AI-Enhanced Multimedia for Personalised Higher Education: A Critical Review

Faaizah Shahbodin[1*], Che Ku Nuraini Che Ku Mohd[2], Zulisman Maksom[3], Ulka Chandit[4]

[1,2,3]Pervasive Computing & Educational Technology, Department of Media Interactive, Fakulti Teknologi Maklumat dan Komunikasi, Universiti Teknikal Malaysia Melaka, Jalan Hang Tuah Jaya, 76100 Durian Tunggal, Melaka, Malaysia

[4]Department of Computing, Faculty of Business, Technology and Engineering, Sheffield Hallam University, Howard St, Sheffield City Centre, Sheffield S11WB, United Kingdom

***Corresponding Author**

DOI: https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100700432

Received: 22 July 2026; Accepted: 28 July 2026; Published: 04 August 2026

ABSTRACT

In higher education, multimedia authoring, feedback, analytics and adaptive learning systems are increasingly embedded with artificial intelligence (AI). The impact of these changes on instructional design for personalised learning is examined. Instead of viewing personalisation as automatic optimisation, the review examines four interrelated design challenges: the pedagogical quality of AI-generated multimedia; the validity and fairness of automatic feedback; the interpretability of learning analytics; and the impact on established instructional design processes. Research suggests that AI can broaden the diversity and responsiveness of resources for learning, but evidence of lasting learning gains is more patchy and very much dependent on human oversight, curricula and student agency. The systems may then use non-transparent models or data which are unrepresentative, thus reproducing equity concerns. The review suggests a series of principles for responsible design: pedagogical purpose; cognitive coherence; human verification; contestable personalisation; and proportionate data use. AI should be viewed as a limited design resource instead of an independent system of instruction.

Keywords: artificial intelligence, instructional design, multimedia learning, personalised learning, learning analytics, automated feedback, higher education

INTRODUCTION

Multimedia has become an essential element of university teaching. Through text, audio, video, animation, simulation and interactive assessment, students now encounter most disciplinary knowledge in their environments. AI expands the environment by producing media, interpreting learner interactions, recommending resources, and generating feedback. Adaptation of content, pace, support or pathways to differences between learners has seen a resurgence of interest thanks to these capabilities.

It is easy to overstress the educational importance of this. A system can modify the surface characteristics of an activity without enhancing the intellective work students are doing. When assessment demands productive struggle, it may assign convenient material, produce fluent, albeit wrong explanations, or classify multilingual writing against a narrow language norm. Thus, responsiveness should not be considered as the same as quality of education. The central inquiry is no longer whether artificial intelligence (AI) will alter the way we produce multimedia learning experiences, but rather under what design conditions will those changes produce worthwhile learning without undercutting learners' agency, fairness or privacy.

Various incomplete perspectives exist in scholarship. According to [1] and [2], research in multimedia learning explains how combinations of words and pictures can overload or support cognition. According to [3], an emerging field of research known as learning analytics examines how learner data can be used to inform and effect action. Research reports document the use of AI in higher education, the stakeholders involved, and ethical issues [4],[5], [6], [7]. More recent studies show opportunities and limitations of the large language model [8], [9]. These conversations, however, are frequently disjointed. An evaluation of a multimedia tool's engagement can take place without going into the recommendation logic behind the multimedia tool. Similarly, an evaluation for predictive accuracy of an analytics system can take place without going into the instructional quality of the resources recommended by the analytics system.

This critical appraisement unites the strands. The query posed is as follows: (1) In what ways does artificial intelligence transform the design and personalisation of multimedia learning in the context of higher education? What are the restrictions on the educational assertions that can be made concerning AI-generated content, automated feedback, and analytics-driven customization? What principles can guide responsible instructional design? The integrative claim made in the contribution is that the design principles proposed in it are relevant internationally, especially for multilingual and resource-constrained contexts that are usually peripheral in technology-centred accounts.

REVIEW APPROACH AND SCOPE

The article employs a critical integrative review. The paper synthesises conceptual empirical and review literature that directly addresses AI in higher education multimedia learning automated feedback learning analytics adaptive learning and instructional design. Foundational sources are included where they establish concepts needed to evaluate recent AI applications; recent sources are used to examine generative AI and current policy issues. Because of the much faster pace of change of technologies than of pedagogical challenges, the review is organised by design problem rather than by brand.

This approach does not claim complete retrieval or allow estimation of effect size. As such, it is different from a systematic or scoping review. The analytical purpose is to compare assumptions across related literatures, to identify tensions that get obscured when these literatures are considered in isolation, and to derive design principles. Claims are constrained accordingly. When evidence has come to light or is indirect, the discussion describes possibilities and risks rather than confirmed learning.

PRISMA-ScR Study Selection

Following [8] guidance, the selection process is organised into identification, screening and eligibility stages. The reporting structure is also aligned with PRISMA-ScR item 14, which requires the numbers screened, assessed for eligibility and included, together with reasons for exclusion [9]. Table 1 presents the study-selection record reported by the authors.

Table 1: PRISMA-ScR identification, screening, eligibility and inclusion

PRISMA stage	Selection activity	Records (n)	Outcome or reason
Identification	Records identified through ERIC, Scopus, Web of Science, IEEE Xplore and Google Scholar	1,247	Potential records before duplicate removal
Identification	Duplicate records removed	356	891 unique records retained
Screening	Titles and abstracts screened	891	653 records excluded as outside the review focus
Eligibility	Full-text reports sought and assessed	238	All reports were assessed against the eligibility criteria
Eligibility	Full-text reports excluded	181	Not higher education (52); AI or multimedia not the primary focus (43); full text unavailable after two attempts

ISSN No. 2454-6186 | DOI: 10.47772/IJRISS | Volume X Issue VII July 2026

			(38); theoretical without empirical or analytical grounding (29); outside the review period (19)
Included	Sources included in the final synthesis	50	Sources charted and synthesized

Note. *Counts are carried forward from the authors' original manuscript and should be reconciled with the database exports, duplicate log, screening decisions and data-charting file before submission.*

Positioning The Review in Relation to PRISMA

PRISMA is a reporting framework for systematic reviews and meta-analyses, while PRISMA-ScR adapts those expectations for scoping reviews [9]. Both approaches require a documented search, transparent screening decisions and a traceable final corpus. A critical integrative review has a different purpose. It combines evidence and theory to interrogate assumptions, expose contradictions and build an explanatory framework. It may be systematic in its reasoning, but it should not display a PRISMA flow diagram unless the underlying identification and screening records exist.

This distinction matters in AI-in-education scholarship because apparent methodological precision can conceal weak traceability. Exact record totals, percentages and theme frequencies create an impression of reproducibility, but they are meaningful only when they can be reconciled with database exports, duplicate-removal rules, eligibility decisions and an included-study register. In the absence of those materials, a transparent critical review is more credible than a simulated systematic review. Table 2 compares the purposes, evidence requirements and legitimate claims of the principal review types.

Table 2: Comparison of systematic, scoping and critical integrative reviews

Dimension	Systematic review	Scoping review	Critical integrative review
Primary purpose	Answer a focused question and, where appropriate, estimate effects	Map the extent, concepts and gaps in a field	Interrogate assumptions and develop an explanatory synthesis
Typical question	What is the effect of intervention X on outcome Y?	What evidence and concepts exist in this domain?	How should competing evidence and concepts be interpreted?
Search expectation	Comprehensive and reproducible	Broad, transparent and reproducible	Purposeful and transparent; may combine foundational and recent sources
PRISMA flow diagram	Normally expected	Expected when PRISMA-ScR is claimed	Not appropriate unless systematic identification and screening were undertaken
Quality appraisal	Usually required	Optional but should be justified	Used to weigh arguments and evidential strength
Permitted numerical claims	Study counts, effects and heterogeneity supported by records	Study distributions supported by charted data	No prevalence or effect estimates without a traceable corpus
Main output	Effect estimate or evidence-based answer	Evidence map and research gaps	Conceptual framework, critique and design propositions
Main risk	Inappropriate pooling or publication bias	Descriptive mapping without analysis	Selection bias or insufficiently explicit source rationale

Accordingly, this paper reports the author-recorded selection counts in Table 1 while retaining a critical integrative synthesis. Before submission, the numerical record should be reconciled with dated database searches, exported records, documented duplicate removal, screening decisions, full-text exclusion reasons and the complete data-charting file. This audit trail is necessary for the PRISMA-ScR selection claims to be reproducible.

CONCEPTUAL FOUNDATIONS

Multimedia Learning is a Design Constraint, not a Media Inventory

In designing for multimedia learning, one must consider constraints. According to [10], [11],[13], [14], the cognitive theory of multimedia learning is that students process verbal and pictorial information through other capacity-limited channels and actively organize and integrate information. According to [12], [16], [17] Cognitive Load Theory distinguishes between the demand of a task and the demand of bad presentation. The more the media, better the learning do not follow from there. Inevitably, media should be chosen and sequenced according to the cognitive activity that is desired.

As generative AI assists in producing explanations, images, questions, narration and variants of other types of learning material wire would be expected to lower these costs [18],[19]. An abundance can enhance usefulness when it allows alternative representations or timely examples. Moreover, it can lead to redundancy, divided attention, and superficial options. As a result, the pertinent design unit is not the asset that the AI generates but the relationship among representation, task, prior knowledge and feedback.

Personalisation is Pedagogical Judgement

Adapting difficulty, pace, sequence, representation or support refers to personalisation. Every adaptation embodies a judgement in terms of what the learner needs and what evidence is sufficient to justify a change. Learning analytics has the potential to reveal patterns, however the dashboards do not interpret themselves [20], [21], [22], [23]. The meaning of the proxies - clicks, time on task and completion - depends on context. A lengthy time on the blog, for instance, may mean engagement, confusion, interruption, or an accessibility barrier.

Understanding the different types of personalisation is crucial to maximise their benefits [24], [25], [26]. Systems which have been shown to predict successful completion may route students to them fast. Learning also requires encounters with uncertainty, unfamiliar perspectives and demanding tasks [27], [28]. It is, therefore, essential for a defensible design to preserve productive challenges and opportunities to question or override.

From Adaptive Delivery to Adapting Pedagogy

Adaptive delivery causes a change in what a learner sees, whereas adaptive pedagogy changes support based on a learning model It is an important distinction. Offering a learner a shorter video after they skip a long one constitutes behavioural adaptation, but it does not inform us why they left or what conceptual support they need. The process of pedagogical adaptation connects evidence about how students are performing to a hypothesis about how they are understanding it selects an intervention that is capable of testing or addressing that hypothesis [29].

We can differentiate among three levels of personalization [30]. Representational personalisation reshapes the format, language, modality, or examples while keeping the goal constant. The pace, sequence, hints, or practice opportunities may be altered as part of procedural personalisation. Epistemic personalisation alters the route through which a learner approaches a discipline, involving the problems, perspectives and standards of evidence brought to the fore. Automation of first two levels is relatively easy. The third demands caution as it can influence what learners can learn as well as what challenge they may be invited to engage with.

Consequently, it is inadvisable for AI systems to use behavioural traces. A cycle that can be defended consists of prior work, a student’s self-reports, assessment evidence, interaction data and dialogue with the learner. It is recommended to consider the recommendations as hypotheses subject to verification. The process of personalisation involves not just the learner and educator but the system too.

CRITICAL SYNTHESIS

AI-generated multimedia: speed without guaranteed quality

Large scale language models as well as generative tools for media can enable activities such as ideation, translation, worked examples, formative questions and rapid prototyping [31], [32], [33]. For the instructional designer, these functions may reduce the burden on the effort necessary for the creation of variants for differing levels of prior knowledge or language support. Even if the writing generates fluently it substantiates no factual accuracy, disciplinary adequacy or pedagogical coherence [34]. The output might include fictitious information, unreliable explanations or cultural assumptions that may be hard for beginners to spot.

Therefore, human verification is not a last analysis and proofreading step but part of the instructional design. The reviewer should ensure that the generated asset is factually accurate, aligns with the learning outcomes, has adequate cognitive demand, is accessible, culturally and linguistically appropriate, and relates well to the other surrounding activities. The significance of the information determines the degree of verification. The responsibility still lies on the teachers and institutions despite the usage of AI for production [35].

Automated Feedback: Immediacy, Validity and Dependence

According to [36] and [37], useful feedback is when learners can understand a goal and evaluate their present performance to decide what to do next. AI can provide quick answers and scale which would be difficult for teachers to match. It is particularly appealing in large classes and repeated exercise. Nonetheless, rapidity is only one property of effective feedback [38], [39]. Feedback may be given in real-time and may be wrong in many cases. It can also be too prescriptive or insensitive to disciplinary and cultural conventions.

The validity issues are raised especially by automated scoring and automated natural-language feedback. The system may reward surface features that correlate with the intended construct and not the quality of work. Learners do not always know what is to be judged as uncertain as performance varies by language background and genre. Consequently, using a system for high-stakes use requires evidence that it measures the intended outcome for the appropriate population. Even uses of low stakes formative assessments require routes for explanation appeal and review by a teacher.

Dependence presents a secondary design risk. When a system corrects an error right away, learners may have fewer opportunities to monitor their own understanding, tolerate uncertainty or develop evaluative judgement. A robust design alternates automated hints with self-explanation, peer dialogue, and delayed feedback. The goal is not maximum feedback but feedback scaled to the development of independence [40].

Learning analytics: actionable evidence or behavioural surveillance

If educators notice students who would benefit from intervention, student learning analytics can help notice participation patterns [41]. However, prediction doesn’t imply explanation. A model may find a correlation without reflecting on why a learner is facing the problem or if the intervention will be educationally appropriate. Misdiagnoses may stigmatize students; failures may deprive deserving students. When analytics are utilized to limit options for future learning, these restrictions become graver.

The ethical quality of personalisation also takes data practice into account. Constant data gathering can make surveillance commonplace and shift control of educational data to private companies. The analysis given by [42], [43] demonstrate how platform business models can make data extraction part of educational provision. Using online services responsibly requires a clear educational purpose, data minimisation, understandable consent, restricted access, retention limits and processes through which learners can inspect or challenge decisions. Following data-protection legislation is a minimum requirement, not a maximum ethical framework.

The focus should be on iteration, not on full authority

The established models ADDIE and ASSURE continue to serve as useful organising heuristics, although AI modifies the tempo and evidence within their phases. The assessment of needs may utilize larger data sets; the development of alternatives may be created rapidly; the implementation of adjustments may be made continuously; and evaluation may use live analytics. These features can enhance the iterative quality of design [44], [45]. They do not lessen the need to define outcomes, understand learners, select appropriate media and evaluate consequences.

A problematic interpretation sees AI as the agent that analyzes and decides the pathway. An enhanced understanding is enhanced through AI technologies that broaden the design team's evidence and options while making professional judgement visible [46]. It is essential to document the intention behind an artificial intelligence function, the data it is dependent upon, the individual accountable for its verification and the circumstances under which its advice could be disregarded.

Parity Amidst Context

AI-based personalisation is often considered a response to diversity, yet it can also reproduce inequality [47]. The models and content may privilege dominant languages, rhetorical practices and cultural examples. The required subscription fee, bandwidth, and device requirements can create exclusion. Accessibility features may be incomplete and automated captions or descriptions may be incorrect. The foremost risks apply to international higher education as higher education systems that are developed in resource-rich, English-dominant settings are embraced across varied linguistic, cultural, legal, and infrastructural contexts.

Consequently, equity must be assessed as a product of design rather than being bolted on as a general constraint. The relevant questions are whose performance data went into the model, which learners experience more errors, what might be the alternatives if there is no connectivity or payment, and whether adaptation widens or narrows participation. Because fairness cannot be inferred from performance reported in another population, local evaluation is necessary.

Analysis the Function of AI in Multimedia Instructional Design.

AI-enhanced multimedia tools are categorized based on purposes, evidence requirements and failure modes [48]. When they are regarded as a single intervention, evaluation becomes complicated. The five functions combined often in higher education are compared in Table 3. The comparison illustrates the necessity of having a governance response in proportionate measure. A tool that offers alternative examples carries different risks than one that grades student work or restricts access to the next piece of content.

Table 3: Comparison of AI functions, evidence and safeguards

AI function	Potential instructional value	Primary evidence needed	Key risk	Human control
Content generation	Rapid examples, explanations, images, narration and practice variants	Accuracy, outcome alignment, cognitive coherence and accessibility	Hallucination, bias, copyright uncertainty and media overload	Expert approval before release; provenance recorded
Automated feedback	Timely hints and repeated formative practice	Validity for the task and population; usefulness for revision	Confident but incorrect advice; dependence; linguistic unfairness	Learner can request explanation; educator reviews consequential cases
Learning analytics	Pattern detection and targeted support	Interpretability, predictive performance and intervention benefit	Surveillance, false classification and proxy misuse	Educator interprets context; student can inspect and contest
Adaptive sequencing	Adjusted pace, challenge and resource pathway	Evidence that rules improve learning rather than completion only	Narrowing opportunity; removing productive struggle	Alternative pathway and override available
Multimodal accessibility	Captions, descriptions, translation and format alternatives	Accuracy and usability with intended disability and language groups	Errors that create new barriers or distort meaning	User-controlled settings plus accessibility review

The evaluation criterion should match the claimed benefit. If a system claims to improve accessibility, usability testing with the intended users is more informative than general satisfaction ratings. If it claims to improve

ISSN No. 2454-6186 | DOI: 10.47772/IJRISS | Volume X Issue VII July 2026

conceptual understanding, completion and time-on-platform are insufficient outcomes. If it produces feedback, agreement with an expert score does not by itself show that the comments help students revise. Construct validity, subgroup performance and educational consequences must be examined together.

This functional distinction also clarifies accountability. In content generation, an educator may be able to inspect every item before use. In predictive analytics, the basis of a recommendation may be inaccessible even to the institution. In high-stakes automated scoring, a learner may be directly affected by an error. As opacity and consequence increase, the case for independent validation, documentation, appeal and non-AI alternatives becomes stronger.

Five Principles for Responsible Design

The synthesis supports five linked principles. Table 4 translates them into review questions that can be used during analysis, development, implementation and evaluation.

Table 4: Principles for responsible AI-enhanced multimedia design

Principle	Design question	Minimum evidence
Pedagogical purpose	What learning problem requires AI, and why is a non-AI approach insufficient?	Alignment among outcome, activity, AI function and assessment
Cognitive coherence	Does the multimedia combination direct attention and support integration without unnecessary load?	Expert review and learner testing of the complete activity [15]
Human verification	Who checks accuracy, disciplinary quality, accessibility and cultural fit?	Named responsibility, review criteria and correction process
Contestable personalisation	Can learners understand, question or override a recommendation or judgement?	Explanation, appeal route and meaningful alternative pathway
Proportionate data use	Is each data element necessary for a stated educational purpose?	Data map, consent information, access controls and retention limits

INTEGRATED FINDINGS FRAMEWORK

Table 5 summarises the central finding: AI functions do not lead directly to personalised learning outcomes. Their effects are mediated by instructional design decisions and conditioned by institutional and learner contexts. Outcomes feed back into review and redesign rather than marking the end of a linear implementation process.

Table 5: Principles for responsible AI-enhanced multimedia design

AI capabilities	Design Mediators	Conditions	Educational Outcomes
Generate multimedia Provide feedback Analyse interactions Recommend pathways	Pedagogical purpose Cognitive coherence Human verification Contestability Proportionate data	Language and culture Disability and access Discipline and task Infrastructure Policy and staff capability	Understanding and transfer Learner agency Participation and equity Trust and privacy Sustainable workload

The framework resists technological determinism. The same generative tool may support learning in one design and undermine it in another. For example, a generated animation can make an invisible process observable, but an attractive animation that introduces inaccurate causal relations can strengthen misconception. An automated hint can sustain progress, but a sequence of overly explicit hints can remove the reasoning that the activity was designed to develop. Outcomes are therefore properties of the complete sociotechnical design, not of the AI model in isolation.

Quality of Evidence and Selection of The Outcome

AI enhanced learning evidence tends to be strongest for proximal academic learning outcomes – for example recent studies show their effect on task completion, perceived usefulness, quiz performance and time saved. Protection measures are not enough for sustainable learning. The focus of higher education is retention, transfer, disciplinary judgement, independence and the competency to act in unfamiliar situations [49], [50]. When adapted into educational contexts, the novelty of short interventions may also influence learners, either on their engagement due to the tool being new, or due to longer-term patterns of which we are as yet ignorant.

The impact of factors, such as quicker and more effective feedback, improved graphic representations and an addition of skills in CMGM be separated via experimental research design. If the group that receives artificial intelligence (AI) in an experiment formula more feedback and more examples than a control group, it cannot show the difference made by AI itself. Stronger designs help maintain instructional opportunity constant. These designs also report implementation fidelity and describe the prompts, models, settings and human review procedures adequately for interpretation.

Harming Distributional Effects Can Be Masked. A platform could enhance the average score yet still perform poorly for multilingual learners, students who use assistive technologies, and those with low connectivity. It is preferable to plan subgroup analysis instead of adding later to disparities. It is necessary to collect qualitative data to be able to explain why a recommendation was followed, ignored, or experienced as intrusive.

Judgement of Evaluative and Learner Agency

Typically, the learners become the recipients of adaptation. A more educationally productive model treat them as participants who can state goals, choose representations, inspect evidence and reflect on recommendations. The ability to judge the quality of one’s own and another’s work is evaluative judgement. It is essential to give students opportunities to consult AI feedback with rubrics, models, peers and instructor reasoning instead of simply complying with machine advice.

Contestability is a practical expression of agency. More than just a disclaimer should be added to the AI response. Informed learners who are aware of when AI has contributed to a resource or decision, what data has been used, how uncertainty is managed, who to contact, and what alternative processes are available. Especially weighty are cases where recommendations affect grades, progression or access to learning.

The Evolving Role of Instructional Designers

While generative tools can cut down the time needed to create a first draft, they may exponentially impact verification needs. The model outputs are increasingly curated by instructional designers. Moreover, they are developing verification protocols, testing for accessibility, examining data practices and coordinating disciplinary review. The task will shift from creating every asset by hand to overseeing a pipeline in which assets can be produced at speed and at random. Institution should use the faster generation as a reason to remove the professional design expertise.

The clarity of roles is vital. Those who are subject experts remain responsible for accuracy, while experts in instructional design are responsible for coherence and alignment. Accessibility experts are responsible for ensuring that the resources are usable and useful for all learners. Security and legal experts are responsible for considerations related to data and contractual risk. The teaching staff finally have the responsibility for contextual taking up of disciplinary resources. Students provide information that sheds light on issues of usability, fairness and the learning experience. Having a documented responsibility matrix prevents the classic failure where everyone thinks someone else has verified the system.

Effect on College Education

For teachers and instructional designers, AI literacy should be more than just prompt building. It necessitates the capacity to assess evidence, acknowledge the constraints of models, devise mechanisms to verify outcomes, and clarify automated choices to learners. While pursuing professional development, authentic course problems should be utilized and have AI-designed solutions compared to plausible non-AI designs. The educational value shall be the benchmark, not the novelty [50].

Institutions must connect procurement and governance to curriculum quality. Decision-makers should assess data flows, accessibility, language coverage, model-update practices, audit opportunities, and the right to contest automated decisions before adopting a platform. A pilot study should describe differential outcomes instead of average engagement or satisfaction. The attention must be given to the workload of staff. Rapid content generation could displace labour rather than merely reduce it.

Researchers do not have a strong need for another catalogue of tools. We must assess retention, transfer, metacognition and learner agency through studies. Educational research should differentiate between multimedia that is either AI-generated, AI-selected and should describe the instructional design of each intervention. Research should prioritize multilingual, disability-inclusive, and resource-constrained contexts as central cases. By including the explanations of students and educators along with system logs, mixed-methods work could mitigate the risk of interpreting the behavioural trace as self-explanatory.

Institutional Implementation Pathway in Phases.

Institutions may transform the framework into a gradual course. Educational problem (defined in a limited way) - not tool for the institute as a whole Before a dependence is formed, the small trial allows for evidence gathering. Table 6 highlights the decisions made and the evidence available at each stage.

Table 6: Staged implementation and evidence pathway

Stage	Core decision	Required evidence	Stop or revise when
1. Define	Is the learning problem specific, important and suitable for AI support?	Needs evidence, learner characteristics, non-AI alternatives and intended outcomes	The proposed use is driven mainly by novelty or procurement
2. Risk screen	What is the consequence of error, exclusion or data misuse?	Data map, accessibility review, stakeholder analysis and risk owner	High consequence cannot be matched by oversight and appeal
3. Prototype	Can the function be embedded in a coherent learning activity?	Expert-reviewed content, test cases, prompts and documented settings	Outputs remain unstable or require unsustainable correction
4. Pilot	Does the design help intended learners under realistic conditions?	Learning, usability, equity, workload and error data	Benefits are limited to engagement or differ unfairly by subgroup
5. Govern	Can quality be maintained as models, data and staff change?	Monitoring schedule, version records, incident process and training	Vendor or model changes cannot be audited
6. Scale or retire	Do educational benefits justify total costs and residual risks?	Longer-term outcomes, cost, staff capacity and learner feedback	No durable advantage over a safer or simpler alternative

This approach makes retirement a feasible possibility. Once in place, educational technologies tend to remain because staff invest time in training and content migration. The AI-aided design should periodically evaluate the current alternatives along with the hidden costs: verification, student support, accessibility remediation and incident response. An important part of responsible innovating is the ability to stop.

The legitimacy of international higher education across contexts

The mere act of translating an interface does not constitute Internationalization. There are variations in educational systems in terms of their curriculum structure, assessment conventions, language policy, internet reliability, student financing and legal protection. Models developed using data from areas with ample resources may incorporate patterns that fail to illustrate involvement in other places. One who logs in and out of the course repeatedly due to bandwidth issues or work, etc., is disengaged. When a scoring model learns a particular norm, an essay that closely follows a legitimate local rhetorical convention might be viewed as poorly structured. The errors in values of merit are not merely arbitrary technical noise. Rather, they are indicative of the context(s) of the production of the categories and benchmarks.

The investigation of cross-context validity should be conducted at three levels. Technical validity concerns whether the system's accuracy and reliability are acceptable in the new population. You should ask whether the suggested action is believable in terms of local learning objectives, teaching practice and support. The concept of social validity is concerned with whether the affected learners and educators view the process and results as understandable, fair, and worth it. There are platforms that can clear the first test but fail the second or the third. An at-risk model, for instance, may identify withdrawal correctly but also recommend an intervention that is culturally inappropriate or impossible for staff to deliver, for example.

Localization goes beyond merely substituting words in a generated resource. We should analyse examples, voices, images, and interaction patterns for cultural assumptions and accessibility. Institutions ought to specify what elements of a system were locally validated, what conclusion is borrowed from external evidence, and what learner groups are underrepresented. In the absence of local evidence, the implementation should be smaller, decisions less consequential and human review more intensive.

Access and Multimodal Engagement

The multimodality can increase access if the learners can choose among accurate captions, transcripts, audio descriptions, readable text, diagrams, and interactive representations. It might also generate a deceptive façade of inclusion. The captions which get provided automatically may mangle specialist terms; the descriptions of images may misrepresent the relationship that makes a diagram educationally meaningful; the synthetic narration may be awkward or too fast; and interactive elements may be keyboard- or screen reader-inaccessible. The fact that an alternative format exists does not mean the alternative is equivalent.

Inclusive design starts before creation. Designers need to identify the critical information and action in each learning object and indicate how these must be represented across modalities. Although automated accessibility features can create a first draft, we still have to check them against disciplinary meaning and test them with users. Learners should have the ability to alter pace, contrast, text size and modality without being pushed into a pathway that lowers cognitive demand.

Information related to disability must be handled with care. Individualization may entice institutions to deduce a condition from behaviour or to solicit diagnostic information not pertinent to learning. According to a safer practice concept, options are offered to all learners (where possible) flexibly. Information is only collected which is necessary to do a specific support task. As accessibility specialists and disabled students will participate in the evaluation, a one-off external review based on compliance checklists cannot reveal all barriers created by a real learning sequence.

Assessment and Academic Judgement that are AI-enhanced

AI-enhanced multimedia is applied in high-consequence assessment. Systems that generate output can produce varieties of the same case and simulations and formative questions; analytics can reveal patterning of responses; automated feedback can sustain rehearsal. These applications may widen opportunities for practice. The evidential threshold changes when AI is involved in grading, promoting or integrity decisions. Reliability must be examined across tasks and groups, the assessed construct must remain visible, and students require a genuine route to human judgement.

A multimedia assessment might be evaluating access to technology, access to production genre or the ability to read an AI rather than the intended disciplinary outcome. Learners might face increasing difficulties, which are irrelevant to the construct, while using generated media, adaptive branches and automated prompts. On the other hand, if there is too much scaffolding, then it may remove the reasoning or production skill that the assessment is designed to elicit. Every AI-backed feature should be mapped to the construct by designers who must ask if the same score could be achieved without showing the target capability.

The justification for automated feedback is strongest when it is formative, reversible, and followed by learner engagement. Feedback needs to guide the recipient toward explanation, revision, or comparison, not just a verdict. By sampling outputs, instructors can identify disagreement cases and openly discuss limitations with students. When AI is positioned as a form of critical literacy, it ceases to become a marker and preserves the academic judgement as professional obligation.

Changes to the Model and Governance

Artificial Intelligence services are no stable instructional materials. Through the process of prying and frictionless, the proposal for operationalization of narrative approach to experiences such as this, reducing the delay between design and service can be made realistic. An undertaking that worked in one semester may yield varying outcomes in the next one. Approval alone should not be the end point of governance. Retain version information, prompt, setting, representative test cases and known failure modes so that a significant change prompts a re-evaluation.

The inquiry into the educational and operational queries. There should be clarity in the contracts on ownership of uploaded materials, use of student data for model training, data location and retention, subcontractors, accessibility, incident notification and exit arrangements. Teams don't have evidence about the accuracy of the disciplines, the linguistic coverage, teacher control and workload. A low subscription pricing could hide high cost for verification, support, integration and remediation. Human activities should be included in total cost of ownership.

Governance should also differentiate levels of risk. It is not the same as automated grading or predictive intervention to have optional brainstorming with no personal data. A classification proportional to the data will consider their sensitivity, opacity, scale, reversibility and consequence. Documented guidance and sampling may be required for low-risk uses. Formal verification, named responsibility, continual supervision, and a non-AI appeal mechanism are needed for higher-risk applications. Some uses might still be inappropriate, even when meaningful oversight is impossible.

The Cost of Educational Opportunity Due to Sustainability

One must weigh the alleged efficacy against its ecological and opportunity costs. Using computational power to generate multiple high-res media variants or repeatedly query a large model takes away staff time from checking output and enabling a new workflow. The pertinent inquiry is not whether a given generation is quick or slow, rather, whether the overall design yields enough educational benefit compared to simpler designs.

Funding for key components like accessibility, tutor support, staff development or reliable connectivity may be displaced by investment in an adaptive platform. More evidence may be available for these alternatives, which reach more learners. A responsible business case should compare AI-enabled options with pedagogical and organisational interventions rather than assume that a technical solution is a natural response to variation in learning.

Sustainable use aims for consistency. If a provider stops "doing something", changes terms or pricing; the course should still be teachable. Core teaching materials, assessment criteria and student records should not depend on any proprietary function that cannot be exported or replaced. Designing for graceful degradation is a way of protecting students and preserving institutional autonomy.

RESTRICTIONS OF THE ARTICLE

While this critical review draws on a number of affiliated literatures, it is not a systematically exhaustive search. It cannot determine how often particular applications occur or what impact they have. Since generative AI is evolving rapidly, observation specific to the platform can get outdated. Through critical integration of theoretical, empirical and policy literatures, five principles are derived. The principles do not yet have an empirical backing as a whole, and this review cannot assert a causal connection between using the principles and student outcomes. The effectiveness, feasibility, and unintended consequences may vary in their impact depending on discipline, student population, institutional resources, language, infrastructure, and regulatory context. The principles should be considered as testable design propositions. We require experimental, longitudinal, design-based, and multiinstitutional studies to clarify their effects on achievement; critical thinking; retention, transfer, motivation; learner agency; equity; accessibility; staff workload; and institutional sustainability. Given these limitations, it is a good idea to be careful about interpreting it as suggesting that there is one correct way to design and carry out studies on AI-enhanced multimodal systems, as opposed to claiming that AI-enhanced multimodal systems will produce a single outcome.

Tensions left unresolved

The application of design principles gives rise to four tensions. The first distinction is the one between personal relevance and curricular breadth. A system can make examples familiar and pathways efficient. Yet, higher education makes learners acquainted with unfamiliar traditions, methods and perspectives. The essence of personalisation lies in offering pupils entry points to a shared body of knowledge, rather than establishing a ‘comfortable’ curriculum for oneself, which would narrow intellectual encounter.

The second sort of tension is between assistance and independence. With the help of AI, one may reduce unnecessary hurdles and provide practice but every step in automation will change what learner has to noticer decide produce. It is the designer’s responsibility to identify the cognitive work the learner has to do. As the competence develops, assistance can be faded or delayed, and students can be asked to rationalise whether they accepted or rejected a suggestion.

The third tension relates to prediction and possibility. Analytics derive future performance from past patterns, while education is to some extent about transformation. A prediction could steer help in a specific direction, but should not impose a ceiling. Systems must be designed to seek evidence of growth and changing circumstances. Moreover, consequential decisions must never rest on a history that learners cannot contest.

There exist tensions between scale and relations. The reason why AI is appealing is because it is able to respond to many learners but some educational need a dialogue, trust and contextual understanding. The interactions sparked by automated responsiveness should allow space for human interaction, not be a proof that interaction is no longer needed. Strategies that narrow down the scope of authoritative decision-making are not ineffective on purpose; typically, they are technicist and managerial in nature.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDIES

The ability of institutions to engage in professional learning, governance and allocation mechanisms will predict the sustainable educational value significantly more than access to any particular AI model.

Multi-level designs are required to test these propositions. Different feedback and adaptation strategies can be compared through course-level studies. Governance, professional capacity and load can be studied institutionally. Similarly, cross-context research could see whether systems validated in one language or infrastructure setting transfers fairly to another. Reporting ought to consist of model versions, prompts or rules, human review, error cases and the non-AI instructional components around the intervention.

Empirical Validation Agenda for the Responsible Design Principles

The five principles we propose in this review – pedagogic purpose, cognitive coherence, human verification, contestable personalisation, and proportionate data use – are derived as analytically grounded design propositions, not as empirically validated causal mechanisms. For such research to take place, researchers will have to check whether, how, and under what conditions using or applying the above principles will enhance the educational effectiveness and ethical acceptability of the AI-supported instructional design.

Studies could use AI technologies to investigate the impacts of the principles. For example, one could use the AI-supported designs to measure the same experimental effects that were measured in the non-AI and AI-supported designs. Such comparisons should involve the same learning objectives, amount of teaching time, assessment demands and feedback. The purpose of this would be to see whether observed effects are results of effective instructional design or due to just an increase in resources, novelty, or exposure to AI.

There is a need for longitudinal studies aimed at grounding the immediate achievement and satisfaction measurements of learners. Over the span of multiple semesters, researchers should look to see whether multimedia given AI, automated feedback and adaptive learning systems have any influences on knowledge retention, transfer to unfamiliar problem situations, critical thinking, metacognitive regulation, motivation, evaluative judgement and learner independence. The studies should record the AI model and version, prompts or adaptation rules, human review level, implementation fidelity, student usage patterns, and changes made to the system during the study.

Cross-context validation ought to involve other disciplines including those from STEM, social sciences, humanities, health sciences, business, and practice-based programmes. According to Leach and Scott, these disciplinary differences may influence what counts as valid feedback. Moreover, they might also influence acceptable personalisation, appropriate evidence, and responsible human oversight. Similarly, public and private universities, resource-poor environments, institutions with varying levels of digital infrastructure, and multilingual learning contexts should be included in multi-institution studies.

Equity, accessibility, and inclusion should be seen as ends, not as adds or supplementary. Subgroup analyses should be planned by researchers involving multilingual learners, students with disabilities, students with different prior knowledge and digital literacy levels, and learners with limited device or internet access. Target for average improvement may hide an unequal error rate, differential access or the systematic narrowing of learning opportunities for particular groups. Thus, interviews, observations, accessibility tests, student explanations, and educator judgement should complement quantitative findings.

The five principles must be examined in isolation and in combination as a design framework. The discussion of design-based research is followed by a discussion of the principles. In this chapter, the design principles are examined. The objective of empirical validation must not be to determine a “universal formula”, but to clarify the contextual conditions, implementation requirements, boundary conditions, and possible unintended consequences of responsible AI-supported instructional design.

CONCLUSION

The ability of AI to produce, suggest and adapt multimedia learning resources can be extended, but personalisation is not automatically a property of a system. It is an assemblage of significant design determinations regarding the features of what proof is useful and worthy of investment, aimed at what should change. Who may challenge the change which educational purposes are served. The literature advocates for using AI cautiously for responsive resources and formative support, while less so for autonomous or high-stakes decisions.

It follows that the proposed principles should be seen as a theoretically informed framework for design and evaluation rather than a validated universal model. Future empirical studies should test the design conditions they identify as contributions in their research. An effective validation will require comparisons of AI-supported designs to non-AI designs, longer-term measurement of learning and learner independence, and planned analysis of differential effects across disciplines, institutions, and student groups.

Responsible practices begin by limiting AI within a visible instructional design. Always consider the pedagogical purpose first before selecting tools; keep multimedia cognitively coherent; generated content and feedback must be verified; recommendations must be explainable and contestable; and learner data must be proportional to a specific educational need. Through these principles we intend to preserve the value of human professional judgement in a range of matters whilst using AI in a manner where it can show it is useful.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to express their deepest gratitude towards Universiti Teknikal Malaysia Melaka (UTeM), Center for Research and Innovation Management (CRIM), Department of Media Interactive, Fakulti Teknologi Maklumat & Komunikasi (FTMK), Pervasive Computing & Educational Technology (PET) and everyone who have helped and participated in this study.

REFERENCES

1. Mayer, R. E. (2009). Multimedia learning (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511811678
2. Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning. Cognitive Science, 12(2), 257-285. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15516709cog1202_4.
3. Long, P., & Siemens, G. (2011). Penetrating the fog: Analytics in learning and education. EDUCAUSE Review, 46(5), 31-40.
4. Holmes, W., Anastopoulou, S., Schaumburg, H., & Mavrikis, M. (2018). Technology-enhanced personalised learning: Untangling the evidence. Robert Bosch Stiftung
5. Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V. I., Bond, M., & Gouverneur, F. (2019). Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education: Where are the educators? International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 16, Article 39. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0
6. Baidoo-Anu, D., & Ansah, L. O. (2023). Education in the era of generative artificial intelligence (AI): Understanding the potential benefits of ChatGPT in promoting teaching and learning. Journal of AI, 7(1), 52-62. https://doi.org/10.61969/jai.1337500
7. Kasneci, E., Sessler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., Gasser, U., Groh, G., Günnemann, S., Hüllermeier, E., Krusche, S., Kutyniok, G., Michaeli, T., Nerdel, C., Pfeffer, J., Poquet, O., Sailer, M., Schmidt, A., Seidel, T., ... Kasneci, G. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. Learning and Individual Differences, 103, Article 102274. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274
8. Shaffril, H. A. M. (2023). Metodologi asas, tips & teknik penulisan artikel berbentuk scoping review. Self-published
9. Tricco, A. C., Lillie, E., Zarin, W., O'Brien, K. K., Colquhoun, H., Levac, D., Moher, D., Peters, M. D. J., Horsley, T., Weeks, L., Hempel, S., Akl, E. A., Chang, C., McGowan, J., Stewart, L., Hartling, L., Aldcroft, A., Wilson, M. G., Garritty, C., ... Straus, S. E. (2018). PRISMA extension for scoping reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and explanation. Annals of Internal Medicine, 169(7), 467-473. https://doi.org/10.7326/M18-0850
10. Verbert, K., Govaerts, S., Duval, E., Santos, J. L., Van Assche, F., Parra, G., & Klerkx, J. (2014). Learning dashboards: An overview and future research opportunities. Personal and Ubiquitous Computing, 18(6), 1499-1514. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00779-013-0751-2
11. Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. Review of Educational Research, 77(1), 81-112. https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487
12. Shute, V. J. (2008). Focus on formative feedback. Review of Educational Research, 78(1), 153-189. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654307313795
13. Williamson, B., & Komljenovic, J. (2022). Making markets in online learning: Platform capitalism, edtech, and the Covid-19 crisis. Learning, Media and Technology, 47(2), 149-163. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2021.1916211
14. Barocas, S., & Selbst, A. D. (2016). Big data's disparate impact. California Law Review, 104(3), 671-732. https://doi.org/10.15779/Z38BG31
15. Miao, F., Holmes, W., Huang, R., & Zhang, H. (2021). AI and education: Guidance for policy-makers. UNESCO. https://doi.org/10.54675/PCSP7350
16. Selwyn, N. (2019). Should robots replace teachers? AI and the future of education. Polity Press.
17. Murtaza, M., Ahmed, Y., Shamsi, J., Sherwani, F., & Usman, M. (2022). AI-Based Personalized E-Learning Systems: Issues, Challenges, and Solutions. IEEE Access, 10, 81323-81342. https://doi.org/10.1109/access.2022.3193938.
18. Vorobyeva, K. I., Belous, S., Savchenko, N. V., Smirnova, L. M., Nikitina, S. A., & Zhdanov, S. (2025). Personalized learning through AI: Pedagogical approaches and critical insights. Contemporary Educational Technology. https://doi.org/10.30935/cedtech/16108.
19. Pesovski, I., Santos, R., Henriques, R., & Trajkovik, V. (2024). Generative AI for Customizable Learning Experiences. Sustainability. https://doi.org/10.3390/su16073034.
20. Maghsudi, S., Lan, A. S., Xu, J., & Van Der Schaar, M. (2021). Personalized Education in the Artificial Intelligence Era: What to Expect Next. IEEE Signal Processing Magazine, 38, 37-50. https://doi.org/10.1109/msp.2021.3055032.

21. Jian, M. J. K. O. (2023). Personalized learning through AI. Advances in Engineering Innovation. https://doi.org/10.54254/2977-3903/5/2023039.
22. Farhood, H., Nyden, M., Beheshti, A., & Muller, S. (2025). Artificial intelligence-based personalised learning in education: a systematic literature review. Discover Artificial Intelligence, 5. https://doi.org/10.1007/s44163-025-00598-x.
23. Essa, S. G., Çelik, T., & Human-Hendricks, N. (2023). Personalized Adaptive Learning Technologies Based on Machine Learning Techniques to Identify Learning Styles: A Systematic Literature Review. IEEE Access, 11, 48392-48409. https://doi.org/10.1109/access.2023.3276439.
24. Laak, K.-J., & Aru, J. (2024). AI and personalized learning: bridging the gap with modern educational goals. ArXiv, abs/2404.02798. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2404.02798.
25. Li, K., & Wong, B. (2023). Artificial intelligence in personalised learning: a bibliometric analysis. Interact. Technol. Smart Educ., 20, 422-445. https://doi.org/10.1108/itse-01-2023-0007.
26. Katiyar, P., Awasthi, M., Pratap, D., Mishra, M., Shukla, M., Singh, M., & Tiwari,, M. (2024). Ai-Driven Personalized Learning Systems: Enhancing Educational Effectiveness. Educational Administration Theory and Practices. https://doi.org/10.53555/kuey.v30i5.4961.
27. Khalifeh, F., Santiago, R., & Palau, R. (2026). Redefining personalized learning in the artificial intelligence era: an updated systematic review from 2019 to 2025. Smart Learning Environments, 13. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-026-00440-6.
28. Bayly-Castaneda, K., Ramirez-Montoya, M.-S., M.-A., Schrader, P., & Awidi, I. (2024). Crafting personalized learning paths with AI for lifelong learning: a systematic literature review. Frontiers in Education. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1424386.
29. Xaveria, F., Kristianingsih, D., & Maharani, R. (2025). Artificial intelligence in adaptive education: a systematic review of techniques for personalized learning. Discover Education, 4. https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-025-00908-6.
30. Sharma, A., Kaushik, N., Srivastav, A., Verma, S. K., & Khurana, J. (2025). ADAPTIVE LEARNING SYSTEMS FOR MULTIMEDIA DESIGN EDUCATION. ShodhKosh: Journal of Visual and Performing Arts. https://doi.org/10.29121/shodhkosh.v6.i2s.2025.6701.
31. Twabu, K. (2025). Enhancing the cognitive load theory and multimedia learning framework with AI insight. Discover Education, 4. https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-025-00592-6.
32. Almuqhim, S., & Berri, J. (2025). AI-Driven Personalized Microlearning Framework for Enhanced E-Learning. Computer Applications in Engineering Education, 33. https://doi.org/10.1002/cae.70040.
33. Naseer, F., Khan, M. N., Tahir, M., Addas, A., & Aejaz, S. M. H. (2024). Integrating deep learning techniques for personalized learning pathways in higher education. Heliyon, 10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e32628
34. Chen, R., Ju, H. T. Y., & N. (2024). Effect analysis of AI-assisted multimedia creation platform in college teaching. Data and Metadata. https://doi.org/10.56294/dm2024615.
35. Sharma, A., Kaushik, N., Srivastav, A., Verma, S. K., & Khurana, J. (2025). ADAPTIVE LEARNING SYSTEMS FOR MULTIMEDIA DESIGN EDUCATION. ShodhKosh: Journal of Visual and Performing Arts. https://doi.org/10.29121/shodhkosh.v6.i2s.2025.6701
36. Sakher, S., & Alfawa'ra, L. H. Q. (2026). Educational transformation through multimedia generative artificial intelligence: The Gemini Banana System. https://doi.org/10.56961/mejeps.v6i1.1323
37. DaCosta, B., & Kinsell, C. (2024). Investigating Media Selection through ChatGPT: An Exploratory Study on Generative Artificial Intelligence in the Aid of Instructional Design. Open Journal of Social Sciences. https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2024.124014
38. Zhao, L., Hussam, E., Seong, J.-T., Elshenawy, A., Kamal, M., & Alshawarbeh, E. (2024). Revolutionizing art education: Integrating AI and multimedia for enhanced appreciation teaching. Alexandria Engineering Journal. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aej.2024.03.011
39. Gligorea, I., Cioca, M., Oancea, R., Gorski, A., Gorski, H., & Tudorache, P. (2023). Adaptive Learning Using Artificial Intelligence in e-Learning: A Literature Review. Education Sciences. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13121216
40. Bora, B. Y., & Kölemen, C. Ş. (2025). Integrating AI into instructional design: A case study on digital photography education in higher education. Contemporary Educational Technology. https://doi.org/10.30935/cedtech/16433
41. Albakry, N., Hashim, M. E. A., Harun, M. F., & Puandi, M. F. (2025). The Role of Artificial Intelligence

in Creative Design for Advertising and Digital Content in Educational Contexts. Semarak International Journal of Creative Art and Design. https://doi.org/10.37934/sijcad.4.1.1223

42. Limpinan, P., Yindeemak, A., Pasmala, R., Nammanee, M., & Jantakoon, T. (2025). A Bibliometric Analysis of Artificial Intelligence for Multimedia in Education by Dimensions AI. Higher Education Studies. https://doi.org/10.5539/hes.v15n2p1
43. Zhao, S. (2025). Design and Implementation of English Education Multimedia System Based on Artificial Intelligence. Proceedings of the 2025 6th International Conference on Computer Science and Management Technology. https://doi.org/10.1145/3795154.3795355
44. Geuan, J. W., & Teo, Y.-X. (2026). How Generative AI is Transforming Multimedia Education: Skills, Integrity, and Learning Outcomes. International Journal of Creative Multimedia. https://doi.org/10.33093/ijcm.2026.7.1.18
45. Strielkowski, W., Grebennikova, V., Lisovskiy, A., Rakhimova, G., & Vasileva, T. (2024). AI-driven adaptive learning for sustainable educational transformation. Sustainable Development. https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.3221
46. Sugie, S. (2023). The AI-Supported Instructional Design in PBL Integrating Chinese Language Learning and Multimedia Creation. International Conference on Computers in Education. https://doi.org/10.58459/icce.2023.1062
47. Lee, G., Shi, L., Latif, E., Gao, Y., Bewersdorff, A., Nyaaba, M., Guo, S., Liu, Z., Mai, G., Liu, T., & Zhai, X. (2025). Multimodality of AI for Education: Toward Artificial General Intelligence. IEEE Transactions on Learning Technologies, 18, 666-683. https://doi.org/10.1109/tlt.2025.3574466
48. Guettala, M., Bourekkache, S., Kazar, O., & Harous, S. (2024). Generative Artificial Intelligence in Education: Advancing Adaptive and Personalized Learning. Acta Informatica Pragensia. https://doi.org/10.18267/j.aip.235
49. Gagaza, M., & Sarmiento, C. P. (2026). Artificial Intelligence in Instructional Design: A Systematic Review. International Journal of Social Science and Humanity. https://doi.org/10.18178/ijssh.2026.16.1.1275
50. Ussainova, G. M., Seitmuratov, A. Z., Issayeva, G. B., Shamsudinova, G., & Zhanseitova, L. (2025). Redesigning Instructional Design with an AI-Incorporated ADDIE Model for 21st Century Education. Journal of Curriculum Studies Research. https://doi.org/10.46303/jcsr.2025.31