
PROACTIVE AND REACTIVE ENGAGEMENT OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE METHODS FOR EDUCATION: A REVIEW

A PREPRINT

Sruti Mallik*
Washington University in St. Louis
St. Louis, MO, USA
sruti.mallik@wustl.edu

Ahana Gangopadhyay†
Washington University in St. Louis
St. Louis, MO, USA
ahana@wustl.edu

January 25, 2023

ABSTRACT

Quality education, one of the seventeen sustainable development goals (SDGs) identified by the United Nations General Assembly, stands to benefit enormously from the adoption of artificial intelligence (AI) driven tools and technologies. The concurrent boom of necessary infrastructure, digitized data and general social awareness has propelled massive research and development efforts in the artificial intelligence for education (AIEd) sector. In this review article, we investigate how artificial intelligence, machine learning and deep learning methods are being utilized to support students, educators and administrative staff. We do this through the lens of a novel categorization approach. We consider the involvement of AI-driven methods in the education process in its entirety - from students admissions, course scheduling etc. in the *proactive* planning phase to knowledge delivery, performance assessment etc. in the *reactive* execution phase. We outline and analyze the major research directions under proactive and reactive engagement of AI in education using a representative group of 194 original research articles published in the past two decades i.e., 2003 - 2022. We discuss the paradigm shifts in the solution approaches proposed, i.e., in the choice of data and algorithms used over this time. We further dive into how the COVID-19 pandemic challenged and reshaped the education landscape at the fag end of this time period. Finally, we pinpoint existing limitations in adopting artificial intelligence for education and reflect on the path forward.

Keywords Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) · Artificial Intelligence Applications (AIA) · Artificial Intelligence for Education (AIEd) · Technology Enhanced Learning · Machine Learning · Artificial Intelligence for Social Good (AI4SG)

1 Introduction

In 2015, the United Nations General Assembly identified quality education as one of the seventeen sustainable development goals or SDGs [1]. The target is to ensure that by 2030, issues pertaining to access to primary, secondary, technical, vocational and tertiary education are addressed globally. In response to this goal, countries have set individual targets in accordance with economic and social development needs. For instance, the United States Department of Education in 2016 adopted a vision for progress in STEM education by 2026 [2]. In a different part of the world, the Ministry of Education in India has rolled out several initiatives to accelerate equitable access to education [3]. In this context, it is anticipated globally that technology and more importantly artificial intelligence (AI) driven tools will be central to achieving the holistic goal set by the United Nations General Assembly [4].

In the past there has been considerable discourse about how adoption of artificial intelligence driven methods for education might alter the course of how we perceive education [5, 6]. However, in many of the earlier debates, the full potential of artificial intelligence was not recognized due to lack of supporting infrastructure. It was not until very

*Both authors have equally contributed to this study

†Both authors have equally contributed to this study

recently that AI-powered techniques could be used in classroom environments. Since the beginning of the 21st century, there has been a rapid progress in the semiconductor industry in manufacturing chips that can handle computations at scale efficiently. In fact, in the coming decade too it is anticipated that this growth trajectory will continue with focus on wireless communication, data storage and computational resource development [7]. With this ongoing progress, therefore, plans to utilize AI driven tools to support students, educators and policy-makers in education appears to be the logical next step.

In this review article, we systematically review **how machine learning and artificial intelligence can be utilized in different phases of the educational process - from planning and scheduling to knowledge delivery and assessment**. To this end, we introduce a broad categorization of original research articles in the literature into methods that are relevant prior to knowledge delivery and those that are relevant in the process of knowledge delivery, i.e., *proactive vs. reactive engagement*. Proactive involvement of AI in education comes from its use in student admission logistics, curriculum design, scheduling, teaching content generation, etc. Reactive involvement of AI is considerably broader in scope - AI-based methods can be used for designing intelligent tutoring systems, assessing performance, predicting student outcomes etc. In the schematic in Fig. 1, we present an overview of our categorization approach. We have selected a sample set of research articles under each category and identified the key problem statements addressed using AI methods in the past 20 years.

The COVID-19 pandemic has been one of the most significant social disruptions in recent history. With the outbreak of the virus, many brick-and-mortar educational institutions had to switch into alternate methods of delivering knowledge to students. This in some situations necessitated creative thinking by the administration, educators and students [8], and in turn accelerated the adoption and use of technology including artificial intelligence for education. In this article, we highlight how the outbreak of the pandemic globally impacted and shaped the trajectory of artificial intelligence research for education (AIEd).

Through this review article, we aim to address the following questions:

- What were the prominent research directions in involvement of AI in the end-to-end education process in the past two decades? How has the AI methodologies (i.e., choice of datasets and algorithms) evolved over this period in these major research directions?
- How did the COVID-19 pandemic influence the education landscape and how AI in particular can drive future developments for educational technologies?
- Does use of AI-driven methodologies for education widen or bridge the gap between population groups when it comes to access to quality education?

The organization of this review article from here on is such. In Section 2, we state our search strategy in identifying research articles and present the summary statistics of the articles considered. Here, we clearly define the technical scope of the review. In Section 3, we contextualize our contribution in the light of technical review articles published in the domain of AIEd in the past five years. In Section 4, we present our categorization approach and review the scientific and technical contributions each category. In Section 5, we discuss the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on AIEd research. Finally, in Section 6, we discuss the existing limitations in the global adoption of AI driven tools for education and the next steps for this field in general.

2 Scope Definition

The term artificial intelligence (AI) was coined in 1956 by John McCarthy [9]. Since the first generally acknowledged work of McCulloch and Pitts in conceptualizing artificial neurons, AI has gone through several dormant periods and shifts in research focus. More recently, researchers and social scientists are increasingly using AI-based techniques to address social issues and to build towards a sustainable future [10]. In this article, we review the scope of using artificial intelligence to ensure quality education.

2.1 Paper Search Strategy

For the purpose of analyzing recent trends in this field (i.e., AIEd), we have sampled research articles published in peer-reviewed conferences and journals over the past 20 years, i.e. between 2003-2022, by leveraging the Google Scholar search engine using keywords specific to each of our identified use cases. Our aim here was to identify *a sufficient number of research articles that outlined the breadth of use cases using AI-driven methods in planning (i.e., proactive) and execution (i.e., reactive) phases of the education process*. To accomplish this, we did not restrict our search space by considering only certain conferences or journals [10] or by only including articles from authors having a certain h-index [11] or on the basis of citations [12]. With this strategy in place, we have selected 194 relevant




Figure 1: Overview of the categorization introduced in this review article

articles. It is worthwhile to mention that this body of 194 articles is by no means the exhaustive list of original research approaches for these use cases, but it is indeed a representative sample size that allows us to identify core research directions in the past two decades and make conclusive statements.

2.2 Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

There is considerable debate in the scientific community about what is the scope of artificial intelligence [13]. Here, we do not provide a perspective for what can be included under purview of AI in the context of education, but rather clearly delineate our inclusion/exclusion criteria. For this review article, we include research articles that use methods such as optimal search strategies (eg. BFS, DFS etc.), density estimation, machine learning, Bayesian machine learning, deep learning, reinforcement learning etc. We do not include original research that proposes use of concepts and methods rooted in operations research, evolutionary algorithms, adaptive control theory, robotics etc. in our corpus of selected articles. In this review, we **only** consider peer-reviewed articles that were published in English. We do not include patented technologies and copyrighted EdTech software systems in our scope unless peer-reviewed articles outlining the same contributions have been published by the authors.

2.3 Summary statistics

With the scope of our review defined above, here we provide the summary statistics of the 194 technical articles we covered in this review. In Figure 2, we show the distribution of the included scientific and technical articles over the past two decades. We also introspected the technical contributions in each category of our categorization approach with respect to the target audiences they catered to (see Figure 3). We primarily identify target audience groups for educational technologies as such - pre-school students, elementary school students, middle and high school students, university students, standardized test examinees, students in e-learning platforms, students of MOOCs, and students in professional/vocational education. Articles where the audience group has not been clearly mentioned were marked as belonging to ‘Unknown’ target audience category.

In Section 4, we introduce our categorization and perform a deep-dive to explore the breadth of technical contributions in each category. If applicable, we have further identified specific research problems currently receiving much attention as sub-categories within a category. In Figure 4, we demonstrate the distribution of significant research problems within a category.




Figure 2: Distribution of the reviewed technical articles across the past two decades




Figure 3: Distribution of reviewed technical articles across categories and target audience categories

We defer the analysis of the identified trends from these summary plots to the Discussion section of this paper.

3 Related Works

Since being identified as one among the seventeen SDGs [1], there has been increased attention in addressing existing issues in the field of education through the latest and greatest technology. It must be noted however, neither the use of technology to benefit education nor artificial intelligence as a technology is an invention of the twenty-first century. It is in fact the increased social awareness about equitable access to developmental resources and simultaneous development of the infrastructure to support it that led to the increase in scientific and technical contributions in AIED research. In this backdrop, the number of review articles surveying the technical progress in this discipline has also increased in the last decade (see Fig. 5 - note that we used Google Scholar as the search engine with the keywords *artificial intelligence for education*, *artificial intelligence for education review articles* etc.). Here, we discuss the premise of the review articles published in the *last five years* and contextualize this article with respect to previously published technical reviews.

Among the review articles identified based on the keyword search on Google Scholar and published between 2018 and 2022, one can identify two thematic categories - (i) *Technical reviews with categorization*: review articles that group research contributions based on some distinguishing factors such as problem statement, solution methodology etc [14, 15, 11, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21]. (ii) *Perspectives on challenges, trends and roadmap*: review articles that highlight the current state of research in a domain and offer critical analysis of the challenges and the future road map for the domain [22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27]. Closely linked with (i) are review articles that dive deep into the developments within a




Figure 4: Distribution of reviewed technical articles across sub-categories under each category

particular sub-category associated with AIEd, such as AIEd in the context of early childhood education [28], online higher education [29] etc. We have designed this review article to belong to category (i) - we distinguish between the use of artificial intelligence for education based on their proactive or reactive involvement in the education process. To the best of our knowledge, we for the first time categorize AIEd research articles through such lens and provide an in-depth review of significant research problems in each category (see schematic in Fig. 1). We believe that our categorization approach introduces researchers to the wide scope of using AI-driven methods for providing quality education. At the same time, the article summarizes for expert researchers the progress of AI research in utilizing diverse datasets and algorithms for problem statements in the education sector and the scope for future research.

In Table 1, we have outlined the context of recent categorical review articles along with ours to provide readers a comprehensive summary of how we place this article in the body of literature for AIEd.




Figure 5: Number of review articles published in AIEd over the past decade.

Table 1: Contextualization with respect to technical reviews published in the past five years (2018 - 2022)

Paper title	Authors	Year	Summary
Artificial Intelligence trends in education: a narrative overview [14]	Chassignol et. al.	2018	Categorizes AI in education into four categories - customized educational content, assessment and evaluation, adaptive systems and personalization, intelligent tutoring systems.
Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education - where are the educators [15]	Zawacki-Richter et. al.	2019	Categorizes AI in education into four categories - profiling and prediction, assessment and evaluation, adaptive systems and personalization, intelligent tutoring systems.
Artificial Intelligence in Education: A Review [11]	Chen et. al.	2020	Identifies and reviews four key ways in which AI has been adopted for education - automation of administrative processes and tasks, curriculum and content development, instruction, modeling students' learning process.
Review of the application of artificial intelligence in education [16]	Yufei et. al.	2020	Identifies and reviews aspects in which AI technology has been used in education - automatic grading system, interval reminder, teacher's feedback, virtual teachers, personalized learning, adaptive learning, augmented reality/virtual reality, accurate reading, intelligent campus and distance learning.
Artificial Intelligence in Education: A panoramic review [17]	Ahmed et. al.	2020	Reviews the various applications of AI such as student grading and evaluations, students retention and drop out prediction, sentiment analysis, intelligent tutoring, classroom monitoring and recommendation systems.
A Review of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Education from 2010 to 2020 [18]	Zhai et.al.	2021	Reviews articles that use AI for social sciences such as in education and classifies the research questions into development layer (classification, matching, recommendation and deep learning), application layer (feedback, reasoning and adaptive learning), and integration layer (affection computing, role-playing, immersive learning and gamification).
Artificial intelligence in education: The three paradigms[19]	Ouyang et. al.	2021	Identifies the paradigm shifts of AIEd and categorizes into AI-directed (learner-as-recipient), AI-supported (learner-as-collaborator), and AI-empowered (learner-as-leader).

Power to the teachers: an exploratory review on artificial intelligence in education[20]	Lameras et. al.	2021	Discusses research contribution along the five aspects of teaching and learning introduced by [30] - 1. AIEd for preparing and transmitting learning content 2. AIEd for helping students to apply knowledge 3. AIEd for engaging students in learning tasks 4. AIEd for helping students to improvement through assessments and feedback 5. AIEd for helping students to become self-regulated learners.
A review on artificial intelligence in education[21]	Huang et. al.	2021	Outlines the application of AI in education - adaptive learning, teaching evaluation, virtual classroom, smart campus, intelligent tutoring robots and then analyzes its impact on teaching and learning.
Towards a tripartite research agenda: A scoping review of artificial intelligence in education research [31]	Wang et. al.	2022	Provides a scoping review of research studies on AIEd published between 2001–2021 and identifies and discusses three distinct agendas - Learning from AI, Learning about AI, and Learning with AI.
Two Decades of Artificial Intelligence in Education: Contributors, Collaborations, Research Topics, Challenges, and Future Directions [32]	Chen et. al.	2022	The authors identify the main research topics in AIEd in the past two decades to be - intelligent tutoring systems for special education, natural language processing for language education, educational robots for AI education, educational data mining for performance prediction, discourse analysis in computer-supported collaborative learning, neural networks for teaching evaluation, affective computing for learner emotion detection, and recommender systems for personalized learning.
Academic and Administrative Role of Artificial Intelligence in Education [33]	Ahmad et. al.	2022	This review article aims to explore the academic and administrative applications of AI with an in-depth discussion on artificial intelligence applications in 1. Grading/Assessment 2. Admission 3. Virtual Reality (VR) for education 4. Learning Analytics etc.
A Comprehensive Overview of Artificial Intelligence Trends in Education [34]	Namatherdhala et. al.	2022	The authors categorize application of AI for education into three distinct groups - Education administration, Instruction Design and Learning outcomes and briefly reviews each of them.
Proactive and Reactive engagement of Artificial Intelligence methods for Education: A review	Mallik & Gangopadhyay		We introduce a novel categorization that distinguishes between proactive (admissions, scheduling, content generation etc.) and reactive (tutoring systems, performance assessment, outcome prediction etc.) involvement of AI for education and review scientific and technical contributions under each sub-category over the past two decades.

4 Engaging artificial intelligence driven methods in stages of education

4.1 Proactive vs Reactive engagement of AI - an introduction

The process of educating a student begins much before the student starts attending lectures and parsing lecture materials. In a traditional education setup, administrative staff and educators begin preparations related to making admissions decisions, scheduling of classes to optimize resources, curating course contents and preliminary assignment materials several weeks prior to the term start date. Once the term starts, the focus of educators is to deliver the course material, give out and grade assignments to assess progress, and provide additional support to students who might benefit from that. The role of the students is to regularly acquire knowledge, ask clarifying questions and seek help to

master the material. The role of administrative staff in this phase is less hands-on - they remain involved to ensure smooth and efficient overall progress. Therefore, we can clearly identify two distinct work phases in the end-to-end education process. First, **proactive engagement** - all efforts in this phase are to design and curate to ensure optimal use of resources, and second, **reactive engagement** - all efforts in this phase are to ensure that students acquire the necessary information and skills from the sessions they attend and to address any blockers they might encounter. In this review article, we leverage these two phases to distinguish between contributions in the field of AIEd research. Our primary categorization of AIEd research is therefore, (i) **Proactive engagement of AI for education**, and (ii) **Reactive engagement of AI for education**. Within these broad categorizations, we further identify different genres of research relevant to the education sector. For instance, in the proactive engagement phase, AI-based algorithms can be leveraged to determine student admission logistics, design curricula and schedules, and create course content. On the other hand, in the reactive engagement phase, AI-based methods can be used for designing intelligent tutoring systems (ITS), performance assessment, prediction of student outcomes etc. (see Figure 1). Another important distinction between the two phases lies in the nature of the available data to develop models. While the former primarily makes use of historical data points or pre-existing estimates of available resources and expectations about learning outcomes, the latter has at its disposal a growing pool of data points from the currently ongoing learning process, and can therefore be more adaptive and initiate faster pedagogical interventions to changing scopes and requirements.

4.2 Proactive engagement of AI for education

4.2.1 Student admission logistics

In the past, although a number of studies used statistical or machine learning-based approaches to analyze or model student admissions decisions, they had little role in the actual admissions process [35, 36]. However in the face of growing numbers of applicants, educational institutes are increasingly turning to AI-driven approaches to efficiently review applications and make admission decisions. For example, the Department of Computer Science at University of Texas Austin (UTCS) introduced an explainable AI system called GRADE (Graduate Admissions Evaluator) that uses logistic regression on past admission records to estimate the probability of a new applicant being admitted in their graduate program [37]. While GRADE did not make the final admission decision, it reduced the number of full application reviews as well as review time per application by experts. [38] used features extracted from application materials of students as well as how they performed in the program of study to predict an incoming applicant's potential performance and identify students best suited for the program. An important metric for educational institutes with regard to student admissions is yield rate, the rate at which accepted students decide to enroll at a given school. Machine learning has been used to predict enrollment decisions of students, which would help the institute make strategic admission decisions in order to improve their yield rate and optimize resource allocation [39, 40]. Additionally, whether students enroll in suitable majors based on their specific backgrounds and prior academic performance is also indicative of future success. Machine learning has also been used to classify students into suitable majors in an attempt to set them up for academic success [41].

Another research direction in this domain approaches the admissions problem from the perspective of students by predicting the probability that an applicant will get admission at a particular university in order to help applicants better target universities based on their profiles as well as university rankings [42, 43, 44]. Notably, more than one such work finds prior GPA (Grade Point Average) of students to be the most significant factor in admissions decisions [45, 46].

Given the high stakes involved and the significant consequences that admissions decisions have on the future of students, there has been considerable discourse on the ethical considerations of using AI in such applications, including its fairness, transparency and privacy aspects [47, 48]. Aside from the obvious potential risks of worthy applicants getting rejected or unworthy applicants getting in, such systems can perpetuate existing biases in the training data from human decision-making in the past [49]. For example, such systems might show unintentional bias towards certain demographics, gender, race, income groups, etc. [49] advocated for explainable models for making admission decisions, as well as proper system testing and balancing before reaching the end user. [50] showed that demographic parity mechanisms like group-specific admission thresholds increase the utility of the selection process in such systems in addition to improving its fairness. Despite concerns regarding fairness and ethics, interestingly, university students in a recent survey rated algorithmic decision-making (ADM) higher than human decision-making (HDM) in admission decisions in both procedural and distributive fairness aspects [51].

4.2.2 Content design

In the context of education, we can define content as - (i) learning content for a course, curriculum or test; and (ii) schedules/timetables of classes. We discuss AI/ML approaches for both of the above in this section.

(i) **Learning content design:** Prior to the start of the learning process, educators and administrators are responsible for identifying an appropriate set of courses for a curriculum, an appropriate set of contents for a course, or an appropriate set of questions for a standardized test. In course and curriculum design, there is a large body of work using traditional systematic and relational approaches [52], however the last decade saw several works using AI-informed curriculum design approaches. For example, [53] uses classical ML algorithms to identify factors prior to declaration of majors in universities that adversely affect graduation rates, and advocates curriculum changes to alleviate these factors. [54] uses tree-based approaches on historical records to prioritize the prerequisite structure of a curriculum in order to determine student progression routes that are effective. [55] proposes an Outcome Based Education (OBE) where expected outcomes from a degree program such as job roles/skills are identified first, and subsequently courses required to reach these outcomes are proposed by modeling the curriculum using ANNs. [56] suggests a semi-automated curriculum design approach by automatically curating low-cost, learner-generated content for future learners, but argues that more work is needed to explore data-driven approaches in curating pedagogically useful peer content.

For designing standardized tests such as TOEFL, SAT or GRE, an essential criteria is to select questions having a consistent difficulty level across test papers for fair evaluation. This is also useful in classroom settings if teachers want to avoid plagiarism issues by setting multiple sets of test papers, or in designing a sequence of assignments or exams with increasing order of difficulty. This can be done through Question Difficulty Prediction (QDP) or Question Difficulty Estimation (QDE), an estimate of the skill level needed to answer a question correctly. QDP was historically estimated by pretesting on students or from expert ratings, which are expensive, time-consuming, subjective and often vulnerable to leakage or exposure [57]. Rule-based algorithms relying on difficulty features extracted by experts were also proposed in [58, 59] for automatic difficulty estimation. As data-driven solutions became more popular, a common approach used linguistic features [60, 61], readability scores, [62, 63] and/or word frequency features [62, 63, 64] with ML algorithms such as linear regression, SVMs, tree-based approaches, neural networks, etc. for downstream classification or regression, depending on the problem setup. With automatic testing systems and ready availability of large quantities of historical test logs, deep learning has been increasingly used for feature extraction (word embeddings, question representations, etc.) and/or difficulty estimation [65, 66, 67]. Attention strategies have been used to model the difficulty contribution of each sentence in reading problems [68] or to model recall (how hard it is to recall the knowledge assessed by the question) and confusion (how hard it is to separate the correct answer from distractors) in [69]. Domain adaptation techniques have also been proposed to alleviate the need of difficulty-labeled question data for each new course by aligning it with the difficulty distribution of a resource-rich course [70]. [71] points out that a majority of data-driven QDP approaches belong to language learning and medicine, possibly spurred on by the existence of a large number of international and national-level standardized language proficiency tests and medical licensing exams.

(ii) **Timetabling:** Educational Timetabling Problem (ETP) deals with the assignment of classes or exams to a limited number of time-slots such that certain constraints (e.g. availability of teachers, students, classrooms, equipments, etc.) are satisfied. This can be divided into three types - course timetabling, school timetabling and exam timetabling [72]. Timetabling not only ensures proper resource allocation, its design considerations (e.g. number of courses per semester, number of lectures per day, number of free time-slots per day, etc.) have noticeable impact on student attendance behavior and academic performance [73]. Popular approaches in this domain such as mathematical optimization, meta-heuristic, hyper-heuristic, hybrid, fuzzy logic approaches, etc. [72, 74] mostly is beyond the scope of our paper (see Section 2.2). Having said that, it must be noted that machine learning has often been used in conjunction with such mathematical techniques to obtain better performing algorithms. For example, [75] used supervised learning to find approximations for evaluating solutions to optimization problems - a critical step in heuristic approaches. Reinforcement learning has been used to select low-level heuristics in hyper-heuristic approaches [76, 77] or to obtain a suitable search neighborhood in mathematical optimization problems [78].

4.2.3 Content generation

The difference between content design and content generation is that of curation versus creation. While the former focuses on selecting and structuring the contents for a course/curriculum in a way most appropriate for achieving the desired learning outcomes, the latter deals with generating the course material itself. AI has been widely adopted to generate and improve learning content prior to the start of the learning process, as discussed in this section.

Automatically generating questions from narrative or informational text, or automatically generating problems for analytical concepts are becoming increasingly important in the context of education. Automatic question generation (AQG) from teaching material can be used to improve learning and comprehension of students, assess information retention from the material and aid teachers in adding supplemental material from external sources without the time-intensive process of authoring assessments from them. They can also be used as a component in intelligent tutoring systems to drive engagement and assess learning. AQG essentially consists of two aspects: content selection or *what to ask*, and question construction or *how to ask it* [79], traditionally considered as separate problems. Content selection

for questions was typically done using different statistical features (sentence length, word/sentence position, word frequency, noun/pronoun count, presence of superlatives, etc.) [80] or NLP techniques such as syntactic or semantic parsing [81, 82], named entity recognition [83], topic modeling [84] etc. Machine learning has also been used in such contexts, e.g. to classify whether a certain sentence is suitable to be used as a stem in cloze questions (passage with a portion occluded which needs to be replaced by the participant) [85]. The actual question construction, on the other hand, traditionally adopted rule-based methods like transformation-based approaches [86] or template-based approaches [87]. The former rephrased the selected content using the correct question key-word after deleting the target concept, while the latter used pre-defined templates that can each capture a class of questions. [88] used an overgenerate-and-rank approach to overgenerate questions followed by the use of supervised learning for ranking them, but still relied on handcrafted generating rules. Following the success of neural language models and concurrent with the release of large-scale machine reading comprehension datasets [89, 90], question generation was later framed as a sequence-to-sequence learning problem that directly maps a sentence (or the entire passage containing the sentence) to a question [91, 92, 93], and can thus be trained in an end-to-end manner [79]. Reinforcement learning based approaches that exploit the rich structural information in the text have also been explored in this context [94]. While text is the most common type of input in AQG, such systems have also been developed for structured databases [95, 96], images [97] and videos [98], and are typically evaluated by experts on the quality of generated questions in terms of relevance, grammatical and semantic correctness, usefulness, clarity etc.

Automatically generating problems that are similar to a given problem in terms of difficulty level, can greatly benefit teachers in setting individualized practice problems to avoid plagiarism and still ensure fair evaluation [99]. It also enables the students to be exposed to as many (and diverse) training exercises as needed in order to master the underlying concepts [100]. In this context, mathematical word problems (MWP) - an established way of inculcating math modeling skills in K-12 education - have witnessed significant research interest. Preliminary work in automatic MWP generation take a template-based approach, where an existing problem is generalized into a template, and a solution space fitting this template is explored to generate new problems [101, 102, 103]. Following the same shift as in AQG, [104] proposed an RNN-based approach that encodes math expressions and topic words to automatically generate such problems. Subsequent research along this direction has focused on improving topic relevance, expression relevance, language coherence, as well as completeness and validity of the generated problems using a spectrum of approaches [105, 106, 107].

On the other end of the content generation spectrum lie systems that can generate solutions based on the content and related questions, which include Automatic Question Answering (AQA) systems, Machine Reading Comprehension (MRC) systems and automatic quantitative reasoning problem solvers [108]. These have achieved impressive breakthroughs with the research into large language models and are widely regarded in the larger narrative as a stepping-stone towards Artificial General Intelligence (AGI), since they require sophisticated natural language understanding and logical inferencing capabilities. However their applicability and usefulness in educational settings remains to be seen.

4.3 Reactive engagement of AI for education

4.3.1 Tutoring aids

Technology has been used to aid learners to achieve their learning goals for a long time. More focused effort on developing computer-based tutoring systems in particular started following the findings of Bloom [109] - students who received tutoring in addition to group classes fared two standard deviations better than those who only participated in group classes. Given its early start, research on Intelligent Tutoring Systems (ITS) is relatively more mature than other research areas under the umbrella of AIED research. Fundamentally, the difference between designs of ITS comes from the difference in the *underlying assumption of what augments the knowledge acquisition process for a student*. In the review paper on ITS [110], a comprehensive timeline and overview of research in this domain is provided. Instead of repeating findings from previous reviews under this category, we distinguish between ITS designs through the lens of the underlying hypotheses. We primarily identified four hypotheses that are currently receiving much attention from the research community - emphasis on tutor-tutee interaction, emphasis of personalization, inclusion of affect and emotion, and consideration of specific learning styles. It must be noted that tutoring itself is an interactive process, therefore most designs in this category have a basic interactive setup. However, contributions in categories (ii) through (iv), have other concept as the focal point of their tutoring aid design.

(i) **Interactive tutoring aids:** Previous research in education [111] has pointed out that *when a student is actively interacting with the educator or the course contents, the student stays engaged in the learning process for a longer duration*. Learning systems that leverage this hypothesis can be categorized as interactive tutoring aids. These frameworks allow the student to communicate (verbally or through actions) with the teacher or the teaching entity (robots or software) and get feedback or instructions as needed.

Early designs of interactive tutoring aids for teaching and support comprised of rule-based systems mirroring interactions between expert teacher and student [112, 113] or between peer companions [114]. These template rules provided output based on the inputs from the student. Over the course of time, interactive tutoring systems gradually shifted to inferring the student's state in real time from the student's interactions with the tutoring system and providing fine-tuned feedback/instructions based on the inference. For instance, [115] used a Bayesian active learning algorithm to assess student's word reading skills while the student was being taught by a robot. Presently, a significant number of frameworks belonging to this category uses chatbots as a proxy for a teacher or a teaching assistant [116]. These recent designs can use a wide variety of data such as text, speech etc. and rely on a combination of sophisticated and resource-intensive deep-learning algorithms to infer and further customize interactions with the student. For example, [117] presents '@dawebot' that uses NLP techniques to train students using multiple choice question quizzes. [118] presents a conversational medical school tutor that uses NLP and natural language understanding (NLU) to understand user's intent and present concepts associated with a clinical case.

Hint construction and partial solution generation is yet another method to keep students engaged interactively. For instance, [119] used Dynamic Bayes Nets to construct a curriculum of hints and associated problems. [120] in their architecture iGeoTutor assisted students in mastering geometry theorems by implementing search strategies (e.g. DFS) from partially complete proofs. [121] aims to improve individual and self-regulated learning in group assignments through a conversational system built using NLU and dialogue management systems that prompts the students to reflect on lessons learnt while directing them to partial solutions, etc.

One of the requirements of certain professional and vocational training such as biology, medicine, military etc. is practical experience. With the support of booming infrastructure, many such training programs are now adopting AI-driven augmented reality (AR)/ virtual reality (VR) lesson plans. Interconnected modules driven by computer vision, NLU, NLP, text-to-speech (TTS), information retrieval algorithms facilitate lessons and/or assessments in biology [122], surgery and medicine [123], pathological laboratory analysis [124], military leadership training [125] etc.

(ii) **Personalized tutoring aids:** As every student is unique, *personalizing instruction and teaching content can positively impact the learning outcome of the student* [126] - tutoring systems that incorporate this can be categorized as personalized learning systems or personalized tutoring aids. Notably, personalization during instruction can occur through course content sequencing, display of prompts and additional resources, etc.

The sequence in which a student reviews course topics plays an important role in their mastery of a concept. One of the criticisms of early computer based learning tools was the 'one approach fits all' method of execution. To improve upon this limitation, personalized instructional sequencing approaches were adopted. In some early developments, [127] developed a course sequencing method that mirrored the role of an instructor using soft computing techniques such as self organized maps and feed-forward neural networks. [128] propose the use of decision trees trained on student background information to propose personalized learning paths for creativity learning. Reinforcement learning naturally lends itself to this task. Here an optimal policy (sequence of instructional activities) is inferred depending on the cognitive state of a student (estimated through knowledge tracing) in order to maximize a learning-related reward function. As knowledge delivery platforms are increasingly becoming virtual and thereby generating more data, deep reinforcement learning has been widely applied to the problem of instructional sequencing [129, 130, 131, 132]. [56] presents a systematic review of RL-induced instructional policies that were evaluated on students, and concludes that over half outperform all baselines they were tested against.

In order to display a set of relevant resources personalized with respect to a student state, algorithmic search is carried out in a knowledge repository. For instance, [133] uses information retrieval and NLP techniques to present two frameworks: PedaBot that allows students to connect past discussions to the current discussion thread and MentorMatch that facilitates student collaboration customized based on student's current needs etc. Both PedaBot and MentorMatch systems use text data coming from a live discussion board in addition to textbook glossaries. In order to reduce information overload and allow learners to easily navigate e-learning platforms, Deep Learning-Based Course Recommender System (DECOR) has been proposed recently [134] - this architecture comprises of neural network based recommendation systems trained using student behavior and course related data.

(iii) **Affect aware tutoring aids:** Scientific research proposes *incorporating affect and behavioral state of the learner into the design of the tutoring system as it enhances the effectiveness of the teaching process* [135, 136]. In [137], Arroyo et. al. suggests that cognition, meta-cognition and affect should indeed be modeled using real time data and used to design intervention strategies. Affect and behavioral state of a student can generally be inferred from sensor data that tracks minute physical movements of the student (eyegaze, facial expression, posture etc.). While initial approaches in this direction required sensor data, a major constraint for availing and using such data pertains to ethical and legal reasons. 'Sensor-free' approaches have thereby been proposed that use data such as student self-evaluations and/or interaction logs of the student with the tutoring system. [138, 139] use interaction data to build affect detector models - the raw data in these cases are first distilled into meaningful features and then fed into simple classifier

models that detect individual affective states. [140] compares the usage of sensor and interaction data in delivering motivational prompts in the course of military training. In [141], uses RNNs to enhance the performance of sensor-free affect detection models. In their review of affect and emotion aware tutoring aids, [142] explore in depth the different use cases for affect aware intelligent tutoring aids such as enriching user experience, better curating learning material and assessments, delivering prompts for appraisal, navigational instructions etc and the progress of research in each direction.

(iv) **Learning style aware tutoring aids:** Yet another perspective in the domain of ITS is that *understanding the learning styles of the students prior to delivery of course content leads to better end outcomes*. [143, 144, 145, 146] among others proposed different approaches to categorize learning styles of students. Traditionally, an individual's learning style was inferred via use of a self-administered questionnaire. However, more recently machine learning based methods are being used to categorize learning styles more efficiently from noisy subject data. [147, 148, 149, 150] use as input the completed questionnaire and/or other data sources such as interaction data, behavioral data of students etc and feed the extracted features into feed-forward neural networks for classification. Unsupervised methods such as self-organizing map (SOM) trained using curated features have also been used for automatic learning style identification [151]. While for categorization per the Felder and Silverman learning style model, count of student visits to different sections of the e-learning platform are found to be more informative [150], [152], for categorization per the Kolb learning model, student performance and student preference features were found to be more relevant. Additionally, machine learning approaches have also been proposed for learning style based learning path design. In [153], learning styles are first identified through a questionnaire and represented on a polar map, thereafter neural networks are used to predict the best presentation layout of the learning objective for a student.

4.3.2 Performance assessment and monitoring

A critical component of the knowledge delivery phase involves assessing student performance by tracing their knowledge development and providing grades and/or constructive feedback on assignments and exams, while simultaneously ensuring academic integrity is upheld. Conversely, it is also important to evaluate the quality and effectiveness of teaching, which has a tangible impact on the learning outcomes of students. AI-driven performance assessment and monitoring tools have been widely developed for both learners and educators. Since a majority of evaluation material are in textual format, NLP-based models in particular have a major presence in this domain. We divide this section into student-focused and teacher-focused approaches, depending on the direct focus group of such applications.

(i) Student-focused:

Knowledge tracing. An effective way of monitoring the learning progress of students is through knowledge tracing, which models knowledge development in students in order to predict their ability to answer the next problem correctly given their current mastery level of knowledge concepts. This not only benefits the students by identifying areas they need to work on, but also the educators in designing targeted exercises, personalized learning recommendations and adaptive teaching strategies [154]. An important step of such systems is cognitive modeling, which models the latent characteristics of students based on their current knowledge state. Traditional approaches for cognitive modeling include factor analysis methods which estimate student knowledge by learning a function (logistic in most cases) based on various factors related to the students, course materials, learning and forgetting behavior, etc. [155, 156, 157]. Another research direction explores Bayesian inference approaches that update student knowledge states using probabilistic graphical models like Hidden Markov Model (HMM) on past performance records [158], with substantial research being devoted to personalizing such model parameters based on student ability and exercise difficulty [159, 160]. Recommender system techniques based on matrix factorization have also been proposed, which predict future scores given a student-exercise performance matrix with known scores [161, 162]. [163] provides a comprehensive taxonomy of recent work in deep learning approaches for knowledge tracing. Deep knowledge tracing (DKT) was one of the first such models which used recurrent neural network architectures for modeling the latent knowledge state along with its temporal dynamics to predict future performance [164]. Extensions along this direction include incorporating external memory structures to enhance representational power of knowledge states [165, 166], incorporating attention mechanisms to learn relative importance of past questions in predicting current response [167, 168], leveraging textual information from exercise materials to enhance prediction performance [169, 154] and incorporating forgetting behavior by considering factors related to timing and frequency of past practice opportunities [170, 171]. Graph neural network based architectures were recently proposed in order to better capture dependencies between knowledge concepts or between questions and their underlying knowledge concepts [172, 173, 174]. Specific to programming, [175] used a sequence of embedded program submissions to train RNNs to predict performance in the current or the next programming exercise. However as pointed out in [163], handling of non-textual content as in images, mathematical equations or code snippets to learn richer embedding representations of questions or knowledge concepts remains relatively unexplored in the domain of knowledge tracing.

Grading and feedback. While technological developments have made it easier to provide content to learners at scale, scoring their submitted work and providing feedback on similar scales remains a difficult problem. While assessing multiple-choice and fill-in-the-blank type questions is easy enough to automate, automating assessment of open-ended questions (e.g. short answers, essays, reports, code samples, etc.) and questions requiring multi-step reasoning (e.g. theorem proving, mathematical derivations, etc.) is equally hard. But automatic evaluation remains an important problem not only because it reduces the burden on teaching assistants and graders, but also removes grader-to-grader variability in assessment and helps accelerate the learning process for students by providing real-time feedback [176].

In the context of written prose, a number of Automatic Essay Scoring (AES) and Automatic Short Answer Grading (ASAG) systems have been developed to reliably evaluate compositions produced by learners in response to a given prompt, and are typically trained on a large set of written samples pre-scored by expert raters [177, 178]. Over the last decade, AI-based essay grading tools evolved from using handcrafted features such as word/sentence count, mean word/sentence length, n-grams, word error rates, POS tags, grammar, punctuation, etc. [179, 180, 181, 182] to automatically extracted features using deep neural network variants [183, 184, 185, 186]. Such systems have been developed not only to provide holistic scoring (assessing essay quality with a single score), but also for more fine-grained evaluation by providing scoring along specific dimensions of essay quality, such as organization [187], prompt-adherence [188], thesis clarity [189], argument strength [190], thesis strength [191], etc. Since it is often expensive to obtain expert-rated essays to train on each time a new prompt is introduced, considerable attention has been given to cross-prompt scoring using multi-task, domain adaptation or transfer learning techniques, both with handcrafted [180, 181] and automatically extracted features [192, 193]. Moreover feedback being a critical aspect of essay drafting and revising, AES systems are increasingly being adopted into Automated Writing Evaluation (AWE) systems that provide formative feedback along with (or instead of) final scores and therefore have greater pedagogical usefulness [194]. For example, AWE systems have been developed for providing feedback on errors in grammar, usage and mechanics [195] and text evidence usage in response-to-text student writings [196].

AI-based evaluation tools are also heavily used in computer science education, particularly programming, due to its inherent structure and logic. Traditional approaches for automated grading of source codes such as test-case based assessments [197] and assessments using code metrics (lines of code, number of variables, number of statements, etc.), while simple, are neither robust nor effective at evaluating program quality.

A more useful direction measures similarities between abstract representations (control flow graphs, system dependence graphs) of the student's program and correct implementations of the program [198, 199] for automatic grading. Such similarity measurements could also be used to construct meaningful clusters of source codes and propagate feedback on student submissions based on the cluster they belong to [200, 201]. [176] extracts informative features from abstract representations of the code to train machine learning models using expert-rated evaluations in order to output a finer-grained evaluation of code quality. [202] used RNNs to learn program embeddings that can be used to propagate human comments on student programs to orders of magnitude more submissions. A bottleneck in automatic program evaluation is the availability of labeled code samples. Approaches proposed to overcome this issue include learning question-independent features from code samples [203, 204] or zero-shot learning using human-in-the-loop rubric sampling [205].

Elsewhere, driven by the maturing of automatic speech recognition technology, AI-based assessment tools have been used for mispronunciation detection in computer-assisted language learning [206, 207, 208] or the more complex problem of spontaneous speech evaluation where the student's response is not known a priori [209]. Mathematical language processing (MLP) has been used for automatic assessment of open response mathematical questions [210, 211], mathematical derivations [212] and geometric theorem proving [213], where grades for previously unseen student solutions are predicted (or propagated from expert-provided grades), sometimes along with partial credit assignment. [214], moreover, overcomes the limitation of having to train a separate model per question by using multi-task and meta-learning tools that promote generalizability to previously unseen questions.

Academic integrity issues. Another aspect of performance assessment and monitoring is to ensure the upholding of academic integrity by detecting plagiarism and other forms of academic or research misconduct. [215] in their review paper on academic plagiarism detection in text (e.g. essays, reports, research papers, etc.) classifies plagiarism forms according to an increasing order of obfuscation level, from verbatim and near-verbatim copying to translation, paraphrasing, idea-preserving plagiarism and ghostwriting. In a similar fashion, plagiarism detection methods have been developed for increasingly complex types of plagiarism, and widely adopt NLP and ML-based techniques for each [215]. For example, lexical detection methods use n-grams [216] or vector space models [217] to create document representations that are subsequently thresholded or clustered [217] to identify suspicious documents. Syntax-based methods rely on PoS tagging [218], frequency of PoS tags [219] or comparison of syntactic trees [220]. Semantics-based methods employ techniques such as word embeddings [221], Latent Semantic Analysis [222], Explicit Semantic Analysis [223], word alignment [224], etc., often in conjunction with other ML-based techniques for downstream

classification [225, 226]. Complementary to such textual analysis-based methods, approaches that use non-textual elements like citations, math expressions, figures, etc. also adopt machine learning for plagiarism detection [227]. [215] also provides a comprehensive summary of how classical ML algorithms such as tree-based methods, SVMs, neural networks, etc. have been successfully used to combine more than one type of detection method to create the best-performing meta-system. More recently, deep learning models such as different variants of convolutional and recurrent neural network architectures have also been used for plagiarism detection [228, 229].

In computer science education where programming assignments are given to evaluate students, source code plagiarism can also be classified based on increasing levels of obfuscation [230]. The detection process typically involves transforming the code into a high-dimensional feature representation followed by measurement of code similarity. Aside from traditionally used features extracted based on structural or syntactic properties of programs [231, 232], NLP-based approaches such as n-grams [233], topic modeling [234], character and word embeddings [235] and character-level language models [236] are increasingly being used for robust code representations. Similarly for downstream similarity modeling or classification, unsupervised [237] and supervised [238, 235] machine learning and deep learning algorithms are popularly used.

It is worth noting that AI itself makes plagiarism detection an uphill battle. With the increasing prevalence of easily accessible large language models like InstructGPT [239] and ChatGPT [240] that are capable of producing natural-sounding essays and short answers, and even working code snippets in response to a text prompt, it is now easier than ever for dishonest learners to misuse such systems for authoring assignments, projects, research papers or online exams. How plagiarism detection approaches, along with teaching and evaluation strategies, evolve around such systems remains to be seen.

(ii) **Teacher-focused:** Teaching Quality Evaluations (TQEs) are important sources of information in determining teaching effectiveness and in ensuring learning objectives are being met. The findings can be used to improve teaching skills through appropriate training and support, and also play a significant role in employment and tenure decisions and the professional growth of teachers. Such evaluations have been traditionally performed by analyzing student evaluations, teacher mutual evaluations, teacher self-evaluations and expert evaluations [241], which are labor-intensive to analyze at scale. Machine learning and deep learning algorithms can help with teacher evaluation by performing sentiment analysis of student comments on teacher performance [242, 243, 244], which provides a snapshot of student attitudes towards teachers and their overall learning experiences. Further, such quantified sentiments and emotional valence scores have been used to predict students' recommendation scores for teachers in order to determine prominent factors that influence student evaluations [245]. [246] uses student ratings related to class planning, presentation, management and student participation to directly predict instructor performance.

Apart from helping extract insights from teacher evaluations, AI can also be used to evaluate teaching strategies on the basis of other data points from the learning process. For example, [247] used a symbolic regression-based approach to evaluate the impact of assignment structures and collaboration type on student scores, which course instructors can use for the purpose of self-evaluation. Several works use a combination of student ratings and attributes related to the course and the instructor to predict instructor performance and investigate factors affecting learning outcomes [248, 249, 250].

4.3.3 Outcome prediction

While a course is ongoing, one way to assess knowledge development in students is through graded assignments and projects. On the other hand, educators can also benefit from automatic prediction of students' performance and automatic identification of students at risk of course non-completion. This can be accomplished by monitoring students' patterns of engagement with the course material in association with their demographic information. Such a priori understanding of a student's outcome allows for designing effective intervention strategies. Presently, most K-12, undergraduate and graduate students, when necessary resources are available, rely on computer and web-based infrastructure [251]. A rich source of data indicating student state is therefore generated when a student interacts with the course modules. Prior to computers being such an integral component in education, researchers frequently used surveys and questionnaires to gauge student engagement, sentiment and attrition probability. In this section we will summarize research developments in the field of AI that *generate early prediction of student outcomes - both final performance and possibility of drop-out*.

Early research in outcome prediction focused on building explanatory regression-based models for understanding student retention using college records [252]. The active research direction in this space gradually shifted to tackling the more complex and more actionable problems of understanding whether a student will complete a program [253], estimating the time a student will take to complete a degree [254] and predicting the final performance of a student [255] given the current student state. In the subsequent paragraphs, we will be discussing the research contributions for outcome prediction with distinction between performance prediction in assessments and course attrition prediction.

Note that we discuss these separately as poor performance in any assessment cannot be generalized into a course non-completion.

(i) **Apriori performance prediction:** Apriori prediction of performance of a student has several benefits - it allows a student to evaluate their course selection, allows educators to evaluate progress and offer additional assistance as needed etc. Not surprisingly therefore AI-based methods have been proposed to automate this important task in the education process.

Initial research articles predicting performance estimated time to degree completion [254] using student demographic, academic, residential and financial aid information, student parent data and school transfer records. In a related theme, researchers have also mapped the question of performance prediction into a final exam grade prediction problem (i.e., excellent, good, fair, fail etc.) [255, 256, 257]. This granular prediction eventually allows educators to assess which students require additional tutoring. Baseline algorithms in this context are Decision Trees, Support Vector Machines, Random Forests, Artificial Neural Networks etc (regression or classification based on the problem setup). Researchers have aimed to improve the performance of the predictors by including relevant information such as student engagement, interactions [258, 256], role of external incentives [259], previous performance records [260] etc. [261] proposed that a student's performance or when the student anticipates graduation should be predicted progressively (using an ensemble machine learning method) over the duration of the student's tenure as the academic state of the student is ever-evolving and can be traced through their student records. The process of generalizing performance prediction to non-traditional modes of learning such as hybrid or blended learning and on-line learning has benefitted from the inclusion of additional information sources such as web-browsing information [262], discussion forum activity, student study habits [263] etc.

In addition to exploring a more informative and robust feature set, recently, deep learning based approaches have been identified to outperform traditional machine learning algorithms. For example, [264] used deep feed-forward neural networks and split the problem of predicting student grade into multiple binary classification problems viz., Pass-Fail, Distinction-Pass, Distinction-Fail, Withdrawn-Pass. [265] analyzed if transfer learning (i.e., pre-training neural networks on student data on a different course) can be used to accurately predict student performance. [266] used a generative adversarial network based architecture, ICGAN-DSVM, to address the challenges of low volume of training data in alternative learning paradigms such as supportive learning. [267] proposed extensive data pre-processing using min-max scaler, quantile transformation etc. before passing the data in a deep-learning model such as one-dimensional convolutional network (CN1D) or recurrent neural networks (LSTM). For a comprehensive survey of ML approaches for this topic, we would refer readers to [267] and [268].

(ii) **Apriori attrition prediction:** Students dropping out before course completion is a concerning trend. This is more so in developing nations where very few students finish primary school [269]. The outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic exacerbated the scenario due to indefinite school closures. This led to loss in learning and progress towards providing access to quality education [270]. The causes for dropping out of a course or a degree program can be diverse, but early prediction of it allows administrative staff and educators to intervene. To this end, there have been efforts in using machine learning algorithms to predict attrition.

Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs): In the context of attrition, special mention must be made of Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs). While MOOCs promise the democratization of education, one of the biggest concerns with MOOCs is the disparity between the number of students who sign up for a course versus the number of students who actually complete the course - the drop-out rate in MOOCs is significantly high [271], [272]. Yet in order to make post-secondary and professional education more accessible, MOOCs have become more a practical necessity than an experiment. The COVID-19 pandemic has only emphasized this necessity [273]. In our literature search phase, we found a sizeable number of contributions in attrition prediction that uses data from MOOC platforms. In this subsection, we will be including those as well as attrition prediction in traditional learning environments.

Early educational data mining methods [253] proposed to predict student drop-out mostly used data sources such as student records (i.e., student demographics, academic, residential, gap year, financial aid information etc.) and administrative records (major administrative changes in education, records of student transfers etc.) to train simple classifiers such as Logistic Regression, Decision Tree, BayesNet, Random Forest etc. Selecting an appropriate set of features and designing explainable models has been important as these later inform intervention [274]. To this end, researchers have explored features such as students' prior experiences, motivation and home environment [275], student engagement with the course [276], [277] etc. In an exciting experiment, [278] crowd-sourced feature engineering for predicting student attrition. With the inclusion of an online learning component (particularly relevant for MOOCs), click-stream data and browser information generated allowed researchers to better understand student behavior in an ongoing course. Using historical click-stream data in conjunction with present click-stream data, allowed [279] to effectively predict drop-outs weekly using a simple Support Vector Machine algorithm. This kind of data has also been helpful in understanding the traits indicative of decreased engagement [280], the role of a social cohort structure [281] and the sentiment in the student discussion boards and communities [282] leading up to student drop-out. [283]

addresses the concern that weekly prediction of probability of a student dropping out might have wide variance by including smoothing techniques. On the other hand, as resources to intervene might be limited, [284] recommends assigning a risk-score per student rather than a binary label. [285] considers the level of activity of a student in bins of time during a semester as a binary features (active vs. inactive) and then uses these sequences as n-grams to predict drop-out. Recent developments in predicting student attrition propose the use of data acquired from disparate sources in addition to more sophisticated algorithms such as deep feed-forward neural networks [286], hybrid logit leaf model [287] etc.

5 Impact of COVID-19 pandemic on driving AI research in the frontier of education

COVID-19 pandemic, possibly the most significant social disruptor in recent history, impacted more than 1.5 billion students worldwide [288] and is believed to have had far-reaching consequences in the domain of education, possibly even generational setbacks [289, 290, 291]. As lockdowns and social distancing mandated a hastened transition to fully virtual delivery of educational content, teachers and administrators grappled with the issue of providing quality education at scale in new formats while ensuring learning progress remains unhindered. We discuss how the pandemic changed the education landscape through remote learning, exacerbated socio-economic inequalities in learning and outline how AI has the potential to address some of the identified issues.

Remote learning and AI. The pandemic era saw an increasing adoption of video conferencing softwares and social media platforms for knowledge delivery, combined with more asynchronous formats of learning. These alternative media of communication were often accompanied by decreasing levels of engagement and satisfaction of learners [292, 293]. There was also a corresponding decrease in practical sessions, labs and workshops, which are quite critical in some fields of education. For example, [294] outlines the disruptive effect of the pandemic on the medical education landscape, possibly making medical students under-prepared for clinical training experiences typically conducted in person, such as history-taking, physical examination, etc.

However, the pandemic also led to an accelerated adoption of AI-based approaches in education. Pilot studies show that the pandemic led to a significant increase in the usage of AI-based e-learning platforms [295]. Moreover, a natural by-product of the transition to online learning environments is the generation and logging of more data points from the learning process [296] that can be used in AI-based methods to assess and drive student engagement and provide personalized feedback. Online teaching platforms also make it easier to incorporate web-based content, smart interactive elements and asynchronous review sessions to keep students more engaged [295, 297].

Inclusive education and AI. Several recent works have investigated the role of pandemic-driven remote and hybrid instruction in widening gaps in educational achievements by race, poverty level and gender [298, 299, 300]. A widespread transition to remote learning necessitates access to proper infrastructure (electricity, internet connectivity and smart electronic devices that can support video conferencing apps and basic file sharing) as well as resources (learning material, textbooks, educational softwares, etc.), which create barriers for low-income groups [301]. [301] also outlines the importance of parents as allies of educators to mitigate some of the limitations of remote learning. This is far less achievable in low-income groups (and ethnic minorities in some cases) due to a lack of awareness, lower educational qualifications of adults in the household, as well as disproportionate loss of income and public health impact of the COVID-19 pandemic in these communities [302]. Even within similar populations, unequal distribution of household chores, income-generating activities and access to technology-enabled devices affect students of different genders disproportionately [300]. Moreover, remote learning requires a level of tech-savviness on the part of students and teachers alike, which might be less prevalent in people with learning disabilities. It is therefore undeniable that such widespread changes had far-reaching impacts on inclusive and quality education worldwide.

In this context, [303] outlines the different ways AI is used in special need education for development of adaptive and inclusive pedagogies. [304] reviews the different ways in which AI positively impacts education of minority students, e.g. through facilitating performance/engagement improvement, student retention, student interest in STEM/STEAM fields, etc. [304] also outlines the technological, pedagogical and socio-cultural barriers for AIEd in inclusive education.

6 Discussion

In this article, we have investigated the involvement of artificial intelligence in the end-to-end educational process. We have highlighted specific research problems both in the planning and in the knowledge delivery phase and reviewed the technological progress in addressing those problems in the past two decades. To the best of our knowledge, such distinction between proactive and reactive phases of education accompanied by a technical deep-dive is a uniqueness of this review.

6.1 Major trends in involvement of AI in the end-to-end education process

The growing interest in AIEd can be inferred from Fig. 2 and Fig. 5 which show how both the count of technical contributions and the count of review articles on the topic have increased over the past two decades. It is to be noted that the number of technical contributions in 2021 and 2022 (assuming our sample of reviewed articles is representative of the population) might have fallen in part due to pandemic-related indefinite school closures and shift to alternate learning models. This triggered a setback on data collection, reporting and annotation efforts due to a number of factors including lack of direct access to participants, unreliable network connectivity, necessity of enumerators adopting to new training modes, etc [305]. Another important observation from Fig. 3 is that AIEd research in most categories focuses heavily on learners in universities, e-learning platforms and MOOCs - work targeting pre-school and K-12 learners is conspicuously absent. A notable exception is research surrounding tutoring aids that has a nearly uniform attention for different target audience groups.

In all categories, to different extents, we see a distinct shift from rule-based and statistical approaches to classical ML to deep learning methods, and from handcrafted features to automatically extracted features. This advancement goes hand-in-hand with the increasingly complex nature of the data being utilized for training AIEd systems. Whereas earlier approaches used mostly static data (e.g. student records, administrative records, demographic information, surveys and questionnaires), the use of more sophisticated algorithms necessitated (and in turn benefited from) more real-time and high-volume data (e.g. student-teacher/peer-peer interaction data, click-stream information, web-browsing data, etc.). The type of data used by AIEd systems also evolved from mostly tabular records to more text-based and even multi-modal data, spurred on by the emergence of large language models that can handle large quantities of such data.

Even though data-hungry models like deep neural networks have grown in popularity across almost all categories discussed here, AIEd often suffers from the availability of sufficient labeled data to train such systems. This is particularly true for small classes and new course offerings, or when existing curriculum or tests are changed to incorporate new elements. As a result, another emerging trend in AIEd focuses on using information from resource-rich courses or existing teaching/evaluation content through domain adaptation, transfer learning, few-shot learning, meta learning, etc.

6.2 Existing challenges in adopting Artificial Intelligence for education

In 2023, artificial intelligence has permeated the lives of people in some aspect or other globally (e.g. chat-bots for customer service, automated credit score analysis, personalized recommendations etc.). At the same time, AI-driven technology for the education sector is gradually becoming a practical necessity globally. The question therefore is, what are the existing barriers in global adoption of AI for education in a safe and inclusive manner, such that SDG4 can be achieved [1]. In this section, we analyze and discuss some of our observations with regards to existing AIEd technologies and the challenges in deploying these technologies globally.

Lack of cultural awareness in AIEd tools: The lack of international representation in the AIEd research field has been brought to light several times through both perspective review articles [306, 307] as well as through bibliometric analysis [32, 308]. In particular, most of the existing AIEd technologies were conceptualized and developed in the context of Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich and Democratic (WEIRD) societies. Therefore, such technologies make implicit assumptions about students and teachers (e.g., individualism, fairness, cooperation, sensitivity to disciplinary actions etc.) that are valid in such demographics. Moreover, it is likely that the training data for the AI entities in these frameworks was obtained from a very specific section of the global population. As a result, the trained models will have limited generalization capabilities when deployed for a different target audience. Classroom instruction strategies, teacher-student interactions, peer to peer interactions, teaching curriculum are expected to vary widely across the globe making cultural awareness and sensitivity in educational frameworks a must [309, 310, 311]. Beyond classroom and online courses, culture aware tutoring systems are relevant for professional and vocational training as well. The notion of developing culturally aware educational technologies is relatively new and some early research in this direction [312, 313, 314] proposes the embodiment of culturally sensitive gestures and movements in intelligent tutoring systems. However, it remains to be seen how this concept matures and is made available in classroom and online settings for learners from different backgrounds [315].

Lack of concrete legal and ethical guidelines for AIEd research: As pointed out by [25], besides most AIEd researchers being concentrated in the technologically advanced parts of the world, most AIEd platforms and applications are owned currently by the private sector. The private investor funded research in big corporations such as Coursera, EdX, IBM, McGraw-Hill and start-ups like Elsa, Century, Querium have yielded several robust AIEd applications. However, as these platforms are privately owned, there is little transparency and regulations regarding their development and operations. Due to this, there is growing concern on the part of guardians and teaching staff regarding the data accessed by these platforms, privacy and security of the data stored and explainability of the deployed models. To

alleviate this, regulation policies at the international, national and state levels can help address the concerns of the end users. While many tech-savvy nations have had a head start in this [316], drafting general guidelines for AIEd platforms is still very much a nascent concept for most policy makers.

Lack of equitable access to infrastructure hosting AIEd: Education is one of the most important social equalizers [317]. However, in order to ensure more people have access to quality education, AI-enabled teaching and studying tools are necessary to reduce the stress on educators and administrative staff [25]. The irony here is that the cost of deploying and operating AIEd tools often alienates communities with limited means thereby widening the gap in access to education. [318] mentions that access to electricity, internet, data storage and processing hardware have been barriers in deploying AI-driven platforms. To remove these obstacles, changes must be brought about in local and global levels. While formation of international alliances that invest in infrastructure development can usher in the technology in developing nations, changes in local policies can expedite the process [319].

Lack of skilled personnels to operate AIEd tools in production: Investing in AIEd research and supporting infrastructure alone is not sufficient to ensure long term utility and usage of AI-driven tools for education. Workforce responsible for using these tools on a day-to-day basis must also be brought up to speed. Currently, there is a considerable amount of apprehension, particularly in developing countries, regarding use of AI for education [315, 320]. The main concerns are related to data privacy and security, job security, ethics etc. post adoption of AI in this sector. These concerns in turn have slowed down integration of technology for education. In this context, we must echo [25] in mentioning that while these concerns are relevant and must be addressed, in our review of AIEd research, we have not found any evidence that should invoke panic in educators and administrative staff. AIEd research as it stands today only augments the role of the teacher, and does not eliminate it. Furthermore, for the foreseeable future, we would need a human in the loop to provide feedback and ensure proper daily usage of these tools.

6.3 Concluding Remarks

Through this review, we identified the paradigm shift over the past 20 years in formulating computational models (i.e., choice of algorithms, choice of features etc.) and training them (i.e., choice of data) - we are indeed increasingly leaning towards *sophisticated yet explainable* frameworks. As the scope of this review includes a period of social disruption due to COVID-19 pandemic, it provided us the opportunity to introspect on the utility and the robustness of the proposed technology thus far. To this end, we have discussed the concerns and limitations brought to light by the pandemic and research ideas spawning from that.

With the target of ensuring equitable access to education being set for 2030, one of the inevitable questions arising is: *are we ready to use AI driven ed-tech tools to support educators and students?*. This remains however a question to be answered. Based on our survey, we have observed that while in some parts of the world we have seen great momentum in making AIEd a part and parcel of the education sector, in other parts of the world this progress is stymied by inadequate access to necessary infrastructure and human resources. The pivotal point at this time is that while there needs to be changes at a socio-economic level to adopt the state of the art AI driven ed-tech technologies as standard tools for education, the progress made and the ongoing conversations are reasons for optimism.

References

- [1] United Nations. Goal 4: Quality education. 2015.
- [2] Courtney Tanenbaum, T Gray, K Lee, M Williams, and R Upton. Stem 2026: A vision for innovation in stem education. *US Department of Education, Washington, DC*, 2016.
- [3] Initiatives taken by the ministry of education — vikaspedia. 2022.
- [4] Stéphan Vincent-Lancrin and Reyer van der Vlies. Trustworthy artificial intelligence (ai) in education: Promises and challenges. 2020.
- [5] Hubert L Dreyfus. Anonymity versus commitment: The dangers of education on the internet. *Ethics and information technology*, 1(1):15–20, 1999.
- [6] Andrew Feenberg. The online education controversy and the future of the university. *Foundations of Science*, 22(2):363–371, 2017.
- [7] O Burkacky, J Dragon, and N Lehmann. The semiconductor decade: A trillion-dollar industry. 2022.
- [8] Paul LeBlanc. Covid-19 has thrust universities into online learning—how should they adapt. *Brookings (blog)*, 2020.
- [9] Michael Haenlein and Andreas Kaplan. A brief history of artificial intelligence: On the past, present, and future of artificial intelligence. *California management review*, 61(4):5–14, 2019.

- [10] Zheyuan Ryan Shi, Claire Wang, and Fei Fang. Artificial intelligence for social good: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.01818*, 2020.
- [11] Lijia Chen, Pingping Chen, and Zhijian Lin. Artificial intelligence in education: A review. *Ieee Access*, 8:75264–75278, 2020.
- [12] Xieling Chen, Haoran Xie, Di Zou, and Gwo-Jen Hwang. Application and theory gaps during the rise of artificial intelligence in education. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 1:100002, 2020.
- [13] James H Fetzer. What is artificial intelligence? In *Artificial Intelligence: Its Scope and Limits*, pages 3–27. Springer, 1990.
- [14] Maud Chassignol, Aleksandr Khoroshavin, Alexandra Klimova, and Anna Bilyatdinova. Artificial intelligence trends in education: a narrative overview. *Procedia Computer Science*, 136:16–24, 2018.
- [15] Olaf Zawacki-Richter, Victoria I Marín, Melissa Bond, and Franziska Gouverneur. Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education—where are the educators? *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 16(1):1–27, 2019.
- [16] Liu Yufeia, Salmiza Salehb, Huang Jiahuic, and Syed Mohamad Syed. Review of the application of artificial intelligence in education. *Integration (Amsterdam)*, 12(8), 2020.
- [17] Kashif Ahmad, J Qadir, A Al-Fuqaha, W Iqbal, A El-Hassan, D Benhaddou, and M Ayyash. Artificial intelligence in education: A panoramic review.(4). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.35542/osf.io/zvu2n>, 2020.
- [18] Xuesong Zhai, Xiaoyan Chu, Ching Sing Chai, Morris Siu Yung Jong, Andreja Istenic, Michael Spector, Jia-Bao Liu, Jing Yuan, and Yan Li. A review of artificial intelligence (ai) in education from 2010 to 2020. *Complexity*, 2021, 2021.
- [19] Fan Ouyang and Pengcheng Jiao. Artificial intelligence in education: The three paradigms. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 2:100020, 2021.
- [20] Petros Lamerias and Sylvester Arnab. Power to the teachers: an exploratory review on artificial intelligence in education. *Information*, 13(1):14, 2021.
- [21] Jiahui Huang, Salmiza Saleh, and Yufei Liu. A review on artificial intelligence in education. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 10(3):206–206, 2021.
- [22] Garima Malik, Devendra Kumar Tayal, and Sonakshi Vij. An analysis of the role of artificial intelligence in education and teaching. In *Recent Findings in Intelligent Computing Techniques*, pages 407–417. Springer, 2019.
- [23] Mehrnaz Fahimirad, Sedigheh Shakib Kotamjani, et al. A review on application of artificial intelligence in teaching and learning in educational contexts. *International Journal of Learning and Development*, 8(4):106–118, 2018.
- [24] Niklas Humble and Peter Mozelius. Artificial intelligence in education—a promise, a threat or a hype. In *Proceedings of the european conference on the impact of artificial intelligence and robotics*, pages 149–156, 2019.
- [25] Francesc Pedro, Miguel Subosa, Axel Rivas, and Paula Valverde. Artificial intelligence in education: Challenges and opportunities for sustainable development. 2019.
- [26] Gwo-Jen Hwang, Haoran Xie, Benjamin W Wah, and Dragan Gašević. Vision, challenges, roles and research issues of artificial intelligence in education, 2020.
- [27] Daniel Schiff. Out of the laboratory and into the classroom: the future of artificial intelligence in education. *AI & society*, 36(1):331–348, 2021.
- [28] Jiahong Su and Weipeng Yang. Artificial intelligence in early childhood education: A scoping review. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, page 100049, 2022.
- [29] Fan Ouyang, Luyi Zheng, and Pengcheng Jiao. Artificial intelligence in online higher education: A systematic review of empirical research from 2011 to 2020. *Education and Information Technologies*, pages 1–33, 2022.
- [30] Na Dong and Zhihui Chen. Seldon, a., and abidoye, o.: The fourth education revolution: will artificial intelligence liberate or infantilise humanity, 2020.
- [31] Tianchong Wang and Eric CK Cheng. Towards a tripartite research agenda: A scoping review of artificial intelligence in education research. In *Artificial Intelligence in Education: Emerging Technologies, Models and Applications*, pages 3–24. Springer, 2022.
- [32] Xieling Chen, Di Zou, Haoran Xie, Gary Cheng, and Caixia Liu. Two decades of artificial intelligence in education. *Educational Technology & Society*, 25(1):28–47, 2022.

- [33] Sayed Fayaz Ahmad, Muhammad Mansoor Alam, Mohd Khairil Rahmat, Muhammad Shujaat Mubarak, and Syed Irfan Hyder. Academic and administrative role of artificial intelligence in education. *Sustainability*, 14(3):1101, 2022.
- [34] Bharatwaja Namatherdhala, Noman Mazher, and Gopal Krishna Sriram. A comprehensive overview of artificial intelligence trends in education. *International Research Journal of Modernization in Engineering Technology and Science*, 4(7), 2022.
- [35] Thomas H Bruggink and Vivek Gambhir. Statistical models for college admission and enrollment: A case study for a selective liberal arts college. *Research in Higher Education*, 37(2):221–240, 1996.
- [36] James S Moore. An expert system approach to graduate school admission decisions and academic performance prediction. *Omega*, 26(5):659–670, 1998.
- [37] Austin Waters and Risto Miikkulainen. Grade: Machine learning support for graduate admissions. *Ai Magazine*, 35(1):64–64, 2014.
- [38] Yijun Zhao, Bryan Lackaye, Jennifer G Dy, and Carla E Brodley. A quantitative machine learning approach to master students admission for professional institutions. *International Educational Data Mining Society*, 2020.
- [39] Joseph Jamison. Applying machine learning to predict davidson college’s admissions yield. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGCSE Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education*, pages 765–766, 2017.
- [40] Dr Esquivel, A Joseph, Dr Esquivel, and A James. Using a binary classification model to predict the likelihood of enrolment to the undergraduate program of a philippine university. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.15601*, 2020.
- [41] Basem Assiri, Mohammed Bashraheel, and Ala Alsuri. Improve the accuracy of students admission at universities using machine learning techniques. In *2022 7th International Conference on Data Science and Machine Learning Applications (CDMA)*, pages 127–132. IEEE, 2022.
- [42] Amal AlGhamdi, Amal Barsheed, Hanadi AlMshjary, and Hanan AlGhamdi. A machine learning approach for graduate admission prediction. In *Proceedings of the 2020 2nd International Conference on Image, Video and Signal Processing*, pages 155–158, 2020.
- [43] Md Omaer Faruq Goni, Abdul Matin, Tonmoy Hasan, Md Abu Ismail Siddique, Oishi Jyoti, and Fahim MD Sifnatul Hasnain. Graduate admission chance prediction using deep neural network. In *2020 IEEE International Women in Engineering (WIE) Conference on Electrical and Computer Engineering (WIECON-ECE)*, pages 259–262. IEEE, 2020.
- [44] Krishna Mridha, Suman Jha, Bikash Shah, P Damodharan, Ankush Ghosh, and Rabindra Nath Shaw. Machine learning algorithms for predicting the graduation admission. In *International Conference on Electrical and Electronics Engineering*, pages 618–637. Springer, 2022.
- [45] Nicholas T Young and Marcos D Caballero. Using machine learning to understand physics graduate school admissions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.01570*, 2019.
- [46] Inssaf El Guabassi, Zakaria Bousalem, Rim Marah, and Aimad Qazdar. A recommender system for predicting students’ admission to a graduate program using machine learning algorithms. 2021.
- [47] Sushant Agarwal. Trade-offs between fairness, interpretability, and privacy in machine learning. Master’s thesis, University of Waterloo, 2020.
- [48] Jessie Finocchiaro, Roland Maio, Faidra Monachou, Gourab K Patro, Manish Raghavan, Ana-Andreea Stoica, and Stratis Tsirtsis. Bridging machine learning and mechanism design towards algorithmic fairness. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pages 489–503, 2021.
- [49] Veronika Bogina, Alan Hartman, Tsvi Kuflik, and Avital Shulner-Tal. Educating software and ai stakeholders about algorithmic fairness, accountability, transparency and ethics. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, 32(3):808–833, 2022.
- [50] Vitalii Emelianov, Nicolas Gast, Krishna P Gummadi, and Patrick Loiseau. On fair selection in the presence of implicit variance. In *Proceedings of the 21st ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 649–675, 2020.
- [51] Frank Marcinkowski, Kimon Kieslich, Christopher Starke, and Marco Lünich. Implications of ai (un-) fairness in higher education admissions: the effects of perceived ai (un-) fairness on exit, voice and organizational reputation. In *Proceedings of the 2020 conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency*, pages 122–130, 2020.
- [52] Joseph Kessels. A relational approach to curriculum design. In *Design approaches and tools in education and training*, pages 59–70. Springer, 1999.

- [53] Robert Ball, Linda Duhadway, Kyle Feuz, Joshua Jensen, Brian Rague, and Drew Weidman. Applying machine learning to improve curriculum design. In *Proceedings of the 50th ACM Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education*, pages 787–793, 2019.
- [54] Randhir Rawatlal. Application of machine learning to curriculum design analysis. In *2017 Computing Conference*, pages 1143–1151. IEEE, 2017.
- [55] M Somasundaram, P Latha, and SA Saravana Pandian. Curriculum design using artificial intelligence (ai) back propagation method. *Procedia Computer Science*, 172:134–138, 2020.
- [56] Shayan Doroudi. Integrating human and machine intelligence for enhanced curriculum design. *PhD diss., Air Force Research Laboratory*, 2019.
- [57] Luca Benedetto, Paolo Cremonesi, Andrew Caines, Paula Buttery, Andrea Cappelli, Andrea Giussani, and Roberto Turrin. A survey on recent approaches to question difficulty estimation from text. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 2022.
- [58] Foteini Grivokostopoulou, Ioannis Hatzilygeroudis, and Isidoros Perikos. Teaching assistance and automatic difficulty estimation in converting first order logic to clause form. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 42(3):347–367, 2014.
- [59] Isidoros Perikos, Foteini Grivokostopoulou, Konstantinos Kovas, and Ioannis Hatzilygeroudis. Automatic estimation of exercises’ difficulty levels in a tutoring system for teaching the conversion of natural language into first-order logic. *Expert Systems*, 33(6):569–580, 2016.
- [60] Josiane Mothe and Ludovic Tanguy. Linguistic features to predict query difficulty. In *ACM Conference on research and Development in Information Retrieval, SIGIR, Predicting query difficulty-methods and applications workshop*, pages 7–10, 2005.
- [61] Jurik Stiller, Stefan Hartmann, Sabrina Mathesius, Philipp Straube, Rüdiger Tiemann, Volkhard Nordmeier, Dirk Krüger, and Annette Upmeier zu Belzen. Assessing scientific reasoning: A comprehensive evaluation of item features that affect item difficulty. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 41(5):721–732, 2016.
- [62] Luca Benedetto, Andrea Cappelli, Roberto Turrin, and Paolo Cremonesi. Introducing a framework to assess newly created questions with natural language processing. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence in Education*, pages 43–54. Springer, 2020.
- [63] Victoria Yaneva, Peter Baldwin, Janet Mee, et al. Predicting item survival for multiple choice questions in a high-stakes medical exam. In *Proceedings of The 12th Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pages 6812–6818, 2020.
- [64] Luca Benedetto, Andrea Cappelli, Roberto Turrin, and Paolo Cremonesi. R2de: a nlp approach to estimating irt parameters of newly generated questions. In *Proceedings of the Tenth International Conference on Learning Analytics & Knowledge*, pages 412–421, 2020.
- [65] Jiansheng Fang, Wei Zhao, and Dongya Jia. Exercise difficulty prediction in online education systems. In *2019 International Conference on Data Mining Workshops (ICDMW)*, pages 311–317. IEEE, 2019.
- [66] Li-Huai Lin, Tao-Hsing Chang, and Fu-Yuan Hsu. Automated prediction of item difficulty in reading comprehension using long short-term memory. In *2019 International Conference on Asian Language Processing (IALP)*, pages 132–135. IEEE, 2019.
- [67] Kang Xue, Victoria Yaneva, Christopher Runyon, and Peter Baldwin. Predicting the difficulty and response time of multiple choice questions using transfer learning. In *Proceedings of the Fifteenth Workshop on Innovative Use of NLP for Building Educational Applications*, pages 193–197, 2020.
- [68] Zhenya Huang, Qi Liu, Enhong Chen, Hongke Zhao, Mingyong Gao, Si Wei, Yu Su, and Guoping Hu. Question difficulty prediction for reading problems in standard tests. In *Thirty-First AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2017.
- [69] Zhaopeng Qiu, Xian Wu, and Wei Fan. Question difficulty prediction for multiple choice problems in medical exams. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*, pages 139–148, 2019.
- [70] Ye Huang, Wei Huang, Shiwei Tong, Zhenya Huang, Qi Liu, Enhong Chen, Jianhui Ma, Liang Wan, and Shijin Wang. Stan: Adversarial network for cross-domain question difficulty prediction. In *2021 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM)*, pages 220–229. IEEE, 2021.
- [71] Samah AlKhuzaei, Floriana Grasso, Terry R Payne, and Valentina Tamma. A systematic review of data-driven approaches to item difficulty prediction. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence in Education*, pages 29–41. Springer, 2021.

- [72] Kaixiang Zhu, Lily D Li, and Michael Li. A survey of computational intelligence in educational timetabling. *International Journal of Machine Learning and Computing*, 11(1):40–47, 2021.
- [73] Souad Larabi-Marie-Sainte, Roohi Jan, Ali Al-Matouq, and Sara Alabduhadi. The impact of timetable on student’s absences and performance. *Plos one*, 16(6):e0253256, 2021.
- [74] Joo Siang Tan, Say Leng Goh, Graham Kendall, and Nasser R Sabar. A survey of the state-of-the-art of optimisation methodologies in school timetabling problems. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 165:113943, 2021.
- [75] Patrick Kenekayoro. Incorporating machine learning to evaluate solutions to the university course timetabling problem. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.00826*, 2020.
- [76] Joe Henry Obit, Dario Landa-Silva, Marc Sevaux, and Djamilia Ouelhadj. Non-linear great deluge with reinforcement learning for university course timetabling. *Metaheuristics–Intelligent Decision Making, Series Operations Research/Computer Science Interfaces*, Springer, pages 1–19, 2011.
- [77] Ender Özcan, Mustafa Misir, Gabriela Ochoa, and Edmund K Burke. A reinforcement learning: great-deluge hyper-heuristic for examination timetabling. In *Modeling, analysis, and applications in metaheuristic computing: advancements and trends*, pages 34–55. IGI Global, 2012.
- [78] Say Leng Goh, Graham Kendall, and Nasser R Sabar. Simulated annealing with improved reheating and learning for the post enrolment course timetabling problem. *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 70(6):873–888, 2019.
- [79] Liangming Pan, Wenqiang Lei, Tat-Seng Chua, and Min-Yen Kan. Recent advances in neural question generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.08949*, 2019.
- [80] Manish Agarwal and Prashanth Mannem. Automatic gap-fill question generation from text books. In *Proceedings of the sixth workshop on innovative use of NLP for building educational applications*, pages 56–64, 2011.
- [81] Michael Heilman. *Automatic factual question generation from text*. PhD thesis, Carnegie Mellon University, 2011.
- [82] David Lindberg, Fred Popowich, John Nesbit, and Phil Winne. Generating natural language questions to support learning on-line. In *Proceedings of the 14th European Workshop on Natural Language Generation*, pages 105–114, 2013.
- [83] Saidalavi Kalady, Ajeesh Elikkotttil, and Rajarshi Das. Natural language question generation using syntax and keywords. In *Proceedings of QG2010: The Third Workshop on Question Generation*, volume 2, pages 5–14. questiongeneration.org, 2010.
- [84] Mukta Majumder and Sujana Kumar Saha. A system for generating multiple choice questions: With a novel approach for sentence selection. In *Proceedings of the 2nd workshop on natural language processing techniques for educational applications*, pages 64–72, 2015.
- [85] Rui Correia, Jorge Baptista, Maxine Eskenazi, and Nuno Mamede. Automatic generation of cloze question stems. In *International Conference on Computational Processing of the Portuguese Language*, pages 168–178. Springer, 2012.
- [86] Andrea Varga and Le An Ha. Wlv: A question generation system for the qgstec 2010 task b. In *Proceedings of QG2010: The third workshop on question generation*, pages 80–83, 2010.
- [87] Jack Mostow and Wei Chen. Generating instruction automatically for the reading strategy of self-questioning. In *AIED*, pages 465–472, 2009.
- [88] Michael Heilman and Noah A Smith. Good question! statistical ranking for question generation. In *Human Language Technologies: The 2010 Annual Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 609–617, 2010.
- [89] Pranav Rajpurkar, Jian Zhang, Konstantin Lopyrev, and Percy Liang. Squad: 100,000+ questions for machine comprehension of text. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.05250*, 2016.
- [90] Tri Nguyen, Mir Rosenberg, Xia Song, Jianfeng Gao, Saurabh Tiwary, Rangan Majumder, and Li Deng. Ms marco: A human generated machine reading comprehension dataset. In *CoCo@ NIPS*, 2016.
- [91] Xinya Du, Junru Shao, and Claire Cardie. Learning to ask: Neural question generation for reading comprehension. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.00106*, 2017.
- [92] Yao Zhao, Xiaochuan Ni, Yuanyuan Ding, and Qifa Ke. Paragraph-level neural question generation with maxout pointer and gated self-attention networks. In *Proceedings of the 2018 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing*, pages 3901–3910, 2018.

- [93] Yanghoon Kim, Hwanhee Lee, Joongbo Shin, and Kyomin Jung. Improving neural question generation using answer separation. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 33, pages 6602–6609, 2019.
- [94] Yu Chen, Lingfei Wu, and Mohammed J Zaki. Reinforcement learning based graph-to-sequence model for natural question generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.04942*, 2019.
- [95] Corentin Jouault and Kazuhisa Seta. Building a semantic open learning space with adaptive question generation support. In *Proceedings of the 21st International Conference on Computers in Education*, pages 41–50, 2013.
- [96] Sathish Reddy Indurthi, Dinesh Raghu, Mitesh M Khapra, and Sachindra Joshi. Generating natural language question-answer pairs from a knowledge graph using a rnn based question generation model. In *Proceedings of the 15th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Volume 1, Long Papers*, pages 376–385, 2017.
- [97] Nasrin Mostafazadeh, Ishan Misra, Jacob Devlin, Margaret Mitchell, Xiaodong He, and Lucy Vanderwende. Generating natural questions about an image. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.06059*, 2016.
- [98] Yi-Ting Huang, Ya-Min Tseng, Yeali S Sun, and Meng Chang Chen. Tedquiz: automatic quiz generation for ted talks video clips to assess listening comprehension. In *2014 IEEE 14th international conference on advanced learning technologies*, pages 350–354. IEEE, 2014.
- [99] Umair Z Ahmed, Sumit Gulwani, and Amey Karkare. Automatically generating problems and solutions for natural deduction. In *Twenty-Third International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2013.
- [100] Stanley Uros Keller. Automatic generation of word problems for academic education via natural language processing (nlp). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.13123*, 2021.
- [101] Paul Deane and Kathleen Sheehan. Automatic item generation via frame semantics: Natural language generation of math word problems. 2003.
- [102] Oleksandr Polozov, Eleanor O’Rourke, Adam M Smith, Luke Zettlemoyer, Sumit Gulwani, and Zoran Popović. Personalized mathematical word problem generation. In *Twenty-Fourth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2015.
- [103] Rik Koncel-Kedziorski, Ioannis Konstas, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. A theme-rewriting approach for generating algebra word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.06210*, 2016.
- [104] Qingyu Zhou and Danqing Huang. Towards generating math word problems from equations and topics. In *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Natural Language Generation*, pages 494–503, 2019.
- [105] Tianqiao Liu, Qiang Fang, Wenbiao Ding, Hang Li, Zhongqin Wu, and Zitao Liu. Mathematical word problem generation from commonsense knowledge graph and equations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.06196*, 2020.
- [106] Zichao Wang, Andrew S Lan, and Richard G Baraniuk. Math word problem generation with mathematical consistency and problem context constraints. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.04546*, 2021.
- [107] Qinzhuo Wu, Qi Zhang, and Xuanjing Huang. Automatic math word problem generation with topic-expression co-attention mechanism and reinforcement learning. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, 30:1061–1072, 2022.
- [108] Dongxiang Zhang, Lei Wang, Luming Zhang, Bing Tian Dai, and Heng Tao Shen. The gap of semantic parsing: A survey on automatic math word problem solvers. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 42(9):2287–2305, 2019.
- [109] Benjamin S Bloom. The 2 sigma problem: The search for methods of group instruction as effective as one-to-one tutoring. *Educational researcher*, 13(6):4–16, 1984.
- [110] Ali Alkhatlan and Jugal Kalita. Intelligent tutoring systems: A comprehensive historical survey with recent developments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.09628*, 2018.
- [111] G Tanner Jackson and Danielle S McNamara. Motivation and performance in a game-based intelligent tutoring system. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 105(4):1036, 2013.
- [112] Ivon Arroyo, Carole Beal, Tom Murray, Rena Walles, and Beverly Woolf. Wayang outpost: Intelligent tutoring for high stakes achievement tests. In *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Intelligent Tutoring Systems (ITS2004)*, pages 468–477, 2004.
- [113] Andrew M Olney, Sidney D’Mello, Natalie Person, Whitney Cade, Patrick Hays, Claire Williams, Blair Lehman, and Arthur Graesser. Guru: A computer tutor that models expert human tutors. In *International conference on intelligent tutoring systems*, pages 256–261. Springer, 2012.

- [114] Javier Movellan, Micah Eckhardt, Marjo Virnes, and Angelica Rodriguez. Sociable robot improves toddler vocabulary skills. In *Proceedings of the 4th ACM/IEEE international conference on Human robot interaction*, pages 307–308, 2009.
- [115] Goren Gordon and Cynthia Breazeal. Bayesian active learning-based robot tutor for children’s word-reading skills. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 29, 2015.
- [116] Mohammed Waseem Ashfaque, Sumegh Tharewal, Sohail Iqbal, and Charansing N Kayte. A review on techniques, characteristics and approaches of an intelligent tutoring chatbot system. In *2020 International Conference on Smart Innovations in Design, Environment, Management, Planning and Computing (ICSIDEMPC)*, pages 258–262. IEEE, 2020.
- [117] Juanan Pereira. Leveraging chatbots to improve self-guided learning through conversational quizzes. In *Proceedings of the fourth international conference on technological ecosystems for enhancing multiculturalism*, pages 911–918, 2016.
- [118] Shazia Afzal, Tejas Indulal Dhamecha, Paul Gagnon, Akash Nayak, Ayush Shah, Jan Carlstedt-Duke, Smriti Pathak, Sneha Mondal, Akshay Gugnani, Nabil Zary, et al. Ai medical school tutor: Modelling and implementation. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence in Medicine*, pages 133–145. Springer, 2020.
- [119] Derek Green, Thomas Walsh, Paul Cohen, and Yu-Han Chang. Learning a skill-teaching curriculum with dynamic bayes nets. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 25, pages 1648–1654, 2011.
- [120] Ke Wang and Zhendong Su. Automated geometry theorem proving for human-readable proofs. In *Twenty-Fourth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2015.
- [121] Charuta Pande, Hans Friedrich Witschel, Andreas Martin, and Devid Montecchiari. Hybrid conversational ai for intelligent tutoring systems. In *AAAI Spring Symposium: Combining Machine Learning with Knowledge Engineering*, 2021.
- [122] Jae-wook Ahn, Ravi Tejwani, Sharad Sundararajan, Aldis Sipolins, Sean O’Hara, Anand Paul, Ravi Kokku, Jan Kjallstrom, Nam Hai Dang, and Yazhou Huang. Intelligent virtual reality tutoring system supporting open educational resource access. In *International Conference on Intelligent Tutoring Systems*, pages 280–286. Springer, 2018.
- [123] Nykan Mirchi, Vincent Bissonnette, Recai Yilmaz, Nicole Ledwos, Alexander Winkler-Schwartz, and Rolando F Del Maestro. The virtual operative assistant: An explainable artificial intelligence tool for simulation-based training in surgery and medicine. *PloS one*, 15(2):e0229596, 2020.
- [124] Joanna Taoum, Bilal Nakhil, Elisabetta Bevacqua, and Ronan Querrec. A design proposition for interactive virtual tutors in an informed environment. In *International Conference on Intelligent Virtual Agents*, pages 341–350. Springer, 2016.
- [125] Andrew Gordon, Michael van Lent, Martin Van Velsen, Paul Carpenter, and Arnav Jhala. Branching storylines in virtual reality environments for leadership development. In *Proceedings of the national conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 844–851. Menlo Park, CA; Cambridge, MA; London; AAAI Press; MIT Press; 1999, 2004.
- [126] Candace A Walkington. Using adaptive learning technologies to personalize instruction to student interests: The impact of relevant contexts on performance and learning outcomes. *Journal of educational psychology*, 105(4):932, 2013.
- [127] Norsham Idris, Norazah Yusof, Puteh Saad, et al. Adaptive course sequencing for personalization of learning path using neural network. *Int. J. Advance. Soft Comput. Appl*, 1(1):49–61, 2009.
- [128] Chun Fu Lin, Yu-chu Yeh, Yu Hsin Hung, and Ray I Chang. Data mining for providing a personalized learning path in creativity: An application of decision trees. *Computers & Education*, 68:199–210, 2013.
- [129] Siddharth Reddy, Sergey Levine, and Anca Dragan. Accelerating human learning with deep reinforcement learning. In *NIPS’17 Workshop: Teaching Machines, Robots, and Humans*, pages 5–9, 2017.
- [130] Utkarsh Upadhyay, Abir De, and Manuel Gomez Rodriguez. Deep reinforcement learning of marked temporal point processes. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 31, 2018.
- [131] Yanjun Pu, Caimeng Wang, and Wenjun Wu. A deep reinforcement learning framework for instructional sequencing. In *2020 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data)*, pages 5201–5208. IEEE, 2020.
- [132] Muhammad Zubair Islam, Rashid Ali, Amir Haider, Md Zahidul Islam, and Hyung Seok Kim. Pakes: A reinforcement learning-based personalized adaptability knowledge extraction strategy for adaptive learning systems. *IEEE Access*, 9:155123–155137, 2021.

- [133] Jihie Kim and Erin Shaw. Pedagogical discourse: connecting students to past discussions and peer mentors within an online discussion board. In *Twenty-First IAAI Conference*, 2009.
- [134] Qinglong Li and Jaekyeong Kim. A deep learning-based course recommender system for sustainable development in education. *Applied Sciences*, 11(19):8993, 2021.
- [135] Maria Ofelia Z San Pedro, Ryan SJ d Baker, Sujith M Gowda, and Neil T Heffernan. Towards an understanding of affect and knowledge from student interaction with an intelligent tutoring system. In *International conference on artificial intelligence in education*, pages 41–50. Springer, 2013.
- [136] Beverly Woolf, Winslow Bureson, Ivon Arroyo, Toby Dragon, David Cooper, and Rosalind Picard. Affect-aware tutors: recognising and responding to student affect. *International Journal of Learning Technology*, 4(3/4):129–164, 2009.
- [137] Ivon Arroyo, Beverly Park Woolf, Winslow Bureson, Kasia Muldner, Dovon Rai, and Minghui Tai. A multimedia adaptive tutoring system for mathematics that addresses cognition, metacognition and affect. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, 24(4):387–426, 2014.
- [138] Beverly Park Woolf, Ivon Arroyo, Kasia Muldner, Winslow Bureson, David G Cooper, Robert Dolan, and Robert M Christopherson. The effect of motivational learning companions on low achieving students and students with disabilities. In *International conference on intelligent tutoring systems*, pages 327–337. Springer, 2010.
- [139] Ivon Arroyo, David G Cooper, Winslow Bureson, and Beverly P Woolf. Bayesian networks and linear regression models of students’ goals, moods, and emotions. *Handbook of educational data mining*, pages 323–338, 2010.
- [140] Jeanine A DeFalco, Jonathan P Rowe, Luc Paquette, Vasiliki Georgoulas-Sherry, Keith Brawner, Bradford W Mott, Ryan S Baker, and James C Lester. Detecting and addressing frustration in a serious game for military training. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, 28(2):152–193, 2018.
- [141] Anthony F Botelho, Ryan S Baker, and Neil T Heffernan. Improving sensor-free affect detection using deep learning. In *International conference on artificial intelligence in education*, pages 40–51. Springer, 2017.
- [142] Jason M Harley, Susanne P Lajoie, Claude Frasson, and Nathan C Hall. Developing emotion-aware, advanced learning technologies: A taxonomy of approaches and features. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, 27(2):268–297, 2017.
- [143] Gordon Pask. Styles and strategies of learning. *British journal of educational psychology*, 46(2):128–148, 1976.
- [144] David A Kolb. Learning style inventory: technical manual boston. *Ma: McBer*, 1976.
- [145] Peter Honey and Alan Mumford. *The manual of learning styles*. Peter Honey, 1986.
- [146] Richard M Felder. Learning and teaching styles in engineering education. 2002.
- [147] Jia-Jiunn Lo and Pai-Chuan Shu. Identification of learning styles online by observing learners’ browsing behaviour through a neural network. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 36(1):43–55, 2005.
- [148] Jorge Eduardo Villaverde, Daniela Godoy, and Analía Amandi. Learning styles’ recognition in e-learning environments with feed-forward neural networks. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 22(3):197–206, 2006.
- [149] L Alfaro, C Rivera, J Luna-Urquizo, E Castañeda, and F Fialho. Online learning styles identification model, based on the analysis of user interactions within an e-learning platforms, using neural networks and fuzzy logic. *International Journal of Engineering & Technology*, 7(3.13):76, 2018.
- [150] Richa Bajaj and Vidushi Sharma. Smart education with artificial intelligence based determination of learning styles. *Procedia computer science*, 132:834–842, 2018.
- [151] Ramón Zatarain-Cabada, María Lucía Barrón-Estrada, Viridiana Ponce Angulo, Adán José García, and Carlos A Reyes García. A learning social network with recognition of learning styles using neural networks. In *Mexican Conference on Pattern Recognition*, pages 199–209. Springer, 2010.
- [152] Jason Bernard, Ting-Wen Chang, Elvira Popescu, and Sabine Graf. Using artificial neural networks to identify learning styles. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence in Education*, pages 541–544. Springer, 2015.
- [153] Jorge Mota. Using learning styles and neural networks as an approach to elearning content and layout adaptation. In *Doctoral Symposium on Informatics Engineering*, 2008.
- [154] Qi Liu, Zhenya Huang, Yu Yin, Enhong Chen, Hui Xiong, Yu Su, and Guoping Hu. Ekt: Exercise-aware knowledge tracing for student performance prediction. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 33(1):100–115, 2019.

- [155] Hao Cen, Kenneth Koedinger, and Brian Junker. Learning factors analysis—a general method for cognitive model evaluation and improvement. In *International conference on intelligent tutoring systems*, pages 164–175. Springer, 2006.
- [156] Philip I Pavlik Jr, Hao Cen, and Kenneth R Koedinger. Performance factors analysis—a new alternative to knowledge tracing. *Online Submission*, 2009.
- [157] Philip I Pavlik Jr and John R Anderson. Practice and forgetting effects on vocabulary memory: An activation-based model of the spacing effect. *Cognitive science*, 29(4):559–586, 2005.
- [158] Albert T Corbett and John R Anderson. Knowledge tracing: Modeling the acquisition of procedural knowledge. *User modeling and user-adapted interaction*, 4(4):253–278, 1994.
- [159] Michael V Yudelson, Kenneth R Koedinger, and Geoffrey J Gordon. Individualized bayesian knowledge tracing models. In *International conference on artificial intelligence in education*, pages 171–180. Springer, 2013.
- [160] Mohammad Khajah, Rowan Wing, Robert V Lindsey, and Michael Mozer. Integrating latent-factor and knowledge-tracing models to predict individual differences in learning. In *EDM*, pages 99–106, 2014.
- [161] Nguyen Thai-Nghe, Lucas Drumond, Artus Krohn-Grimberghe, and Lars Schmidt-Thieme. Recommender system for predicting student performance. *Procedia Computer Science*, 1(2):2811–2819, 2010.
- [162] Andreas Toscher and Michael Jahrer. Collaborative filtering applied to educational data mining. *KDD cup*, 2010.
- [163] Ghodai Abdelrahman, Qing Wang, and Bernardo Pereira Nunes. Knowledge tracing: A survey. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 2022.
- [164] Chris Piech, Jonathan Bassen, Jonathan Huang, Surya Ganguli, Mehran Sahami, Leonidas J Guibas, and Jascha Sohl-Dickstein. Deep knowledge tracing. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 28, 2015.
- [165] Jiani Zhang, Xingjian Shi, Irwin King, and Dit-Yan Yeung. Dynamic key-value memory networks for knowledge tracing. In *Proceedings of the 26th international conference on World Wide Web*, pages 765–774, 2017.
- [166] Ghodai Abdelrahman and Qing Wang. Knowledge tracing with sequential key-value memory networks. In *Proceedings of the 42nd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, pages 175–184, 2019.
- [167] Shalini Pandey and George Karypis. A self-attentive model for knowledge tracing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.06837*, 2019.
- [168] Aritra Ghosh, Neil Heffernan, and Andrew S Lan. Context-aware attentive knowledge tracing. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*, pages 2330–2339, 2020.
- [169] Yu Su, Qingwen Liu, Qi Liu, Zhenya Huang, Yu Yin, Enhong Chen, Chris Ding, Si Wei, and Guoping Hu. Exercise-enhanced sequential modeling for student performance prediction. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 32, 2018.
- [170] Koki Nagatani, Qian Zhang, Masahiro Sato, Yan-Ying Chen, Francine Chen, and Tomoko Ohkuma. Augmenting knowledge tracing by considering forgetting behavior. In *The world wide web conference*, pages 3101–3107, 2019.
- [171] Shuanghong Shen, Qi Liu, Enhong Chen, Zhenya Huang, Wei Huang, Yu Yin, Yu Su, and Shijin Wang. Learning process-consistent knowledge tracing. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, pages 1452–1460, 2021.
- [172] Hiromi Nakagawa, Yusuke Iwasawa, and Yutaka Matsuo. Graph-based knowledge tracing: modeling student proficiency using graph neural network. In *2019 IEEE/WIC/ACM International Conference On Web Intelligence (WI)*, pages 156–163. IEEE, 2019.
- [173] Yang Yang, Jian Shen, Yanru Qu, Yunfei Liu, Kerong Wang, Yaoming Zhu, Weinan Zhang, and Yong Yu. Gikt: a graph-based interaction model for knowledge tracing. In *Joint European Conference on Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*, pages 299–315. Springer, 2020.
- [174] Shiwei Tong, Qi Liu, Wei Huang, Zhenya Hunag, Enhong Chen, Chuanren Liu, Haiping Ma, and Shijin Wang. Structure-based knowledge tracing: an influence propagation view. In *2020 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM)*, pages 541–550. IEEE, 2020.
- [175] Lisa Wang, Angela Sy, Larry Liu, and Chris Piech. Learning to represent student knowledge on programming exercises using deep learning. *International Educational Data Mining Society*, 2017.

- [176] Shashank Srikant and Varun Aggarwal. A system to grade computer programming skills using machine learning. In *Proceedings of the 20th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 1887–1896, 2014.
- [177] Semire Dikli. An overview of automated scoring of essays. *The Journal of Technology, Learning and Assessment*, 5(1), 2006.
- [178] Mark D Shermis and Jill C Burstein. *Automated essay scoring: A cross-disciplinary perspective*. Routledge, 2003.
- [179] Alex Adamson, Andrew Lamb, and RM December. Automated essay grading. 2014.
- [180] Peter Phandi, Kian Ming A Chai, and Hwee Tou Ng. Flexible domain adaptation for automated essay scoring using correlated linear regression. In *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 431–439, 2015.
- [181] Ronan Cummins, Meng Zhang, and Edward Briscoe. Constrained multi-task learning for automated essay scoring. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2016.
- [182] Jennifer O Contreras, Shadi Hilles, and Zainab Binti Abubakar. Automated essay scoring with ontology based on text mining and nltk tools. In *2018 International Conference on Smart Computing and Electronic Enterprise (ICSCEE)*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2018.
- [183] Kaveh Taghipour and Hwee Tou Ng. A neural approach to automated essay scoring. In *Proceedings of the 2016 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing*, pages 1882–1891, 2016.
- [184] Tirthankar Dasgupta, Abir Naskar, Lipika Dey, and Rupsa Saha. Augmenting textual qualitative features in deep convolution recurrent neural network for automatic essay scoring. In *Proceedings of the 5th Workshop on Natural Language Processing Techniques for Educational Applications*, pages 93–102, 2018.
- [185] Farah Nadeem, Huy Nguyen, Yang Liu, and Mari Ostendorf. Automated essay scoring with discourse-aware neural models. In *Proceedings of the fourteenth workshop on innovative use of NLP for building educational applications*, pages 484–493, 2019.
- [186] Masaki Uto and Masashi Okano. Robust neural automated essay scoring using item response theory. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence in Education*, pages 549–561. Springer, 2020.
- [187] Isaac Persing, Alan Davis, and Vincent Ng. Modeling organization in student essays. In *Proceedings of the 2010 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing*, pages 229–239, 2010.
- [188] Isaac Persing and Vincent Ng. Modeling prompt adherence in student essays. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1534–1543, 2014.
- [189] Isaac Persing and Vincent Ng. Modeling thesis clarity in student essays. In *Proceedings of the 51st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 260–269, 2013.
- [190] Isaac Persing and Vincent Ng. Modeling argument strength in student essays. In *Proceedings of the 53rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 7th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 543–552, 2015.
- [191] Zixuan Ke, Hrishikesh Inamdar, Hui Lin, and Vincent Ng. Give me more feedback ii: Annotating thesis strength and related attributes in student essays. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 3994–4004, 2019.
- [192] Xia Li, Minping Chen, and Jian-Yun Nie. Sednn: Shared and enhanced deep neural network model for cross-prompt automated essay scoring. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 210:106491, 2020.
- [193] Wei Song, Kai Zhang, Ruiji Fu, Lizhen Liu, Ting Liu, and Miaomiao Cheng. Multi-stage pre-training for automated chinese essay scoring. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 6723–6733, 2020.
- [194] Nicky Hockly. Automated writing evaluation, 2019.
- [195] Jill Burstein, Martin Chodorow, and Claudia Leacock. Automated essay evaluation: The criterion online writing service. *Ai magazine*, 25(3):27–27, 2004.
- [196] Haoran Zhang, Ahmed Magooda, Diane Litman, Richard Correnti, Elaine Wang, LC Matsmura, Emily Howe, and Rafael Quintana. erevise: Using natural language processing to provide formative feedback on text evidence usage in student writing. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 33, pages 9619–9625, 2019.
- [197] Christopher Douce, David Livingstone, and James Orwell. Automatic test-based assessment of programming: A review. *Journal on Educational Resources in Computing (JERIC)*, 5(3):4–es, 2005.

- [198] Tiantian Wang, Xiaohong Su, Yuying Wang, and Peijun Ma. Semantic similarity-based grading of student programs. *Information and Software Technology*, 49(2):99–107, 2007.
- [199] Milena Vujošević-Janičić, Mladen Nikolić, Dušan Tošić, and Viktor Kuncak. Software verification and graph similarity for automated evaluation of students’ assignments. *Information and Software Technology*, 55(6):1004–1016, 2013.
- [200] Jonathan Huang, Chris Piech, Andy Nguyen, and Leonidas Guibas. Syntactic and functional variability of a million code submissions in a machine learning mooc. In *AIED 2013 Workshops Proceedings Volume*, volume 25. Citeseer, 2013.
- [201] Bassam Mokbel, Sebastian Gross, Benjamin Paassen, Niels Pinkwart, and Barbara Hammer. Domain-independent proximity measures in intelligent tutoring systems. In *Educational Data Mining 2013*, 2013.
- [202] Chris Piech, Jonathan Huang, Andy Nguyen, Mike Phulsuksombati, Mehran Sahami, and Leonidas Guibas. Learning program embeddings to propagate feedback on student code. In *International conference on machine Learning*, pages 1093–1102. PMLR, 2015.
- [203] Gursimran Singh, Shashank Srikant, and Varun Aggarwal. Question independent grading using machine learning: The case of computer program grading. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 263–272, 2016.
- [204] Botond Tarscsay, Jelena Vasić, and Fernando Perez-Tellez. Use of machine learning methods in the assessment of programming assignments. In *International Conference on Text, Speech, and Dialogue*, pages 151–159. Springer, 2022.
- [205] Mike Wu, Milan Mosse, Noah Goodman, and Chris Piech. Zero shot learning for code education: Rubric sampling with deep learning inference. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 33, pages 782–790, 2019.
- [206] Hongyan Li, Shijin Wang, Jiaen Liang, Shen Huang, and Bo Xu. High performance automatic mispronunciation detection method based on neural network and trap features. In *Tenth Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association*, 2009.
- [207] Wei Li, Kehuang Li, Sabato Marco Siniscalchi, Nancy F Chen, and Chin-Hui Lee. Detecting mispronunciations of 12 learners and providing corrective feedback using knowledge-guided and data-driven decision trees. In *Interspeech*, pages 3127–3131, 2016.
- [208] Long Zhang, Ziping Zhao, Chunmei Ma, Linlin Shan, Huazhi Sun, Lifen Jiang, Shiwen Deng, and Chang Gao. End-to-end automatic pronunciation error detection based on improved hybrid ctc/attention architecture. *Sensors*, 20(7):1809, 2020.
- [209] Vinay Shashidhar, Nishant Pandey, and Varun Aggarwal. Automatic spontaneous speech grading: A novel feature derivation technique using the crowd. In *Proceedings of the 53rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 7th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1085–1094, 2015.
- [210] Andrew S Lan, Divyanshu Vats, Andrew E Waters, and Richard G Baraniuk. Mathematical language processing: Automatic grading and feedback for open response mathematical questions. In *Proceedings of the second (2015) ACM conference on learning@ scale*, pages 167–176, 2015.
- [211] Sami Baral, Anthony F Botelho, John A Erickson, Priyanka Benachamardi, and Neil T Heffernan. Improving automated scoring of student open responses in mathematics. *International Educational Data Mining Society*, 2021.
- [212] Sindy Tan, Finale Doshi-Velez, Juan Quiroz, and Elena Glassman. Clustering latex solutions to machine learning assignments for rapid assessment. 2017.
- [213] Chamupathi Mendis, Dhanushka Lahiru, Naduni Pamudika, Supun Madushanka, Surangika Ranathunga, and Gihan Dias. Automatic assessment of student answers for geometric theorem proving questions. In *2017 Moratuwa Engineering Research Conference (MERCon)*, pages 413–418. IEEE, 2017.
- [214] Mengxue Zhang, Sami Baral, Neil Heffernan, and Andrew Lan. Automatic short math answer grading via in-context meta-learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.15219*, 2022.
- [215] Tomáš Foltýnek, Norman Meuschke, and Bela Gipp. Academic plagiarism detection: a systematic literature review. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 52(6):1–42, 2019.
- [216] Salha Alzahrani. Arabic plagiarism detection using word correlation in n-grams with k-overlapping approach. In *Proceedings of the Workshops at the 7th Forum for Information Retrieval Evaluation (FIRE)*, pages 123–125, 2015.

- [217] K Vani and Deepa Gupta. Using k-means cluster based techniques in external plagiarism detection. In *2014 international conference on contemporary computing and informatics (IC3I)*, pages 1268–1273. IEEE, 2014.
- [218] Deepa Gupta, K Vani, and Charan Kamal Singh. Using natural language processing techniques and fuzzy-semantic similarity for automatic external plagiarism detection. In *2014 International Conference on Advances in Computing, Communications and Informatics (ICACCI)*, pages 2694–2699. IEEE, 2014.
- [219] Manuela Hürlimann, Benno Weck, Esther van den Berg, Simon Suster, and Malvina Nissim. Glad: Groningen lightweight authorship detection. In *CLEF (Working Notes)*, 2015.
- [220] Michael Tschuggnall and Günther Specht. Detecting plagiarism in text documents through grammar-analysis of authors. In *BTW*, pages 241–259, 2013.
- [221] Jérémy Ferrero, Frédéric Agnes, Laurent Besacier, and Didier Schwab. Using word embedding for cross-language plagiarism detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.03082*, 2017.
- [222] Sidik Soleman and Ayu Purwarianti. Experiments on the Indonesian plagiarism detection using latent semantic analysis. In *2014 2nd International Conference on Information and Communication Technology (ICoICT)*, pages 413–418. IEEE, 2014.
- [223] Norman Meuschke, Nicolas Siebeck, Moritz Schubotz, and Bela Gipp. Analyzing semantic concept patterns to detect academic plagiarism. In *Proceedings of the 6th international workshop on mining scientific publications*, pages 46–53, 2017.
- [224] Md Arafat Sultan, Steven Bethard, and Tamara Sumner. Dls @ cu: Sentence similarity from word alignment. In *SemEval@ COLING*, pages 241–246, 2014.
- [225] Zakiy Firdaus Alfikri and Ayu Purwarianti. Detailed analysis of extrinsic plagiarism detection system using machine learning approach (naive bayes and svm). *TELKOMNIKA Indonesian Journal of Electrical Engineering*, 12(11):7884–7894, 2014.
- [226] Christian Hänig, Robert Remus, and Xose De La Puente. Exb themis: Extensive feature extraction from word alignments for semantic textual similarity. In *Proceedings of the 9th international workshop on semantic evaluation (SemEval 2015)*, pages 264–268, 2015.
- [227] Solange de L Pertile, Viviane P Moreira, and Paolo Rosso. Comparing and combining content-and citation-based approaches for plagiarism detection. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 67(10):2511–2526, 2016.
- [228] Faouzia Benabbou El Mostafa Hambi. A new online plagiarism detection system based on deep learning. *International Journal of Advanced Computer Sciences and Applications*, 11(9):470–478, 2020.
- [229] Mohamed A El-Rashidy, Ramy G Mohamed, Nawal A El-Fishawy, and Marwa A Shouman. Reliable plagiarism detection system based on deep learning approaches. *Neural Computing and Applications*, 34(21):18837–18858, 2022.
- [230] Jinan AW Faidhi and Stuart K Robinson. An empirical approach for detecting program similarity and plagiarism within a university programming environment. *Computers & Education*, 11(1):11–19, 1987.
- [231] Jeong-Hoon Ji, Gyun Woo, and Hwan-Gue Cho. A source code linearization technique for detecting plagiarized programs. In *Proceedings of the 12th annual SIGCSE conference on Innovation and technology in computer science education*, pages 73–77, 2007.
- [232] Robert Charles Lange and Spiros Mancoridis. Using code metric histograms and genetic algorithms to perform author identification for software forensics. In *Proceedings of the 9th annual conference on Genetic and evolutionary computation*, pages 2082–2089, 2007.
- [233] Tony Ohmann and Imad Rahal. Efficient clustering-based source code plagiarism detection using piy. *Knowledge and Information Systems*, 43(2):445–472, 2015.
- [234] Farhan Ullah, Sohail Jabbar, and Leonardo Mostarda. An intelligent decision support system for software plagiarism detection in academia. *International Journal of Intelligent Systems*, 36(6):2730–2752, 2021.
- [235] Mohammed SM Manahi. A deep learning framework for the detection of source code plagiarism using siamese network and embedding models. Master’s thesis, Kuala Lumpur: Kulliyah of Information and Communication Technology . . . , 2021.
- [236] Jitendra Yaraswi Bharadwaj Katta. *Machine learning for source-code plagiarism detection*. PhD thesis, International Institute of Information Technology Hyderabad, University of . . . , 2018.
- [237] Giovanni Acampora and Georgina Cosma. A fuzzy-based approach to programming language independent source-code plagiarism detection. In *2015 IEEE International Conference on Fuzzy Systems (FUZZ-IEEE)*, pages 1–8. IEEE, 2015.

- [238] Upul Bandara and Gamini Wijayarathna. A machine learning based tool for source code plagiarism detection. *International Journal of Machine Learning and Computing*, 1(4):337, 2011.
- [239] Long Ouyang, Jeff Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll L Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.02155*, 2022.
- [240] OpenAI blog. Chatgpt: Optimizing language models for dialogue, Nov 2022.
- [241] Jingjing Hu. Teaching evaluation system by use of machine learning and artificial intelligence methods. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (iJET)*, 16(5):87–101, 2021.
- [242] Guadalupe Gutiérrez Esparza, Alejandro de Luna, Alberto Ochoa Zezzatti, Alberto Hernandez, Julio Ponce, Marco Álvarez, Edgar Cossio, and Jose de Jesus Nava. A sentiment analysis model to analyze students reviews of teacher performance using support vector machines. In *International Symposium on Distributed Computing and Artificial Intelligence*, pages 157–164. Springer, 2017.
- [243] Guadalupe Gutiérrez, Juana Canul-Reich, Alberto Ochoa Zezzatti, Lourdes Margain, and Julio Ponce. Mining: Students comments about teacher performance assessment using machine learning algorithms. *International Journal of Combinatorial Optimization Problems and Informatics*, 9(3):26, 2018.
- [244] Aytuğ Onan. Mining opinions from instructor evaluation reviews: a deep learning approach. *Computer Applications in Engineering Education*, 28(1):117–138, 2020.
- [245] Kingsley Okoye, Arturo Arrona-Palacios, Claudia Camacho-Zuñiga, Joaquín Alejandro Guerra Achem, Jose Escamilla, and Samira Hosseini. Towards teaching analytics: a contextual model for analysis of students' evaluation of teaching through text mining and machine learning classification. *Education and Information Technologies*, 27(3):3891–3933, 2022.
- [246] V Vijayalakshmi, K Panimalar, and Sakthivel Janarthanan. Predicting the performance of instructors using machine learning algorithms. *High Technology Letters*, 26(12), 2020.
- [247] Fedor Duzhin and Anders Gustafsson. Machine learning-based app for self-evaluation of teacher-specific instructional style and tools. *Education Sciences*, 8(1):7, 2018.
- [248] Sona Mardikyan and Bertan Badur. Analyzing teaching performance of instructors using data mining techniques. *Informatics in Education*, 10(2):245–257, 2011.
- [249] Ahmed Mohamed Ahmed, Ahmet Rizaner, and Ali Hakan Ulusoy. Using data mining to predict instructor performance. *Procedia Computer Science*, 102:137–142, 2016.
- [250] Basem S Abunasser, Mohammed Rasheed J AL-Hiealy, Alaa M Barhoom, Abdelbaset R Almasri, and Samy S Abu-Naser. Prediction of instructor performance using machine and deep learning techniques. *International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications (IJACSA)*, 13(7):78–83, 2022.
- [251] George Bulman and Robert W Fairlie. Technology and education: Computers, software, and the internet. In *Handbook of the Economics of Education*, volume 5, pages 239–280. Elsevier, 2016.
- [252] Eric L Dey and Alexander W Astin. Statistical alternatives for studying college student retention: A comparative analysis of logit, probit, and linear regression. *Research in higher education*, 34(5):569–581, 1993.
- [253] Gerben W Dekker, Mykola Pechenizkiy, and Jan M Vleeshouwers. Predicting students drop out: A case study. *International Working Group on Educational Data Mining*, 2009.
- [254] Serge Herzog. Estimating student retention and degree-completion time: Decision trees and neural networks vis-à-vis regression. *New directions for institutional research*, 131:17–33, 2006.
- [255] Nguyen Thai Nghe, Paul Janecek, and Peter Haddawy. A comparative analysis of techniques for predicting academic performance. In *2007 37th annual frontiers in education conference-global engineering: knowledge without borders, opportunities without passports*, pages T2G–7. IEEE, 2007.
- [256] Hana Bydžovská. A comparative analysis of techniques for predicting student performance. *International Educational Data Mining Society*, 2016.
- [257] Tran Thanh Dien, Sang Hoai Luu, Nguyen Thanh-Hai, and Nguyen Thai-Nghe. Deep learning with data transformation and factor analysis for student performance prediction. *International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications*, 11(8), 2020.
- [258] Arti Ramesh, Dan Goldwasser, Bert Huang, Hal Daumé III, and Lise Getoor. Modeling learner engagement in moocs using probabilistic soft logic. In *NIPS workshop on data driven education*, volume 21, page 62, 2013.
- [259] Suhang Jiang, Adrienne Williams, Katerina Schenke, Mark Warschauer, and Diane O'dowd. Predicting mooc performance with week 1 behavior. In *Educational data mining 2014*, 2014.

- [260] Ashay Tamhane, Shajith Ikbal, Bikram Sengupta, Mayuri Duggirala, and James Appleton. Predicting student risks through longitudinal analysis. In *Proceedings of the 20th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 1544–1552, 2014.
- [261] Jie Xu, Yuli Han, Daniel Marcu, and Mihaela Van Der Schaar. Progressive prediction of student performance in college programs. In *Thirty-First AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2017.
- [262] Ruangsak Trakunphutthirak, Yen Cheung, and Vincent CS Lee. A study of educational data mining: Evidence from a thai university. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 33, pages 734–741, 2019.
- [263] Niki Gitinabard, Yiqiao Xu, Sarah Heckman, Tiffany Barnes, and Collin F Lynch. How widely can prediction models be generalized? an analysis of performance prediction in blended courses. *CoRR*, 2019.
- [264] Hajra Waheed, Saeed-Ul Hassan, Naif Radi Aljohani, Julie Hardman, Salem Alelyani, and Raheel Nawaz. Predicting academic performance of students from v1e big data using deep learning models. *Computers in Human behavior*, 104:106189, 2020.
- [265] Maria Tsiakmaki, Georgios Kostopoulos, Sotiris Kotsiantis, and Omiros Ragos. Transfer learning from deep neural networks for predicting student performance. *Applied Sciences*, 10(6):2145, 2020.
- [266] Kwok Tai Chui, Ryan Wen Liu, Mingbo Zhao, and Patricia Ordóñez De Pablos. Predicting students’ performance with school and family tutoring using generative adversarial network-based deep support vector machine. *IEEE Access*, 8:86745–86752, 2020.
- [267] Juan L Rastrollo-Guerrero, Juan A Gómez-Pulido, and Arturo Durán-Domínguez. Analyzing and predicting students’ performance by means of machine learning: A review. *Applied sciences*, 10(3):1042, 2020.
- [268] Arto Hellas, Petri Ihantola, Andrew Petersen, Vangel V Ajanovski, Mirela Gutica, Timo Hynninen, Antti Knutas, Juho Leinonen, Chris Messom, and Soohyun Nam Liao. Predicting academic performance: a systematic literature review. In *Proceedings companion of the 23rd annual ACM conference on innovation and technology in computer science education*, pages 175–199, 2018.
- [269] Allie Knofczynski. Why global drop-out rates aren’t improving. 2017.
- [270] Laura Moscoviz and David Evans. Learning loss and student dropouts during the covid-19 pandemic: A review of the evidence two years after schools shut down. 2022.
- [271] Fiona Hollands and Aasiya Kazi. Benefits and costs of mooc-based alternative credentials. *Center for Benefit-Cost Studies of Education*, 2018.
- [272] Justin Reich and José A Ruipérez-Valiente. The mooc pivot. *Science*, 363(6423):130–131, 2019.
- [273] Nilanjana Purkayastha and Manoj Kumar Sinha. Unstoppable study with moocs during covid 19 pandemic: a study. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, pages 1–12, 2021.
- [274] Everaldo Aguiar, Himabindu Lakkaraju, Nasir Bhanpuri, David Miller, Ben Yuhas, and Kecia L Addison. Who, when, and why: A machine learning approach to prioritizing students at risk of not graduating high school on time. In *Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Learning Analytics And Knowledge*, pages 93–102, 2015.
- [275] Jennifer DeBoer, Glenda S Stump, Daniel Seaton, Andrew Ho, David E Pritchard, and Lori Breslow. Bringing student backgrounds online: Mooc user demographics, site usage, and online learning. In *Educational data mining 2013*, 2013.
- [276] Everaldo Aguiar, Nitesh V Chawla, Jay Brockman, G Alex Ambrose, and Victoria Goodrich. Engagement vs performance: using electronic portfolios to predict first semester engineering student retention. In *Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Learning Analytics And Knowledge*, pages 103–112, 2014.
- [277] Arti Ramesh, Dan Goldwasser, Bert Huang, Hal Daume III, and Lise Getoor. Learning latent engagement patterns of students in online courses. In *Twenty-eighth AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, 2014.
- [278] Kalyan Veeramachaneni, Una-May O’Reilly, and Colin Taylor. Towards feature engineering at scale for data from massive open online courses. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1407.5238*, 2014.
- [279] Marius Kloft, Felix Stiehler, Zhilin Zheng, and Niels Pinkwart. Predicting mooc dropout over weeks using machine learning methods. In *Proceedings of the EMNLP 2014 workshop on analysis of large scale social interaction in MOOCs*, pages 60–65, 2014.
- [280] Tanmay Sinha, Nan Li, Patrick Jermann, and Pierre Dillenbourg. Capturing" attrition intensifying" structural traits from didactic interaction sequences of mooc learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.5887*, 2014.

- [281] Diyi Yang, Tanmay Sinha, David Adamson, and Carolyn Penstein Rosé. Turn on, tune in, drop out: Anticipating student dropouts in massive open online courses. In *Proceedings of the 2013 NIPS Data-driven education workshop*, volume 11, page 14, 2013.
- [282] Miaomiao Wen, Diyi Yang, and Carolyn Rose. Sentiment analysis in mooc discussion forums: What does it tell us? In *Educational data mining 2014*, 2014.
- [283] Jiazhen He, James Bailey, Benjamin Rubinstein, and Rui Zhang. Identifying at-risk students in massive open online courses. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 29, 2015.
- [284] Himabindu Lakkaraju, Everaldo Aguiar, Carl Shan, David Miller, Nasir Bhanpuri, Rayid Ghani, and Kecia L Addison. A machine learning framework to identify students at risk of adverse academic outcomes. In *Proceedings of the 21th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 1909–1918, 2015.
- [285] Christopher Brooks, Craig Thompson, and Stephanie Teasley. A time series interaction analysis method for building predictive models of learners using log data. In *Proceedings of the fifth international conference on learning analytics and knowledge*, pages 126–135, 2015.
- [286] Ali Shariq Imran, Fisnik Dalipi, and Zenun Kastrati. Predicting student dropout in a mooc: An evaluation of a deep neural network model. In *Proceedings of the 2019 5th International Conference on Computing and Artificial Intelligence*, pages 190–195, 2019.
- [287] Kristof Coussement, Minh Phan, Arno De Caigny, Dries F Benoit, and Annelies Raes. Predicting student dropout in subscription-based online learning environments: The beneficial impact of the logit leaf model. *Decision Support Systems*, 135:113325, 2020.
- [288] Unesco’s education response to covid-19, Nov 2022.
- [289] Seble Tadesse and Worku Muluye. The impact of covid-19 pandemic on education system in developing countries: a review. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 8(10):159–170, 2020.
- [290] E Dorn, B Hancock, J Sarakatsannis, and E Viruleg. Covid-19 and education: The lingering effects of unfinished learning. 2021.
- [291] C Spector. New research details the pandemic’s variable impact on u.s. school districts. 2022.
- [292] Emma R Wester, Lisa L Walsh, Sandra Arango-Caro, and Kristine L Callis-Duehl. Student engagement declines in stem undergraduates during covid-19–driven remote learning. *Journal of microbiology & biology education*, 22(1):ev22i1–2385, 2021.
- [293] Brooke Hollister, Praveen Nair, Sloan Hill-Lindsay, and Leanne Chukoskie. Engagement in online learning: Student attitudes and behavior during covid-19. In *Frontiers in Education*, volume 7, page 851019. Frontiers Media SA, 2022.
- [294] Rachel Hilburg, Niralee Patel, Sophia Ambruso, Mollie A Biewald, and Samira S Farouk. Medical education during the coronavirus disease-2019 pandemic: learning from a distance. *Advances in Chronic Kidney Disease*, 27(5):412–417, 2020.
- [295] Florin-Valeriu Pantelimon, Razvan Bologna, Andrei Toma, and Bogdan-Stefan Posedaru. The evolution of ai-driven educational systems during the covid-19 pandemic. *Sustainability*, 13(23):13501, 2021.
- [296] Xin Xie, Keng Siau, and Fiona Fui-Hoon Nah. Covid-19 pandemic–online education in the new normal and the next normal. *Journal of information technology case and application research*, 22(3):175–187, 2020.
- [297] Liu Kexin, Qu Yi, Song Xiaou, and Li Yan. Future education trend learned from the covid-19 pandemic: Take artificial intelligence online course as an example. In *2020 International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Education (ICAIE)*, pages 108–111. IEEE, 2020.
- [298] Clare Halloran, Rebecca Jack, James C Okun, and Emily Oster. Pandemic schooling mode and student test scores: Evidence from us states. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research, 2021.
- [299] Dan Goldhaber, Thomas J Kane, Andrew McEachin, Emily Morton, Tyler Patterson, and Douglas O Staiger. The consequences of remote and hybrid instruction during the pandemic. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research, 2022.
- [300] *When schools shut: gendered impact of COVID-19 school closures*. UNESCO Publishing, 2021.
- [301] Alberto Muñoz-Najar, Alison Gilberto, Amer Hasan, Cristóbal Cobo, Joao Pedro Azevedo, and Maryam Akmal. Remote learning during covid-19: Lessons from today. *Principles for Tomorrow*, 2021.

- [302] Miguel Luengo-Oroz, Joseph Bullock, Katherine Hoffmann Pham, Cynthia Sin Nga Lam, and Alexandra Luccioni. From artificial intelligence bias to inequality in the time of covid-19. *IEEE Technology and Society Magazine*, 40(1):71–79, 2021.
- [303] Shalini Garg and Shipra Sharma. Impact of artificial intelligence in special need education to promote inclusive pedagogy. *International Journal of Information and Education Technology*, 10(7):523–527, 2020.
- [304] Sdenka Zobeida Salas-Pilco, Kejiang Xiao, and Jun Oshima. Artificial intelligence and new technologies in inclusive education for minority students: A systematic review. *Sustainability*, 14(20):13572, 2022.
- [305] Sharon Wolf, Elisabetta Aurino, Autumn Brown, Edward Tsinigo, and Richard Murphy Edro. Remote data-collection during covid 19: Thing of the past or the way of the future? 2022.
- [306] Emmanuel G Blanchard. On the weird nature of its/aied conferences. In *International conference on intelligent tutoring systems*, pages 280–285. Springer, 2012.
- [307] Emmanuel G Blanchard. Socio-cultural imbalances in aied research: Investigations, implications and opportunities. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, 25(2):204–228, 2015.
- [308] Binar Kurnia Prahani, Iqbal Ainur Rizki, Budi Jatmiko, Nadi Suprpto, and Tan Amelia. Artificial intelligence in education research during the last ten years: A review and bibliometric study. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning*, 17(8), 2022.
- [309] Emmanuel G Blanchard and Amy Ogan. Infusing cultural awareness into intelligent tutoring systems for a globalized world. In *Advances in Intelligent Tutoring Systems*, pages 485–505. Springer, 2010.
- [310] Amy Ogan and W Lewis Johnson. Preface for the special issue on culturally aware educational technologies, 2015.
- [311] Phaedra S Mohammed and Eleanor Nell’Watson. Towards inclusive education in the age of artificial intelligence: Perspectives, challenges, and opportunities. *Artificial intelligence and inclusive education*, pages 17–37, 2019.
- [312] Phaedra Mohammed and Permanand Mohan. Using culture to motivate learning in a digital game based learning environment. In *CATS 2008: Workshop on Culturally-Aware Tutoring Systems*, page 59, 2008.
- [313] Patricia A Young. The significance of the culture based model in designing culturally aware tutoring systems. *AI & society*, 26(1):35–47, 2011.
- [314] Mei Si. A virtual space for children to meet and practice chinese. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, 25(2):271–290, 2015.
- [315] Simon J Buckingham Shum and Rosemary Luckin. Learning analytics and ai: Politics, pedagogy and practices. *British journal of educational technology*, 50(6):2785–2793, 2019.
- [316] Richard Stirling, Hannah Miller, and Emma Martinho-Truswell. Government ai readiness index. *KOREA*, 4:7–812407479, 2017.
- [317] Rebecca Winthrop. *Leapfrogging inequality: Remaking education to help young people thrive*. Brookings Institution Press, 2018.
- [318] Benjamin D Nye. Intelligent tutoring systems by and for the developing world: A review of trends and approaches for educational technology in a global context. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, 25(2):177–203, 2015.
- [319] Daniel Kwalipo Mbangula. Adopting of artificial intelligence and development in developing countries: Perspective of economic transformation. In *Handbook of Research on Connecting Philosophy, Media, and Development in Developing Countries*, pages 276–288. IGI Global, 2022.
- [320] Ashraf Alam. Possibilities and apprehensions in the landscape of artificial intelligence in education. In *2021 International Conference on Computational Intelligence and Computing Applications (ICCICA)*, pages 1–8. IEEE, 2021.