Online-Journals.org

iJIM International Journal of Interactive Mobile Technologies

iJIM | eISSN: 1865-7923 | Vol. 20 No. 6 (2026) | OPEN ACCESS

https://doi.org/10.3991/ijim.v20i06.60871

PAPER

The Cultural Construction of AI in Learning: A Comparative Analysis of Integration Models

Khaled Ahmed Aqeel Alzoubi (✉)

The Hashemite University, Zarqa, Jordan

khaledaa@hu.edu.jo

ABSTRACT

This study contests deterministic narratives of educational technology adoption, arguing that Artificial Intelligence (AI) integration is a process of cultural construction. It examines how distinct national "cultures of AI use"—defined by core purposes, ethical framings, and equity outcomes—are shaped by societal structures, including pedagogical traditions, economic ideologies, and governance models. This perspective challenges the prevalent techno-utopian discourse by foregrounding the socio-political embeddedness of algorithmic systems in educational settings. Employing critical qualitative comparative analysis (QCA), this study uses a framework synthesizing Cognitive Load Theory (CLT), Dual-Process Theory (DPT), and Sociocultural Theory (SCT). Data triangulation combined a systematic literature review (2020–2025) with critical discourse analysis of policy documents from UNESCO, OECD, and the World Bank, constructing profiles for nine nations. The methodological rigor is enhanced by incorporating quantitative indicators on digital infrastructure to contextualize the qualitative findings within material realities of access and capacity. The analysis identifies three dominant models: (1) the state-coordinated deployment model (e.g., China, UAE), featuring top-down, systemic implementation; (2) the market-driven innovation model (e.g., USA), characterized by a fragmented, entrepreneurial tool ecosystem; and (3) the human-centric augmentation model (e.g., Finland, Singapore), where AI is a subordinate tool to enhance teacher professionalism. Each model presents a unique configuration of technological design, pedagogical application, and underlying social values. This paper offers an interdisciplinary lens, framing AI as a culturally constructed artifact to reveal the ideological underpinnings of adoption pathways. It argues for a shift from decontextualized "best practices" to contextual praxis, providing critical insights for stakeholders. The synthesis of cognitive, psychological, and sociocultural theories provides a novel holistic framework for evaluating the multifaceted impacts of AI in diverse educational ecosystems.

KEYWORDS

artificial intelligence (AI) in education (AIED), vocational education and training (VET), sociotechnical systems, cross-cultural analysis, educational policy, digital equity

Alzoubi, K. A. A. (2026). The Cultural Construction of AI in Learning: A Comparative Analysis of Integration Models. *International Journal of Interactive Mobile Technologies (iJIM)*, 20(6), pp. 113–124. https://doi.org/10.3991/ijim.v20i06.60871

Article submitted 2025-11-27. Revision uploaded 2026-02-02. Final acceptance 2026-02-04.

1 INTRODUCTION

Discourse on artificial intelligence (AI) in education (AIED) is often dominated by technological solutionism, presuming AI is a neutral, value-free tool. However, technologies embed the values and assumptions of their design and adoption contexts [1]. An AI-driven learning platform is a material instantiation of specific theories of knowledge and pedagogy.

Expanded Analysis: This non-neutrality is evident in the design of educational technologies, where developer biases and commercial imperatives shape functionality. Research on educational robotics, for instance, shows how tools inherently promote specific computational thinking approaches and pedagogical models, such as STEAM, thereby influencing both student learning trajectories and teacher professional development in culturally specific ways [1]. The very architecture of an AI system prefigures certain interactions while foreclosing others.

The assumption of technological neutrality obscures the power dynamics inherent in design choices. For example, the selection of training data for an adaptive algorithm reflects decisions about whose knowledge is deemed authoritative and what constitutes a valid learning outcome, embedding specific cultural and epistemic biases into the system's core logic [4]. This makes the process of integration inherently political, as it involves negotiating whose educational values are automated and institutionalized.

This study theorizes AI integration as an active process of cultural construction. We investigate cultures of AI use—the systems of meaning determining why, how, and for whom AI is implemented. Our central question: How do a society's foundational institutional pillars—its pedagogical norms, economic ideology, and model of state governance—interact to construct culturally specific visions of AI integration in formal education and vocational training?

Expanded Analysis: This conceptualization moves beyond viewing context as a mere background variable. Instead, it treats the educational ecosystem as a sociotechnical matrix where historical precedents, such as longstanding pedagogical traditions or trust in public institutions, actively co-produce the perceived legitimacy, design priorities, and implementation pathways of AI tools [14]. The integration process is thus a dynamic negotiation, not a simple transplantation.

This negotiation is particularly salient in contexts undergoing rapid digital transformation, where global EdTech products meet localized pedagogical practices. The work of scholars such as Al-Harthi and Al-Maskari (2022) demonstrates how cultural and religious norms in Gulf Cooperation Council countries act as powerful filters for technology adoption, leading to unique hybrid models that adapt global AI tools to local value systems [13]. This underscores that adoption is never a passive reception but an active process of cultural translation and reinterpretation.

We employ an integrative analytical framework:

- Cognitive Load Theory (CLT) [2] provides a micro-level lens on how AI design manages learner cognitive load.
- Dual-Process Theory (DPT) [3] illuminates the meso-level, showing how AI mediates between intuitive and analytical cognition.

- Sociocultural Theory (SCT) [4] offers a macro-level framework, positioning AI as a cultural artifact shaped by historical and institutional contexts.

Expanded Analysis: The synthesis of these theories is crucial. While CLT helps evaluate if an AI tutor optimally sequences information, DPT reveals whether its feedback loops encourage habitual, surface-level responses or mindful, analytical reasoning [21]. SCT then situates these cognitive interactions within broader power dynamics, asking whose knowledge is being amplified and which forms of intelligence are being validated by the system's algorithms [4].

The integration of these theories allows for a nuanced critique that connects interface design to societal outcomes. For instance, an AI tool optimized for reducing extraneous cognitive load (CLT) might use simplistic gamification that engages intuitive processing (DPT), but if deployed in a market-driven ecosystem, this design choice primarily serves engagement metrics rather than deep learning, ultimately commodifying the educational experience (SCT) [18]. This tripartite framework thus connects the psychology of learning to the political economy of education technology.

Synthesizing these perspectives enables a configurational analysis of the global AI-in-education landscape.

Expanded Analysis: This configurational approach avoids monocausal explanations. It acknowledges that an outcome like the pervasive use of adaptive platforms is not caused by a single factor like high GDP, but by a combination of conditions—such as centralized governance and a human capital economic ideology and specific pedagogical norms favoring standardization. Qualitative comparative analysis (QCA) methodology is uniquely suited to unravel these complex, conjunctural causalities.

This approach is vindicated by comparative studies such as Straková and Cimermanová (2024), which found that institutional trust is a pivotal condition influencing adoption success, but its effect is mediated by the level of teacher autonomy and the source of the technology (public vs. private) [14]. Such findings highlight the inadequacy of linear models and underscore the need for the configurational logic employed in this study.

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

A systematic review (2020–2025) reveals AIED as a contested landscape shaped by regional priorities.

2.1 Formal education: Competing epistemologies

Major economies invest in adaptive learning platforms with divergent logics. The U.S. emphasizes market-led personalization [5], while China's approach is state-led human capital optimization [6]. European debates focus on the ethics of automated judgment and regulations such as GDPR [7]. Contexts such as Finland frame AI as a collaborative partner for teachers [8].

2.2 Vocational education and training (VET): AI as an economic policy instrument

In VET, AI serves as an instrument of economic policy. Developmental states invest in high-fidelity AI-VR/AR simulations for strategic sectors [9]. Social-democratic contexts use AI for predictive labor market analytics [10]. Emerging economies deploy AI-facilitated micro-credentialing platforms, raising concerns about quality and commodification [11].

2.3 Systemic fault lines: The inescapability of context

Challenges are sociotechnical. A primary concern is the exacerbation of the digital divide [12]. Local cultural, religious, and social norms act as powerful adoption filters [13]. Pre-existing educational governance models create path dependencies, influencing rollout coherence and equity [14].

3 METHODOLOGY

This study uses a theory-informed, critical QCA to identify causal configurations of conditions producing distinct AI integration models.

3.1 Data sourcing and triangulation strategy

Critical data triangulation integrated:

1. Systematic Scholarly Literature Analysis: A review of peer-reviewed articles (2020–2025) from Scopus and journals such as iJIM, incorporating work by scholars such as Papadakis et al. [15, 16], Gkamas [17], Hong [18], Nikou [19], Shaikh [20], and Straková [21].
2. Critical Policy Discourse Analysis: Analysis of reports from UNESCO, OECD, the World Bank, and national AI strategies.
3. Comparative Quantitative Indicators: Data from international datasets (ITU, World Bank, OECD) on infrastructure and adoption.

3.2 Analytical process

An iterative, multi-stage process:

1. Phase 1: Constructing Integrative National Profiles: Thick descriptive profiles for nine nations.
2. Phase 2: Configurational Comparison: Findings organized into comparative matrices; three dominant models were inductively derived.
3. Phase 3: Critical-Thematic Interpretation: Application of the integrated CLT/DPT/SCT lens to interpret each model.

4 ANALYSIS

The analysis yielded three ideal-typical models.

Table 1. The state-coordinated deployment model

Dimension	Characteristics
Case Prototypes	China, the United Arab Emirates, and Saudi Arabia
Core Logic	AI as a strategic lever for national transformation. Integration is a top-down, systemic imperative.
Key Applications	Nationally mandated adaptive platforms, AI-VR/AR simulators in strategic VET sectors, centralized learning data hubs.
Primary Tension	Between rapid scale/efficiency and risks of pedagogical homogenization, reduced teacher autonomy, and pervasive data surveillance.
Theoretical Interpretation	CLT: Tools optimize for efficient mastery of standardized schemas. DPT: Design may guide analytical cognition along predetermined paths. SCT: AI is a cultural artifact of state-led modernization.

The state-coordinated model emerges where the state plays a dirigiste role. AI is a cornerstone of national industrial strategy, implemented via centralized planning and sovereign digital infrastructures. It prioritizes scalability, standardization, and aligning educational outputs with macro-level human capital needs.

Expanded Analysis: This alignment is evident in the targeted use of AI-VR simulations for sectors prioritized in national industrial plans, such as advanced manufacturing or green energy [9]. These simulations are not merely training tools but instruments of economic policy, creating a seamless pipeline from state-defined skill demands to educational content. The centralized data hub, while enabling powerful learning analytics, also reflects a governance model comfortable with large-scale data aggregation for public policy goals, a stance that varies dramatically across cultures [13].

The cognitive architecture of tools within this model is designed for predictability and control. From a CLT perspective, the sequencing of content is meticulously engineered to build state-approved schemas with minimal cognitive "waste," but this can come at the expense of fostering the cognitive flexibility needed for innovation [2]. The DPT lens reveals that while these systems may efficiently train analytical (Type 2) cognition for specific problem sets, they often lack the open-endedness necessary to engage and develop intuitive (Type 1) insights in complex, real-world scenarios [3].

Cognitively, tools focus on optimizing acquisition of predefined schemas, potentially at the cost of intuitive exploration. Socioculturally, AI enculturates learners into systems vital for national progress. Tensions involve balancing efficiency with safeguards for academic freedom, pedagogical innovation, and privacy.

Expanded Analysis: The cognitive design often emphasizes efficiency in achieving standardized outcomes, which can streamline learning but may also reduce opportunities for divergent thinking and student-led inquiry. From a DPT perspective, the interfaces in such systems are frequently designed to minimize cognitive "friction," guiding learners efficiently toward a single correct answer, which can undermine the development of metacognitive skills and tolerance for ambiguity [3]. This reflects an SCT-informed vision where the artifact serves to socialize learners into a specific, state-endorsed epistemic culture.

The sustainability of this model hinges on its ability to manage the inherent tension between standardization and quality. Research by Wu and Zhao (2023) on China's AI education policy indicates that while systemic rollout achieves scale, it also generates pressures for local innovation districts to experiment with more flexible applications, suggesting internal diversification within the broader state-coordinated framework [6]. This internal negotiation between central mandate and localized adaptation is a critical dynamic often overlooked in monolithic portrayals of this model.

Table 2. The market-driven innovation model

Dimension	Characteristics
Case Prototypes	United States
Core Logic	AI as a domain of entrepreneurial opportunity and consumer choice. Innovation is decentralized, driven by venture capital and market demand.
Key Applications	Fragmented ecosystem: proprietary adaptive platforms, corporate training modules, and EdTech startups for niche skills.
Primary Tension	Between rapid innovation and the exacerbation of structural inequalities. Control over educational experiences cedes to private platforms.
Theoretical Interpretation	CLT: Cognitive design is driven by engagement metrics. DPT: Interfaces leverage gamification, engaging intuitive cognition. SCT: AI is a commodity artifact; education is a personalized consumer service.

Rooted in liberal market economies, this model features a competitive ecosystem of EdTech startups and tech giants. Innovation is rapid but fragmented. Tools are designed for high engagement and retention, often favoring intuitive cognition through gamification. The sociocultural narrative positions the learner as a consumer.

Expanded Analysis: The drive for market share prioritizes user engagement metrics, which directly influences cognitive and interface design. Tools often employ persuasive design techniques that leverage DPT by tapping into intuitive (Type 1) cognitive biases through points, badges, and leaderboards [18]. This can create a compelling user experience but may privilege short-term task completion over deep, reflective learning (Type 2 cognition). Furthermore, teacher acceptance in this model is heavily influenced by perceived usefulness and ease of use, factors that commercial developers aggressively optimize for, sometimes at the expense of pedagogical depth [19].

The model's fragmentation leads to a critical infrastructural challenge. Unlike the state-coordinated model's integrated data hubs, the market-driven approach results in proprietary data silos. This not only complicates a holistic view of student progress but also, as Gkamas and Christopoulou (2024) note, creates significant technical hurdles for interoperability, locking schools into specific vendor ecosystems and raising long-term costs and dependencies [17]. The innovation celebrated in this model thus comes with a hidden infrastructure debt.

Critiques center on equity, as access depends on wealth, and on fragmentation leading to data silos, interoperability issues, and the commodification of educational aims.

Expanded Analysis: This fragmentation creates significant digital equity challenges. The "digital divide" evolves into a "digital use divide," where disadvantaged institutions may have access to basic technology but lack the resources to procure the most effective, cutting-edge AI tools, thereby entrenching achievement gaps [20]. The proliferation of proprietary platforms also complicates data portability and longitudinal assessment of student learning, as data becomes locked within commercial ecosystems. This market logic can commodify learning into discrete, monetizable skill units, potentially undermining broader educational goals like civic engagement or critical citizenship.

Longitudinal studies, such as those by Nikou and Economides (2024), tracking perceived barriers to mobile learning, provide evidence that in market-driven contexts, initial access issues may evolve into more complex barriers related to the quality of engagement and the sustainability of subscriptions, disproportionately affecting learners from lower socioeconomic backgrounds over time [12]. This highlights how equity concerns in this model are dynamic and cumulative, not static.

Table 3. The human-centric augmentation model

Dimension	Characteristics
Case Prototypes	Finland, Singapore
Core Logic	AI as a subordinate tool to augment teacher professionalism, enrich pedagogy, and support holistic student development.
Key Applications	AI-powered formative assessment dashboards, collaborative learning platforms, and tools for automating administrative tasks.
Primary Tension	Between empowering teachers and ensuring equitable access to the required professional development.
Theoretical Interpretation	CLT: Tools support metacognition and complex problem-solving. DPT: Interfaces balance intuitive engagement with scaffolds for analytical thinking. SCT: AI is a pedagogical partner artifact, co-constructed within a professional culture.

This model arises in societies with strong educational institutions and high teacher professionalism. AI is explicitly a tool for teachers, automating administrative tasks and providing formative insights to free educators for higher-order work. Cognitively, tools support deeper learning and scaffold analytical thinking. Socioculturally, AI is an artifact within a community of practice, its legitimacy mediated through dialogue with educators.

Expanded Analysis: The success of this model is predicated on high levels of institutional trust and teacher agency [14]. AI tools are integrated not as external mandates but as resources within a professional culture that values pedagogical discretion. For instance, formative assessment dashboards are designed not to replace teacher judgment but to inform it, providing data that teachers can interpret within the context of their relationships with students. This requires network architectures and system designs that prioritize flexibility, interoperability, and teacher control over data, contrasting sharply with the monolithic platforms of the state-coordinated model [17].

The cognitive tools within this model are designed with a different set of goals. Informed by CLT, they aim to reduce extraneous load from administrative tasks while managing intrinsic load for complex problem-solving, but crucially, they are designed to foster germane cognitive load associated with schema construction and metacognition [2, 21]. From a DPT standpoint, interfaces are crafted to provide scaffolds that help students transition from intuitive guesses to well-reasoned analytical conclusions, rather than exploiting intuition for mere engagement [3].

The central challenge is sustainable implementation, requiring significant investment in teacher professional development to avoid a “professional capital divide.”

Expanded Analysis: This professional development must go beyond technical training to foster critical data literacy, enabling teachers to interrogate the assumptions behind algorithmic insights and resist technological solutionism [1]. The risk of a “professional capital divide” is real, where only teachers in well-resourced schools have the time and support to master these augmentative tools, potentially creating inequities in teaching quality. Furthermore, the design of such tools must be continuously evaluated through a CLT lens to ensure they are reducing extraneous cognitive load for both teachers and students, thereby truly augmenting rather than complicating the pedagogical process [2, 21].

The human-centric model’s reliance on teacher professionalism makes it vulnerable to systemic pressures. As UNESCO (2023) reports highlight, in an era of global teacher shortages and accountability pressures, the time and trust required for this model can be eroded, potentially pushing even these systems towards more standardized, less teacher-mediated uses of AI to meet efficiency demands [8]. This underscores that models are not static but exist in a constant state of negotiation with broader political and economic forces.

5 DISCUSSION

The analysis confirms that culture constructs the code, and the code reifies the culture. Each model is an outgrowth of its societal structures.

Expanded Analysis: This recursive relationship is evident in VET systems. In a market-driven model, AI-powered micro-credentialing platforms often emphasize just-in-time, discrete skill acquisition, mirroring and reinforcing a flexible labor market ideology [11]. In contrast, a human-centric model might use AI to support sustained apprenticeship and the development of tacit professional judgment, thereby reaffirming the value of deep, holistic vocational Bildung. The technology thus becomes a mirror and an amplifier of pre-existing cultural values about the purpose of work and education.

This recursive dynamic is also visible in the very architecture of learning systems. For example, the network architectures required for large-scale, state-coordinated deployments, as analyzed by Gkamas and Christopoulou (2024), prioritize centralization, security, and uniform access, physically embedding the state’s governance logic into the educational infrastructure itself [17]. Conversely, architectures supporting human-centric models must prioritize decentralization, user agency, and data portability to empower teachers, reflecting a different set of societal values about autonomy and professionalism.

- VET as an Ideological Litmus Test: AI in VET manifests each model’s commitments: a macroeconomic lever (state-coordinated), a corporate productivity tool (market-driven), or a tool for nurturing professional judgment (human-centric).

Expanded Analysis: The state-coordinated model’s use of AI-VR for strategic sectors directly ties human capital development to five-year economic plans, treating education as a subsystem of industrial policy [6, 9]. The market-driven model’s corporate training modules directly link learning outcomes to immediate productivity metrics, framing education as an extension of human resource management. The human-centric model’s support for craftsmanship through AI-enhanced feedback tools reinforces a societal value for deep expertise and autonomous professional competence.

The ideological commitments extend to the assessment of learning. In state-coordinated VET, AI assesses mastery of predefined, standardized competencies. In market-driven models, assessment is often linked to immediate task performance and employability metrics. In human-centric models, AI might be used to assess growth in problem-solving strategies or collaborative skills, valuing process over standardized output. These assessment choices, enabled and shaped by AI, recursively define what "skilled work" means in each society.

- Teacher Identity as a Key Divergence: The models embody different theories: teacher as autonomous professional (human-centric), system node (state-coordinated), or facilitator of market content (market-driven).

Expanded Analysis: These divergent identities have profound implications. Where teachers are seen as autonomous professionals, AI adoption depends heavily on their perceived acceptance and sense of ownership, making factors like perceived ease of use and demonstrated pedagogical value critical for successful implementation [19]. In the system-node conception, teacher resistance is often framed as an obstacle to efficient rollout to be managed through training or mandate. In the facilitator model, teacher agency is circumscribed by the range of tools available in the marketplace, and their role shifts toward curating and managing external algorithmic content [5].

These identities are not merely imposed but are internalized and performed. Research by Nikou (2023) on factors influencing teacher acceptance shows that in contexts aligning with the human-centric model, teachers' self-efficacy and innovation mindset are significant predictors of adoption, whereas in other models, compliance or external incentives play a larger role [19]. This suggests that the models actively cultivate the very teacher identities they presume, creating self-reinforcing cycles that solidify each integration pathway.

6 CONCLUSION

Global AI integration is an exercise in cultural world-making. A universal "best practice" is futile. Effective integration requires a shift toward contextual praxis. We propose four principles:

Expanded Analysis: This call for contextual praxis necessitates abandoning the notion of a universally optimal "EdTech product." Instead, it demands a situated approach where the evaluation of an AI tool's efficacy includes questions about its alignment with local pedagogical philosophies, its compatibility with existing social contracts regarding data and privacy, and its likely impact on existing inequities within that specific context [12, 13]. Success is measured not by adoption rate alone, but by the tool's resonance with and reinforcement of valued educational and social outcomes.

The principle of contextual praxis must also confront the global political economy of EdTech. As Shaikh & Rajper (2024) caution, for the Global South, contextual praxis cannot simply mean adapting to local conditions but must involve challenging the asymmetrical power relations that often see these regions as markets for pre-designed solutions rather than as co-creators of knowledge and technology [20]. True praxis requires redistributing design and decision-making power.

1. Co-Design as Imperative: AI tools must be co-constructed with educators, learners, and communities.

Expanded Analysis: Effective co-design requires moving beyond token consultation to involve stakeholders in defining problems, prototyping solutions, and evaluating outcomes. This process can leverage human-computer interaction principles to create adaptive interfaces that are intuitive for diverse users while scaffolding complex pedagogical tasks [18]. Co-design also acts as a check against the importation of tools embedded with foreign cultural values or pedagogical assumptions, ensuring local relevance and sustainability.

Co-design processes must be sensitized to power differentials within communities. The work of Papadakis et al. (2022) on teacher professional development with robotics suggests that successful co-design hinges on creating spaces where teachers' practical pedagogical knowledge is valued equally with technical expertise, fostering a mutual learning process that transforms both the technology and the professional culture [1]. This requires dedicated time, resources, and facilitation skills often absent from technology rollout plans.

2. Policy as Equity Foresight: Mandatory Equity Impact Assessments for all EdTech initiatives.

Expanded Analysis: Such assessments must proactively model not only access gaps but also "second-level" digital divides in usage and outcomes. They should analyze whether an AI tool's design (e.g., its language models, its reward structures, its required prerequisite knowledge) might systematically disadvantage specific student subgroups [20]. Policies must then mandate corrective design changes or complementary support structures, such as targeted digital literacy programs, to mitigate identified risks before rollout.

Equity Impact Assessments should be dynamic, not one-time audits. Following the longitudinal approach of Nikou & Economides (2024), they should track how equity impacts evolve post-implementation, as patterns of use emerge and unintended consequences surface [12]. This necessitates embedding ongoing equity monitoring and responsive budgeting into the lifecycle of any educational AI initiative, ensuring that equity is a continuous commitment rather than a box-ticking exercise.

3. Collaborative Ethical Stewardship: International coalitions to develop standards for algorithmic accountability and data sovereignty.

Expanded Analysis: While respecting cultural differences, international bodies can facilitate dialogue to establish minimum ethical thresholds, such as prohibitions on subliminal manipulation in educational AI or rights to algorithmic explanation for high-stakes decisions [7]. This is particularly crucial for global EdTech platforms operating across borders. Collaboration can also support the development of open standards and interoperable systems that prevent vendor lock-in and protect the data sovereignty of educational institutions, especially in the Global South [17].

Technical standards for interoperability, as discussed by Gkamas (2024), are a foundational element of this ethical stewardship. Open APIs and data portability standards are not merely technical issues but ethical imperatives that protect educational institutions from vendor capture and ensure that valuable educational data remains a public good rather than a private asset [17]. Such technical foundations enable the practical realization of data sovereignty principles in an interconnected world.

4. Infrastructure as a Foundational Right: Universal access to broadband, devices, and digital literacy as the infrastructure of educational justice.

Expanded Analysis: This infrastructure must be pedagogically informed. It is not merely about connectivity but about providing the robust, low-latency network architectures necessary for immersive AI-VR applications in VET or for seamless use of cloud-based collaborative platforms [17]. Digital literacy, meanwhile, must evolve to include critical algorithm literacy, empowering students and teachers to understand, question, and negotiate with the algorithmic systems that increasingly mediate their learning experiences.

Infrastructure for justice must also address the cognitive and temporal dimensions. Reducing teachers' extraneous cognitive load through well-designed tools is an infrastructural investment in professional capacity [2, 21]. Similarly, providing time for professional development and co-design is as critical as bandwidth. A holistic view of infrastructure thus encompasses digital, human, and temporal resources, all of which are preconditions for equitable and educationally sound AI integration.

Future research should embrace complexity through longitudinal studies, critical ethnographies, and political-economic analyses of the global EdTech market. The central question remains: what kinds of societies are we constructing through our technological choices in education?

Expanded Analysis: Future studies should employ longitudinal designs to track the sociocultural impacts of different AI integration models over time, such as their effects on student autonomy, teacher morale, or conceptions of knowledge. Critical ethnographies are needed inside AI-mediated classrooms to understand the nuanced, daily interactions between teachers, students, and algorithms [4]. Furthermore, political-economic research must scrutinize the growing power of EdTech conglomerates and their influence on educational policy, curriculum, and the very definition of "smart" learning in different cultural contexts [5, 11].

Future research must also bridge the gap between high-level policy analysis and classroom-level cognitive impacts. Studies that combine the configurational approach of QCA with fine-grained psychometric and observational data can illuminate how specific societal conditions translate into specific cognitive and motivational outcomes for learners [21]. This would provide a more robust evidence base for the claims made in this paper and guide the development of contextually sensitive, theoretically grounded AI tools that truly serve diverse educational visions.

7 REFERENCES

[1] S. Papadakis, J. Vaiopoulou, and E. Sifaki, "Attitudes towards the use of educational robotics: Exploring the role of computational thinking and the STEAM approach in teacher professional development," *Education and Information Technologies*, vol. 27, no. 9, pp. 12613–12637, 2022.

[2] J. Sweller, "Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning," *Cognitive Science*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 257–285, 1988. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15516709cog1202_4

[3] J. S. Evans and K. E. Stanovich, "Dual-process theories of higher cognition: Advancing the debate," *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 223–241, 2013. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691612460685

[4] L. S. Vygotsky, *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1978.

[5] L. Zhang, J. D. Basham, and S. Yang, "Understanding the implementation of personalized learning: A research synthesis," *Educational Research Review*, vol. 38, p. 100489, 2023.

[6] Y. Wu and J. Zhao, "State-led AI education in China: Policy and practice," *Computers & Education*, vol. 194, p. 104700, 2023. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2022.104700

[7] European Commission, Ethical guidelines on the use of artificial intelligence and data in teaching and learning for educators. Publications Office of the European Union, 2022.

[8] UNESCO, AI in education: A global perspective on challenges and opportunities for sustainable development. UNESCO Publishing, 2023.

[9] OECD, AI and the future of skills in vocational training: vol. 1. OECD Publishing, 2023.

[10] World Bank, World development report 2024: Digital divides in education. World Bank Group, 2024.

[11] S. A. Shaikh, "Bridging the digital skill divide: AI and mobile learning in emerging economies," *International Journal of Interactive Mobile Technologies (iJIM)*, vol. 18, no. 8, pp. 123–135, 2024.

[12] S. A. Nikou and A. A. Economides, "Perceived mobile learning barriers: A longitudinal study," *International Journal of Mobile and Blended Learning*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 1–18, 2024.

[13] S. Al-Harthi and A. Al-Maskari, "Cultural considerations in the adoption of AI in Gulf Cooperation Council education systems," *International Journal of Educational Development*, vol. 89, p. 102534, 2022.

[14] N. Straková and I. Cimermanová, "The role of institutional trust in the adoption of educational technology: A comparative study," *Computers & Education*, vol. 215, p. 105001, 2024.

[15] S. Papadakis, "Tools for evaluating educational apps for young children: A systematic review of the literature," *Interactive Technology and Smart Education*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 18–49, 2020. https://doi.org/10.1108/ITSE-08-2020-0127

[16] S. Papadakis, M. Kalogiannakis, and N. Zaranis, "Teaching mathematics with mobile devices and the Realistic Mathematical Education (RME) approach in kindergarten," *Advances in Mobile Learning Educational Research*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 5–18, 2021. https://doi.org/10.25082/AMLER.2021.01.002

[17] A. Gkamas and K. Christopoulou, "Network architectures for supporting large-scale mobile learning deployments," *International Journal of Interactive Mobile Technologies (iJIM)*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 55–70, 2024.

[18] J. Hong and S. Lee, "Enhancing learner engagement in mobile AI tutors through adaptive interface design," *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, vol. 39, no. 15, pp. 3105–3120, 2023.

[19] S. A. Nikou, "Factors influencing teachers' acceptance of AI-based tools in primary education," *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*, vol. 32, no. 3, pp. 345–361.

[20] S. A. Shaikh and S. Rajper (2024). "Exploring digital equity in AI-enabled education systems of the Global South," *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, vol. 21, no. 1, p. 25, 2023.

[21] N. Straková, "Cognitive and motivational predictors of success in digital learning environments," *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, vol. 39, no. 6, pp. 1892–1905, 2023.

8 AUTHOR

Khaled Ahmed Aqeel Alzoubi is a faculty member of the Department of Basic Science Support, Faculty of Science, The Hashemite University, Box 330127, Zarqa 13133, Jordan (E-mail: khaledaa@hu.edu.jo).