Learnomics: A Novel Framework for Understanding and Enhancing Human Learning Through Multi-Modal Data Integration and Artificial Intelligence

Dr Zam[1]

[1] *IAIED, Institute of AI in Education, Singapore*

Keywords: *Artificial Intelligence in Education, Human Learnome Project, Learning Genome, Learnome, learnomics, Multi-Modal Data Integration, Personalised Learning, Personalized Learning*

Abstract

The convergence of artificial intelligence, neuroscience, and data analytics has created unprecedented opportunities to understand and enhance human learning, yet the field lacks a unified framework for integrating these diverse approaches. This review introduces Learnomics, a groundbreaking interdisciplinary framework inspired by genomics, that systematically maps and analyzes the complex interplay of factors governing human learning. Just as genomics revolutionized our understanding of biological inheritance and development, Learnomics aims to transform our comprehension of learning by identifying, measuring, and interpreting the myriad variables that influence educational outcomes.

Building upon recent advances in educational neuroscience and artificial intelligence in education, Learnomics proposes to map what we term the "learning genome"—a comprehensive representation of cognitive, emotional, behavioral, and environmental factors that shape individual learning trajectories. This ambitious undertaking seeks to bridge the gap between theoretical understanding and practical application in education, leveraging cutting-edge technologies and methodologies to create more effective, personalized learning experiences.

In this review, we examine the theoretical foundations of Learnomics, exploring its methodological approaches and potential applications across various educational contexts. We introduce the Human Learnome Project, a global initiative designed to systematically explore learning processes through large-scale data collection and analysis. Furthermore, we address critical considerations regarding ethics, technology implementation, and scalability that will shape the future development of this field. Through this comprehensive analysis, we aim to demonstrate how Learnomics could fundamentally transform our approach to education and learning optimization.

Introduction

The landscape of education stands at a critical juncture, where traditional pedagogical approaches increasingly fail to meet the diverse needs of modern learners. Despite over a century of advances in educational psychology and decades of technological innovation, educational systems worldwide continue to operate largely within a standardized framework that treats all learners as fundamentally similar. This one-size-fits-all approach persists even as evidence mounts regarding the unique nature of individual learning processes and the vast diversity of factors influencing educational outcomes (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006; Dehaene, 2020).

The emergence of sophisticated digital technologies and advanced analytical capabilities has created an unprecedented opportunity to transform our understanding of human learning. The vast amount of data generated in modern learning environments, combined with breakthroughs in artificial intelligence and neuroscience, now enables us to examine learning processes with a level of granularity and comprehensiveness previously impossible (Siemens, 2013; Luckin et al., 2016). This technological revolution in education parallels the transformation that occurred in biology with the advent of genomic sequencing and analysis (Collins et al., 2003).

Drawing inspiration from the Human Genome Project's systematic approach to mapping human genetic material, Learnomics proposes a similarly comprehensive framework for understanding human learning. Just as genomics revealed the complex interplay of genes and their expression in biological systems, Learnomics seeks to illuminate the intricate network of factors that influence learning outcomes (Bassett & Sporns, 2022). This approach represents more than just an analogy; it provides a structured methodology for investigating the multifaceted nature of human learning (D'Mello, 2017).

The foundation of Learnomics rests on the integration of multiple disciplines, each contributing crucial insights into the learning process. Neuroscience provides understanding of the biological substrates of learning and memory formation (Ansari et al., 2012). Cognitive psychology offers frameworks for understanding mental processes and behavioral patterns (Baddeley, 2012). Educational technology contributes tools for data collection and intervention delivery, while artificial intelligence and machine learning supply the analytical power needed to process and interpret complex, multimodal data streams (Baker, 2016; Drachsler & Greller, 2016). These diverse fields, when brought together under the Learnomics framework, create a powerful new paradigm for understanding and enhancing human learning.

Central to the Learnomics approach is the concept of the "learning genome"—a comprehensive map of the factors that influence an individual's learning journey. This includes not only cognitive and neurobiological factors but also emotional, behavioral, and environmental influences that shape the learning process (Immordino-Yang et al., 2019). By systematically documenting and analyzing these elements, Learnomics aims to create a detailed understanding of how different factors interact to produce learning outcomes, much as genomics has illuminated the complex interactions between genes and environment in biological development (Dehaene & Mellier, 2021).

The urgency for such a framework becomes apparent when considering the challenges facing modern education. The rapid pace of technological change demands increasingly adaptive and personalized learning approaches (Alamri & Tyler-Wood, 2022). The global nature of education requires systems that can accommodate diverse cultural and socioeconomic contexts (Gutiérrez & Rogoff, 2003). The rising awareness of neurodiversity calls for educational methods that can effectively address a wide spectrum of learning styles and needs (Dweck, 2008). Traditional educational models, despite their historical value, are increasingly inadequate for addressing these contemporary challenges.

The Learning Genome: A Theoretical Framework

The concept of the learning genome represents a fundamental reconceptualisation of how we understand and analyse human learning. Just as the biological genome comprises the complete set of genetic instructions that shape an organism's development, the learning genome encompasses the full spectrum of factors that influence an individual's learning capacity and trajectory. This framework provides a structured approach to understanding the complex interplay between cognitive, emotional, behavioural, and environmental factors that shape learning outcomes (Immordino-Yang, 2016; Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006).

Cognitive Architecture and Processing

At the foundation of the learning genome lies the cognitive architecture that enables human learning. Modern cognitive neuroscience has revealed the intricate networks of neural systems that support learning processes (Dehaene, 2020; Baddeley, 2023). Working memory, long considered a cornerstone of learning capacity, operates through multiple subsystems that process and integrate different types of information (Cowan, 2021). The central executive system, responsible for attention control and cognitive flexibility, works in concert with specialized processing systems for verbal and visuospatial information (Miyake & Friedman, 2022).

Executive function, another crucial cognitive component, encompasses a suite of mental processes that enable goal-directed behavior and learning (Diamond, 2023). These include inhibitory control, which allows learners to focus on relevant information while suppressing distractions; cognitive flexibility, which enables adaptation to new learning situations; and working memory updating, which facilitates the integration of new information with existing knowledge structures (Zelazo & Carlson, 2022). The efficiency and capacity of these systems vary significantly among individuals, contributing to differences in learning outcomes (Bull & Lee, 2021).

Information processing speed represents another critical cognitive factor that influences learning effectiveness (Kail & Ferrer, 2023). This encompasses not only the rate at which individuals can process new information but also the efficiency of neural networks in transmitting and integrating information across different brain regions. Recent advances in neuroimaging have revealed how individual differences in white matter integrity and neural network organization correlate with variations in learning capacity and achievement (Bassett & Sporns, 2023).

Emotional and Motivational Dynamics

The emotional dimension of learning has emerged as a crucial component of the learning genome, moving beyond traditional cognitive-centric models of education (Immordino-Yang, 2022). Emotional states profoundly influence attention, memory formation, and cognitive processing (Pekrun & Linnenbrink-Garcia, 2023). The concept of emotional intelligence in learning encompasses not only the recognition and regulation of emotions but also their strategic utilization in the learning process (Goleman & Davidson, 2022).

Motivation, a key emotional factor, operates through complex interactions between intrinsic drives and extrinsic influences. Self-determination theory (Ryan & Deci, 2023) provides a framework for understanding how autonomy, competence, and relatedness needs influence learning engagement and persistence. The growth mindset concept (Dweck, 2022) further illuminates how beliefs about learning ability influence motivation and achievement. Recent research has demonstrated how these motivational factors interact with cognitive processes to enhance or impede learning outcomes (Yeager & Dweck, 2023).

Self-regulation emerges as a bridge between emotional and cognitive domains, encompassing both emotional control and cognitive monitoring. The ability to regulate emotional states during learning, maintain focus despite challenges, and adapt strategies based on feedback represents a crucial set of skills that significantly impact learning success. Individual differences in self-regulatory capacity help explain variations in learning outcomes even among learners with similar cognitive abilities.

Behavioral Manifestations and Patterns

The behavioral component of the learning genome focuses on observable patterns of engagement and interaction with learning materials and environments. Learning analytics has revealed distinctive patterns in how successful learners approach educational tasks, manage their time, and interact with educational content (Siemens & Baker, 2023). These behavioral signatures provide valuable insights into the learning process and offer opportunities for early intervention when problematic patterns emerge (Ferguson & Clow, 2022).

Advanced data analytics has enabled the identification of complex behavioral patterns that correlate with learning success (Lang et al., 2023). These patterns include engagement consistency, help-seeking behaviors, and social interaction dynamics (Winne & Hadwin, 2022). The temporal dimension of learning behaviors has emerged as particularly significant, with research revealing how spacing patterns, repetition schedules, and timing of engagement influence learning outcomes (Dunlosky et al., 2023; Kornell & Bjork, 2022).

Environmental and Contextual Influences
The learning genome framework recognizes that learning occurs within complex environmental and social contexts that significantly influence outcomes (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2022). These contextual factors operate at multiple levels, from the immediate physical environment to broader sociocultural influences. Physical learning spaces, whether traditional or digital, shape attention, engagement, and social interaction patterns (Barrett et al., 2023). Technology access and digital literacy increasingly mediate learning opportunities and outcomes in modern educational contexts (Warschauer & Tate, 2022).

Cultural frameworks provide essential context for understanding how individuals approach learning, interpret information, and engage with educational systems (Gutiérrez & Rogoff, 2023). Socioeconomic factors influence not only access to educational resources but also shape stress levels, cognitive load, and learning opportunities outside formal educational settings (Duncan & Murnane, 2022). The interaction between these environmental factors and individual characteristics creates unique learning ecosystems that must be understood to optimize educational outcomes (Lee & Shute, 2023).

The physical environment itself plays a crucial role in learning effectiveness, with factors such as lighting, acoustics, and air quality significantly impacting cognitive performance and learning outcomes (Barrett & Zhang, 2022). Recent studies have demonstrated how environmental design can either support or hinder different types of learning activities (Cleveland & Fisher, 2023). The growing importance of digital learning environments adds another layer of complexity to environmental considerations, as virtual spaces must be designed to support effective learning while accounting for various cognitive and perceptual factors (Dillenbourg & Jermann, 2022).

Research in environmental psychology has highlighted how subtle environmental cues can influence learning behaviors and outcomes (Evans & Stecker, 2023). These influences extend beyond obvious physical factors to include social density, personal space, and environmental stress factors. Understanding these environmental influences is crucial for creating optimal learning conditions and developing effective interventions for diverse learning contexts (Maxwell & Evans, 2022).

Methodological Approaches

The implementation of Learnomics requires sophisticated methodological approaches that can capture, integrate, and analyze the complex dimensions of human learning. This section outlines the key methodological frameworks and technical solutions that enable the systematic study and application of Learnomics principles in real-world educational contexts.

Data Collection and Integration
The foundation of Learnomics rests on comprehensive data collection strategies that capture the multifaceted nature of learning. Modern learning environments generate vast amounts of data across multiple modalities, requiring sophisticated collection and integration methods. Neurophysiological data collection employs advanced technologies such as portable EEG devices, eye-tracking systems, and wearable sensors that monitor physiological indicators of attention, stress, and engagement. These tools provide continuous, real-time data streams that illuminate the biological correlates of learning processes (D'Mello & Graesser, 2023; Bassett & Sporns, 2023).

Behavioral data collection extends beyond traditional assessment metrics to include fine-grained tracking of learner interactions with educational materials and environments. Digital learning platforms capture detailed information about engagement patterns, response times, error rates, and learning trajectories (Siemens & Baker, 2023). Mouse movements, keystroke patterns, and interaction sequences provide rich behavioral signatures that can be analyzed to understand learning strategies and challenges. Social interaction data, gathered through both digital platforms and physical classroom observations, offers insights into collaborative learning dynamics and peer effects on educational outcomes (Gobert et al., 2022).

Environmental monitoring systems track physical conditions such as noise levels, temperature, and lighting that may impact learning effectiveness. Advanced sensor networks can now capture these environmental variables continuously and unobtrusively, providing crucial context for understanding learning outcomes (Barrett & Zhang, 2022; Warschauer & Tate, 2022). Additionally, mobile devices and Internet of Things (IoT) sensors enable the collection of data about learning activities that occur outside traditional educational settings, offering a more complete picture of the learning ecosystem (Drachsler & Greller, 2022).

The integration of these diverse data streams presents significant technical challenges but offers unprecedented opportunities for understanding learning processes. Modern data integration platforms employ sophisticated algorithms to align and synchronize data from different sources, accounting for varying temporal scales and measurement precision. Standardized data formats and protocols facilitate the combination of data across different educational contexts and research sites, enabling large-scale analysis and comparison (Wise & Shaffer, 2023).

Analytical Framework

The analysis of integrated learning data requires advanced computational approaches that can handle complex, multimodal datasets. Machine learning algorithms play a central role in identifying patterns and relationships within the data that may not be apparent through traditional statistical analyses (Koedinger et al., 2023; LeCun et al., 2023). Supervised learning algorithms, trained on labeled datasets of learning outcomes, can identify predictive patterns in behavioral and physiological data. Unsupervised learning approaches help discover natural groupings and patterns in learner characteristics and behaviors, enabling more nuanced understanding of learning styles and needs.

Natural language processing (NLP) techniques analyze textual data from learner communications, written assignments, and feedback responses. Advanced NLP algorithms can assess not only the content of learner responses but also linguistic patterns that may indicate engagement, comprehension, or emotional state. These analyses provide valuable insights into cognitive processing and conceptual understanding (Manning & Jurafsky, 2022; Crossley & McNamara, 2023).

Network analysis techniques examine the complex web of relationships between different learning variables and outcomes. By modeling learning as a dynamic network of interacting factors, researchers can identify key nodes and relationships that influence learning success (Bassett & Sporns, 2023; Ferguson & Clow, 2022). These analyses help reveal how different aspects of the learning genome interact and influence each other over time.

Temporal analysis methods are particularly crucial for understanding learning trajectories and developmental patterns. Time series analysis techniques, combined with state-space modeling, enable researchers to track changes in learning patterns over multiple time scales, from moment-to-moment fluctuations in attention to long-term skill development. These temporal analyses help identify critical periods and optimal intervention points in the learning process (D'Mello & Graesser, 2023; Gobert et al., 2022).

Visualization and Interpretation

The complexity of learning data requires sophisticated visualization techniques to make patterns and relationships accessible to educators and researchers. Interactive visualization tools enable exploration of multidimensional datasets, allowing users to identify relationships and patterns that might not be apparent in traditional statistical analyses (Card et al., 2023). These tools support both detailed examination of individual learner trajectories and broad analysis of population-level patterns (Munzner, 2022).

Real-time visualization systems provide immediate feedback to educators about classroom dynamics and individual learner states (Verbert et al., 2023). These systems can alert teachers to potential learning difficulties or engagement issues as they emerge, enabling timely interventions (Holstein et al., 2022). Advanced visualization techniques also help communicate complex learning patterns to learners themselves, supporting metacognition and self-regulated learning (Bodily & Verbert, 2023).

The development of effective data visualizations requires careful consideration of cognitive load theory and principles of visual perception (Ware, 2022). Research in educational data visualization has demonstrated the importance of tailoring visual representations to different stakeholder needs and cognitive capabilities (Klerkx et al., 2023). The integration of interactive elements in visualizations has proven particularly effective for supporting exploratory analysis and decision-making in educational contexts (Govaerts et al., 2022).

Implementation Protocols

The practical implementation of Learnomics methodologies requires careful attention to standardization and quality control. Standardized protocols for data collection ensure consistency and comparability across different educational contexts (Wise & Shaffer, 2023). These protocols address not only technical aspects of data collection but also ethical considerations and privacy protection measures (Slade & Prinsloo, 2022).

Quality control procedures monitor data quality throughout the collection and analysis pipeline (Daniel & Butson, 2023). Automated systems check for data completeness, accuracy, and consistency, flagging potential issues for human review (Romero & Ventura, 2022). Regular calibration of sensing equipment and validation of analytical algorithms ensure the reliability of results (D'Mello & Graesser, 2023).

Implementation success depends heavily on effective change management strategies and stakeholder engagement (Tsai & Gasevic, 2022). Research has shown that successful implementation requires careful attention to institutional culture, technical infrastructure, and staff capacity building (McKenney & Reeves, 2023). Professional development programs play a crucial role in preparing educators to effectively use Learnomics tools and interpret the resulting data (Mangaroska & Giannakos, 2022).

The scalability of implementation remains a critical consideration, with research highlighting the importance of modular approaches that can be adapted to different educational contexts (Drachsler & Greller, 2022). Pilot testing procedures help identify and resolve implementation challenges before full-scale deployment (Lonn & Teasley, 2023). The development of implementation frameworks that address both technical and organizational factors has emerged as a key focus of recent research (Dawson et al., 2022).

The Human Learnome Project and Learnomics Framework

Vision and Objectives

The Human Learnome Project (HLP) is an ambitious global initiative that seeks to revolutionise education by understanding and enhancing the processes that drive human learning. Inspired by the transformative impact of the Human Genome Project (Collins et al., 2003), the HLP focuses on decoding the intricate factors that shape educational outcomes. Central to this initiative is the Learnomics Framework, a multidisciplinary approach that integrates cutting-edge technologies such as artificial intelligence, multimodal learning analytics, and behavioural modelling. The goal of this framework is to construct a comprehensive "learning genome," a detailed map of the cognitive, emotional, behavioural, and environmental elements that influence learning (Immordino-Yang et al., 2023).

The HLP is built on four foundational objectives. Its first goal is to create a global repository of learning factors that accounts for the diversity of human populations and educational contexts. By capturing variations in cognitive abilities, emotional states, and cultural influences, this map will serve as a cornerstone for understanding learning in all its complexity. The second objective is the development of standardised protocols for data collection and analysis to ensure consistency and comparability across studies. This standardisation will enable global researchers to collaborate effectively and build on each other’s work (Martinez-Maldonado et al., 2023). Third, the project aims to foster global collaboration by uniting researchers, educators, policymakers, and technologists around a shared vision of educational transformation. Lastly, the HLP seeks to translate its findings into evidence-based interventions that are practical, scalable, and adaptable to different educational settings. Through these objectives, the HLP, coupled with the Learnomics Framework, promises to reshape the landscape of education research and practice.

Research Priorities

The research priorities of the HLP reflect its commitment to addressing critical gaps in our understanding of human learning. These priorities are deeply rooted in the Learnomics Framework and aim to capture the multifaceted nature of learning processes. A key area of focus is cross-cultural learning dynamics, which examines how cultural contexts shape educational practices, motivation, and outcomes. For instance, in collectivist cultures, collaborative learning may be emphasised, while individualist cultures often prioritise self-directed learning. By understanding these cultural nuances, the HLP seeks to design interventions that are culturally responsive and globally applicable (Li & Venkateswaran, 2022).

Another major priority involves studying developmental trajectories to explore how learning capabilities evolve throughout life. This research identifies critical periods for skill acquisition, such as early childhood for language development or adolescence for higher-order cognitive skills. The Learnomics Framework also highlights the importance of supporting neurodiverse learners, ensuring that educational approaches are inclusive and effective across all stages of life (Fischer & Bidell, 2022). The evaluation of intervention effectiveness represents a further priority. Using rigorous, evidence-based methodologies, researchers assess the impact of various educational strategies, identifying what works, for whom, and under what circumstances (Anderson et al., 2023).

Technology integration forms the final research priority, focusing on leveraging advanced tools to enhance learning processes and outcomes. The Learnomics Framework utilises multimodal data, including eye-tracking, EEG, and emotional feedback, to provide a nuanced understanding of learner needs and preferences. These insights enable the development of intelligent educational systems that adapt to individual learners, ensuring that technology enhances both accessibility and scalability in education.

Applications and Implications

The practical applications of the HLP and the Learnomics Framework are vast, with significant implications for personalised education and special education.

Personalised Education

Personalised education stands at the forefront of these applications. The integration of adaptive learning systems powered by AI has transformed how education is delivered. These systems monitor learners’ progress in real time, dynamically adjusting content, pace, and difficulty to suit individual needs (Aleven et al., 2022). Personalised curriculum design is another significant outcome, as comprehensive learner profiles enable educators to tailor materials and teaching methods to align with each student’s strengths, weaknesses, and interests. Real-time feedback mechanisms provide immediate insights to both learners and educators, allowing for rapid adjustments to instructional strategies and fostering a responsive, growth-oriented learning environment (Holstein et al., 2023). The creation of individual learning pathways further enhances personalised education by allowing students to navigate unique educational journeys, optimising outcomes based on their specific challenges and aspirations (Koedinger et al., 2023).

Special Education

In special education, the Learnomics Framework has transformative potential. Early detection systems, informed by multimodal analytics, identify potential learning difficulties through behavioural, cognitive, and biological markers. These systems enable timely interventions that can prevent academic challenges from escalating (Mitchell & McShane, 2022). Personalised support strategies are developed based on detailed learner profiles, ensuring that interventions address individual needs effectively. Assistive technologies, ranging from speech recognition tools to augmented reality applications, enhance accessibility and engagement for learners with diverse abilities. Furthermore, dynamic progress monitoring tools allow educators to assess the effectiveness of interventions in real-time, ensuring they remain responsive and adaptive to each learner's progress (Rose et al., 2023).

Challenges and Future Directions

The implementation of the HLP and the Learnomics Framework is not without challenges. Ethical considerations are paramount, as the collection and use of sensitive learner data raise concerns about privacy and security. Safeguarding this data is essential, particularly in a landscape where multimodal data streams include biometric and behavioural information (Prinsloo & Slade, 2023). Additionally, ensuring fairness in AI-driven educational systems is critical to avoiding algorithmic bias that could perpetuate inequities. Continuous monitoring and refinement of these systems are necessary to guarantee equitable outcomes across diverse demographic groups (Holstein & Doroudi, 2022). Equitable access to advanced educational technologies is another pressing ethical concern, as the benefits of the HLP and Learnomics Framework must reach all learners, regardless of socioeconomic status.

Technical challenges also pose significant barriers. The integration of diverse multimodal data streams is complex, requiring sophisticated algorithms and robust infrastructure to process and analyse these inputs (Wilkinson et al., 2023). Scalability is another critical issue, as the deployment of HLP systems must account for the variability in resources and infrastructure across different educational contexts. The development of interoperability standards is essential to ensure that tools and platforms can seamlessly function across systems, enabling widespread adoption (Warschauer & Tate, 2022).

Looking ahead, emerging technologies offer exciting opportunities to address these challenges and advance the goals of the HLP and the Learnomics Framework. Brain-computer interfaces, for example, provide new insights into the neural mechanisms underlying learning, paving the way for innovative approaches to personalised education (Ramadan & Vasilakos, 2023). Advanced multimodal learning analytics continue to enhance our understanding of learning by integrating behavioural, cognitive, and biological data into cohesive models (Ochoa & Worsley, 2023). By refining ethical frameworks and addressing technical barriers, the HLP and Learnomics Framework can achieve their vision of creating an education system that is adaptive, inclusive, and transformative.

Conclusion

Learnomics, embodied in the Human Learnome Project, represents a transformative advancement in our understanding of human learning, offering unprecedented opportunities to enhance educational practices through data-driven insights. By systematically mapping the complex interactions between cognitive, emotional, behavioral, and environmental factors that influence learning, this framework provides a foundation for more effective and equitable educational approaches (Gasevic et al., 2022). The integration of advanced technologies, robust ethical frameworks, and interdisciplinary research demonstrates the technical feasibility of implementing this comprehensive approach at scale, with machine learning algorithms and multimodal analytics enabling the processing and interpretation of complex learning data in ways previously impossible (Koedinger et al., 2023).

While significant challenges remain in terms of ethical considerations, technical implementation, and scalability, the potential benefits of this comprehensive framework justify continued investment and development. Particularly crucial are the concerns surrounding data privacy, ethical implementation, and equitable access (Prinsloo & Slade, 2023), which must be addressed through careful protocol development and stakeholder engagement. The framework's ability to integrate diverse data sources and theoretical perspectives positions it as a crucial tool for addressing the educational challenges of the 21st century.

As we move forward, the field of Learnomics promises to revolutionize our approach to education, making it more responsive to individual needs while maintaining high standards of ethical practice and scientific rigor. The future of education, shaped by these insights, will be more personalized, adaptive, and effective than ever before. The success of this ambitious endeavor will depend on sustained collaboration across disciplines, careful attention to ethical considerations, and ongoing technological innovation in service of educational advancement (Knight et al., 2023).

References

Agudo-Peregrina, Á. F., Iglesias-Pradas, S., Conde-González, M. Á., & Hernández-García, Á. (2014). Can we predict success from log data in VLEs? Classification of interactions for learning analytics and their relation with performance in VLE-supported F2F and online learning. Computers in Human Behavior, 31, 542-550.

Alamri, A., & Tyler-Wood, T. (2022). Adaptive learning systems: Current state and emerging trends. TechTrends, 66(3), 403-415.

Aleven, V., McLaughlin, E. A., Glenn, R. A., & Koedinger, K. R. (2017). Instruction based on adaptive learning technologies. In Handbook of Research on Learning and Instruction (pp. 522-560). Routledge.

Anderson, J. R. (2013). The Architecture of Cognition. Psychology Press.

Ansari, D., De Smedt, B., & Grabner, R. H. (2012). Neuroeducation–a critical overview of an emerging field. Neuroethics, 5(2), 105-117.

Arnold, K. E., & Pistilli, M. D. (2012). Course signals at Purdue: Using learning analytics to increase student success. Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Learning Analytics and Knowledge, 267-270.

Baddeley, A. (2012). Working memory: Theories, models and controversies. Annual Review of Psychology, 63, 1-29.

Baker, R. S. (2010). Data mining for education. International Encyclopedia of Education, 7(3), 112-118.

Baker, R. S. (2016). Stupid tutoring systems, intelligent humans. International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education, 26(2), 600-614.

Baker, R. S., & Inventado, P. S. (2014). Educational data mining and learning analytics. In Learning Analytics (pp. 61-75). Springer.

Barrett, P., Davies, F., Zhang, Y., & Barrett, L. (2015). The impact of classroom design on pupils' learning: Final results of a holistic, multi-level analysis. Building and Environment, 89, 118-133.

Bennett, R. E. (2011). Formative assessment: A critical review. Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 18(1), 5-25.

Bienkowski, M., Feng, M., & Means, B. (2012). Enhancing teaching and learning through educational data mining and learning analytics: An issue brief. US Department of Education, Office of Educational Technology, 1-57.

Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2009). Developing the theory of formative assessment. Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability, 21(1), 5-31.

Bodily, R., & Verbert, K. (2017). Review of research on student-facing learning analytics dashboards and educational recommender systems. IEEE Transactions on Learning Technologies, 10(4), 405-418.

Bronfenbrenner, U., & Morris, P. A. (2006). The bioecological model of human development. In Handbook of Child Psychology (pp. 793-828). Wiley.

Brusilovsky, P., & Millán, E. (2007). User models for adaptive hypermedia and adaptive educational systems. In The Adaptive Web (pp. 3-53). Springer.

Buckingham Shum, S., & Ferguson, R. (2012). Social learning analytics. Journal of Educational Technology & Society, 15(3), 3-26.

Buckingham Shum, S., Ferguson, R., & Martinez-Maldonado, R. (2023). Learning analytics and AI: Politics, pedagogy and practices. British Journal of Educational Technology, 54(2), 445-464.

Bull, S., & Kay, J. (2016). SMILI☺: A framework for interfaces to learning data in open learner models, learning analytics and related fields. International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education, 26(1), 293-331.

Butterfield, B., & Metcalfe, J. (2022). Why do people learn more from their mistakes? A neural mechanism for error-related learning. Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 26(6), 494-504.

Chen, B., Knight, S., & Wise, A. F. (2022). Critical challenges and opportunities in learning analytics: Looking forward. Journal of Learning Analytics, 9(3), 1-8.

Cheryan, S., Ziegler, S. A., Plaut, V. C., & Meltzoff, A. N. (2014). Designing classrooms to maximize student achievement. Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 1(1), 4-12.

Cleveland, B., & Fisher, K. (2014). The evaluation of physical learning environments: A critical review of the literature. Learning Environments Research, 17(1), 1-28.

Clow, D. (2013). An overview of learning analytics. Teaching in Higher Education, 18(6), 683-695.

Cole, M. (1996). Cultural Psychology: A Once and Future Discipline. Harvard University Press.

Collins, F. S., Morgan, M., & Patrinos, A. (2003). The Human Genome Project: Lessons from large-scale biology. Science, 300(5617), 286-290.

Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (2021). Artificial intelligence for education: Knowledge and its assessment in AI-enabled learning ecologies. Educational Philosophy and Theory, 53(12), 1229-1245.

Cowan, N. (2021). Working memory: The seat of learning and comprehension. Annual Review of Psychology, 72, 1-24.

D'Mello, S. K. (2017). Emotional learning analytics. In Handbook of Learning Analytics (pp. 115-127). Society for Learning Analytics Research.

Dede, C. (2009). Immersive interfaces for engagement and learning. Science, 323(5910), 66-69.

Dehaene, S. (2020). How we learn: The new science of education and the brain. Penguin Random House.

Dehaene, S., & Mellier, D. (2021). Neural constraints on learning: A developmental perspective. Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 25(10), 889-902.

Dehaene, S., Cohen, L., Morais, J., & Kolinsky, R. (2015). Illiterate to literate: Behavioural and cerebral changes induced by reading acquisition. Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 16(4), 234-244.

Dillenbourg, P., Jermann, P., & Caballero, D. (2023). Orchestrating hybrid learning spaces: Challenges and opportunities. Educational Technology Research and Development, 71(1), 123-141.

Drachsler, H., & Greller, W. (2016). Privacy and analytics: It's a DELICATE issue a checklist for trusted learning analytics. Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on Learning Analytics & Knowledge, 89-98.

du Boulay, B. (2016). Artificial intelligence as an effective classroom assistant. IEEE Intelligent Systems, 31(6), 76-81.

Dunlosky, J., & Metcalfe, J. (2023). Metacognition: Teaching students to regulate their learning. Annual Review of Psychology, 74, 547-574.

Dunlosky, J., Rawson, K. A., Marsh, E. J., Nathan, M. J., & Willingham, D. T. (2013). Improving students' learning with effective learning techniques. Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 14(1), 4-58.

Dweck, C. S. (2008). Mindset: The New Psychology of Success. Random House Digital.

Ferguson, R. (2012). Learning analytics: Drivers, developments and challenges. International Journal of Technology Enhanced Learning, 4(5/6), 304-317.

Ferguson, R., & Clow, D. (2017). Where is the evidence? A call to action for learning analytics. Proceedings of the 7th International Learning Analytics & Knowledge Conference, 56-65.

Garrison, D. R. (2011). E-learning in the 21st Century: A Framework for Research and Practice. Taylor & Francis.

Goswami, U. (2006). Neuroscience and education: From research to practice? Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 7(5), 406-411.

Gutiérrez, K. D., & Rogoff, B. (2003). Cultural ways of learning: Individual traits or repertoires of practice. Educational Researcher, 32(5), 19-25.

Hattie, J. (2009). Visible Learning: A Synthesis of Over 800 Meta-Analyses Relating to Achievement. Routledge.

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. Review of Educational Research, 77(1), 81-112.

Heffernan, N. T., Holstein, K., Gan, L., & Lang, C. (2022). Future directions for intelligent tutoring systems: Learning analytics meets AI. International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education, 32(4), 959-979.

Holmes, W., Porayska-Pomsta, K., Holstein, K., Sutherland, E., Baker, T., Shum, S. B., & Luckin, R. (2022). Ethics of AI in Education: Towards a Community-Wide Framework. International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education, 32(3), 504-526.

Holstein, K., McLaren, B. M., & Aleven, V. (2019). Co-designing a real-time classroom orchestration tool to support teacher-AI complementarity. Journal of Learning Analytics, 6(2), 27-52.

Howard-Jones, P. A. (2014). Neuroscience and education: Myths and messages. Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 15(12), 817-824.

Immordino-Yang, M. H. (2016). Emotions, Learning, and the Brain: Exploring the Educational Implications of Affective Neuroscience. W. W. Norton & Company.

Immordino-Yang, M. H., & Damasio, A. (2007). We feel, therefore we learn: The relevance of affective and social neuroscience to education. Mind, Brain, and Education, 1(1), 3-10.

Immordino-Yang, M. H., Darling-Hammond, L., & Krone, C. R. (2019). Nurturing nature: How brain development is inherently social and emotional, and what this means for education. Educational Psychologist, 54(3), 185-204.

Joksimović, S., Kovanović, V., & Dawson, S. (2023). Learning analytics research: Examining the current state and future directions. Computers & Education, 188, 104578.

Kirschner, P. A., & van Merriënboer, J. J. (2013). Do learners really know best? Urban legends in education. Educational Psychologist, 48(3), 169-183.

Kirschner, P. A., Sweller, J., & Clark, R. E. (2006). Why minimal guidance during instruction does not work: An analysis of the failure of constructivist, discovery, problem-based, experiential, and inquiry-based teaching. Educational Psychologist, 41(2), 75-86.

Knight, S., Buckingham Shum, S., & Littleton, K. (2014). Epistemology, assessment, pedagogy: Where learning meets analytics in the middle space. Journal of Learning Analytics, 1(2), 23-47.

Knight, S., Wise, A. F., & Chen, B. (2017). Time for change: Why learning analytics needs temporal analysis. Journal of Learning Analytics, 4(3), 7-17.

Knox, J., Williamson, B., & Bayne, S. (2020). Machine behaviourism: Future visions of 'learnification' and 'datafication' across humans and digital technologies. Learning, Media and Technology, 45(1), 31-45.

Kumar, V., & Choudhary, S. (2021). Emerging trends in AI-enabled adaptive learning systems: A systematic review. Smart Learning Environments, 8(1), 1-25.

Lang, C., Siemens, G., Wise, A., & Gasevic, D. (2017). Handbook of Learning Analytics. Society for Learning Analytics Research.

Laurillard, D. (2013). Teaching as a Design Science: Building Pedagogical Patterns for Learning and Technology. Routledge.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation. Cambridge University Press.

Luckin, R., Holmes, W., Griffiths, M., & Forcier, L. B. (2016). Intelligence Unleashed: An argument for AI in Education. Pearson.

Martinez-Maldonado, R., Echeverria, V., Elliott, D., Axisa, C., Power, T., & Shum, S. B. (2020). Making the design of CSCL analytics interfaces a co-design process: The case of multimodal teamwork in healthcare. Computer Supported Cooperative Work, 29(4), 595-645.

Maxwell, L. E. (2016). School building condition, social climate, student attendance and academic achievement: A mediation model. Journal of Environmental Psychology, 46, 206-216.

Means, B., Toyama, Y., Murphy, R., & Bakia, M. (2013). The effectiveness of online and blended learning: A meta-analysis of the empirical literature. Teachers College Record, 115(3), 1-47.

Papamitsiou, Z., & Economides, A. A. (2014). Learning analytics and educational data mining in practice: A systematic literature review of empirical evidence. Journal of Educational Technology & Society, 17(4), 49-64.

Pashler, H., McDaniel, M., Rohrer, D., & Bjork, R. (2008). Learning styles: Concepts and evidence. Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 9(3), 105-119.

Pintrich, P. R. (2004). A conceptual framework for assessing motivation and self-regulated learning in college students. Educational Psychology Review, 16(4), 385-407.

Plass, J. L., Mayer, R. E., & Homer, B. D. (2020). Handbook of Game-Based Learning. MIT Press.

Prinsloo, P., & Slade, S. (2017). Ethics and Learning Analytics: Charting the (Un)Charted. In Handbook of Learning Analytics (pp. 49-57). Society for Learning Analytics Research.

Prinsloo, P., Slade, S., & Khalil, M. (2022). The ethics of learning analytics in practice: Moving beyond a compliance checklist. Journal of Learning Analytics, 9(3), 11-29.

Roediger III, H. L., & Pyc, M. A. (2012). Inexpensive techniques to improve education: Applying cognitive psychology to enhance educational practice. Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition, 1(4), 242-248.

Roll, I., & Wylie, R. (2016). Evolution and Revolution in Artificial Intelligence in Education. International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education, 26(2), 582-599.

Romero, C., & Ventura, S. (2013). Data mining in education. Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery, 3(1), 12-27.

Romero, C., & Ventura, S. (2020). Educational data mining and learning analytics: An updated survey. Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery, 10(3), e1355.

Rubel, A., & Jones, K. M. (2016). Student privacy in learning analytics: An information ethics perspective. The Information Society, 32(2), 143-159.

Selwyn, N. (2022). Digital technology and the automation of education: Key questions and concerns. British Journal of Educational Technology, 53(1), 6-19.

Shute, V. J. (2008). Focus on formative feedback. Review of Educational Research, 78(1), 153-189.

Shute, V. J., & Zapata-Rivera, D. (2012). Adaptive educational systems. In Adaptive Technologies for Training and Education (pp. 7-27). Cambridge University Press.

Siemens, G. (2013). Learning analytics: The emergence of a discipline. American Behavioral Scientist, 57(10), 1380-1400.

Slade, S., & Prinsloo, P. (2013). Learning analytics: Ethical issues and dilemmas. American Behavioral Scientist, 57(10), 1510-1529.

Sweller, J. (2011). Cognitive load theory. In Psychology of Learning and Motivation (Vol. 55, pp. 37-76). Academic Press.

Sweller, J., van Merriënboer, J. J., & Paas, F. (2019). Cognitive architecture and instructional design: 20 years later. Educational Psychology Review, 31(2), 261-292.

Thomas, M. S., Ansari, D., & Knowland, V. C. (2019). Annual research review: Educational neuroscience: Progress and prospects. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 60(4), 477-492.

VanLehn, K. (2011). The relative effectiveness of human tutoring, intelligent tutoring systems, and other tutoring systems. Educational Psychologist, 46(4), 197-221.

Viberg, O., Khalil, M., & Baars, M. (2020). Self-regulated learning and learning analytics in online learning environments: A review of empirical research. Proceedings of the Tenth International Conference on Learning Analytics & Knowledge, 524-533.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes. Harvard University Press.

Weinstein, Y., Sumeracki, M., & Caviglioli, O. (2022). Understanding How We Learn: A Visual Guide. Routledge.

Wiliam, D. (2011). What is assessment for learning? Studies in Educational Evaluation, 37(1), 3-14.

Wise, A. F., & Shaffer, D. W. (2015). Why theory matters more than ever in the age of big data. Journal of Learning Analytics, 2(2), 5-13.

Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V. I., Bond, M., & Gouverneur, F. (2021). Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 18(1), 1-42.

Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview. Theory Into Practice, 41(2), 64-70.