PERSONALIZED LEARNING WITH ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

Abdurashidova Marguba Bakhodir kizi
3 rd year student majoring in Foreign Language and Literature at Namangan State Institute of Foreign Languages named after Is'hoqxon Ibrat.
Email: abdurashidovamarguba@gmail.com
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23918602

ABSTRACT

Artificial intelligence (AI) is reshaping personalized learning by enabling adaptive content sequencing, formative feedback, intelligent tutoring, and data-informed instructional support. This article critically examines the educational value, implementation requirements, and ethical limitations of AI-enabled personalization, with particular attention to higher education and emerging digital education contexts. A structured narrative review and comparative synthesis of peer-reviewed meta-analyses, reviews, and international guidance published primarily between 2023 and 2026 were undertaken. The synthesis distinguishes evidence of learning gains from broader claims about engagement, fairness, and scalability. The findings suggest that AI is most defensible as an augmentation of pedagogical judgement rather than a substitute for educators. Effective adoption requires accessibility, privacy protection, transparent evaluation, teacher preparation, and continuous monitoring of learning outcomes.

Keywords: artificial intelligence; personalized learning; adaptive learning; intelligent tutoring systems; learning analytics; higher education; educational ethics.

INTRODUCTION

Learners enter educational settings with different levels of prior knowledge, language proficiency, motivation, accessibility needs, and learning pace. Conventional instruction must often balance these differences against limited instructional time and resources. Personalized learning seeks to adjust educational goals, learning activities, feedback, and support to learners' demonstrated needs without abandoning shared curricular standards. AI has expanded the technical means for such adjustment through predictive models, recommendation systems, natural-language interfaces, and automated analysis of learning interactions [1, 2].

AI-based personalization is not synonymous with allowing an algorithm to determine the entire learning process. A recommendation may be statistically plausible but pedagogically unsuitable, particularly when student data are incomplete or the system misinterprets errors, language differences, or disability-related needs. UNESCO therefore advocates human-centred, age-appropriate, privacy-conscious uses of generative AI and highlights the importance of teacher competence and student agency [3–5]. The key research problem is how to obtain measurable learning benefits while preserving instructional quality, equity, and meaningful human oversight.

This article aims to (i) synthesize credible empirical evidence on AI-enabled personalized learning; (ii) explain the mechanisms through which AI can adapt instruction; (iii) identify conditions and risks that influence effectiveness; and (iv) develop an evidence-informed implementation framework relevant to higher education. Its contribution is a critical, practice-oriented synthesis, not a claim to have conducted a new classroom experiment.

LITERATURE REVIEW

© Ushbu material Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) litsenziyasi asosida tarqatiladi.

Personalized learning has roots in differentiated instruction, mastery learning, and intelligent tutoring. AI-enabled approaches add computational mechanisms for estimating learner knowledge and selecting a subsequent task or feedback response. Such systems may use knowledge tracing, item-response modelling, machine learning, or language models; however, the presence of AI alone does not guarantee effective pedagogy. Educational value depends on whether adaptation is aligned with learning objectives and whether the assessment signals used by the system are valid.

Wang and colleagues' 2024 meta-analysis examined 45 independent studies identified through 18 academic databases and found a medium-to-large positive average effect on cognitive outcomes for AI-enabled adaptive learning relative to non-adaptive interventions (Hedges' g = 0.70) [1]. Importantly, effects were moderated by student level, discipline, duration, research design, and other characteristics. This result supports potential effectiveness but should not be interpreted as a universal improvement for every learner or platform.

Hooshyar and colleagues' 2024 meta-analysis of personalized technology-enhanced learning in higher education reported positive average effects on cognitive and non-cognitive outcomes, while emphasizing the influence of instructional settings and design choices [2]. A 2024 scoping review of personalized adaptive learning in higher education likewise documented diverse approaches to adaptation and highlighted the importance of engagement and academic-performance evaluation [6]. Together, these studies suggest that personalized learning is a family of interventions rather than a single, uniformly effective technology.

More recent synthesis reinforces the need for cautious interpretation. Yuensook, Jantakoon, and Limpinan reviewed 15 empirical studies published during 2020–2024, identifying promising applications in STEM, language learning, and blended education, alongside barriers involving infrastructure, faculty readiness, privacy, and disciplinary coverage [7]. A 2026 meta-analysis restricted to four controlled studies in computing and engineering reported a large pooled estimate, but its small evidence base, substantial heterogeneity, and wider uncertainty under sensitivity analysis limit confident generalization [8]. These findings illustrate why impressive headline effects must be interpreted alongside study quality and transferability.

International policy literature places educational agency at the centre of implementation. UNESCO's Guidance for Generative AI in Education and Research addresses privacy, governance, and pedagogical validation [3]. Its 2024 AI Competency Framework for Teachers stresses responsible AI pedagogy and the teacher's continuing role in designing and assessing learning [4]. The parallel student framework emphasizes a human-centred mindset, AI ethics, technical understanding, and system design [5]. These sources support a model in which personalization remains accountable to educators and learners.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Uzbekistan's policy literature provides an important national context for AI-supported personalized learning. The Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan "On Education" (No. ZRU-637, 23 September 2020) establishes the broader legal framework for educational provision [9]. The Presidential Decree No. PF-6079 of 5 October 2020, approving the "Digital Uzbekistan – 2030" Strategy, promotes digital transformation and infrastructure development [10]. Presidential Resolution No. PQ-358 of 14 October 2024, approving the Strategy for the Development of Artificial Intelligence Technologies until 2030, provides a national policy basis for expanding AI applications [11]. These acts do not establish that AI personalization improves student outcomes; rather, they identify the institutional and policy conditions within which such tools may be responsibly evaluated and implemented.

© Ushbu material Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) litsenziyasi asosida tarqatiladi.

The study used a structured narrative literature review with comparative thematic synthesis. Sources were selected for direct relevance to AI-supported personalization, educational outcomes, or responsible deployment. Priority was given to peer-reviewed meta-analyses and reviews, established educational research databases, and official UNESCO publications. The evidence set included studies and guidance available by November 2026, with emphasis on 2023–2026 literature and selected foundational concepts.

Each source was examined across five analytic dimensions:

1) type of personalization, including content, pacing, feedback, or assessment;
2) learner population and educational setting;
3) reported learning outcomes and strength of evidence;
4) implementation conditions, such as educator readiness and infrastructure;
5) ethical risks, including privacy, bias, transparency, and learner autonomy.

Findings were compared narratively rather than statistically pooled because the selected sources included overlapping reviews, heterogeneous interventions, and different outcome measures. No primary student data were collected, no new experiment was conducted, and no original effect size was calculated.

A conceptual implementation model was then derived by combining evidence on effective adaptive feedback with UNESCO's human-centred recommendations. The proposed model is a design proposition requiring subsequent empirical validation, not an experimentally demonstrated intervention.

RESULTS

The synthesis identified four recurring instructional opportunities. First, diagnostic personalization can identify prerequisite gaps and recommend suitable entry points, potentially reducing the mismatch between instructional difficulty and current learner knowledge. Second, adaptive sequencing can vary the order and difficulty of tasks in response to performance. Third, immediate formative feedback can clarify errors and suggest targeted practice. Fourth, learning analytics can help educators identify patterns of disengagement or persistent difficulty and allocate additional human support. These benefits are conditional: unreliable learner models or poorly designed feedback can reproduce misconceptions or direct learners toward inappropriate activities.

The clearest quantitative evidence in the selected literature concerns cognitive learning outcomes. Wang et al. reported Hedges' g = 0.70 across 45 independent studies [1]. This is an average standardized effect, not a 70% improvement in grades, and the variation across contexts means it cannot be assumed for an individual university. Hooshyar et al. likewise identified benefits of personalized technology-enhanced learning, but not every outcome or design was equally effective [2]. Recent controlled-study evidence remains limited in certain disciplines [8]. The overall finding is therefore promising but qualified, rather than conclusive for all settings.

A five-stage, teacher-supervised personalization cycle emerged as a practical design framework. In Stage 1, a teacher defines learning objectives and collects proportionate diagnostic evidence. In Stage 2, the system constructs a provisional learner profile, including strengths, misconceptions, and support needs. In Stage 3, it recommends tasks, resources, and feedback at an appropriate level. In Stage 4, formative assessment tests whether the intervention improved understanding. In Stage 5, the teacher and learner review progress, challenge unsuitable recommendations, and revise the learning plan. A safeguard applies across all stages: data minimization, accessibility checks, clear explanations, and the possibility of opting for human support.

The review also identified recurrent constraints: unequal access to devices and connectivity; algorithmic bias caused by unrepresentative training or interaction data; overreliance on automated feedback; uncertain accuracy of generated explanations; privacy risks from extensive student profiling;

© Ushbu material Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) litsenziyasi asosida tarqatiladi.

and insufficient teacher training [3–7]. These factors can undermine the very equity that personalization is intended to improve.

Table 1. Evidence-informed design requirements for AI-personalized learning

Design component	Educational function	Human-centred safeguard
Diagnostic assessment	Identify starting knowledge and misconceptions	Validate with teacher observations
Adaptive recommendations	Adjust difficulty, sequence, and pace	Allow educator and learner overrides
AI feedback	Provide timely explanations and practice	Verify accuracy and encourage reasoning
Learning analytics	Flag persistent difficulties and support needs	Minimize data and avoid punitive profiling
Outcome evaluation	Monitor mastery, retention, and engagement	Use comparable assessments and equity checks

DISCUSSION

The evidence indicates that personalization should be evaluated as an instructional intervention, not simply as a software feature. A system that recommends different content to different students may appear personalized yet fail to improve understanding if it optimizes clicks, speed, or task completion rather than mastery. Accordingly, institutions should specify learning objectives, use meaningful baseline and follow-up assessments, and compare AI-supported instruction with a credible alternative. Retention, transfer of knowledge, student agency, and differential outcomes across groups should be considered alongside immediate test scores.

Generative AI introduces a further distinction between adaptive delivery and trustworthy explanation. Conversational tutors can respond flexibly to questions, but plausible answers may be inaccurate or pedagogically misleading. Teachers should therefore curate materials, establish rules for verification, and teach students to question AI-generated outputs. Personalization must also avoid trapping learners in narrow predicted ability categories; students should be able to attempt more challenging work and contest algorithmic assumptions.

In universities with variable connectivity, multilingual cohorts, and uneven digital readiness, phased deployment is preferable to institution-wide automation. A feasible starting point is a bounded pilot in one course, using a defined curriculum, teacher-reviewed resources, voluntary or appropriately governed data collection, and a clear escalation route to human instructors. Evaluation should include completion and achievement measures, student and faculty feedback, accessibility testing, and an assessment of the cost and workload associated with maintaining the system. In Uzbekistan, this phased approach is also consistent with the national emphasis on digital transformation and AI capacity development [9–11].

Ethically responsible deployment requires a transparent purpose for each data element, limited retention, access controls, appropriate consent or other lawful grounds, and independent review of consequential decisions. Institutions should not treat engagement traces as direct measures of intelligence or motivation. UNESCO's frameworks reinforce the importance of protecting human agency and preparing both teachers and learners to use AI critically [3–5]. These principles are especially relevant where educational institutions lack mature AI governance procedures.

This article has limitations. The review was structured but was not a registered systematic review and did not reproduce database search strings or independent risk-of-bias assessments. Some cited

© Ushbu material Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) litsenziyasi asosida tarqatiladi.

reviews may include overlapping primary studies, so their reported findings cannot be counted as independent confirmations. Moreover, the proposed implementation cycle has not been tested experimentally. Future research should compare teacher-supervised AI personalization with conventional differentiated instruction in controlled, sufficiently powered studies and report subgroup fairness, long-term retention, and cost-effectiveness.

CONCLUSION

AI-enabled personalized learning offers credible opportunities to tailor practice, provide timely formative feedback, and help educators respond to diverse learning needs. Meta-analytic evidence indicates positive average effects in several contexts, but these benefits vary with instructional design, learner characteristics, and research quality. The central implication is not that AI should replace teachers, but that it should support evidence-based pedagogical decisions within transparent and accountable educational processes.

The proposed teacher-supervised personalization cycle integrates diagnostic assessment, provisional learner modelling, adaptive support, formative evaluation, and human review. Its practical adoption should be accompanied by privacy safeguards, accessibility measures, educator preparation, and rigorous outcome evaluation. For higher education institutions, careful pilot testing and continuous improvement offer a more defensible pathway than assuming that personalization automatically produces better learning.

REFERENCES

1. Wang, X., Huang, R., Sommer, M., Pei, B., Shidfar, P., Rehman, M. S., Ritzhaupt, A. D., & Martin, F. The efficacy of artificial intelligence-enabled adaptive learning systems from 2010 to 2022 on learner outcomes: A meta-analysis. Journal of Educational Computing Research, 62(6), 1568–1603. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1441048
2. Hooshyar, D., Weng, X., Sillat, P. J., Tammets, K., Wang, M., & Hämäläinen, R. The effectiveness of personalized technology-enhanced learning in higher education: A meta-analysis with association rule mining. Computers & Education, 223, 105169. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2024.105169
3. Miao, F., & Holmes, W. Guidance for generative AI in education and research. UNESCO. https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/guidance-generative-ai-education-and-research
4. Miao, F., & Cukurova, M. AI competency framework for teachers. UNESCO. https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/ai-competency-framework-teachers
5. Miao, F., Shiohira, K., & Lao, N. AI competency framework for students. UNESCO. https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/ai-competency-framework-students
6. Personalized adaptive learning in higher education: A scoping review of key characteristics and impact on academic performance and engagement. Heliyon, 10(21), e39630. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e39630
7. Yuensook, T., Jantakoon, T., & Limpinan, P. AI-driven adaptive learning systems in higher education: A systematic review. Journal of Education and Learning, 15(2), 117–132. https://doi.org/10.5539/jel.v15n2p117
8. Govea Sotomayor, J. G., & García Ortiz, J. S. AI-based personalized learning and academic performance in computing and engineering higher education: A systematic review and meta-analysis of controlled studies. Frontiers in Education. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2026.1970736
9. Republic of Uzbekistan. (2020, September 23). Law No. ZRU-637 "On Education." National Database of Legislation. https://lex.uz/docs/5013007

© Ushbu material Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) litsenziyasi asosida tarqatiladi.

10. President of the Republic of Uzbekistan. (2020, October 5). Decree No. PF-6079 “On approval of the Digital Uzbekistan – 2030 Strategy and measures for its effective implementation.” National Database of Legislation. https://lex.uz/docs/5030957
11. President of the Republic of Uzbekistan. (2024, October 14). Resolution No. PQ-358 “On approval of the Strategy for the Development of Artificial Intelligence Technologies until 2030.” National Database of Legislation. https://lex.uz/acts/7158604

© Ushbu material Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) litsenziyasi asosida tarqatiladi.