

# Psychological foundations of technology-mediated educational process management: a narrative review

Olena L. Pinska, Svitlana V. Shokaliuk, Halyna I. Alieka and Iryna S. Zakarliuka

Kryvyi Rih State Pedagogical University, 54 Universytetskyi Ave., Kryvyi Rih, 50086, Ukraine

**Abstract.** The rapid proliferation of educational technologies has outpaced systematic understanding of the psychological principles that should inform their design and implementation. This narrative review synthesises research on the psychological foundations of technology-mediated educational process management, employing Scopus AI-assisted literature discovery to comprehensively map the theoretical landscape. The review examines how cognitive load theory, self-determination theory, self-regulated learning frameworks, social cognitive theory, and affective perspectives inform the design of learning management systems, adaptive learning platforms, intelligent tutoring systems, and learning analytics applications. It analyses how educational paradigms – constructivism, connectivism, humanism, and critical pedagogy – shape technology integration approaches. The synthesis reveals significant gaps between psychological research and educational technology practice, including under-theorisation of many technology implementations, methodological limitations in evaluation studies, and insufficient attention to diverse learner populations and cultural contexts. To address these gaps, the paper proposes the psychological integration framework for educational technology management (PI-ETM), a four-layer model that connects psychological foundations, educational paradigm alignment, technological instantiation, and contextual implementation. Seven guiding principles – theoretical explicitness, multidimensional integration, paradigmatic coherence, learner-centred adaptation, teacher empowerment, contextual sensitivity, and ethical grounding – structure framework application. Implications for researchers, designers, practitioners, and policymakers are articulated, alongside a future research agenda that addresses emerging technologies, including generative AI and extended reality. The review presents a unified conceptual architecture for psychologically informed educational technology, guiding both scholarship and practice.

**Keywords:** educational technology, psychological foundations, learning management, cognitive load theory, self-determination theory, self-regulated learning, technology-enhanced learning, educational process management, integrative framework

## 1. Introduction

The integration of technology into educational processes has become a defining characteristic of contemporary education. From primary schools to universities, from corporate training environments to lifelong learning platforms, digital technologies now mediate substantial portions of instructional activity. Learning management

ORCID: 0000-0003-2558-6805 (O. L. Pinska); 0000-0003-3774-1729 (S. V. Shokaliuk); 0000-0001-6432-2154 (H. I. Alieka); 0000-0002-5615-4151 (I. S. Zakarliuka)

✉ [pinskayaklava@gmail.com](mailto:pinskayaklava@gmail.com) (O. L. Pinska); [shokalyuk@kdpu.edu.ua](mailto:shokalyuk@kdpu.edu.ua) (S. V. Shokaliuk); [galina.ivanova.2308@gmail.com](mailto:galina.ivanova.2308@gmail.com) (H. I. Alieka); [irinazakar@kdpu.edu.ua](mailto:irinazakar@kdpu.edu.ua) (I. S. Zakarliuka)

🌐 <https://kdpu.edu.ua/personal/opinska.html> (O. L. Pinska); <https://kdpu.edu.ua/personal/svshokaliuk.html> (S. V. Shokaliuk); [https://kdpu.edu.ua/personal/halyna\\_alieka.html](https://kdpu.edu.ua/personal/halyna_alieka.html) (H. I. Alieka); <https://kdpu.edu.ua/personal/iszakarliuka.html> (I. S. Zakarliuka)



© Copyright for this article by its authors, published by the Academy of Cognitive and Natural Sciences. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons License Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

systems (LMS) serve millions of learners worldwide, adaptive learning platforms promise personalised educational pathways, and artificial intelligence applications are reshaping expectations about what technology-enhanced education can achieve. Yet the psychological foundations underlying these technological implementations – the theories of learning, motivation, and cognition that should inform design decisions – remain inconsistently understood and unevenly applied.

This gap between technological capability and psychological grounding presents a significant challenge for the field of educational technology. Technologies deployed without adequate attention to how learners process information, what motivates sustained engagement, how self-regulation develops, and what social conditions support learning risk producing disappointing outcomes despite substantial investment. Conversely, psychological research that remains disconnected from the realities of technology design and implementation may fail to realise its potential for improving educational practice. Bridging this divide requires a systematic synthesis of what is known about the psychological foundations of technology-mediated learning and a clear articulation of how this knowledge can inform educational process management.

Despite decades of research at the intersection of psychology and educational technology, the field continues to grapple with fundamental questions about how psychological principles should inform technology-mediated instruction. Reviews of the literature have identified several persistent challenges. First, many educational technology implementations are under-theorised, deploying features and functionalities without explicit grounding in established psychological frameworks [35]. Second, when theories are invoked, they are often applied superficially or in isolation, thereby missing opportunities to address the multidimensional nature of learning, which involves cognitive, motivational, affective, and social processes simultaneously [54]. Third, the rapid pace of technological change outstrips the capacity of traditional research approaches to generate timely, actionable guidance, creating a persistent lag between innovation and evidence [12].

The field of educational technology has historical roots in both behavioural and cognitive psychology, with programmed instruction, computer-assisted learning, and intelligent tutoring systems reflecting successive theoretical orientations [55]. Contemporary systems draw on an even broader range of psychological constructs, including cognitive load theory [84], self-determination theory [72], self-regulated learning frameworks [62], and social-cognitive perspectives [6]. Yet integration of these diverse theoretical streams into coherent frameworks for educational technology design remains limited.

The emergence of new methodological tools for literature synthesis, including AI-assisted search and discovery platforms, offers opportunities to map this complex theoretical landscape more comprehensively than traditional review methods allow. This paper leverages Scopus AI to conduct a narrative review that synthesises psychological foundations of technology-mediated educational process management, identifies gaps and tensions in current approaches, and proposes an integrative framework to guide future research and practice.

This review addresses four interrelated research questions:

- RQ1: What psychological theories and constructs have been most influential in shaping technology-mediated educational process management, and how have these theoretical foundations evolved?
- RQ2: How do contemporary educational paradigms (constructivism, connectivism, humanism, critical pedagogy) manifest in the psychological underpinnings of educational technology design and implementation?

RQ3: What evidence-based frameworks exist for integrating psychological principles into the management of technology-enhanced learning environments, and what gaps or limitations characterise current approaches?

RQ4: What factors facilitate or hinder the translation of psychological research into educational technology practice, and how might these barriers be addressed?

This review focuses on psychological foundations as they relate to the management of educational processes in technology-enhanced environments. The term “educational process management” encompasses the design, implementation, monitoring, and optimisation of learning experiences mediated by digital technologies. This includes but is not limited to learning management systems, adaptive learning platforms, intelligent tutoring systems, educational games, and learning analytics applications.

The significance of this synthesis lies in its potential contributions to both theory and practice. Theoretically, the review aims to identify patterns of connection and disconnection among psychological frameworks applied to educational technology, revealing opportunities for theoretical integration and areas requiring further conceptual development. Practically, the review seeks to guide educational technology designers, instructional designers, educators, and administrators who must make decisions about technology selection, configuration, and implementation without always having direct access to the underlying psychological research base.

The remainder of this paper is organised as follows. Section 2 describes the methodological approach, including the use of Scopus AI for literature discovery and the analytical procedures employed. Section 3 examines key psychological theories informing educational technology, including cognitive load theory, self-determination theory, self-regulated learning, social cognitive approaches, and affective dimensions. Section 4 analyses how educational paradigms shape technology integration. Section 5 reviews technology systems, including learning management systems, adaptive learning platforms, and learning analytics. Section 6 examines integration frameworks and implementation considerations. Section 7 provides a critical analysis of gaps and limitations. Section 8 proposes an integrative framework. Section 9 discusses implications and future directions.

## **2. Methodological approach**

This section outlines the methodological approach employed in this narrative review, with a particular focus on the role of Scopus AI in supporting literature discovery and synthesis. The approach combines AI-assisted search capabilities with traditional narrative review methods to achieve comprehensive coverage while maintaining analytical depth.

### **2.1. Review design and rationale**

A narrative review approach was selected for several reasons. First, the breadth of the topic – spanning multiple psychological theories, educational paradigms, and technology types – called for a synthetic approach capable of identifying patterns across diverse literatures, rather than a narrowly focused systematic review. Second, the goal of proposing an integrative framework required interpretive synthesis that narrative methods support. Third, the rapid evolution of educational technology and the emergence of novel AI tools made a traditional systematic review impractical for capturing the current state of a fast-moving field.

Narrative reviews have been criticised for potential bias in literature selection; however, this limitation can be mitigated through transparent reporting of search procedures and triangulation across multiple sources. This review addresses these

concerns through the structured use of AI-assisted discovery tools, explicit documentation of search queries and results, and iterative refinement of thematic categories based on emerging evidence.

## 2.2. Scopus AI literature discovery

Scopus AI represents a novel tool for academic literature discovery, combining traditional database search capabilities with artificial intelligence-enhanced query processing and summarisation. Unlike keyword-based searching, Scopus AI enables researchers to pose complex conceptual queries and receive synthesised responses that draw on the Scopus database of peer-reviewed literature.

For this review, a structured set of queries was developed to address each research question systematically. Queries were organised in layers, beginning with broad foundational questions and progressively narrowing to specific theoretical and practical concerns (table 1).

**Table 1**  
Scopus AI query structure

Layer	Focus area	Queries
1. Foundation	Research landscape and theoretical overview	3
2. Psychological theories	CLT, SDT, SRL, social learning, affect	5
3. Educational paradigms	Constructivism, connectivism, humanism, critical pedagogy	5
4. Technology systems	LMS, adaptive learning, ITS, analytics	7
5. Integration	Frameworks, teacher psychology, cultural factors	4
6. Gaps and trends	Research gaps, emerging directions, barriers	3

Each query was designed to elicit both summary responses from Scopus AI and lists of relevant source documents. Source documents were then retrieved for detailed analysis, with particular attention to empirical studies, systematic reviews, and theoretical contributions.

## 2.3. Inclusion and quality considerations

While this narrative review did not employ formal inclusion/exclusion criteria typical of systematic reviews, several quality considerations guided source selection:

- **Relevance** – sources directly addressing the psychological foundations of educational technology or technology-enhanced learning were prioritised over tangentially related works.
- **Recency** – emphasis was placed on literature from 2014 to 2024 to capture current theoretical developments, though seminal earlier works establishing foundational theories were included.
- **Publication venue** – peer-reviewed journal articles, book chapters, and conference proceedings from established venues were prioritised.
- **Empirical grounding** – where available, empirical studies were preferred over purely conceptual works, though theoretical contributions were included when they provided important frameworks.

## 2.4. Analytical approach

Analysis proceeded through iterative cycles of reading, coding, and synthesis. Initial Scopus AI responses provided orientation to key themes and sources within each query domain. Retrieved sources were then analysed for: (a) theoretical frameworks

employed, (b) key findings or arguments, (c) methodological approaches, and (d) connections to other sources and themes.

Thematic synthesis followed principles outlined by Braun and Clarke [13], involving familiarisation with sources, generation of initial codes, searching for themes, reviewing and refining themes, and producing the final narrative. Throughout this process, attention was paid to convergences and divergences across sources, gaps in the literature, and opportunities for theoretical integration.

### **2.5. Methodological limitations**

Several limitations of this approach should be acknowledged. First, Scopus AI is a novel tool whose capabilities and limitations are still being understood; its summarisation algorithms may introduce biases not fully apparent to users. Second, the Scopus database, while comprehensive, does not include all relevant literature, particularly grey literature, dissertations, and publications in languages other than English. Third, narrative reviews depend on author judgment in ways that may limit reproducibility. These limitations are addressed through transparent reporting and by positioning this review as a synthesis intended to stimulate further investigation rather than a definitive account.

## **3. Psychological theories in educational technology**

Psychological theories provide the conceptual foundation for understanding how technology-mediated learning environments can be designed to support effective educational outcomes. This section examines five major theoretical streams that have shaped educational technology research and practice: cognitive load theory, self-determination theory, self-regulated learning, social cognitive approaches, and affective dimensions of learning.

### **3.1. Cognitive load theory and information processing**

Cognitive load theory (CLT) has emerged as one of the most influential frameworks for instructional design in technology-enhanced learning environments. Originally developed by Sweller [83] and subsequently refined over decades of research, CLT addresses the fundamental constraints of human cognitive architecture and their implications for instructional design.

The theory posits that working memory – the cognitive system responsible for temporarily storing and manipulating information – has severe limitations in capacity and duration when processing novel information. Learning requires that information be processed in working memory before it can be encoded into long-term memory as organised knowledge structures called schemas. Instructional designs that overwhelm working memory impede learning, whereas designs that effectively manage cognitive load facilitate schema construction and automation.

CLT distinguishes among three types of cognitive load: intrinsic load (determined by the complexity of the learning material and learner expertise), extraneous load (imposed by suboptimal instructional design), and germane load (the mental effort devoted to schema construction and learning processes). Effective instructional design seeks to minimise extraneous load, manage intrinsic load through appropriate sequencing and scaffolding, and maximise the working memory resources available for germane processing [84].

In educational technology contexts, CLT has been applied to inform interface design, multimedia presentation, adaptive scaffolding, and sequencing of instructional content. Research has demonstrated that split-attention effects, redundancy effects, and modality effects – all derived from CLT principles – significantly impact learning outcomes in digital environments [52]. Technology-enhanced learning environments

that present verbal and visual information in integrated formats, eliminate redundant information, and use audio narration alongside visual displays consistently outperform designs that violate these principles.

Recent developments have extended CLT to address collaborative learning environments, where collective working memory resources and transactive memory systems introduce additional considerations [43]. The theory has also been applied to understand cognitive demands in immersive technologies such as virtual reality, where environmental complexity may impose additional extraneous load.

### **3.2. Self-determination theory and motivation**

Self-determination theory (SDT), developed by Deci and Ryan [21] and elaborated in subsequent decades, provides a comprehensive framework for understanding human motivation with significant implications for educational technology design. Unlike theories that treat motivation as a unitary concept varying only in amount, SDT differentiates among types of motivation based on their underlying regulatory processes and relationship to autonomous functioning.

The theory identifies three basic psychological needs whose satisfaction is essential for optimal motivation, development, and wellbeing: autonomy (the need to experience volition and self-endorsement of one's actions), competence (the need to feel effective in one's interactions with the environment), and relatedness (the need to feel connected to others and to belong) [71]. Learning environments that support satisfaction of these basic needs foster more autonomous forms of motivation, which in turn predict deeper engagement, better learning outcomes, and greater persistence.

SDT distinguishes intrinsic motivation (engaging in activities for their inherent satisfaction) from extrinsic motivation (engaging in activities for separable outcomes). Importantly, extrinsic motivation is not treated as uniformly inferior; rather, the theory identifies a continuum of extrinsic regulatory styles ranging from external regulation (behaviour controlled by external rewards and punishments) through introjected, identified, and integrated regulation, representing progressively more internalised and autonomous forms of extrinsic motivation.

In educational technology contexts, SDT has informed the design of gamified learning systems, adaptive feedback mechanisms, and learner choice architectures. Research indicates that technology features supporting autonomy – such as meaningful choices, acknowledgement of learner perspectives, and provision of rationales – enhance motivation and learning outcomes [89]. Conversely, controlling features such as surveillance, performance contingencies, and controlling feedback can undermine autonomous motivation even when they produce short-term behavioural compliance.

Competence support in educational technology involves providing optimal challenges, clear feedback, and structures that enable learners to perceive progress. Relatedness support can be implemented through social features, collaborative tools, and the communication of care and respect [72]. Recent research has examined how AI-driven systems can be designed to support basic psychological needs while providing personalised instruction.

### **3.3. Self-regulated learning**

Self-regulated learning (SRL) refers to the processes by which learners actively manage their cognitive, metacognitive, motivational, and behavioural engagement with learning tasks [98]. SRL frameworks conceptualise learning as a cyclical process in which learners set goals, select strategies, monitor progress, and adjust approaches based on feedback – processes that take on particular significance in technology-mediated environments where external regulation may be reduced.

Prominent SRL models share common features while differing in emphasis. Zimmer-

man's social cognitive model emphasises forethought, performance, and self-reflection phases. Pintrich's model emphasises the interplay of cognition, motivation, and behaviour across the planning, monitoring, control, and reaction phases. Winne and Hadwin's COPES model emphasises the information processing aspects of SRL, distinguishing conditions, operations, products, evaluations, and standards [62].

Educational technology environments present both opportunities and challenges for SRL development. On one hand, digital tools can provide scaffolds for goal-setting, planning, and monitoring that support learners in developing self-regulatory skills. Learning analytics dashboards, for instance, can present learners with information about their progress and engagement patterns that would otherwise be invisible [11]. On the other hand, highly structured or automated systems may reduce opportunities for learners to exercise self-regulatory agency, potentially undermining the development of skills needed for independent learning.

Research has examined how specific technology features support or constrain SRL processes. Prompts for self-explanation, metacognitive reflection tools, and strategy training embedded within digital learning environments have shown positive effects on self-regulatory behaviour and learning outcomes [5]. The design of feedback systems significantly influences whether learners engage in productive self-monitoring and strategy adjustment or merely respond reactively to external cues.

### **3.4. Social cognitive perspectives**

Social cognitive theory, as articulated by Bandura [6], emphasises the reciprocal interactions among personal factors, environmental influences, and behaviour in human learning and development. This triadic reciprocity model has significant implications for understanding learning in technology-mediated environments, where the "environment" encompasses technological tools, digital content, and virtually present others.

Central to social cognitive theory is the concept of self-efficacy – beliefs about one's capability to execute courses of action required to achieve desired outcomes. Self-efficacy influences task selection, effort expenditure, persistence in the face of difficulty, and ultimately performance. In educational technology contexts, learner self-efficacy for both the learning domain and technology use affects engagement patterns and outcomes [96].

Observational learning – learning by observing models perform behaviours and experience consequences – is another key mechanism in social cognitive theory. Technology-mediated environments afford new possibilities for observational learning through video demonstrations, worked examples, peer modelling, and virtual agents. Research indicates that the characteristics of models (similarity, competence, and warmth) influence learning from observation in both digital and face-to-face contexts.

Computer-supported collaborative learning (CSCL) environments operationalise social cognitive principles by enabling learners to interact with peers, share perspectives, engage in joint problem-solving, and construct knowledge collectively [82]. Social presence – the sense of being with others in a mediated environment – influences engagement and learning in online and blended contexts. Virtual learning communities can foster the development of shared knowledge and social support networks, thereby enhancing both individual and collective learning.

### **3.5. Affective and emotional dimensions**

Increasing research attention has focused on the affective dimensions of technology-mediated learning. Emotions influence attention, memory, motivation, and problem-solving, making them integral to understanding learning processes in any environment [64]. Technology-enhanced learning environments both evoke emotional responses

and provide opportunities for emotion-sensitive design.

Control-value theory identifies achievement emotions – emotions directly related to achievement activities and outcomes – as particularly relevant in educational contexts [63]. Emotions such as enjoyment, hope, pride, boredom, anxiety, and frustration arise from learners' appraisals of control over and value of learning activities and outcomes. Technology designs that provide appropriate challenge, meaningful choices, and clear feedback can support positive emotional experiences, while designs that induce confusion, helplessness, or irrelevance evoke negative emotions that impede learning.

Flow theory, developed by Csikszentmihalyi [19], describes optimal experience states characterised by complete absorption, intrinsic enjoyment, and loss of self-consciousness that occur when challenges match skills. Educational games and simulations have been designed to induce a state of flow by providing clear goals, immediate feedback, and appropriately calibrated challenges. Research indicates that flow experiences in educational technology contexts predict engagement, enjoyment, and learning outcomes.

Affective computing and intelligent tutoring systems increasingly incorporate emotion detection and response capabilities. Systems that recognise learner frustration, confusion, or boredom can adapt instruction accordingly – providing hints, adjusting difficulty, or offering encouragement [23]. While promising, such systems raise questions about the accuracy of emotion detection, privacy implications, and the appropriate scope of technological intervention in emotional experience.

#### **4. Educational paradigms and technology integration**

Educational paradigms shape how psychological principles are interpreted and applied in technology-enhanced learning environments. Rather than viewing these paradigms as mutually exclusive alternatives, this section examines constructivism, connectivism, humanism, and critical pedagogy as complementary lenses that illuminate different aspects of technology-mediated learning, while also acknowledging tensions among them.

##### **4.1. Constructivism and technology-enhanced learning**

Constructivism, rooted in the work of Piaget, Vygotsky, and subsequent theorists, posits that learners actively construct knowledge through interaction with their environment rather than passively receiving transmitted information. This epistemological orientation has profoundly influenced educational technology design, shifting the emphasis from the delivery of content to the creation of environments that support active exploration, experimentation, and meaning-making [85].

Technology implementations informed by constructivist principles prioritise learner agency, authentic tasks, and opportunities for discovery. Cognitive flexibility approaches, operationalised in platforms presenting multiple cases, perspectives, and representations, support learners in developing transferable understanding of complex domains [18]. Virtual laboratories and simulations enable experiential learning that is impossible or impractical in physical settings [70].

Social constructivism emphasises the collaborative dimension of knowledge construction. Computer-supported collaborative learning tools enable dialogue, perspective-sharing, and joint meaning-making that extend constructivist principles into networked environments [25]. Research indicates that collaborative technologies supporting productive discourse patterns enhance both individual and collective learning outcomes.

Tensions exist between constructivist intentions and technological constraints. Learning object approaches, despite constructivist aspirations, often default to trans-

missive models due to technical and practical limitations [20]. The design challenge is creating technologies flexible enough to support genuine construction while providing sufficient structure to prevent unproductive floundering.

#### **4.2. Connectivism and networked learning**

Connectivism, articulated by Siemens [80], emerged as a learning theory for the digital age, arguing that learning occurs through the formation and traversal of connections across networks of people, ideas, and resources. Unlike theories locating knowledge primarily in individual minds, connectivism positions knowledge as distributed across networks, with learning capacity residing in the ability to identify and connect relevant nodes.

Four principles characterise connectivist learning: knowledge is distributed across networks, the capacity to know is more important than current knowledge, learning consists of connecting specialised nodes, and the ability to see connections is a core skill. These principles have informed the design of massive open online courses (MOOCs), personal learning environments, and social learning platforms [45].

Connectivist MOOCs (cMOOCs) emphasise autonomy, diversity, openness, and networked participation, distributing the teaching function among network actors rather than centralising it in instructors [81]. Research on cMOOC participation has examined how learners develop social capital, form learning networks, and navigate distributed knowledge landscapes [40].

Debates persist regarding the theoretical status of connectivism. Critics question whether connectivism constitutes a genuine learning theory or rather a pedagogical approach applicable within existing theoretical frameworks [46]. The evolution of MOOCs toward more structured, instructivist formats (xMOOCs) suggests market and practical pressures that may constrain connectivist implementations [61].

#### **4.3. Humanistic perspectives on educational technology**

Humanistic educational philosophy, emphasising whole-person development, learner agency, and human flourishing, offers important counterweights to purely cognitive or technical approaches to educational technology. While less frequently invoked than constructivism or cognitivism, humanistic perspectives inform growing concerns about learner wellbeing, ethical technology design, and education's broader purposes.

Humanistic approaches to educational technology prioritise learner-centred design that respects individual differences, supports autonomy, and promotes holistic development [66]. This includes attention to emotional experience, social connection, and the development of self-understanding alongside cognitive and skill outcomes. Holistic self-regulated learning models integrate metacognitive skills, motivational factors, and behavioural self-management within supportive technological environments [15].

The intersection of humanistic concerns with artificial intelligence presents particular tensions. AI-enhanced learning environments offer adaptive personalisation and emotional monitoring capabilities that can support individual development, yet also raise questions about surveillance, autonomy, and the appropriate role of algorithmic systems in human development [93]. Humanistic perspectives advocate for designs that enhance rather than replace human capacities and relationships.

#### **4.4. Critical pedagogy and digital equity**

Critical pedagogy, drawing on the work of Paulo Freire and subsequent scholars, examines education through lenses of power, equity, and social transformation. Applied to educational technology, critical perspectives interrogate whose interests technology serves, how digital tools may reproduce or challenge existing inequalities, and what role technology might play in education for social justice [44].

The digital divide represents a central concern, encompassing not only access to technology but also disparities in usage patterns, digital literacy, and the quality of technology-mediated educational experiences [91]. Case studies demonstrate how digital divides intersect with broader social, economic, and political inequalities that cannot be addressed solely through technology provision [27].

Critical digital pedagogy distinguishes between technology-infused equity pedagogy (leveraging technology to teach about equity and social justice) and digital equity pedagogy (taking a critical stance toward technology's roles in schools and society). Both approaches emphasise that technologies are never neutral; they carry embedded assumptions, values, and political implications that warrant ongoing scrutiny.

#### **4.5. Paradigmatic tensions and integration**

The paradigms examined in this section are not mutually exclusive; instead, they offer different emphases that may complement one another in comprehensive approaches to educational technology design. Constructivism and connectivism share commitments to active learning and knowledge building, while differing in their views on where knowledge resides – both elaborate on humanistic concerns with agency and authentic engagement. Critical pedagogy offers essential questions about whose interests are served by any particular approach.

Integrative frameworks attempt to bridge paradigmatic perspectives. The adaptable learning theory framework for technology-enhanced learning (AF-TEL) builds on the community of inquiry model's cognitive, social, and teaching presence dimensions while remaining open to various theoretical orientations [33]. Pedagogically flexible designs support both structured and open-ended approaches, adapting to contexts and learner needs [20].

A historical perspective reveals an evolution rather than a replacement of paradigms. Early educational technology reflected behaviourist assumptions; cognitive and constructivist perspectives gained prominence through the 1980s and 1990s; connectivist and critical perspectives have emerged more recently [55]. Future developments will likely draw on multiple traditions rather than privileging any single paradigm.

### **5. Technology-mediated educational process management**

Educational technologies vary substantially in their psychological sophistication – the degree to which they explicitly incorporate and operationalise psychological theories in their design. This section examines three major categories of educational technology systems through a psychological lens: learning management systems, adaptive learning and intelligent tutoring systems, and learning analytics.

#### **5.1. Learning management systems: psychological design principles**

Learning management systems have become a ubiquitous infrastructure in contemporary education, providing web-based platforms for content distribution, assessment, communication, and progress tracking [95]. While often designed primarily for administrative functionality, LMS platforms are increasingly incorporating features with psychological foundations.

Cognitive load considerations inform interface design in well-designed LMS implementations. Streamlined navigation, consistent layouts, and progressive disclosure of information help manage working memory demands and reduce extraneous load [50]. Conversely, poorly designed systems with cluttered interfaces, inconsistent navigation, and overwhelming information presentation can impede learning before instructional content is even accessed.

Self-regulated learning support represents a key psychological function of LMS platforms. Features supporting goal-setting, planning, monitoring, and adjustment can

scaffold SRL development when thoughtfully implemented [32]. Research examining LMS as behaviour change support systems finds that while monitoring and evaluation features are commonly utilised, goal-setting and planning features remain underused, suggesting design and implementation gaps.

Motivational considerations inform engagement features in contemporary LMS design. The technology acceptance model emphasises that perceived usefulness and ease of use determine engagement [37]. Third-generation LMS designs incorporate gamification elements – points, badges, leaderboards, and progress visualisation – to enhance motivation, though evidence for their effectiveness varies by implementation and population [73].

Social-psychological needs are addressed through collaboration features, including discussion forums, group project spaces, and peer review tools [87]. The community of inquiry framework emphasises teacher presence, cognitive presence, and social presence as interconnected dimensions that LMS designs should support [88]. Research consistently finds that LMS features are often underutilised, highlighting the need for teacher professional development on effective online teaching practices alongside technology provision.

## **5.2. Adaptive learning and intelligent tutoring systems**

Adaptive learning systems and intelligent tutoring systems represent the most psychologically sophisticated category of educational technology, explicitly incorporating models of cognition, learning, and individual differences to provide personalised instruction [4, 74].

Cognitive models underpin adaptive system design. Cognitive load theory informs sequencing and presentation decisions that optimise information processing [3]. Bloom's taxonomy and constructive alignment principles enable the creation of individualised learning paths based on learner proficiency and objectives [38]. Learner digital readiness has emerged as a strong predictor of learning path optimisation in adaptive systems.

Learner models in adaptive systems encompass cognitive, affective, and behavioural dimensions [1]. Techniques, including fuzzy logic and educational data mining, identify personal traits that inform personalisation. Two broad approaches characterise personalisation: providing the same learning path at different rates, or creating unique trajectories based on learner responses [4].

Motivational state modelling represents an advancing frontier. Systems incorporating machine learning and persuasive technology adapt to learner motivation in real-time [59]. Psychologically-aware platforms adapt based on emotional feedback and personality traits, significantly enhancing engagement and reducing dropout [36].

Evidence supports the effectiveness of well-designed adaptive systems. Longitudinal research demonstrates improvements in mathematics, reading, and language through personalised approaches [53]. Psychological variables, including self-efficacy and SRL, positively predict satisfaction and outcomes [24]. Emerging systems combining AI with gamification and immersive technologies (VR/AR) represent the cutting edge of personalised learning.

## **5.3. Learning analytics: psychological foundations and applications**

Learning analytics – the measurement, collection, analysis, and reporting of learner data – increasingly draws on psychological theories to guide both what is measured and how insights are translated into interventions [39, 94].

Theoretical grounding shapes learning analytics approaches. Self-regulated learning and social constructivism frameworks inform many analytics implementations, linking behavioural log variables to theoretical constructs [90]. However, research

reveals that behavioural measures derived from learning management systems often correlate poorly with survey-based measures of psychological constructs, except for time management and motivation [68]. This finding highlights the need for multimodal approaches combining behavioural traces with other data sources.

Psychological constructs targeted by learning analytics include emotional states, motivation, and engagement [42]. Physiology-aware systems integrate biosensors to assess cognitive load and detect stress [10]. Facial expression analysis enables measurement of discrete emotions during learning [2]. These approaches move beyond behaviour to address internal psychological states, though validity and privacy concerns warrant attention.

Learning analytics interventions target study performance, provide personalised feedback, and support retention through methods including recommendations and dashboards [94]. Teacher-facing analytics enable real-time identification of student difficulties and evidence-informed instructional adjustment [39]. Third-generation LMS platforms integrate learning analytics for predictive and prescriptive functionality [73].

Challenges persist in learning analytics implementations. Questions remain about the valid measurement of psychological constructs from behavioural traces, the translation of insights into effective interventions, and ensuring equity in how analytics systems affect diverse learner populations. Grounding in psychological theory offers principled frameworks for addressing these challenges [51].

## **6. Integration frameworks and implementation considerations**

The translation of psychological theories into effective educational technology practice requires frameworks that bridge conceptual understanding with practical implementation. This section examines existing integrative frameworks that combine multiple psychological dimensions, explores the critical role of teacher psychology in technology adoption, and identifies the barriers and facilitators affecting the successful implementation of psychologically informed educational technologies.

### **6.1. Multi-theory integration frameworks**

Educational technology research increasingly recognises that single-theory approaches cannot adequately capture the complexity of technology-mediated learning. Multiple frameworks have emerged to integrate cognitive, motivational, affective, and social dimensions into comprehensive models that guide both research and practice.

The cognitive-affective-motivation model of learning (CAMML) represents a significant integrative effort, combining cognitive abilities (informed by CHC theory), affective dimensions (drawing on Big Five personality research), and motivational constructs into a comprehensive framework [54]. CAMML emphasises the importance of combining cognitive abilities with personal investment mechanisms – including motivation and self-regulation – to enhance learning readiness. This model is particularly useful for understanding how different psychological constructs interact to influence learning outcomes and for guiding the design of educational interventions that address multiple dimensions simultaneously.

The adaptable learning theory framework for technology-enhanced learning (AF-TEL) provides a practical framework designed explicitly for technology-mediated educational contexts [33]. Based on the community of inquiry model, AF-TEL incorporates cognitive presence, social presence, and teaching presence as interconnected dimensions that educators must align with educational technologies to achieve desired learning outcomes. The framework has been applied in professional development programs for STEM teachers, demonstrating its utility in connecting learning theory with the selection and implementation of instructional technology.

Models that focus specifically on affective dimensions have also contributed to an integrative understanding. The model of technology-enhanced affective learning merges embodied knowledge construction approaches with holistic learning frameworks to create a pedagogy that considers learners' motivations, interests, and experiences alongside cognitive processes [26]. This model integrates sensory and motor perceptions with embodied cognition within technology-enhanced environments, recognising that learning is not purely cognitive but involves the whole person in situated activity.

Emerging computational approaches are beginning to operationalise multi-theory integration. The theory-guided educational learning transformer (TGEL-Transformer) integrates multiple intelligence theories and social cognitive theories within a machine learning framework [28]. Research on multimodal learning environments has demonstrated the practical benefits of multi-theory integration, with studies showing that multimodal teaching significantly reduces cognitive load, increases collaborative interaction, and extends voluntary practice time through mechanisms such as enhanced embodied cognition and fulfilment of intrinsic motivational needs.

## **6.2. Teacher psychology and technology integration**

The successful implementation of educational technology depends critically on teachers who must adopt, adapt, and effectively utilise technological tools in their instructional practices. Research has identified several psychological factors that influence teachers' integration of technology, providing important considerations for planning implementation.

Teacher beliefs constitute a fundamental influence on technology integration. Pedagogical beliefs significantly impact integration practices, with teachers holding constructivist beliefs more likely to integrate technology effectively compared to those with traditional, transmission-oriented beliefs [31]. Technology value beliefs – teachers' perceptions of whether technology genuinely benefits student learning – also play crucial roles, with positive value beliefs associated with greater integration efforts [17].

Self-efficacy – teachers' confidence in their ability to use technology effectively – emerges as one of the strongest predictors of technology integration across multiple studies [22, 29, 31, 65]. Higher self-efficacy is associated with more positive attitudes toward technology and a greater likelihood of classroom use. Process-focused self-efficacy, which relates specifically to the process of using technology rather than outcomes, appears particularly influential in shaping positive attitudes toward integration [22].

Attitudes toward technology represent another critical factor. Positive attitudes are essential for adoption, with teachers holding favourable attitudes more likely to integrate technology into their teaching practices [41, 75]. Research examining TPACK (technological, pedagogical, and content knowledge) found that attitudes toward technology and TPACK self-beliefs are positively related, suggesting the need for differentiated professional development approaches [75].

Sources of teacher self-efficacy for technology integration extend beyond formal professional development to include informal and independent learning [7]. This finding suggests that implementation strategies should foster environments conducive to peer learning and experimentation, rather than relying solely on structured training programs.

## **6.3. Implementation barriers and facilitators**

The translation of psychologically informed educational technology from research to practice faces multiple barriers, while also benefiting from identifiable facilitating factors. Understanding these dynamics is essential for effective implementation planning.

Technological barriers include inadequate infrastructure and connectivity, particularly in low-resource settings where deployment of sophisticated educational technologies may be constrained by fundamental technical limitations [60, 67]. Institutional barriers encompass a lack of administrative support, inadequate policies promoting technology adoption, and insufficient time allocated for teachers to learn and experiment with new technologies [60].

Psychological barriers include resistance to change, often stemming from low digital self-efficacy and a lack of familiarity with new technologies. Compatibility between new technologies and existing curricular and instructional practices presents challenges, as does the absence of pedagogy designed explicitly for novel technologies [57].

Facilitating factors for successful implementation include iterative adaptation of technologies to fit specific educational contexts and tailored training for educators that addresses their particular concerns and skill levels [67]. A strong institutional commitment and the adoption of universal design principles can significantly enhance the integration of inclusive technologies [47]. Professional learning communities facilitate translation of research into practice by fostering collaboration between researchers and educators.

Design research frameworks offer structured approaches for facilitating and evaluating educational innovations, emphasising the importance of adapting research designs to the complex and dynamic nature of educational systems [16]. Evidence from case studies demonstrates successful translation of psychological theories into practice when collaborative approaches involve practitioners in the development process [9, 58].

## **7. Critical analysis and research gaps**

The preceding sections have synthesised substantial research on the psychological foundations of technology-mediated educational process management. This section critically examines the current state of the field, identifying theoretical limitations, methodological weaknesses, underexplored areas, and the persistent gap between research and practice that constrains the realisation of psychologically-informed educational technology.

A significant critique of educational technology research concerns its theoretical foundations. Many studies in the field are characterised as “under-theorised”, with a substantial proportion lacking explicit engagement with established psychological or educational theories [35]. This theoretical deficit limits the advancement of conceptual frameworks and constrains the cumulative development of knowledge. When studies do invoke theory, they often do so superficially – citing theoretical constructs without rigorously operationalising them or testing theoretical predictions.

The fragmentation of theoretical approaches presents additional challenges. As this review has demonstrated, multiple psychological theories inform educational technology research; yet, these theories are rarely integrated into coherent frameworks. Studies typically draw on single theoretical perspectives, missing opportunities to examine how cognitive, motivational, affective, and social processes interact in technology-mediated learning.

Cultural assumptions embedded in dominant psychological theories represent another limitation. Most influential theories in educational technology emerged from Western, predominantly North American research contexts [79]. The applicability of these frameworks to diverse global educational settings – where cultural values regarding autonomy, social relationships, and learning may differ significantly – remains underexamined. Research from non-Western contexts, particularly African regions, is notably underrepresented in the literature [12].

Methodological concerns pervade educational technology research. Investigations

into methodological capacity within the field have identified prevalent use of basic descriptive research methods and a lack of advanced quantitative and qualitative analytical skills among researchers [14, 34]. This methodological limitation affects the depth, rigour, and generalizability of research findings.

The quality of meta-analyses in educational technology varies significantly, with many exhibiting moderate levels of methodological and reporting quality [86]. Survey and questionnaire methods dominate data collection; yet, these approaches have inherent limitations in capturing the complexity of technology use in educational settings [8]. The alignment between learning analytics measures and psychological constructs presents particular challenges, with research finding that behavioural measures are often poorly correlated with survey measurements [68].

Several areas warrant substantially more research attention. Studies examining the use of educational technology in naturalistic settings remain scarce compared to controlled experimental interventions [12]. Research on educational technology for learners with disabilities continues to reveal gaps in representing the full range of disabilities and in evaluating the long-term impacts of interventions [56].

Emerging technologies, including artificial intelligence, blockchain, and extended reality, remain under-researched in formal educational settings [78]. Gender dynamics in technology-enhanced learning constitute an under-explored area. The psychological impacts of long-term technology use in education remain largely unknown, as most studies employ short intervention periods.

Perhaps the most consequential gap concerns the persistent disconnect between psychological research and the practice of educational technology. Despite decades of research articulating how cognitive load, motivation, self-regulation, and social processes affect learning, many educational technologies are designed and deployed with minimal attention to psychological principles [76].

Several factors contribute to this gap. Researchers often lack practical experience in educational settings, leading to findings that may be theoretically sound but difficult to implement [30]. Communication barriers between disciplines exacerbate the gap, with psychological research often inaccessible to educational technologists, instructional designers, and teachers. Teacher preparation and professional development represent critical but often weak links in translating psychological research to practice [47].

## 8. Toward an integrative framework

Building on the synthesis presented in preceding sections and addressing gaps identified in the critical analysis, this section proposes a conceptual framework for integrating psychological foundations with technology-mediated educational process management. The psychological integration framework for educational technology management (PI-ETM) aims to provide a structured approach for researchers, designers, and practitioners seeking to ground educational technology in psychological principles while attending to implementation realities.

The PI-ETM framework comprises four interconnected layers that must be addressed in the design, implementation, and evaluation of psychologically-informed educational technology: (1) psychological foundations, (2) educational paradigm alignment, (3) technological instantiation, and (4) contextual implementation. These layers interact bidirectionally, with each informing and constraining the others.

The **psychological foundations layer** encompasses the core theoretical constructs that explain how learning occurs and what conditions support effective learning. This layer includes:

- *Cognitive dimensions* – working memory limitations, schema construction, cognitive load management, and information processing considerations.

- *Motivational dimensions* – intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, basic psychological needs (autonomy, competence, relatedness), goal orientations, and self-efficacy beliefs.
- *Self-regulatory dimensions* – metacognitive monitoring, strategic planning, goal-setting, self-assessment, and adaptive help-seeking.
- *Social-emotional dimensions* – social learning processes, collaborative knowledge construction, emotional states, and affective responses.

The **educational paradigm alignment layer** connects psychological foundations to broader pedagogical orientations. The **technological instantiation layer** addresses how psychological principles and paradigmatic orientations are operationalised in specific technology systems. The **contextual implementation layer** addresses the ecological factors that determine whether psychologically-grounded technology achieves its potential in practice.

Seven principles guide the application of the PI-ETM framework:

1. *Theoretical explicitness* – educational technology initiatives should explicitly identify the psychological theories informing design decisions and articulate testable predictions derived from those theories.
2. *Multidimensional integration* – effective educational technology addresses cognitive, motivational, self-regulatory, and social-emotional dimensions in concert rather than isolation.
3. *Paradigmatic coherence with flexibility* – technology design should maintain coherence with chosen pedagogical paradigms while allowing adaptation to diverse instructional contexts.
4. *Learner-centred adaptation* – technologies should adapt to individual learner characteristics, including prior knowledge, cognitive abilities, motivational states, and learning preferences.
5. *Teacher empowerment* – systems should support rather than supplant teacher professional judgment, providing actionable insights and customisation options.
6. *Contextual sensitivity* – implementation must account for institutional, cultural, and resource contexts.
7. *Ethical grounding* – educational technology design and implementation must attend to ethical considerations, including data privacy, algorithmic fairness, accessibility, and digital equity.

The PI-ETM framework makes several contributions. First, it provides a structured approach for connecting psychological theory to educational technology practice, helping bridge the theory-practice gap. Second, the framework's multidimensional approach counters the tendency toward single-theory perspectives. Third, the explicit attention to contextual implementation factors addresses the limitations of strategies that focus exclusively on technology design without considering deployment realities. Finally, the framework's emphasis on ethical grounding ensures that psychological effectiveness is pursued within appropriate normative constraints.

## **9. Implications and future directions**

This review has synthesised research on psychological foundations of technology-mediated educational process management, identified critical gaps, and proposed an integrative framework. This concluding section articulates implications for research, practice, and policy, and outlines directions for future inquiry.

Several implications for research emerge from this review. First, there is a pressing need for more theoretically-grounded research that explicitly derives hypotheses from psychological theories and rigorously tests them in educational technology contexts. Multi-theory research designs warrant greater attention, examining how cognitive load, motivation, self-regulation, and social processes interact within technology-enhanced learning environments.

Methodological advancement is essential. The field needs the development of validated measures that accurately capture psychological constructs in digital learning environments. Longitudinal research, which tracks learners over extended periods, is critically needed. Research in diverse contexts – including underrepresented geographical regions, varied educational levels, and populations with different needs – will strengthen the evidence base.

For educational technology designers and developers, this review highlights the importance of basing design decisions on psychological research. The PI-ETM framework provides a structured approach for connecting theory to design. Attention to multiple psychological dimensions should inform design rather than a narrow focus on any single dimension.

For educators and instructional designers, understanding psychological foundations enables more effective technology selection and integration. Teacher preparation and ongoing professional development emerge as critical priorities. Institutional leaders and administrators should create conditions conducive to psychologically informed technology implementation, including adequate infrastructure, time for teacher learning, and a culture of continuous improvement.

Emerging technologies present both opportunities and challenges for psychological research in education. Generative artificial intelligence is transforming the creation and interaction of educational content [49, 97]. Research must examine the psychological impacts of learning with AI systems and what new competencies learners need to engage effectively with AI-enhanced learning environments.

Extended reality technologies offer unprecedented possibilities for immersive, embodied learning experiences [48, 92]. The combination of AI with XR technologies to create intelligent virtual tutors presents particularly rich research opportunities. Learning analytics continues to evolve, with future research addressing how analytics can support learner self-regulation and agency.

Ethical dimensions of educational technology require sustained attention. As systems become more powerful, questions of data privacy, algorithmic bias, digital equity, and appropriate human-AI relationships become increasingly urgent [69, 77]. Research-practice partnerships offer promising models for bridging the theory-practice gap through collaborative arrangements bringing together psychological researchers, technology developers, and educational practitioners.

Technology-mediated educational process management has become ubiquitous across educational contexts worldwide. This review has demonstrated that psychological theories provide essential foundations for understanding, designing, and implementing educational technologies that genuinely support learning. The technology systems examined – learning management systems, adaptive learning platforms, intelligent tutoring systems, and learning analytics – vary substantially in their psychological sophistication.

Addressing the gap between research and practice requires coordinated effort across research, design, and practice communities. The PI-ETM framework proposed here offers a structured approach for integration, emphasising theoretical explicitness, multidimensional consideration, contextual sensitivity, and ethical grounding. Ultimately, the goal is educational technology that supports not merely the transmission of information but the development of capable, motivated, self-directed learners prepared to thrive in an increasingly technology-mediated world.

## References

- [1] Afini Normadhi, N.B., Shuib, L., Md Nasir, H.N., Bimba, A., Idris, N. and Balakrishnan, V., 2019. Identification of personal traits in adaptive learning environment: Systematic literature review. *Computers and Education*, 130, pp.168–190. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2018.11.005>.
- [2] Ahn, B. and Harley, J.M., 2020. Facial expressions when learning with a Queer History App: Application of the Control Value Theory of Achievement Emotions. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 51(5), pp.1563–1576. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12989>.
- [3] Alsaffar, R.D., 2025. The Role of AI-Driven Adaptive Multimedia Systems on Personalized Learning Paths. *Asian Journal of University Education*, 21(2), pp.380–402. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.24191/ajue.v21i1.26>.
- [4] Anoir, L., Khaldi, M. and Erradi, M., 2024. Intelligent Tutor Systems and the Personalization of Pedagogical Objects in Adaptive e-Learning. In: C.S. Gosavi, G. Bhutkar, A. Banubakode and E. Eilu, eds. *Interactive Media with Next-Gen Technologies and Their Usability Evaluation*. New York: Chapman and Hall/CRC. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1201/9781032664828>.
- [5] Azevedo, R., Bouchet, F., Duffy, M., Harley, J., Taub, M., Trevors, G. and Wiedbusch, M., 2022. Lessons Learned and Future Directions of Meta-Tutor: Leveraging Multichannel Data to Scaffold Self-Regulated Learning with an Intelligent Tutoring System. *Frontiers in Psychology*. Frontiers Media SA, vol. 7, p.813632. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.813632>.
- [6] Bandura, A., 2001. Social Cognitive Theory: An Agentive Perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52(1), pp.1–26. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.1>.
- [7] Barton, E.A. and Dexter, S., 2020. Sources of teachers' self-efficacy for technology integration from formal, informal, and independent professional learning. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 68(1), pp.89–108. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-019-09671-6>.
- [8] Bebell, D., Russell, M., O'Dwyer, L.M. and Hoffmann, T., 2010. Concerns, Considerations, and New Ideas for Data Collection and Research in Educational Technology Studies. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 43(1), pp.29–52. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2010.10782560>.
- [9] Begolli, K.N., Bermudez, V.N., Lawrence, L., Acevedo-Farag, L.M., Valdez, S.V., Santana, E., Alvarez-Vargas, D., Ahn, J., Bailey, D., Rhodes, K., Richland, L.E. and Bustamante, A.S., 2024. Incorporating Design Based Implementation Research with a Randomized Controlled Trial to develop and evaluate the efficacy of playful rational number learning. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 78, p.102296. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2024.102296>.
- [10] Bleck, M., Le, N.T. and Pinkwart, N., 2020. Physiology-Aware Learning Analytics Using Pedagogical Agents. *CEUR Workshop Proceedings*. vol. 2610, pp.17–22. Available from: <https://ceur-ws.org/Vol-2610/paper4.pdf>.
- [11] Bodily, R. and Verbert, K., 2017. Review of Research on Student-Facing

- Learning Analytics Dashboards and Educational Recommender Systems. *IEEE Transactions on Learning Technologies*, 10(4), pp.405–418. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1109/TLT.2017.2740172>.
- [12] Bond, M., Zawacki-Richter, O. and Nichols, M., 2019. Revisiting five decades of educational technology research: A content and authorship analysis of the British Journal of Educational Technology. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 50(1), pp.12–63. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12730>.
- [13] Braun, V. and Clarke, V., 2006. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), pp.77–101. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp0630a>.
- [14] Bulfin, S., Henderson, M., Johnson, N.F. and Selwyn, N., 2014. Methodological capacity within the field of “educational technology” research: An initial investigation. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 45(3), pp.403–414. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12145>.
- [15] Cárdenas-Robledo, L.A. and Peña-Ayala, A., 2019. A holistic self-regulated learning model: A proposal and application in ubiquitous-learning. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 123, pp.299–314. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2019.01.007>.
- [16] Castillo, J.M., Dorman, C., Gaunt, B., Hardcastle, B., Justice, K. and March, A.L., 2016. Design Research as a Mechanism for Consultants to Facilitate and Evaluate Educational Innovations. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 26(1), pp.25–48. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10474412.2015.1039125>.
- [17] Cheng, L., Antonenko, P.D. and Ritzhaupt, A.D., 2024. The impact of teachers’ pedagogical beliefs, self-efficacy, and technology value beliefs on 3D printing integration in K-12 science classrooms. *Educational technology research and development*, 72(1), pp.181–208. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-023-10276-3>.
- [18] Chieu, V.M., 2007. An operational approach for building learning environments supporting cognitive flexibility. *Educational technology and society*, 10(3), pp.32–46. Available from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/jeductechsoci.10.3.32>.
- [19] Csikszentmihalyi, M., 1997. *Finding Flow: The Psychology of Engagement with Everyday Life*. New York: Basic Books.
- [20] Dahl, J.E. and Mørch, A., 2025. A theoretical and empirical analysis of tensions between learning objects and constructivism. *Education and Information Technologies*, 30(15), pp.22101–22150. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-025-13636-z>.
- [21] Deci, E.L. and Ryan, R.M., 1985. *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behavior*, Perspectives in Social Psychology. New York: Plenum Press. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4899-2271-7>.
- [22] Ding, L. and Hong, Z., 2024. On the Relationship Between Pre-service Teachers’ Sense of Self-efficacy and Emotions in the Integration of Technology in Their Teacher Developmental Programs. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 33(4), pp.869–878. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-023-00758-6>.
- [23] D’Mello, S. and Graesser, A., 2013. AutoTutor and Affective AutoTutor: Learning by Talking with Cognitively and Emotionally Intelligent Computers that Talk Back. *ACM Transactions on Interactive Intelligent Systems*, 2(4), pp.23:1–23:39. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2395123.2395128>.
- [24] Eom, S.B., 2012. Effects of LMS, self-efficacy, and self-regulated learning on LMS effectiveness in business education. *Journal of International Education in Business*, 5(2), p.129–144. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1108/18363261211281744>.
- [25] Feyzi Behnagh, R. and Yasrebi, S., 2020. An examination of constructivist

- educational technologies: Key affordances and conditions. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 51(6), pp.1907–1919. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13036>.
- [26] Frangou, S.M. and Körkkö, M., 2020. Model of Technology Enhanced Affective Learning. In: T.C. Huang, T.T. Wu, J. Barroso, F.E. Sandnes, P. Martins and Y.M. Huang, eds. *Innovative Technologies and Learning*. Cham: Springer International Publishing, *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 12555, pp.582–590. Available from: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-63885-6\\_63](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-63885-6_63).
- [27] Fuente, O. Pérez de la, 2025. Bridging the Digital Divide: On Overview. In: O. Pérez de la Fuente and J. Skrzypczak, eds. *Bridging the Digital Divide: Perspectives on Inequality and Discrimination in the Digital Age*. Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland, *Palgrave Studies in Digital Inequalities*, pp.1–21. Available from: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-83479-0\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-83479-0_1).
- [28] Gong, Y., Wang, F., Zhang, Y. and Geng, J., 2025. TGEL-transformer: Fusing educational theories with deep learning for interpretable student performance prediction. *PLOS ONE*, 20(6), p.e0327481. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0327481>.
- [29] Govender, D. and Govender, I., 2009. The Relationship between Information and Communications Technology (ICT) Integration and Teachers' Self-efficacy Beliefs about ICT. *Education as Change*, 13(1), pp.153–165. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/16823200902943346>.
- [30] Grima-Farrell, C.R., Long, J., Bentley-Williams, R. and Laws, C., 2014. A School System and University Approach to Reducing the Research to Practice Gap in Teacher Education: A Collaborative Special Education Immersion Project. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 39(5). Available from: <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2014v39n5.2>.
- [31] Han, I., Shin, W.S. and Ko, Y., 2017. The effect of student teaching experience and teacher beliefs on pre-service teachers' self-efficacy and intention to use technology in teaching. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 23(7), pp.829–842. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2017.1322057>.
- [32] Haque, M.S., Tripathi, A., Lau, S.L. and Porras, J., 2025. Do Metacognitive Strategies Work? Moodle as a BCSS Tool to Enhance Self-Regulated Learning Behavior in Software Engineering Students. In: H. Oinas-Kukkonen and S. Nabwire, eds. *Proceedings of the 13th International Workshop on Behavior Change Support Systems (BCSS 2025), co-located with the 20th International Conference on Persuasive Technology 2025, Limassol, Cyprus, May 5, 2025*. CEUR-WS.org, *CEUR Workshop Proceedings*, vol. 3965, pp.73–83. Available from: [https://ceur-ws.org/Vol-3965/BCSS25\\_Paper6.pdf](https://ceur-ws.org/Vol-3965/BCSS25_Paper6.pdf).
- [33] Havard, B., East, M.L., Prayaga, L. and Whiteside, A., 2016. Adaptable Learning Theory Framework for Technology-Enhanced Learning. In: Information Resources Management Association, ed. *Leadership and Personnel Management: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications*. Hershey, PA: IGI Global Scientific Publishing, vol. 1, chap. 18, pp.384–406. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-4666-9624-2.ch018>.
- [34] Heinrich, E., 2024. Revolutionising educational technology: The imperative for authentic qualitative research. *Social Sciences and Humanities Open*, 10, p.101073. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2024.101073>.
- [35] Hew, K.F., Lan, M., Tang, Y., Jia, C. and Lo, C.K., 2019. Where is the “theory” within the field of educational technology research? *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 50(3), pp.956–971. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12770>.
- [36] Hu, W. and Shao, Z., 2025. Design and evaluation of a GenAI-based personalized

- educational content system tailored to personality traits and emotional responses for adaptive learning. *Computers in Human Behavior Reports*, 19, p.100735. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbr.2025.100735>.
- [37] Husin, H.S., Ibrahim, I., Ibrahim, H.M., Mahari, M., Yue, Z. and Phang, S.K., 2024. Students' Acceptance and Attitude of Using Learning Management System (LMS). *2024 International Visualization, Informatics and Technology Conference, IVIT 2024*. pp.177–183. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1109/IVIT62102.2024.10692779>.
- [38] Huu, P.N., Tangworakitthaworn, P. and Gilbert, L., 2021. Towards self-regulated individual learning path generation using outcome taxonomies and constructive alignment. *Tale 2021 - iee international conference on engineering, technology and education, proceedings*. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1109/TALE52509.2021.9678575>.
- [39] Ifenthaler, D. and Yau, J.Y.K., 2022. Analytics for Supporting Teaching Success in Higher Education: A Systematic Review. *IEEE Global Engineering Education Conference, EDUCON*. pp.1721–1727. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1109/EDUCON52537.2022.9766734>.
- [40] Joksimović, S., Dowell, N., Skrypnik, O., Kovanović, V., Gašević, D., Dawson, S. and Graesser, A.C., 2015. How do you connect? Analysis of social capital accumulation in connectivist MOOCs. *Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Learning Analytics And Knowledge*. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, LAK '15, p.64–68. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2723576.2723604>.
- [41] Kao, C.P., Wu, Y.T., Chang, Y.Y., Chien, H.M. and Mou, T.Y., 2020. Understanding Web-Based Professional Development in Education: The Role of Attitudes and Self-efficacy in Predicting Teachers' Technology-Teaching Integration. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 29(5), pp.405–415. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-019-00493-x>.
- [42] Kew, S.N. and Tasir, Z., 2022. Developing a Learning Analytics Intervention in E-learning to Enhance Students' Learning Performance: A Case Study. *Education and Information Technologies*, 27(5), pp.7099–7134. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-022-10904-0>.
- [43] Kirschner, P.A., Sweller, J., Kirschner, F. and Zambrano R., J., 2018. From Cognitive Load Theory to Collaborative Cognitive Load Theory. *International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning*, 13(2), pp.213–233. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11412-018-9277-y>.
- [44] Koh, J., 2024. Critical Digital Pedagogy: A Collaborative Teaching Approach. In: M.M. Asad, P.P. Churi, F. Sherwani and R.B. Hassan, eds. *Innovative Pedagogical Practices for Higher Education 4.0: Solutions and Demands of the Modern Classroom*. Boca Raton: CRC Press, pp.320–331. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1201/9781003400691-20>.
- [45] Kop, R., 2011. The Challenges to Connectivist Learning on Open Online Networks: Learning Experiences during a Massive Open Online Course. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 12(3), pp.19–38. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v12i3.882>.
- [46] Kop, R. and Hill, A., 2008. Connectivism: Learning theory of the future or vestige of the past? *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 9(3). Available from: <https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v9i3.523>.
- [47] Kruty, K., Zdanevych, L., Desnova, I., Blashkova, O. and Zameliuk, M., 2024. The Main Trends in the Formation of Psychological Competence in the Process of Teacher Training. *Academia*, (35-36), pp.50–72. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.26220/aca.5002>.

- [48] Lampropoulos, G., 2025. Combining Artificial Intelligence with Augmented Reality and Virtual Reality in Education: Current Trends and Future Perspectives. *Multimodal Technologies and Interaction*, 9(2), p.11. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.3390/mti9020011>.
- [49] Linares-Pellicer, J., Izquierdo-Domenech, J., Ferri-Molla, I. and Aliaga-Torro, C., 2025. Breaking the Bottleneck: Generative AI as the Solution for XR Content Creation in Education. In: E. Vendrell Vidal, U.R. Cukierman and M.E. Auer, eds. *Advanced Technologies and the University of the Future*. Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland, *Lecture Notes in Networks and Systems*, vol. 1140, pp.9–30. Available from: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-71530-3\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-71530-3_2).
- [50] Llantos, O.E. and Estuar, M.R.J.E., 2018. my.Eskwela: Designing An Enterprise Learning Management System to Increase Social Network and Reduce Cognitive Load. *Procedia Computer Science*. vol. 138, pp.595–602. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2018.10.080>.
- [51] Marzouk, Z., Rakovic, M., Liaqat, A., Vytasek, J.M., Samber, D., Stewart-Alonso, J., Ram, I., Woloshen, S., Navarro, P. and Nesbit, J.C., 2016. What if learning analytics were based on learning science? *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 32(6), pp.1–18. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.3058>.
- [52] Mayer, R.E., 2021. Evidence-Based Principles for How to Design Effective Instructional Video. *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition*, 10(2), pp.229–240. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jarmac.2021.03.007>.
- [53] McCarthy, E.M., Liu, Y. and Schauer, K.L., 2020. Strengths-based blended personalized learning: An impact study using virtual comparison group. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 52(3), pp.353–370. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2020.1716202>.
- [54] McGrew, K.S., 2022. The cognitive-affective-motivation model of learning (CAMML): Standing on the shoulders of giants. *Canadian journal of school psychology*, 37(1), pp.3–34. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1177/08295735211053973>.
- [55] Molenda, M., 2008. Historical Foundations. In: M.J. Spector, M.D. Merrill, J. van Merriënboer and M.P. Driscoll, eds. *Handbook of Research on Educational Communications and Technology*. 3rd ed. New York: Routledge, pp.3–20. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203880869>.
- [56] Murillo-Jiménez, H., Centeno-Alarcón, M., Buele, J. and Yumbra, F., 2025. Analyzing barriers to the effective implementation of technological tools in inclusive education: a scoping review. *Frontiers in Education*, 10, p.1687664. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2025.1687664>.
- [57] Ndjama, J.D.J.D.N. and Westhuizen, J. van der, 2025. A Systematic Review of the Challenges and Limitations of VR in Education. In: S.M. Hussain and A.N. Hakro, eds. *Creating Immersive Learning Experiences Through Virtual Reality (VR)*. Hershey, PA: IGI Global Scientific Publishing, chap. 1, pp.1–31. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-6407-9.ch001>.
- [58] Norwich, B., Koutsouris, G., Fujita, T. and Milton, F., 2016. Exploring knowledge bridging and translation in lesson study using an inter-professional team. *International Journal for Lesson and Learning Studies*, 5(3), pp.180–195. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJLLS-02-2016-0006>.
- [59] Orji, F.A. and Vassileva, J., 2021. Modelling and Quantifying Learner Motivation for Adaptive Systems: Current Insight and Future Perspectives. In: R.A. Sottolare and J. Schwarz, eds. *Adaptive Instructional Systems. Adaptation Strategies and Methods*. Cham: Springer International Publishing, *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 12793, pp.79–92. Available from: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-77873-6\\_6](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-77873-6_6).

- [60] Oulamine, A., Chakra, R., Ziky, R., Bahida, H., Gareh, F.E., Oubihi, I. and Massiki, A., 2025. A Systematic Literature Review of Barriers Affecting e-Learning in Higher Education. *Educational Process: International Journal*, 17, p.e2025396. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.22521/edupij.2025.17.396>.
- [61] Öztürk, H.T., 2015. Examining value change in MOOCs in the scope of connectivism and open educational resources movement. *International review of research in open and distributed learning*, 16(5), pp.1–25. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v16i5.2027>.
- [62] Panadero, E., 2017. A Review of Self-regulated Learning: Six Models and Four Directions for Research. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, p.422. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00422>.
- [63] Pekrun, R., 2006. The Control-Value Theory of Achievement Emotions: Assumptions, Corollaries, and Implications for Educational Research and Practice. *Educational Psychology Review*, 18(4), pp.315–341. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-006-9029-9>.
- [64] Pekrun, R., 2017. Emotion and Achievement During Adolescence. *Child Development Perspectives*, 11(3), pp.215–221. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdep.12237>.
- [65] Peng, R., Razak, R.A. and Halili, S.H., 2024. Exploring the role of attitudes, self-efficacy, and digital competence in influencing teachers' integration of ICT: A partial least squares structural equation modeling study. *Heliyon*, 10(8), p.e29549. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e29549>.
- [66] Philip, A., 2024. Educating Generation Z: Adapting Humanistic Teaching in Blended Learning Environment. In: M.F.b. Romlie, S.H. Shaikh Ali, Z.B. Hari and M.C. Leow, eds. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Advancing and Redesigning Education 2023*. Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore, Lecture Notes in Educational Technology, pp.499–510. Available from: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-97-4507-4\\_54](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-97-4507-4_54).
- [67] Pollini, A. and Giacobone, G.A., 2025. Unsustainability in Sustainability Education: Limits of Technology In Situ. *Sustainability*, 17(20), p.9178. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.3390/su17209178>.
- [68] Quick, J., Motz, B., Israel, J. and Kaetzel, J., 2020. What college students say, and what they do: aligning self-regulated learning theory with behavioral logs. *Proceedings of the Tenth International Conference on Learning Analytics & Knowledge*. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, LAK '20, p.534–543. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3375462.3375516>.
- [69] Rajamanickam, L., Riskhan, B., Tshering, U., Setiawan, I. and Ahmed, M.H., 2025. Integrating Emerging Technologies in Higher Education: Impact, Challenges, and Scalable Adoption Strategies. *2025 International Conference on Metaverse and Current Trends in Computing, ICMCTC 2025*. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICMCTC62214.2025.11196713>.
- [70] Rugelj, J., Cigliarič, M., Krevl, A., Pančur, M. and Brodnik, A., 2012. Constructivist Learning Environment in a Cloud. In: L. Uden, E.S. Corchado Rodríguez, J.F. De Paz Santana and F. De la Prieta, eds. *Workshop on Learning Technology for Education in Cloud (LTEC'12)*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, *Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing*, vol. 173, pp.193–204. Available from: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-30859-8\\_18](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-30859-8_18).
- [71] Ryan, R.M. and Deci, E.L., 2017. *Self-Determination Theory: Basic Psychological Needs in Motivation, Development, and Wellness*. New York: The Guilford Press. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1521/978.14625/28806>.
- [72] Ryan, R.M. and Deci, E.L., 2020. Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation from a self-determination theory perspective: Definitions, theory, practices, and future

- directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 61, p.101860. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101860>.
- [73] Şahin, M. and Yurdugül, H., 2022. Learners' Needs in Online Learning Environments and Third Generation Learning Management Systems (LMS 3.0). *Technology, Knowledge and Learning*, 27(1), pp.33–48. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10758-020-09479-x>.
- [74] Sani, S.M., Aris, T.N.M., Mustapha, N. and Sulaiman, M.N., 2015. A fuzzy logic approach to manage uncertainty and improve the prediction accuracy in student model design. *Journal of Theoretical and Applied Information Technology*, 82(3), pp.366–377. Available from: <https://www.jatit.org/volumes/Vol82No3/5Vol82No3.pdf>.
- [75] Scherer, R., Tondeur, J., Siddiq, F. and Baran, E., 2018. The importance of attitudes toward technology for pre-service teachers' technological, pedagogical, and content knowledge: Comparing structural equation modeling approaches. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 80, pp.67–80. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2017.11.003>.
- [76] Schneider, J., Limbu, B. and Kiesler, N., 2025. Of house of cards and air castles, a deep dive into the fertile fields of educational technologies and technology enhanced learning. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*, 37(2), pp.561–613. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12528-025-09450-8>.
- [77] Scrivner, O., Nguyen, A., Scrivner, J. and De Laat, M., 2025. Transforming Teaching and Learning: Ethical Considerations, Student Engagement, and Innovative Technologies. *Proceedings of the Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*. pp.2–3. Available from: <https://scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/server/api/core/bitstreams/7ba86119-280f-4ef9-91b5-c4824db192d9/content>.
- [78] Sembey, R., Hoda, R. and Grundy, J., 2024. Emerging technologies in higher education assessment and feedback practices: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Systems and Software*, 211, p.111988. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jss.2024.111988>.
- [79] Shadiev, R., Wang, X., Wu, T.T. and Huang, Y.M., 2021. Review of Research on Technology-Supported Cross-Cultural Learning. *Sustainability*, 13(3), p.1402. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13031402>.
- [80] Siemens, G., 2008. Learning and Knowing in Networks: Changing Roles for Educators and Designers. *ITFORUM for Discussion*. Available from: <https://eclass.uoa.gr/modules/document/file.php/PPP233/%CE%AC%CF%81%CE%B8%CF%81%CE%B1%20%CE%B2%CE%B9%CE%B2%CE%BB%CE%B9%CE%BF%CE%B3%CF%81%CE%B1%CF%86%CE%AF%CE%B1%CF%82/Siemens%202008.pdf>.
- [81] Skrypnyk, O., Joksimović, S., Kovanović, V., Gašević, D. and Dawson, S., 2015. Roles of course facilitators, learners, and technology in the flow of information of a cMOOC. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 16(3), pp.188–217. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v16i3.2170>.
- [82] Stahl, G., 2006. *Group Cognition: Computer Support for Building Collaborative Knowledge*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/3372.001.0001>.
- [83] Sweller, J., 1988. Cognitive Load During Problem Solving: Effects on Learning. *Cognitive Science*, 12(2), pp.257–285. Available from: [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15516709cog1202\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15516709cog1202_4).
- [84] Sweller, J., Merriënboer, J.J.G. van and Paas, F., 2019. Cognitive Architecture and Instructional Design: 20 Years Later. *Educational Psychology Review*, 31(2), pp.261–292. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-019-09465-5>.

- [85] Tafrova-Grigorova, A., 2016. Historical roots and development of constructivism. *Chemistry: Bulgarian Journal of Science Education*, 25(1), pp.75–106.
- [86] Tamim, R.M., Borokhovski, E., Bernard, R.M., Schmid, R.F., Abrami, P.C. and Pickup, D.I., 2021. A study of meta-analyses reporting quality in the large and expanding literature of educational technology. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 37(4), pp.100–115. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.6322>.
- [87] Teasley, S.D. and Lonn, S., 2007. Using learning management systems to support students' collaborative learning in higher education. *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Computer Supported Collaborative Learning*. International Society of the Learning Sciences, CSCL'07, p.718–720.
- [88] Tshahla, M., 2023. The Role of Learning Management Systems to Enhance Learner Support. In: N. Eteokleous, D. Ktoridou and A. Kafa, eds. *Emerging Trends and Historical Perspectives Surrounding Digital Transformation in Education*. Hershey, PA: IGI Global Scientific Publishing, chap. 11, pp.254–266. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-6684-4423-8.ch011>.
- [89] Vansteenkiste, M., Aelterman, N., De Muyneck, G.J., Haerens, L., Patall, E. and Reeve, J., 2018. Fostering Personal Meaning and Self-relevance: A Self-Determination Theory Perspective on Internalization. *The journal of experimental education*, 86(1), pp.30–49. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220973.2017.1381067>.
- [90] Wang, Q., Mousavi, A. and Lu, C., 2022. A scoping review of empirical studies on theory-driven learning analytics. *Distance Education*, 43(1), pp.6–29. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2021.2020621>.
- [91] Warschauer, M., 2003. Dissecting the “Digital Divide”: A Case Study in Egypt. *Information society*, 19(4), pp.297–304. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01972240309490>.
- [92] Wei, Z. and Yuan, M., 2023. Research on the Current Situation and Future Development Trend of Immersive Virtual Reality in the Field of Education. *Sustainability*, 15(9), p.7531. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15097531>.
- [93] Widigdo, M.S.A., Ramli, S.A., Asrifan, A., Kadir, A., Sairin, S. and Madjid, A., 2025. Creating Holistic Learning Environments: Integrating AI, Education, and Psychological Principles. In: A. Asrifan, ed. *Human-Centered Learning Design in the AI Era*. Hershey, PA: IGI Global Scientific Publishing, chap. 2, pp.29–59. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3373-5786-7.ch002>.
- [94] Wong, B.T.m. and Li, K.C., 2020. A review of learning analytics intervention in higher education (2011–2018). *Journal of Computers in Education*, 7(1), pp.7–28. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40692-019-00143-7>.
- [95] Yildirim, S., Temur, N., Kocaman, A. and Göktaş, Y., 2004. What makes a good LMS: An analytical approach to assessment of LMSs. *Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Information Technology Based Higher Education and Training, ITHET 2004*. pp.125–130. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ITHET.2004.1358150>.
- [96] Yokoyama, S., 2019. Academic Self-Efficacy and Academic Performance in Online Learning: A Mini Review. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, p.2794. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.02794>.
- [97] Yuan, X., Ding, Z., Zhang, Z., Zhou, L., Zhou, Y. and Ge, Z., 2025. Personalized learning resources created by generative artificial intelligence: A systematic review. *2025 11th International Conference on Education and Training Technologies (ICETT)*. pp.84–89. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICETT66247.2025.11137092>.
- [98] Zimmerman, B.J., 2000. Attaining Self-Regulation: A Social Cognitive Perspective.

In: M. Boekaerts, P.R. Pintrich and M. Zeidner, eds. *Handbook of Self-Regulation*. San Diego: Academic Press, chap. 2, pp.13–39. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-012109890-2/50031-7>.