

This paper is based on the keynote talk given by the author at the ACM International Conference on Learning Analytics & Knowledge LAK2024 in Kyoto, Japan.

The Interplay of Learning, Analytics, and Artificial Intelligence in Education

Mutlu Cukurova
University College London, United Kingdom

Abstract

This paper presents a multi-dimensional view of AI's role in learning and education, emphasizing the intricate interplay between AI, analytics, and the learning processes. Here, I challenge the prevalent narrow conceptualization of AI as stochastic tools as exemplified in generative AI and argue for the importance of alternative conceptualisations of AI. I highlight the differences between human intelligence and artificial information processing, the “cognitive diversity” inherent in AI algorithms, and posit that AI can also serve as an instrument for understanding human learning. Early learning sciences and AI in Education research, which saw AI as an analogy for human intelligence, have diverged from this perspective, prompting a need to rekindle this connection. The paper presents three unique conceptualizations of AI in education: the externalization of human cognition, the internalization of AI models to influence human mental models, and the extension of human cognition via tightly integrated human-AI systems. Examples from current research and practice are examined as instances of the three conceptualisations, highlighting the potential value and limitations of each conceptualisation for education, as well as the perils of overemphasis on externalising human cognition. It is argued that AI models can be useful as objects to think about learning even though some aspects of learning might just come through the slow experience of living those learning moments and can't be fully explained with AI models to be hacked with predictions. The paper concludes with advocacy for a broader approach to AI in Education that goes beyond considerations on the design and development of AI solutions in Education, but also includes educating people about AI and innovating educational systems to remain relevant in an AI-ubiquitous world.

Keywords

Artificial Intelligence, Generative AI, Learning Analytics, Educational Technology, Human Cognition, Future of Education

Human Intelligence and Artificial Information Processing

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is often defined as the simulation of intelligence in machines. Intelligence is a complex and multifaceted concept that encompasses several abilities. It does indeed include the capacity to learn, understand, reason, make decisions, and adapt to new situations. It expands beyond commonly considered cognitive abilities, to include emotional and social components, acknowledging that intelligence is not just about how well one thinks, but also about how well one interacts with the world and others.

Intelligence is not only about what is certain, decontextualized, disembodied, and reduced to its parts, so that it is predictable and controlled. It is also about understanding things that are dynamic. It is about the ability to live with, and survive despite uncertainty, and that what we are seeing as parts may indeed be wholes at another level. Today, most AI we see in educational research and practice considers

AI as tools that have been developed to replace decision-making processes through analysis of data, and prediction of the best value for a designated outcome variable, which is conveyed through a user interface. Intelligence, in my opinion, is more than that.

What do I mean by AI as tools? Let's have a look at it through the most prominent AI tool of today, open AI's ChatGPT. Most state-of-the-art language models today including ChatGPT are based on a transformer architecture. During pre-training, a large-scale dataset of sentences is used as input to the transformer architecture. The inputs, for example masked-out words or paired sentences, are processed automatically and the neural network model is optimized to reconstruct the original text. First, an input is fed into the neural network, and it passes through the network's layers to produce an output. This process is known as the forward pass, where each layer's output is the input for the next layer, culminating in a final output from the network and it provides some predictions on masked words, next sentences, and so on. Since the actual masked words and next sentences in the original text are known, based on the differences between actual and model-predicted labels, a loss function is calculated. This function measures how far the network's prediction is from the actual result and backpropagation is used to minimize the loss by adjusting the weights of the network. This process of forward pass, loss calculation, backpropagation, and weight update is repeated over many iterations (or epochs) across the entire training dataset leading to the final pre-trained large language model. After the pre-training stage, LLMs are commonly fine-tuned to improve their performance. This is the subsequent process of refining the model on a smaller, more specific dataset to adapt it to a particular domain or task (e.g. through reinforcement learning with human feedback). They are also further prompt-tuned which involves optimizing the input prompts to guide the pre-trained model's behaviour on specific tasks without actually changing the model's parameters. After these large language models are trained, they are used to help or replace decision-making processes for the particular task of text generation and their predictions are conveyed through a user interface.

To a certain extent, this is a simplified description, but it broadly covers the essence of the large language model (LLM)'s training process without getting into the details. This approach leads to the current best performing generative AI models and tools of the day. However, due to their non-transparent nature, their value for certain learning tasks might be limited. They also lack clear, reliable, and valid measures of success in educational contexts which makes it difficult for performance evaluations in real-world implementations and feedback opportunities for learners. This is not to say they do not have any value for educational purposes since they can still be valuable for certain productivity gains (e.g. generating initial draft content to be reviewed) and diagnosis purposes (e.g. predicting particular language issues with relatively high accuracy to support teachers in their prioritisation of interventions for their learners).

Many researchers and practitioners of AI in Education already know these in detail, so you might be wondering why we need to keep reminding ourselves about the gist of how these models work, and why this is even important in this paper. But it matters hugely. It matters because when we think about AI in these terms it does not really cover all the terms I used when I was describing intelligence above, it sounds more like artificial information processing, rather than intelligence. Information processing is an important aspect of intelligence, but diminishing the whole concept to it would be a


mistake. This is one of the reasons, LLMs are sometimes referred to as ‘stochastic parrots’ (Bender et al., 2021). Stochastic in that they generate content based on probability analysis, and parrot because they have no understanding of the meaning of anything they generate. Yet, this is not a competition between human intelligence and artificial information processing. We do not necessarily need more replications of human intelligence in machines. Humans are very good at many things that today’s AI is still pretty poor at, and AI is good at some others. Machines are much ahead of humans on some variables like computing floating point arithmetic, yet way behind on others like cognitive flexibility and long-term planning in unusual situations. This is not to say that humans are more intelligent than machines, or vice versa, we are just differently abled. This can itself be an advantage for the use of AI in Education.

AI in Education and The Direction of Research towards AI as an Applied Tool

When we start thinking about intelligence in these broad terms, it becomes clear that considering AI as an applied tool is only one part of a much bigger picture. AI can also be considered as a method for understanding human intelligence and learning, an opportunity to understand the differences and similarities between humans and artificial information processing. In this sense, studying human learning and studying AI are naturally intertwined. Interestingly, this way of thinking was indeed prevalent in the early roots of the learning sciences and AI in Education communities. Yet, it seems like we are losing this connection. In an interesting review piece mapping publications from past and recent AI in Education conference proceedings and International Journal of AI in Education manuscripts on the coordinates of using AI as an applied tool vs AI as an analogy to human intelligence to study learning processes; Rismanchina and Doroudi (2023) showed that although early publications had well-distributed contributions on these coordinates, there was only one single publication in 2021 focusing on the use of AI as an analogy to human intelligence for studying learning. Why is that?

AI in Education can also be conceptualised to externalize, to be internalised, or extend human cognition (Cukurova, 2019). As the first conceptualization, in the externalization of cognition, certain human tasks are defined, modelled and replaced by AI as a tool. In the second conceptualisation, AI models can be used to help humans change their representations of thought, through the internalization of these models. At last, AI models can be used to extend human cognition as part of tightly coupled human and AI systems. It is important to note that in such systems, changes in both agents are observed through their interactions and the whole emergent intelligence is synergistic, that is, it is expected to be more than the sum of each agent’s intelligence, both human and artificial (Cukurova, 2019).

If we try to map these conceptualisations on the coordinates of Schneiderman’s human control and agency versus automation through AI (Schneiderman, 2020), perhaps most traditional educational technology could be considered to have a low allowance for human agency and low automation built into them. With the initial proliferation of AI in education, many researchers had the ambitious goal of creating systems that are as perceptive as human educators through the automation of certain tutoring behaviours, which led to significant developments in intelligent tutoring systems (ITSs).



Mainly driven by the cognitivist approaches that consider learning as an intracranial activity of information processing, these systems have the main goal of adapting to the individual levels of mastery and needs of each student, tailoring the content, pacing, and feedback accordingly. The field of AI in Education has multiple examples of early successful ITSs including Carnegie Learning (Ritter et al., 2015), Duolingo (Von Ahn, 2013), and Assistments (Heffernan, & Heffernan, 2014). It is important to highlight that perhaps one of the reasons for the success of these systems compared to relatively less successful ones in the field is that they have engaged with end users (e.g. teachers, students, and school admins) and taken the dynamics of education systems, school environments, and classrooms very seriously early on. For Carnegie Learning, for instance, there are physical course books and other resources in addition to the tutoring system itself. There is significant guidance, advice, and support for how teachers and students should interact ahead of any use of the tutoring systems, as well as while they are being used. So, there is significant human agency support, both for the teachers and the students, at the deployment phase of these ITS examples even the tools themselves have pedagogical action externalisation and automation at the system levels.

ITSs have traditionally focused on pedagogical task automation in digital environments. However, these systems can also work with data from physical spaces and can focus on a range of affective, metacognitive, and engagement tasks. For instance, we built a system in collaboration with my colleagues at Osaka University using multimodal data to detect students' engagement states while working with an ITS. The system processes data from students' heart rate, seat pressure, and facial recognition to model students' level of awakesness and aims to provide suggestions for rest or adjusts the content or feedback accordingly (Kawamura *et al.*, 2022).

These systems are also not limited to traditional human-generated educational content but can be delivered with AI-synthetic media. In our experimental research investigating the potential of using AI-generated synthetic video to create viable educational content for ITSs, we have observed no significant differences in learning gains and learner experience between the two conditions of students learning from a recorded human lecture vs. from an AI-generated synthetic media that delivers the

same content (Leiker *et al.*, 2023). Admittedly, this was from a relatively small sample of 83 adult learners in an explorative study, but these models are getting better by the day, and the promising results justify further large-scale explorations of their potential.

Such tutoring systems, that externalise particular pedagogical tasks to model and automate their support, have been a significant area of research in AI in Education and they seem to be working very well for various domains and knowledge acquisition tasks. Sure, we would always welcome more long-term evaluation studies and RCTs with larger sample sizes and better-controlled conditions but there is indeed good evidence both at the individual studies level including but not limited to SQL-Tutor (Mitrovic, & Ohlsson 1999), ALEKS (Craig *et al.* 2013), Cognitive Tutor (Pane *et al.* 2014), ASSISTments (Koedinger *et al.* 2010) and also at the meta-reviews level. For instance, VanLehn (2011) found that the effectiveness of intelligent tutoring systems were nearly as effective as average human tutors; Ma *et al.* (2014) found similar results both when compared to no tutoring or to large group human-tutor instruction; Pane *et al.* (2014) found evidence of the relative effectiveness of online tutors over conventional teaching; in Kulik & Fletcher (2016)'s work, the median effect was to raise test scores 0.66 standard deviations over conventional levels, or from the 50th to the 75th percentile and du Boulay, B. (2016) summarised some metareviews in his work and showed that these systems can achieve good results in the delivery of knowledge acquisition particularly for the subjects of Maths, Language learning, and Algebra.

Why AI's adoption in Education is slow?

Considering these systems are not necessarily new, and the evidence about their effectiveness is not necessarily new, one question to ponder upon as a community is why they are still not prevalent in mainstream education.

There are various reasons why this is the case and each one of these reasons would probably require a paper on its own to be discussed in detail. But, let me attempt to mention a few reasons, from my point of view, briefly here. First, there are numerous factors influencing the adoption and use of AI in education that are broader than the effectiveness of the specific AI technology. These include but are not limited to policy landscape, institutional governance, pedagogical culture, technological infrastructure, and social support mechanisms provided to teachers. In our recent work looking at the factors influencing teachers' adoption of AI in schools with about 800 schoolteachers (Cukurova *et al.*, 2023), we observed that although AI-tool related factors were indeed important, they were not necessarily the most important factors influencing the teachers' engagement with AI in schools. Not generating any additional workload, teachers' knowledge of, and confidence in using AI, increasing teacher ownership, generating support mechanisms for help when needed, and assuring that ethical issues are minimised, were also essential for the adoption of AI in schools. So let us never forget that the tools we are working on are not only closed engineering systems but are part of a large socio-technical ecosystem, and many factors will influence their adoption and effectiveness.

Second, education with fully automated systems that externalise human cognition to deliver educational practice can be argued to dehumanise learning. When AI in education is considered in a narrow sense, as lonely individual learners working on their own with an AI system, this might indeed lead learners to prioritise information


gathering and declarative knowledge acquisition over tacit knowledge and wisdom which comes through rich experiences in the real world. Particularly, if these systems are considered as a replacement for human interactions with each other, and with the real world, then the knowledge that comes through experience and practical acquisition of an embodied skill can be replaced with tokens of representations that are far off the actual construct. Learning is not only about absorbing information, it is also about developing social competence, emotional intelligence, and various metacognitive abilities in real-world interactions. Fully automated systems are unlikely to deliver such experiences in the near future.

Third, a significant amount of work is still needed to address socio-psychological barriers to the use of AI in Education. Teachers and learners tend to have confirmation biases, and unrealistic expectations of AI in education (Nazaretsky et al., 2021). A few years ago, in our research, we showed that when people are presented with content framed as coming from AI, they tend to judge it as less credible and trustworthy compared to the same content framed as products of educational psychology or neuroscience (Cukurova et al., 2020). Similar results are now emerging, when AI-generated content or feedback is presented to teachers and students they tend to judge its quality lower and trust it less if they know that it is AI-generated. There is emerging work focusing on how we measure and gain the trust of teachers and learners in AI in education, but considerably more research is needed in this space to optimise end users' trust in AIEd (e.g. Nazaretsky et al., 2022).

Fourth, particularly with the goal of keeping the talk focused on AI itself rather than opening it up to broader issues, one of the most significant limitations of these AI systems that externalize tasks to automate them is that they are usually built on computational cognitive models that overlook the intricacies of socio-cultural learning occurring beyond an individual's mind (Doroudi, 2023). For many learning scientists or educational researchers who are aligned with constructivist learning theories, this approach is considered too simple to represent the complexities of the kind of learning they are interested in.

Alternative Conceptualisations of AI in Education

In this regard, another conceptualization of AI can provide significant opportunities. AI can also be conceptualized as computational models of complex learning phenomena for humans to internalize and change their representation of thought. These lead to relatively low automation systems that allow high human agency and control.



In learning sciences literature, it is well established that learning may be facilitated with mental models. Mental models help us explain and predict how people interact with the world, and how they explain, understand, solve anticipated events, and communicate. While mental models are internal structures, they can be exteriorised when triggered by interaction. The assumption in this conceptualisation of AI is that computational models can offer an externalisation trigger for mental models. By that, they can serve as a learning affordance, and the learning outcomes can be observed through changes in learners' language, and their ability to explain, predict or diagnose phenomena (Kent *et al.*, 2021). So, although everyone comes to a learning situation with their own mental model of what success looks like, as well as the models that learners hold about themselves, we can use data to model what success looks like with computational approaches and present these models back to people and trigger them to refine their mental models.

This conceptualisation allows more opportunities for researchers interested in understanding and designing learning environments through the lens of constructivist and socio-cultural learning perspectives. It allows opportunities to focus on AI models to help develop learner competence through rich learning experiences and reflecting on these experiences with the help of computational models.

With my team for the last decade or so, we have been mainly focusing on such open-ended learning environments and trying to design analytics and AI models that would support teachers and learners in these constructivist contexts. There are other, probably better examples, particularly within the multimodal learning analytics space, so please do not take the examples from my work presented here as if these are the only examples but it is easier to talk about and critique one's own work. For instance, we were investigating students who were engaged in solving open-ended design problems (e.g. Cukurova *et al.*, 2018) and have been collecting data through 2D and 3D video for face and gesture analysis, tracking the speed and distance between their hands, logging their physical computing kit interactions, their mobile tool reflections and notes, as well as their self-declared emotions (Spikol *et al.*, 2018).

If we take the first conceptualisation of AI, we can use these kinds of data to build machine learning classifications of success in these environments. First, using these different modalities of data, one can calculate various input measures as independent variables (For instance about the group itself e.g. number of faces looking at the screen, their mean distances, their hand movement in space and speed, their audio features, gaze directions, emotional states etc., but also from the context such as the amount of time each group spends on different phases of the collaborative problem-solving process such as ideation (problem scoping), activities to solve the problem, and reflection on potential solutions. Then, you can ask researchers/teachers/experts to use existing frameworks and evaluation metrics to label groups' competence while watching these interaction videos and meticulously labelling them (e.g. Cukurova *et al.*, 2016).


This leads to having multimodal measures of potentially relevant variables as input and labelled competencies of groups as the ground truth output. Then it becomes a machine learning problem of building reliable and accurate classification and regression models for the tasks of predicting competence classes or scores (e.g. Spikol *et al.*, 2018). In order to see the value of different modalities of data we also train models with various features removed, to often find out that the best results are achieved when multimodal data is used compared to unimodal predictions (Cukurova, Giannakos, & Martinez-Maldonado, 2020). Clearly, these models at this stage still have significant technical problems, and they are usually prototypical, rather than reliable tools for immediate real-world use.

Regardless, often time the ultimate goal of such prediction models is to generate some kind of a dashboard for teachers and learners to directly intervene in the practice. For instance, Aslan *et al.*, (2019) used an MMLA tool with a dashboard to provide teachers with help to prioritise and structure their interactions with students. Their results indicate that when teachers are using the dashboard, they spend statistically significantly less amount of time in close monitoring actions and more amount of time in scaffolding activities. Students also appear to spend less time in bored states, and there can be a positive impact on their learning gains.

The Challenge of Using AI as a Tool to Directly Intervene in Teaching and Learning

However, the use of AI that directly intervenes in the practice of teaching and learning in such constructivist learning environments has significant challenges. As summarised in the figure below, I think these issues broadly relate to threatened human agency, the challenges of predictions in social contexts and the normativity issue of not being able to decide what is actually, or eventually, good or bad in a complex social learning situation. Of course, these include well-documented issues of algorithmic bias, transparency, and accountability of AI tools (e.g. Baker & Hawn, 2022), but I think it is even bigger than these. The issue is that in the design and development of these tools, we are used to doing engineering work where we can in effect see how the gears mesh to understand how things work. Whereas I am not sure if it is always possible to make a mathematical narrative or a model to explain, or predict, how a complex social system behaves. Is it always possible to explain or predict all aspects of human learning and human competence development? We somehow live under the impression that if only we could find them, there would be

formulas and models to somehow predict all aspects of human learning. Yet, maybe to find out that to develop what such learning is, we just have to go through the same irreducible steps as the system itself. Maybe some aspects of learning just come through the slow experience of living those learning experiences. This itself makes the time spent on them more meaningful in the sense that, we just can't jump ahead to get the answer with a prediction telling us what would be the most productive next step to take in these complex socio-cultural learning environments. Maybe, for some kind of learning, we just have to live the steps to develop the relevant competence.



On the other hand, if we take the second conceptualisation of AI, as computational models for humans to internalize; they can be considered as opportunities to describe the learning processes in more precision, rather than aiming for “the potentially impossible task” of explaining the exact mechanisms of a complex social learning process. In this sense, AI models become opportunities for thinking about learning. As Seymour Papert (2005) famously noted “You can't think about thinking without thinking about thinking about something.” This suggests that to engage in the process of thinking, one must have something specific to think about. It underscores the importance of the objects of our thoughts in shaping the processes and pathways through which our thinking unfolds. In this sense, AI models can be objects to think about human learning. In learning analytics research, we often utilise this idea of “from clicks to constructs” (e.g. Knight, & Buckingham-Shum, 2017) aiming to describe precisely the relationship between the digital traces of data collected and the educationally meaningful constructs we are interested in supporting. An example from our own work focuses on the concept of collaboration, moving from digital traces of

audio data and video data processed with computer vision to model group interaction behaviours and their connections to outcome measures of shared understanding, satisfaction, and product quality (Zhou, Suraworachet, & Cukurova, 2024). Sometimes, colleagues may get the impression that our attempts are for, or only, to explain the exact mechanisms behind these learning processes or to build prediction models accordingly. If such an impression is taken forward, as the constructs are broken into small measurable components, more mechanistic measures of how much, how fast, or how precisely a component is completed may be prioritised. In our collaboration process modelling for example, as if one keeps eye contact for one more second, starts speaking with a peer one second earlier, clicks the resource button faster, or attempts to answer a question one more time, they would develop the expected competence in collaboration. For certain learning experiences, more and faster completion of a component, or even the more precise yet not flexible completion of it, may not lead to improvements in the quality of learning. Such measures are great for measuring the capabilities of machines, but not for all aspects of human learning. However, taking a more modest goal of using these models for describing these learning processes in more detail and precision can still allow significant opportunities for researchers, teachers, and learners.

Value of Making Lived Experiences Visible to End Users

For end users the models provide, specific and precise feedback opportunities to improve their awareness of the lived experiences and keep them motivated to engage with them. Building on the same example on the collaboration process, for instance, visualisations of speech time percentages and the types of group interactions each group can be used as feedback after group interactions. Similarly, different types of group interactions students engage with during the timeline of their activity and relevant feedback based on these interactions for self-awareness, reflection, and guidance for future interactions can be created and sent to students (e.g. Zhou et al., 2021) and teachers (Pozdniakov *et al.*, 2022). In my view, these models are tools for making sense of the phenomena being modelled, but they are not necessarily the mirrors of the reality representing the complex process of collaborative learning itself.

This recognition of the limitations of the AI models also provides opportunities for more realistic interaction between the model outputs and end users. For instance, we have been working on models that detect speech in groups, transcribe it from speech to text, and label the text with groups' challenge moments in their collaborative discourse (Suraworachet *et al.*, 2024). Then these detected challenge moments are also sent back to students as feedback with visualisations with further explanations based on the threshold values on certain aspects and diagnosed challenges, building upon the human interpretation of these values and providing suggestions on how to address these challenges in their next group activities. Rather than assuming that what is being modelled and detected as the reality, we also provide students with their own transcriptions, as well as the details on how these models are built, and their episode level and sentence level predictions. So, they see the sense-making process we use in detail and interpret it themselves when such feedback is valuable or it is safe to ignore.

We have been building and implementing AI models with this conceptualization for feedback for quite a few years now and also evaluating the value of them for end

users. It is always interesting to observe what meaning learners and teachers generate from the visible information from these models, what actions they take based on such an understanding, what is the accountability of this understanding, and what are their concerns related to their values and moral considerations. At least in our own investigations, end users were often aware of the limitations of these models and agreed about the incomplete nature of them. However, they still tend to find them valuable to increase their awareness of their own learning activities, and also awareness of others' behaviours in these socio-constructivist learning environments. The accountability of this awareness tends to influence both their own engagement with the learning experience, and their regulation (including co-regulation and socially shared regulation). Making the lived experiences of learning more visible and explicit with computational models has significant value for end users.

Value of Contributing to Learning Sciences Literature

Another value of this conceptualisation of AI as models for making sense of the phenomena being modelled is that they enable opportunities for clarification and communication of researchers' concepts in a more detailed, precise and formal language; generating potential insights into complex learning processes to advance theory. For instance, in our recent work, we have been using five-channel multimodal data to make sense of Collaborative problem-solving processes. Instead of looking at each group's collaborative problem-solving activities separately, we merged all sequences from all groups in our dataset for a given task, then looked at clusters of patterns emerging using optimal matching algorithms and Ward's clustering, identifying three different clusters of CPS patterns in multichannel data streams at a granularity level that is not possible with traditional statistics. We then looked at the transitional and structural differences of each CPS pattern type with Hidden Markov Models and Epistemic Network Analysis to discover that they are associated with different performance outcomes (Ouyang, Xu, & Cukurova, 2023).


In turn, such insights can provide opportunities for learning theory to be further improved. A recently published literature review investigating the relationship between learning theories and models in MMLA research indicated that such models have the potential to contribute to learning theory (Giannakos, & Cukurova, 2023). For instance, in their work on embodied learning and maths education using insights from computational models and eye-tracking data, Abrahamson et al. (2015) revisit, support, refine, and elaborate further on some of the seminal claims from Piaget's theory of genetic epistemology (e.g. his insistence on the role of situated motor-action coordination in the process of reflective abstraction). This was only possible with the use of computational models and fine granular data to make better sense of the process they were investigating.

Human-AI Hybrid Intelligence Systems


Now you might have noticed that I have been writing for a while on this conceptualization of AI Models for Changing the Representations of Thought for end users and researchers. Going back to three conceptualizations of AI in education in the earlier diagram presented, this leaves us with the last corner of high automation and high human agency, the corner of human cognition being extended with AI in tightly coupled human-AI systems. I have not really talked about this corner as much,

mainly because I think we are yet to see substantial work on this front in AI in Education. At best, the current complementarity paradigm is to make a better match between existing human intelligence and the problems to be tackled with AI rather than making humans more intelligent. More commonly, for any given job, we tend to give up our agency to AI to complete a task for us, which in turn is expected to improve the performance of task completion. This inclination to employ AI for task performance is not only appealing but also reflects a natural human propensity for automating processes, which is a trend evident throughout human history. However, we must be judicious in selecting the tasks we delegate to AI as the over-reliance on AI could lead to the atrophy of critical competencies in the long term. For instance, there are ongoing attempts to automate qualitative coding processes with the use of large language models, as this can increase the productivity gains in generating labelled qualitative data. However, on many occasions, qualitative coding is not only done to generate final labelled datasets but also to improve researchers' and practitioners' meaning-making competence through their engagement with the reflective coding process. Similarly for the literature reviews with LLMs, the goal is not only to identify gaps in the literature but to improve one's understanding of the research undertaken on a particular topic. Full automation is unlikely to be valuable with these tasks in the long-term. There is also significant concern regarding human-in-the-loop correction of AI-generated content, as this process might lead to convergence towards the AI-generated content and labels rather than critically evaluating them to ground them in our own understanding. Similarly, in today's society, most people converge towards the first suggestion of a Google search engine rather than critically engaging with suggestions to choose the most appropriate for our goals. We might end up in a future where the first generated automated content is taken as 'the truth.' I think this is a significant concern for the future of education, therefore, just because we can technically automate a task does not always mean that we should. Adopting an approach that involves testing any automation ideas with LLMs and observing the outcomes may potentially result in humans forfeiting their fundamental cognitive competencies and evolutionary superiority as a species in the future. A potentially wiser perspective would be to highlight the critical importance of maintaining and enhancing our intrinsic intellectual abilities, which have historically conferred upon us distinct advantages for survival and adaptation.

On the other hand, for AI models that are internalised by humans, the goal would be to fade away as humans' competence at the task develops through their interaction with the model. At last, extending human cognition for intelligence augmentation in tightly coupled-human AI systems would require AI to be a synergistic superstructure built on top of the human intelligence structure, in a way that as the interaction with the tool increases, our skills also increase.




Our interactions with AI systems are influencing us and we are currently lacking long-term impact studies of these interactions as a research community. In order to be able to achieve human-AI hybrid intelligence systems, we need AI models that are able to interact fluidly with us to understand our interests dynamically and change accordingly, current AI systems lack the ability to update their models based on data learned or received through interactions with users. Rather than pushing their predictions to us, human-AI hybrid systems would require a dialogic interaction with AI models in which AI encourages people to reach their own conclusions by enabling them to access and question all the relevant information to the situation at hand. I hope that we will be seeing more of these from our community in the future.



AI in Education is broader than the Design, Development, and Use of AI

For most of the paper, I have been focusing on the design and development of AI in education and its different conceptualisations trying to make the point that AI is more than an applied tool. Indeed, many researchers in Learning Analytics and Educational Data Mining are working in this space, but I do not want to give the impression that this line of work is the only line of research that is relevant and important in AI in Education. Broadly speaking, in addition to the design, development, and use of AI systems in education, there are two other AI implications for Education that are equally important for our community. One is about educating people about AI and data so that they can learn how to use it safely, effectively, and ethically. Another one is work that focuses on how we should think about innovating our education systems so that they are more compatible with, and still relevant to a world heavily influenced by AI (Luckin, & Cukurova, 2019).



Educating People about AI

Educating people about AI is indeed about teaching AI to certain parts of the nation and including some dimensions of AI in our school curricula in schools as well as investing further in our tertiary education institutes to improve capacity to train experts in AI. There are many specific research and policymaking initiatives providing guidance in this space (e.g. AI4K12, UNESCO K-12 AI Curricula). But it is not limited to this.

Educating people about AI does involve teaching AI, but it is not limited to this. Perhaps more importantly, it is about helping an overwhelming majority of society to develop relevant AI competencies so that they can use AI effectively and ethically. A recent example in this space is the draft UNESCO AI competency framework¹ for teachers we worked on in collaboration with Fengchun Miao's unit.

¹ <https://www.unesco.org/en/digital-education/ai-future-learning/competency-frameworks>

Aspects	Progression		
	Acquire	Deepen	Create
Human-centred Mindset	Human agency	Human accountability	AI social responsibility
Ethics of AI	Ethical principles	Safe and responsible use	Co-creating AI ethics
AI Foundations & Applications	Basic AI techniques and applications	Application skills	Creating with AI
AI Pedagogy	AI-assisted teaching	AI-pedagogy integration	AI-enhanced pedagogical transformation
AI for Professional Development	AI enabling lifelong professional learning	AI to enhance organizational learning	AI to support professional transformation

The key distinctions between AI and previous iterations of ICT tools necessitate the definition of a specific set of competencies for people. This demands a stronger emphasis on competencies related to human agency, ethical considerations, critical thinking, and human-centred design in human-AI collaborations. AI competency is not limited to gaining fundamental AI knowledge, techniques, and skills to apply AI. It is much broader than this. As can be seen above, in this version of the UNESCO AI competency framework for teachers, AI techniques and applications is only one of the five main aspects of AI competence. Often time both learning analytics and AI in Education communities consider the creation of a particular AI tool, model, or dashboard as the end goal of our research. It might be more productive to start considering them as the start of another research and practice journey in which end users' competence is developed to achieve the expected impact of these solutions. For this, end user interactions with tools and models should be appropriately scaffolded and supported.

Innovating Education Systems for an AI-driven World

At last, AI does not only have implications for our education systems that are direct but there are also multiple indirect implications which necessitate innovations in our existing education systems.

For instance, although most skills and competencies we are interested in and expect people to develop through education in modern societies are process-driven; often times these are only evaluated through the outcomes of this competence rather than the process that leads to it. We need to move towards innovations in our assessment structures that encourage process evaluations rather than outcome evaluations only. Recent advancements in LLMs created significant concerns that most student will use them to submit their assignments rather than write essays themselves. I think this is a valid concern, but it misses the point in the big picture. Essay writing is most often assigned not because the resulting essay has much value to us, but because the process of writing an essay teaches crucial skills to people: regulation of one's own behaviours to engage in a topic, researching a topic, judging claims' accuracy, synthesizing knowledge and expressing it in a clear, coherent and persuasive manner. These skills should be the focus of assessment not *only the final product of what is*

produced. This is an example of the kind of innovation we need in our education systems now that AI is ubiquitous.

In my own teaching, I also have essay submissions as assignments. For the last few years, in addition to traditional content feedback on students' writings, we have been providing students with personalised behavioural feedback based on their writing engagement analytics using their data from online word-processing platforms like Word or Google Docs. When students are engaged with the platform we are collecting data on time, how much they edit content and what content exactly they add, to be able to model their engagement trends. Based on the analytics of their engagement we send students feedback with key suggestions on how they can improve their engagement (Suraworachet *et al.*, 2022). The feedback has formative suggestions on how they can space their writing practice rather than cramming to complete it all the night before, as well as how previous years' high performing students engaged with their writing assignments.

When we evaluate the impact of such analytics feedback interventions, it is interesting to observe that they have limited impact on students who are already doing well in the course, but significantly boost the engagement and performance of those students who are struggling and were predicted to fail (Suraworachet *et al.*, 2023). This approach allows us to get some indications on the extent to which an essay is written by a human, how much they spaced their writing practice, what words they edited, when in the week they were engaging with their writing, how regular their engagement was, and how much they regulated their behaviours after feedback. This kind of innovation prioritising process evaluations is an example of the kind of innovation we need in our education systems. There are many similar example tools from the communities of learning analytics and AI in education to support the process of learning. However, perhaps more efforts should be put into changing the existing assessment structures in education systems for these solutions to be impactful in the real world.

Concluding Remarks

To conclude this paper, allow me to reiterate some of the main points I was trying to make here. AI is more than a set of applied tools we use in education. AI can be conceptualised to externalise, be internalised, or extend human cognition; and computational models can be useful as objects to think about learning. While we are doing so, we might notice that some aspects of learning just come through the slow experience of living those learning moments and can't be fully explained with AI models to be hacked with predictions. Still though, if we take the more modest goal of using AI models for describing these learning processes in more detail and precision, they can provide valuable opportunities for feedback, awareness, and contributions to theoretical understanding. At last, AI in Education research and practice are broader than the design, development and use of AI including implications for educating people about AI, and innovating education systems for the future.

As we finally get the expected attention from society due to recent developments in generative AI, let us not stop questioning who we are as a community, and what we are doing as researchers and practitioners of learning, analytics, and AI. Let us not forget that the purpose of scientific research is only realized to the extent that it helps

us understand who we are. Research in AI began as an attempt to understand our own intelligence, its atrophy, its augmentation, or amplification. Which goal are we striving for? When is it acceptable to entrust core cognitive competencies to an AI tool, and when might this pose too great a risk? What are the long-term implications of the tools we are developing on our own competence? We must exercise wisdom in making such decisions and consider alternative conceptualisations of AI in our research and practice. I think that everything we do as a research community is about humans; it has always been so, and it always should be.

Acknowledgements

Mutlu Cukurova is Professor of Learning and Artificial Intelligence at University College London. This paper is based on the keynote talk given by the author at the ACM International Conference on Learning Analytics & Knowledge (LAK) 2024 in Kyoto, Japan. The ideas presented here are shaped during the years of discussions and debates with many colleagues to whom I am grateful.

References

- Abrahamson, D., Shayan, S., Bakker, A., & Van Der Schaaf, M. (2015). Eye-tracking Piaget: Capturing the emergence of attentional anchors in the coordination of proportional motor action. *Human Development*, 58(4–5), 218–244.
- Aslan, S., Alyuz, N., Tanriover, C., Mete, S. E., Okur, E., D'Mello, S. K., & Arslan Esme, A. (2019). Investigating the impact of a real-time, multimodal student engagement analytics technology in authentic classrooms. In *Proceedings of the 2019 chi conference on human factors in computing systems* (pp. 1-12).
- Baker, R. S., & Hawn, A. (2022). Algorithmic bias in education. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, 1-41.
- Bender, E. M., Gebru, T., McMillan-Major, A., & Shmitchell, S. (2021, March). On the dangers of stochastic parrots: Can language models be too big?. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency* (pp. 610-623).
- Craig, S. D., Hu, X., Graesser, A. C., Bargagliotti, A. E., Sterbinsky, A., Cheney, K. R., et al. (2013). The impact of a technology-based mathematics after-school program using ALEKS on student's knowledge and behaviors. *Computers & Education*, 68, 495–504.
- Cukurova, M., Miao, X., & Brooker, R. (2023). Adoption of Adaptive Learning Platforms in Schools: Unveiling Factors Influencing Teachers Engagement. *Artificial Intelligence in Education*, Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-36272-9_13
- Cukurova, M. (2019). Learning Analytics as AI Extenders in Education: Multimodal Machine Learning versus Multimodal Learning Analytics. *Proceedings of the Artificial Intelligence and Adaptive Education Conference*, xx1-xx3.
- Cukurova, M., Luckin, R., Millán, E., & Mavrikis, M. (2018). The NISPI framework: Analysing collaborative problem-solving from students' physical interactions. *Computers & Education*, 116, 93-109.
- Cukurova, M., Avramides, K., Spikol, D., Luckin, R., & Mavrikis, M. (2016). An analysis framework for collaborative problem solving in practice-based learning activities: A mixed-method approach. In *Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on Learning Analytics & Knowledge* (pp. 84-88).
- 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*, 1-31.
- Cukurova, M., Giannakos, M., & Martinez-Maldonado, R. (2020). The promise and challenges of multimodal learning analytics. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 51(5), 1441-1449.
- Demszky, D., Yang, D., Yeager, D. S., Bryan, C. J., Clapper, M., Chandhok, S., ... & Pennebaker, J. W. (2023). Using large language models in psychology. *Nature Reviews Psychology*, 2(11), 688-701.
- Doroudi, S. (2023). What happened to the interdisciplinary study of learning in humans and machines?. *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 32(4-5), 663-681.
- Du Boulay, B. (2016). Recent meta-reviews and meta-analyses of AIED systems. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, 26(1), 536–537.
- Giannakos, M., & Cukurova, M. (2023). The role of learning theory in multimodal learning analytics. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 54(5), 1246-1267.
- 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, 470-497.

Kawamura et al. (2022) Detecting Drowsy Learners at the Wheel of e-Learning Platforms with Multimodal Learning Analytics, *IEEE Access*, vol. 9, pp. 115165-115174, 2021, doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3104805

Kent, C., Chaudhry, M., Cukurova, M., Bashir, I., Pickard, H., Jenkins, C., du Boulay, B., Luckin, R., (2021). Machine learning models and their development process as learning affordances for humans. *International Conference of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, Springer, Cham.

Knight, S., & Buckingham Shum, S. (2017): Theory and learning analytics, *Handbook of learning analytics*, 17-22.

Koedinger, K. R., McLaughlin, E. A., & Heffernan, N. T. (2010). A quasi-experimental evaluation of an on-line formative assessment and tutoring system. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 43(4), 489–510.

Kulik, J. A., & Fletcher, J. D. (2016). Effectiveness of intelligent tutoring systems: a meta-analytic review. *Review of educational research*, 86(1), 42-78.

Luckin, R., & Cukurova, M. (2019). Designing educational technologies in the age of AI: A learning sciences-driven approach. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 50(6), 2824-2838.

Ma, W., Adesope, O. O., Nesbit, J. C., & Liu, Q. (2014). Intelligent tutoring systems and learning outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of educational psychology*, 106(4), 901.

Mitrovic, A., & Ohlsson, S. (1999). Evaluation of a constraint-based tutor for a database language. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, 10, 238–256.

Nazaretsky, T., Cukurova, M., Ariely, M., & Alexandron, G. (2021). Confirmation bias and trust: human factors that influence teachers' attitudes towards AI-based educational technology. In *CEUR Workshop Proceedings* (Vol. 3042).

Nazaretsky, T., Ariely, M., Cukurova, M., Alexandron, G. (2022). Teachers' Trust in AI-powered Educational Technology and a Professional Development Program to Improve It, *British Journal of Educational Technology*, DOI: 10.1111/bjet.13232

Ouyang, F., Xu, W., & Cukurova, M. (2023). An artificial intelligence-driven learning analytics method to examine the collaborative problem-solving process from the complex adaptive systems perspective. *International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning*, 18(1), 39-66.

Pane, J. F., Griffin, B. A., McCaffrey, D. F., & Karam, R. (2014). Effectiveness of cognitive tutor algebra I at scale. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 36(2), 127–144.

Papert, S. (2005). You can't think about thinking without thinking about thinking about something. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education*, 5(3), 366-367.

Pozdniakov, S., Martinez-Maldonado, R., Tsai, Y. S., Cukurova, M., Bartindale, T., Chen, P., ... & Gasevic, D. (2022). The question-driven dashboard: how can we design analytics interfaces aligned to teachers' inquiry?. In *LAK22: 12th International Learning Analytics and Knowledge Conference* (pp. 175-185).

Rismanchina, S., & Doroudi, S. (2023). Four interactions between AI and education: Broadening our perspective on what AI can offer education, <https://edarxiv.org/kps79>.

Ritter, S., Carlson, R., Sandbothe, M., & Fancsali, S. E. (2015). Carnegie Learning's adaptive learning products. *Educational Data Mining Proceedings*, 8th.

Shneiderman, B. (2020). Human-centered artificial intelligence: Reliable, safe & trustworthy. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, 36(6), 495-504.

Spikol, D., Ruffaldi, E., Dabisias, G., & Cukurova, M. (2018). Supervised machine learning in multimodal learning analytics for estimating success in project-based learning. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 34(4), 366-377.

Suraworachet, W., Seon, J., & Cukurova, M. (2024). Predicting challenge moments from students' discourse: A comparison of large language models to other natural language processing approaches. In *Proceedings of the 14th Learning Analytics and Knowledge Conference* (pp. 473-485).

Suraworachet, W., Zhou, Q., & Cukurova, M. (2023). Impact of combining human and analytics feedback on students' engagement with, and performance in, reflective writing tasks. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 20(1), 1-24.

Suraworachet, W., Villa-Torrano, C., Zhou, Q., Asensio-Pérez, J. I., Dimitriadis, Y., & Cukurova, M. (2021). Examining the relationship between reflective writing behaviour and self-regulated learning competence: A time-series analysis. In *Technology-Enhanced Learning for a*

Free, Safe, and Sustainable World: 16th European Conference on Technology Enhanced Learning, EC-TEL 2021, Bolzano, Italy, Proceedings 16 (pp. 163-177). Springer International Publishing.

Van Lehn, K. (2011). The relative effectiveness of human tutoring, intelligent tutoring systems, and other tutoring systems. *Educational Psychologist*, 46(4), 197–221.

Von Ahn, L. (2013). Duolingo: learn a language for free while helping to translate the web. In *Proceedings of the 2013 international conference on Intelligent user interfaces* (pp. 1-2).

Zhou, Q., Suraworachet, W., Pozdniakov, S., Martinez-Maldonado, R., Bartindale, T., Chen, P., ... & Cukurova, M. (2021). Investigating students' experiences with collaboration analytics for remote group meetings. In *Artificial Intelligence in Education: 22nd International Conference, AIED 2021, Utrecht, The Netherlands, June 14–18, 2021, Proceedings, Part I 22* (pp. 472-485). Springer International Publishing.

Zhou, Q., Suraworachet, W., & Cukurova, M. (2024). Detecting non-verbal speech and gaze behaviours with multimodal data and computer vision to interpret effective collaborative learning interactions. *Education and Information Technologies*, 29(1), 1071-1098.