelligent Tutoring Systems, Learning Analytics, Student Learning Outcomes

INTRODUCTION

Artificial intelligence has become an important area of educational technology because of its potential to support individualized instruction and improve the management of learning activities. In traditional classrooms, teachers must address differences in students' prior knowledge, abilities, interests, and learning speeds. Providing individualized support to every student can be challenging, particularly in large classrooms and online learning environments.

AI-supported educational systems can analyze learner performance, recommend learning materials, generate explanations, provide feedback, and identify areas requiring additional support. These capabilities have encouraged research into personalized learning environments that adapt instructional activities according to students' needs [1], [2], [13].

Personalized learning itself is not a new educational concept. Teachers have long adapted instruction according to student progress. The contribution of AI is its ability to support or automate some instructional decisions through computational models and learner data. Adaptive hypermedia research established important foundations for tailoring digital information to individual users [23], while research on intelligent tutoring systems examined the potential of computer-based instructional support to improve learning [14]–[17].

Relevant conflicts of interest/financial disclosures: The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Nevertheless, a system's ability to adapt content does not automatically demonstrate educational effectiveness. A recommendation system may select appropriate material without improving long-term understanding. Similarly, increased engagement with a learning platform does not necessarily indicate higher academic achievement. Researchers must therefore distinguish technical performance from educational outcomes.

Recent reviews have examined AI-based personalized learning and its applications across educational contexts [1], [2], [9]–[13]. Meta-analyses have also investigated the effects of AI and generative AI on student achievement and other learning outcomes [3], [3], [6]–[8]. Although these studies provide encouraging evidence, differences in study designs and intervention characteristics make broad conclusions difficult.

Feedback research offers an additional perspective. Hattie and Timperley emphasized that feedback can have a substantial influence on learning, but its effectiveness depends on the information it provides and how it supports progress toward learning goals [18]. Shute similarly highlighted the importance of formative feedback that is specific, useful, and appropriate to the task [19]. AI can help deliver feedback at scale, but it must preserve these pedagogical qualities.

Objectives of the Review

This article aims to:

1. Examine the principal AI technologies used for personalized learning.
2. Critically analyze evidence concerning student learning outcomes.
3. Identify methodological and pedagogical factors affecting reported benefits.
4. Discuss ethical, technical, and practical challenges.
5. Propose a framework for evaluating effective and responsible AI-supported learning.

REVIEW SCOPE AND APPROACH

This article adopts a critical narrative-review approach. It synthesizes selected peer-reviewed research, systematic reviews, meta-analyses, and foundational publications relevant to AI-enabled personalized learning. The literature includes research on adaptive educational systems, intelligent tutoring, generative AI, feedback, learning analytics, and educational ethics [1]–[23].

The review is structured around three themes: the mechanisms through which AI personalizes learning, the outcomes used to evaluate educational effectiveness, and the conditions that influence the interpretation of reported benefits.

This manuscript is not presented as a systematic review or a new meta-analysis. It does not claim an exhaustive database search, new screening process, or original quantitative synthesis. The PRISMA 2020 statement provides reporting guidance for systematic reviews and should be followed if this work is subsequently developed into a systematic review [20].

The review uses evidence from different types of publications, which should not be treated as interchangeable. For example, a review describing available AI technologies answers a different question from a meta-analysis estimating average effects on academic achievement. Foundational studies of intelligent tutoring and feedback provide theoretical and historical context, whereas recent generative-AI studies address newer forms of educational support [3], [6], [15]–[19].

Evidence Selection and Interpretation

The discussion prioritizes research that directly evaluates AI interventions in educational settings for claims about student achievement, retention, and engagement. Systematic reviews and meta-analyses are used to characterize the broader evidence, whereas studies from other application domains are cited solely to illustrate potential methods or governance considerations. Because the sources were selected narratively rather than through a documented exhaustive search, publication bias and selection bias cannot be ruled out. No pooled effect size or risk-of-bias rating is calculated in this article.

Distinguishing Educational Outcomes from Technical Indicators

This review distinguishes three levels of evaluation: (i) technical validity, including predictive accuracy, recommendation relevance, and reliability; (ii) instructional processes, including feedback quality, learner participation, and teacher workload; and (iii) independently assessed student learning, including achievement, delayed retention, and knowledge

transfer. Improvement at one level cannot be presumed to establish improvement at another. Accordingly, studies reporting only accuracy, satisfaction, or usage are not treated as evidence of causal learning gains.

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE APPROACHES TO PERSONALIZED LEARNING

Adaptive Learning Systems

Adaptive learning systems adjust instructional content, question difficulty, or learning sequences according to student performance and other available information. A system may provide additional practice when a learner demonstrates difficulty or introduce more advanced material after sufficient mastery.

Research on adaptive hypermedia established early principles for adjusting digital learning environments to users' needs [23]. More recent reviews examine machine learning, predictive modeling, and other AI methods for adaptive educational experiences [1], [10], [23].

However, the effectiveness of an adaptive system depends on the accuracy of its learner model and the quality of its instructional decisions. Incorrect predictions can result in unsuitable recommendations or unnecessary repetition. Evaluation should therefore examine both model performance and actual learning outcomes.

Intelligent Tutoring Systems

Intelligent tutoring systems provide individualized explanations, hints, feedback, and practice opportunities. Meta-analytic research has examined their effects on student learning, providing important evidence for computer-based tutoring as an educational intervention [15], [16].

VanLehn compared human tutoring, intelligent tutoring systems, and other tutoring approaches, demonstrating the importance of distinguishing among forms of instructional support [17]. Roll and Wylie further discussed the evolution of AI in education and the changing relationship between educational theory and intelligent technologies [14].

Effective tutoring should encourage students to reason independently. Systems that provide graduated hints, explain errors, and allow students to retry tasks may support deeper understanding. Conversely, systems that immediately provide complete answers may reduce opportunities for productive problem-solving.

Generative Artificial Intelligence

Generative AI can produce explanations, summaries, examples, practice questions, and conversational responses. Large language models may allow students to request clarification and explore alternative explanations at their own pace [10].

Recent systematic reviews and meta-analyses have examined the educational effects of generative AI and ChatGPT [3], [4], [7]–[9]. These studies indicate that generative AI may support selected learning outcomes, but its effectiveness depends on the educational task, the way the tool is used, and the design of the intervention.

A central limitation is that generative AI may produce inaccurate or misleading information. Learners may not recognize these errors, especially when they lack sufficient prior knowledge. UNESCO has therefore emphasized the need for human-centred and responsible approaches to generative AI in education and research [21].

The use of conversational AI in healthcare has also raised concerns about unreliable advice, confidentiality, and professional accountability [25]. These concerns provide a useful analogy for educational chatbots, although healthcare publications do not establish educational effectiveness. Educational applications should encourage verification, critical questioning, and appropriate teacher involvement. AI-generated explanations should be treated as instructional resources requiring evaluation, rather than automatically reliable answers.

Automated Feedback and Assessment

AI can assist with formative assessment by identifying errors, generating feedback, and recommending additional practice. These functions can help students receive support without waiting for every response to be reviewed manually.

The educational value of automated feedback can be understood through established feedback research. Hattie and Timperley examined how feedback influences learning and performance, while Shute discussed principles of effective formative feedback [18], [19].

AI-generated feedback should be timely, relevant, and actionable. It should also be evaluated for accuracy and fairness. In open-ended assignments, automated systems may focus on surface characteristics rather than the depth of a student's reasoning. Consequently, AI-assisted assessment should complement teacher judgment where nuanced evaluation is required.

Learning Analytics and Predictive Models

Learning analytics uses assessment results, student interactions, and other educational information to identify patterns and support instructional decisions. AI-based student advising and research-support services provide a broader higher-education context, but their administrative benefits should be distinguished from measurable gains attributable to personalized instruction [24]. AI models can potentially identify learning difficulties and recommend suitable interventions [11]–[13].

However, prediction alone does not improve learning. Identifying students who may be struggling is useful only when appropriate support follows. Predictive systems must therefore be evaluated according to their accuracy, fairness, and influence on educational decisions.

Academic Achievement

Academic achievement is commonly measured through tests, examinations, assignments, and performance-based assessments. Several meta-analyses have examined the relationship between AI-supported instruction and academic achievement [3], [6]–[8].

Dong et al. reported a positive average effect of AI-supported instruction on academic achievement, while also identifying substantial variation among the included studies [6]. This finding supports the potential value of AI but does not establish that every technology or implementation produces similar results.

Researchers should distinguish between immediate task performance and genuine conceptual understanding. Assessments should test whether students can explain concepts, solve unfamiliar problems, and apply knowledge independently.

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

AI-enabled personalized learning should be evaluated through multiple outcomes rather than through a single performance measure.

Knowledge Retention and Transfer

Knowledge retention refers to the ability to recall and use learned information over time. Knowledge transfer involves applying learning in new situations.

These outcomes are particularly important when AI tools provide frequent hints or complete answers. A student may perform well with AI assistance but struggle to solve a similar problem independently.

Future studies should include delayed assessments and tasks that measure transfer. Such assessments can help establish whether AI support produces durable learning rather than temporary improvements in assisted performance.

Engagement and Motivation

AI-supported platforms may increase participation through interactive exercises, rapid feedback, and personalized learning sequences. Recent reviews of generative AI have investigated academic, motivational, and other learning-related outcomes [3], [7], [9].

Nevertheless, engagement is not equivalent to achievement. Increased time on a platform may indicate productive practice, but it may also indicate confusion or inefficient learning activities. Researchers should therefore measure engagement alongside independent assessments of learning.

Self-Regulated Learning

Self-regulated learning involves setting goals, monitoring progress, identifying difficulties, and selecting suitable strategies. AI may support these activities through progress summaries, feedback, and recommendations.

However, excessive reliance on AI-generated explanations may reduce opportunities for independent decision-making. Educational systems should encourage students to attempt tasks, evaluate feedback, and reflect on their own learning.

Higher-Order Thinking

Critical thinking, analytical reasoning, creativity, and problem-solving are important learning outcomes. AI can support these abilities by providing alternative examples, prompting further questions, and helping students examine different solutions.

However, AI-generated answers can also allow students to bypass the reasoning process. Assessments

should therefore require students to justify conclusions, evaluate evidence, explain their reasoning, and apply concepts to unfamiliar problems.

CRITICAL SYNTHESIS OF THE EXISTING EVIDENCE

Evidence of Potential Benefits

Existing reviews suggest that AI can support personalized learning through adaptive instruction, tutoring, automated feedback, and generative AI [1], [2], [10]–[17]. Meta-analyses have also reported positive average effects for some AI-supported educational interventions [3], [3], [6]–[8].

These findings justify continued research and carefully designed implementation. However, they should not be interpreted as evidence that every AI tool improves learning or that every student benefits equally.

Variation Between Studies

An important issue is the variation in reported results. Han et al. synthesized 68 experimental and quasi-experimental studies of generative AI and reported an overall standardized mean difference of 0.45 (95% confidence interval: 0.43–0.47), but very high heterogeneity ($I^2 = 95\%$) [3]. This estimate describes the source meta-analysis and must not be interpreted as an effect size calculated by the present review. Dong et al. also reported a positive average effect on academic achievement but found considerable variability among studies [6].

Such variation suggests that outcomes depend on factors including educational level, subject domain, intervention duration, instructional strategy, and assessment design. Results from one setting may not generalize to another.

The Importance of Comparison Conditions

A further challenge is determining whether reported improvements result from AI itself or from other features of the intervention.

An AI-supported group may receive more practice, faster feedback, additional instructional time, or more individual attention than a comparison group. If these differences are not controlled or clearly described, the contribution of AI cannot be isolated.

Research should compare AI-supported instruction with credible alternatives and report differences in teaching methods, practice opportunities, and teacher involvement.

Feedback as a Pedagogical Mechanism

The value of AI feedback should be assessed against established principles of effective feedback. Feedback is most useful when it helps learners understand the gap between their current performance and the intended learning goal [18], [19].

AI can potentially make such feedback more frequent and accessible. However, the number of feedback messages is not a meaningful measure of quality. Researchers should examine whether feedback is accurate, understandable, actionable, and associated with improved independent performance.

Short-Term Performance Versus Long-Term Learning

Many educational interventions rely on immediate post-tests. Such assessments can provide useful information about short-term performance but may not establish whether learning persists.

Longitudinal research should investigate retention, transfer, and independent problem-solving after AI support has been reduced or removed. These outcomes are particularly important for evaluating whether personalization develops lasting competence.

Novelty and Original Contribution

Existing publications have already reviewed AI-based personalized learning, adaptive education, and generative AI in education [1], [2], [5], [9]–[13]. Consequently, another broad review must establish a clear contribution beyond summarizing existing applications.

This article emphasizes the connection between learner information, AI adaptation, instructional action, and independently measured learning outcomes. The objective is to evaluate not simply whether a system personalizes instruction, but whether its adaptations improve meaningful and sustained learning.

PROPOSED EVIDENCE-TO-DESIGN FRAMEWORK

This review proposes an analytical framework connecting four stages: learner information, AI adaptation, instructional action, and measured learning

outcomes. Privacy, fairness, transparency, accessibility, and human oversight apply across all stages.

Learner Information

AI systems may use assessment results, previous responses, stated goals, or interaction patterns to estimate learning needs. The information selected should be relevant to a defined educational purpose and sufficiently reliable for the decisions being made.

Collecting additional data does not automatically improve personalization. Unnecessary data collection can increase privacy risks without improving instructional decisions.

AI Adaptation Mechanism

The adaptation mechanism converts learner information into a prediction, recommendation, or instructional decision. Researchers should explain what the system is designed to optimize and how it has been evaluated.

For example, a system optimized for engagement may produce different recommendations from one optimized for mastery or retention. The selected objective should align with the educational purpose.

Instructional Action

The system should translate predictions into meaningful educational actions, such as recommending additional practice, changing the sequence of topics, providing a hint, or suggesting teacher support.

The action must be appropriate to the learner's needs and learning objective. A technically accurate prediction is insufficient if the resulting intervention does not support learning.

Measured Learning Outcomes

The final stage evaluates whether the instructional action improves learning. Relevant measures include achievement, retention, transfer, self-regulation, engagement, and learner experience.

Where possible, studies should include independent assessments and delayed measurements. These measures help distinguish genuine learning improvements from increased platform use or successful completion of AI-assisted tasks.

Governance and Human Oversight

Privacy, transparency, fairness, accessibility, and teacher oversight should be considered throughout the framework. UNESCO's guidance on generative AI provides a useful policy perspective on human-centred implementation and responsible educational use [21].

Evaluation Matrix for Future Studies

A practical test of the proposed framework should document: the characteristics and consent status of learner data; the version and adaptation logic of the AI system; the teacher's instructional role; the comparison condition and exposure time; pre-specified primary outcomes; delayed follow-up; subgroup fairness; and adverse outcomes such as dependency or misinformation. Technical evaluation should include error analysis and calibration where predictive scores are used. Educational evaluation should include independent, appropriately blinded assessment where feasible. This matrix is a proposed evaluation checklist, not a validated instrument.

Transferable Insights from Adjacent AI Application Domains

AI applications outside education demonstrate methods and risks that may inform future learning-system design, but they cannot be interpreted as empirical proof of improved student learning. Work on AI-driven drug discovery illustrates the importance of domain-specific validation [26]; AI-supported fraud and behavior analytics and research into cloud/6G-enabled environments raise questions about the use and security of behavioral data [27], [28]. Reviews of ICT-enabled smart cities and AI-assisted waste management demonstrate the diversity of contexts in which AI-enabled decision support and automation are discussed [29], [30]. Studies of AI in engineering and finance and agricultural prediction similarly highlight the need to evaluate performance within the relevant domain before generalizing findings [31], [32]. Research on neural and quantum-integrated methods for gene-expression analysis offers examples of advanced computational modeling, but is methodologically distinct from evidence about education [33], [34]. These studies are included as contextual comparisons only; none is counted as a personalized-learning outcome study.

CHALLENGES AND ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Data Privacy and Security

Personalized learning systems may process student performance records, interaction histories, and other potentially sensitive educational information. Institutions should establish transparent policies governing data collection, access, retention, and security.

Data should be collected only when it serves a legitimate educational purpose. Privacy safeguards should be incorporated into the design and implementation of AI systems [21].

Algorithmic Bias and Fairness

AI systems may perform differently across languages, educational settings, and learner groups. Models developed using unrepresentative datasets may generate less accurate recommendations for some students.

Researchers should evaluate system performance across relevant populations and examine whether automated decisions disadvantage particular groups. Fairness should be treated as an implementation requirement, not simply as a general principle.

Accuracy and Reliability

Generative AI can produce inaccurate explanations, misleading examples, and unsupported claims. Such errors are particularly concerning when students cannot independently verify the information.

Educational applications should encourage fact-checking, provide access to reliable learning materials, and communicate the limitations of AI assistance [10], [21].

Learner Dependency

Immediate access to AI-generated answers may discourage students from attempting difficult problems independently. If AI replaces the cognitive effort required for learning, successful task completion may not translate into independent competence.

Systems should provide graduated hints, guiding questions, and opportunities for revision. Such designs can help students develop reasoning skills while receiving appropriate support.

Accessibility and the Digital Divide

AI-enabled learning depends on access to suitable devices, reliable connectivity, accessible interfaces, and digital literacy. Unequal access may limit the benefits of these systems and reinforce existing educational inequalities.

Responsible implementation should consider accessibility, affordability, language diversity, and infrastructure requirements [21].

Teacher Roles and Professional Judgment

AI can assist teachers by providing feedback, analyzing learner data, and preparing instructional materials. However, teaching also involves contextual judgment, encouragement, social interaction, and ethical responsibility.

Research on AI in education emphasizes the importance of connecting technical developments with educational theory and the work of educators [11], [12], [14]. AI should therefore support teacher expertise rather than automatically replace it.

FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

The literature suggests several priorities for future research.

1. **Longitudinal evaluation:** Examine retention, transfer, and independent performance over extended periods.
2. **Stronger comparison designs:** Compare AI-supported instruction with credible alternatives and clearly document instructional differences.
3. **Transparent reporting:** Describe the AI system, its educational role, intervention duration, assessment methods, and teacher involvement.
4. **Equity and inclusion:** Investigate accessibility, language coverage, and differences in outcomes across relevant learner populations.
5. **Human–AI collaboration:** Examine how teachers can use AI recommendations without increasing workload or compromising professional judgment.
6. **Independent learning:** Determine whether students can apply knowledge after AI assistance is withdrawn.
7. **Ethical implementation:** Integrate privacy, fairness, transparency, and error management into system design and evaluation.

8. **Reproducibility:** Use transparent research methods and provide enough information for independent verification.
9. **Feedback quality:** Evaluate whether AI-generated feedback is accurate, actionable, and associated with improved learning, drawing on established feedback principles [18], [19].
10. **Review methodology:** Future systematic reviews should report their search and screening processes according to established reporting guidance [20].

IMPLICATIONS FOR EDUCATIONAL PRACTICE

Educational institutions should select AI tools according to clearly defined learning objectives rather than technological popularity. Before adopting a system, institutions should identify the educational problem it is intended to address and determine how improvement will be measured.

Teachers should receive training in interpreting AI-generated feedback, checking system outputs, and recognizing the limitations of automated recommendations. Students should learn to verify information, evaluate AI-generated explanations, and use AI as a learning aid rather than a substitute for their own reasoning.

Evaluation should consider both educational benefits and potential harms. Institutions should examine achievement, retention, accessibility, privacy, teacher workload, and implementation costs before expanding AI-supported practices.

A responsible implementation strategy should begin with a clearly defined use case and expand only when evidence demonstrates educational value and acceptable risks. This approach is consistent with the need for human-centred and responsible AI implementation in education [21].

LIMITATIONS OF THIS REVIEW

This article is a critical narrative review based on selected published research and review-level evidence. It is not an exhaustive systematic review and does not present a new meta-analysis. The discussion is therefore limited by the scope and methods of the cited publications.

AI technologies and educational practices also evolve rapidly. Findings associated with a particular model, subject, educational level, or intervention may not generalize to other settings. The proposed evidence-to-design framework is an analytical contribution that requires further empirical testing.

Before submission, the manuscript would benefit from a reproducible literature-search log, verification of all bibliographic metadata and primary claims, and a study-by-study evidence table. Because this is a narrative review, a PRISMA flow diagram, pooled effect estimate, and formal study-level risk-of-bias ratings are not asserted without supporting work. The cross-domain sources are used for conceptual transfer, not educational effect estimation.

CONCLUSION

Artificial intelligence offers important opportunities to personalize learning through adaptive content, intelligent tutoring, automated feedback, generative AI, and learning analytics. Existing research and meta-analyses indicate that AI-supported educational interventions can improve selected learning outcomes [3], [3], [6]–[8], although their effectiveness varies across educational contexts and instructional designs.

The effectiveness of AI-enabled personalization should not be assumed from technological sophistication alone. It depends on the relevance of learner information, the quality of the adaptation mechanism, the appropriateness of the instructional action, and the validity of the outcomes used for evaluation.

Privacy, fairness, accuracy, accessibility, and human oversight are essential considerations in responsible implementation [21]. Future research should emphasize sustained learning, independent performance, transparent reporting, and equitable outcomes.

Ultimately, the value of AI in personalized learning should be determined by whether it helps students develop meaningful knowledge and skills that persist beyond their immediate interaction with the technology.

REFERENCES

1. H. Farhood, M. Nyden, A. Beheshti, and S. Muller, “Artificial intelligence-based personalised learning in education: A systematic literature review,” *Discover Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 5, Art. no. 331, 2025, doi: 10.1007/s44163-025-00598-x.

2. A. Fortuna et al., "Artificial intelligence in personalized learning: A global systematic review of current advancements and shaping future opportunities," *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, vol. 12, Art. no. 102114, 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.ssaho.2025.102114.
3. X. Han, H. Peng, and M. Liu, "The impact of GenAI on learning outcomes: A systematic review and meta-analysis of experimental studies," *Educational Research Review*, vol. 48, Art. no. 100714, 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.edurev.2025.100714.
4. S. Chen and A. C. K. Cheung, "Effect of generative artificial intelligence on university students learning outcomes: A systematic review and meta-analysis," *Educational Research Review*, 2025, Art. no. 100737, doi: 10.1016/j.edurev.2025.100737.
5. A. Drobnjak, B. Svetec, B. Divjak, and I. Boticki, "A systematic literature review on artificial intelligence use in personalized learning," *IEEE Transactions on Learning Technologies*, vol. 19, pp. 711–727, 2026, doi: 10.1109/TLT.2026.3711814.
6. L. Dong, X. Tang, and X. Wang, "Examining the effect of artificial intelligence in relation to students' academic achievement: A meta-analysis," *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 8, Art. no. 100400, 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.caeai.2025.100400.
7. R. Deng, M. Jiang, X. Yu, Y. Lu, and S. Liu, "Does ChatGPT enhance student learning? A systematic review and meta-analysis of experimental studies," *Computers & Education*, vol. 227, Art. no. 105224, 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.compedu.2024.105224.
8. Y. Zhu, Q. Liu, and L. Zhao, "Exploring the impact of generative artificial intelligence on students' learning outcomes: A meta-analysis," *Education and Information Technologies*, vol. 30, no. 11, pp. 16211–16239, 2025.
9. S. Sharma, P. Mittal, M. Kumar, and V. Bhardwaj, "The role of large language models in personalized learning: A systematic review of educational impact," *Discover Sustainability*, vol. 6, Art. no. 243, 2025, doi: 10.1007/s43621-025-01094-z.
10. Hariyanto, F. X. D. Kristianingsih, and R. Maharani, "Artificial intelligence in adaptive education: A systematic review of techniques for personalized learning," *Discover Education*, vol. 4, Art. no. 458, 2025, doi: 10.1007/s44217-025-00908-6.
11. X. Chen, H. Xie, D. Zou, and G.-J. Hwang, "Application and theory gaps during the rise of artificial intelligence in education," *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 1, Art. no. 100002, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.caeai.2020.100002.
12. O. Zawacki-Richter, V. I. Marín, M. Bond, and F. Gouverneur, "Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education—Where are the educators?" *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, vol. 16, Art. no. 39, 2019, doi: 10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0.
13. S. Wang, F. Wang, Z. Zhu, J. Wang, T. Tran, and Z. Du, "Artificial intelligence in education: A systematic literature review," *Expert Systems with Applications*, vol. 252, Art. no. 124167, 2024, doi: 10.1016/j.eswa.2024.124167.
14. I. Roll and R. Wylie, "Evolution and revolution in artificial intelligence in education," *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 582–599, 2016, doi: 10.1007/s40593-016-0110-3.
15. W. Ma, O. O. Adesope, J. C. Nesbit, and Q. Liu, "Intelligent tutoring systems and learning outcomes: A meta-analysis," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, vol. 106, no. 4, pp. 901–918, 2014, doi: 10.1037/a0037123.
16. J. A. Kulik and J. D. Fletcher, "Effectiveness of intelligent tutoring systems: A meta-analytic review," *Review of Educational Research*, vol. 86, no. 1, pp. 42–78, 2016, doi: 10.3102/0034654315581420.
17. K. VanLehn, "The relative effectiveness of human tutoring, intelligent tutoring systems, and other tutoring systems," *Educational Psychologist*, vol. 46, no. 4, pp. 197–221, 2011, doi: 10.1080/00461520.2011.611369.
18. J. Hattie and H. Timperley, "The power of feedback," *Review of Educational Research*, vol. 77, no. 1, pp. 81–112, 2007, doi: 10.3102/003465430298487.

19. V. J. Shute, "Focus on formative feedback," *Review of Educational Research*, vol. 78, no. 1, pp. 153–189, 2008, doi: 10.3102/0034654307313795.
20. M. J. Page et al., "The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews," *BMJ*, vol. 372, Art. no. n71, 2021, doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71.
21. F. Miao and W. Holmes, *Guidance for Generative AI in Education and Research*. Paris, France: UNESCO, 2023.
22. B. S. Bloom, "The 2-sigma problem: The search for methods of group instruction as effective as one-to-one tutoring," *Educational Researcher*, vol. 13, no. 6, pp. 4–16, 1984, doi: 10.3102/0013189X013006004.
23. P. Brusilovsky, "Adaptive hypermedia," *User Modeling and User-Adapted Interaction*, vol. 11, pp. 87–110, 2001, doi: 10.1023/A:1011143116306.
24. A. Kalam and M. Kaur, "AI in higher education: Transforming admissions, student advising, and research support," *International Journal for Research in Applied Science & Engineering Technology*, vol. 13, no. 5, pp. 6915–6922, 2025, doi: 10.22214/ijraset.2025.71728.
25. M. Kaur, "ChatGPT in healthcare: Revolutionizing patient interactions and medical consultations while navigating ethical challenges," *International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 4708–4714, 2025, doi: 10.55248/gengpi.6.0225.1029.
26. W. Akram and M. Kaur, "AI-driven drug discovery: Accelerating the search for new treatments," *International Journal of Contemporary Research in Multidisciplinary*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 282–288, 2025, doi: 10.5281/zenodo.16276691.
27. M. Kaur, "AI-powered user behavior analytics for fraud detection in consumer applications: A proactive security approach," *International Research Journal of Modernization in Engineering Technology and Science*, vol. 8, no. 6, 2026, doi: 10.56726/IRJMETS100968.
28. M. Kaur and S. Kaur, "AI driven cloud and 6G enabled metaverse: A systematic review of big data analytics, security, privacy, and digital trust," *International Journal of Scientific Research and Technology*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 900–911, 2026, doi: 10.5281/zenodo.22059517.
29. M. Kaur, "Innovative ICT applications in smart cities: A PRISMA-based systematic literature review," *International Journal of Scientific Research in Engineering and Management*, vol. 10, no. 6, 2026, doi: 10.55041/IJSREM65240.
30. Harshvardhan, M. Kaur, and M. Kaur, "Sustainable waste management using AI and robotics," *International Journal of Advanced Robotics and Automation Technology*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 42–48, 2025.
31. M. Kaur and S. Kaur, "Transformative role of artificial intelligence in engineering and finance: A comparative review," *International Journal Research Publication Analysis*, vol. 1, no. 7, 2025, doi: 10.1555/ijrpa.6192.
32. M. Kaur and D. Kumar, "Comparison of different techniques to predict disease in agriculture production—A review," *International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology*, pp. 550–555, 2020, doi: 10.17577/IJERTV9IS080217.
33. A. E. Muthalvan, M. Jacob, G. Sarala, K. Natarajan, B. Rajasekaran, R. Naveenkumar, and M. Kaur, "Scalable big data and neural network architectures for integrative gene expression analysis in Parkinson's and Alzheimer's disease research," *Genetics and Molecular Research*, vol. 25, no. 1, 2026, doi: 10.4238/6mx06z89.
34. A. M. Subashini, A. Bostani, N. Muninathan, T. K. Wable, M. Aruna, T. Nagalakshmi, and M. Kaur, "Quantum-integrated deep learning framework for large-scale gene expression analysis and predictive modeling of Parkinson's and Alzheimer's disease," *Genetics and Molecular Research*, vol. 25, no. 1, 2026, doi: 10.4238/x1xkaz17.

HOW TO CITE: Er. Sukhwinder Kaur, The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Personalized Learning and Student Learning Outcomes: A Critical Review, Int. J. Sci. R. Tech., 2026, 3 (11), 530-539. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24159094