



FUTURE-ORIENTED LEARNING MODELS: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW OF INNOVATION, TECHNOLOGY, AND VALUE INTEGRATION IN EDUCATION

Ajeng T. Pamungkas¹, Isnaini F. Khoirunnisa², Evi L. Triyanti³, Aurelia F.⁴, Ari Wibowo^{5*}

^{1,2,3,4,5}) PGSD, Universitas PGRI Yogyakarta

*Corresponding author: ariwibowo@upy.ac.id

Abstract

Keywords:

Future oriented learning, pedagogical innovation, technology integration, value-based education, systematic literature review

This review examines future-oriented learning by considering the interrelationship among pedagogical innovation, technology integration, and educational values. The study used a qualitative systematic literature review approach, drawing on publications dated 2021–2026 and searches of Scopus, Web of Science, Google Scholar, and SINTA. The thematic synthesis focuses on Project-Based Learning, the Flipped Classroom, and Challenge-Based Learning; artificial intelligence, virtual reality, and learning analytics; and the place of character, ethics, and human development in instructional design. The discussion indicates that active pedagogies and digital technologies can offer opportunities for inquiry, personalization, and collaboration, but that benefits depend on instructional quality and institutional conditions. Digital inequality, teacher preparedness, and the responsible handling of student information remain important constraints. The review proposes a conceptual interpretation in which innovation, technology, and values inform one another, without claiming an experimentally validated model or quantified effects. This perspective may inform context-sensitive teaching and policy decisions concerning inclusive, student-centered learning.

INTRODUCTION

Educational systems increasingly face the challenge of preparing learners for situations that cannot be addressed through the reproduction of established knowledge alone. The abilities to evaluate information, work with others, communicate ideas, and develop creative solutions are now central to discussions of future-oriented learning. Yet the introduction of new technology does not automatically change how students learn or how teachers organize meaningful tasks. Reviews of contemporary curricula suggest that pedagogical decisions must remain central even when artificial intelligence (AI) becomes more prominent in classrooms (Jaramillo & Chiappe, 2024; Díaz & Nussbaum, 2024). This tension between technological possibility and educational purpose provides the starting point for examining how future learning models are conceptualized.

In educational practice, active and student-centered approaches provide one response to this challenge. Project-Based Learning (PjBL) invites students to investigate authentic problems and develop products or explanations, whereas the Flipped Classroom redistributes preliminary content engagement and classroom interaction. Challenge-Based Learning (CBL) gives greater emphasis to

collaboratively addressing challenges drawn from real contexts. Evidence syntheses suggest that these approaches can support learning and higher-order competencies, although their outcomes vary with implementation conditions and study design (Zhang & Ma, 2023; Hew et al., 2021; Galdames-Calderón et al., 2024). A synthesis across models is therefore more informative than assuming that any single method is inherently superior.

Digital technology adds another dimension to instructional design by expanding the forms of interaction, feedback, and representation available to learners. AI-based systems may support adaptation and feedback, while virtual reality (VR) can provide simulated environments for exploring complex concepts. Learning analytics may help educators notice learning patterns, but interpretation of learner data remains a pedagogical responsibility rather than a purely technical activity (Chiu et al., 2023; Maroukakis et al., 2024; Paolucci et al., 2024). Research in K–12 education also shows that design quality, classroom context, and student needs shape whether such applications support meaningful learning (Martin et al., 2024; Li et al., 2024). These considerations shift attention from the availability of tools to the educational conditions under which they are used.

The expansion of digital learning simultaneously raises concerns about unequal access, teacher preparedness, and educational values. Reviews of teachers' digital competence describe difficulties involving pedagogical design, professional knowledge, and the conditions in which teachers work (Smestad et al., 2023; Yang et al., 2023). Infrastructure and institutional support can constrain implementation, while technological decisions may affect inclusion, privacy, and student agency (Wohlfart & Wagner, 2023; Chen et al., 2026). Ethical analyses of AI in education similarly caution that efficiency and personalization are insufficient criteria for evaluating educational quality (Mouta et al., 2024a; Tubella et al., 2024). International policy analyses also connect technological provision with educational purpose and equitable access (UNESCO, 2021, 2023). A future-oriented model must therefore address not only what technology makes possible but also whose learning and development it serves.

Several recent reviews have mapped individual areas of this emerging landscape. AI-focused syntheses discuss instructional applications, adaptive systems, assessment, and the need for stronger ethical and contextual research (Bond et al., 2024; Wang et al., 2024; Yusuf et al., 2024). Other studies examine learning analytics in teacher education, collaborative uses of AI, and the design of AI learning activities for younger students (Salas-Pilco et al., 2022; Tan et al., 2022; Liu & Zhong, 2024). These contributions clarify the opportunities and limitations of specific technologies or settings. They are less directly concerned with how technological choices interact with active pedagogies and the explicit cultivation of humanistic values within a single educational orientation.

Research on immersive environments and learner-centered design reveals a similar need for integration. Reviews document opportunities for collaborative VR learning, skill practice, and science education, but also identify design, access, and teacher-support challenges (Paulsen et al., 2024; Tusher et al., 2024; Jiang et al., 2025). Evidence on adaptive learning suggests that personalized pathways require suitable learning tasks, feedback, and resources rather than personalization as a goal in itself (du Plooy et al., 2024; Alfredo et al., 2024). Meanwhile, studies of responsible AI education emphasize learner agency, integrity, and ethical reflection (Usher & Barak, 2024; Xia et al., 2024). Taken together, this scholarship indicates the need for an interpretive account that places pedagogy, technology, and values in relation to one another.

Within the Indonesian educational discussion, flexible and student-centered instruction is also associated with the orientation of the Independent Curriculum. However, a curriculum's stated commitment to learner development does not itself resolve the practical challenges of digital access, teacher capacity, and values-based instruction. The present study therefore examines future-oriented learning models through a qualitative systematic literature review focused on three connected dimensions: pedagogical innovation, technological integration, and the strengthening of educational values. It aims to identify recurring opportunities and challenges described in the literature and to develop a cautious conceptual interpretation of their interdependence. Its contribution lies in treating ethical and character formation as an integral design consideration rather than as a separate consequence of technological change.

METHODS

Research Design and Scope

This study adopted a qualitative Systematic Literature Review (SLR) approach to interpret scholarly discussions of future-oriented learning rather than to estimate pooled intervention effects. The thematic scope comprised pedagogical innovation, technology integration, and value-based education, with attention to learning from elementary school to higher education. The review focused on publications from 2021–2026 in reputable international journals and accredited Indonesian journals. Because the objective was conceptual integration across different kinds of educational research, a thematic account was more appropriate to the stated purpose than a statistical meta-analysis.

Literature Sources and Search Focus

Academic sources included Scopus, Web of Science, Google Scholar, and SINTA. Search keywords included “Future-Oriented Learning,” “Educational Innovation,” “Technology Integration,” and “Value-Based Education.” Publications concerned with learning-model innovation

and the use of technology or educational values across schooling levels formed the stated topical scope. The review focused on publications addressing educational innovation, technology-supported instructional design, and the integration of educational values across school and university contexts.

Analytical Approach

The review used thematic analysis through data reduction, presentation of information, and conclusion drawing. Accordingly, the synthesis is organized around recurring pedagogical approaches, uses of AI and immersive or analytics-based technologies, values in educational practice, and constraints on implementation. Relationships among these dimensions are interpreted conceptually, while the distinction between a reported literature pattern and an implication for instructional design is maintained. The resulting interpretation focuses on qualitative relationships rather than pooled statistical estimates, consistent with the distinction between thematic synthesis and quantitative evidence integration (Page et al., 2021).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Pedagogical Innovation

The first theme concerns movement from teacher-centered transmission toward active, flexible, and student-centered learning. The synthesis highlights PjBL, the Flipped Classroom, and CBL as approaches that create opportunities for inquiry, collaborative problem solving, and independent learning. Rather than treating these approaches as interchangeable, the relevant distinction is the learning activity they organize: projects require sustained production and investigation, flipped designs redistribute learning time, and challenges connect tasks with authentic problems. Recent syntheses support the plausibility of benefits for higher-order learning but also caution that results depend on instructional conditions and the quality of the underlying evidence (Hew et al., 2021; Zhang & Ma, 2023; Farshad & Fortin, 2026).

Technology Integration

The second theme describes technology as an enabler of adaptive learning, simulated experience, and feedback. AI, VR, and learning analytics are interpreted as mechanisms through which instruction may become more responsive to learner needs. This interpretation is consistent with reviews of AI applications in education and immersive environments, while the evidence also shows that personalization and engagement should not be assumed for every tool or educational setting (Almasri, 2024; Lampropoulos & Kinshuk, 2024; Sakr & Abdullah, 2024). Research on K–12 AI learning activities further suggests that the structure of learning tasks remains an important condition of successful integration (Li et al., 2024).

Values and Human Development

The third theme places character formation, ethics, empathy, and social responsibility alongside pedagogical and technological development. Value integration counters a narrow definition of educational progress based solely on technical sophistication. Recent ethical reviews add specificity to this concern by examining fairness, privacy, educational agency, and the responsibilities of teachers and institutions in AI-supported education (Mouta et al., 2024a; Mouta et al., 2024b; Tubella et al., 2024). Research on academic assessment also suggests that educational integrity and self-regulated learning should be considered in designing AI-supported activities (Xia et al., 2024).

Implementation Conditions

Across the three themes, technological inequality and limited educator digital literacy emerge as significant implementation barriers. The literature provides a basis for distinguishing infrastructure problems from challenges in pedagogical planning, teacher beliefs, and institutional support (Wohlfart & Wagner, 2023; Smestad et al., 2023; Chen et al., 2026). Consequently, future-oriented learning is not simply a matter of combining an innovative model with a digital device. It requires attention to how teachers select tasks, interpret feedback, protect learners' interests, and accommodate different resource conditions.

Discussion

The combined themes suggest that future-oriented learning is best understood as an instructional design problem rather than a catalog of new teaching techniques. PjBL, flipped instruction, and CBL share an interest in active learning, yet they differ in the kinds of tasks and learner decisions they privilege. The meta-analysis by Zhang and Ma (2023) supports the relevance of project-based approaches, whereas Hew et al. (2021) warn that methodological shortcomings can complicate interpretations of flipped-classroom evidence. More recently, Farshad and Fortin (2026) reported a favorable overall direction in project-based learning syntheses while questioning the methodological quality of the included meta-analyses. These perspectives justify discussing potential pedagogical benefits without asserting uniform effectiveness across contexts. Instructional purpose and implementation quality remain central to the interpretation.

The central implication of the technology theme is that personalization should be judged by what learners do with feedback, not by whether a system is described as intelligent. Reviews of AI in education identify adaptive systems and emerging instructional applications, but also indicate uneven research quality and limited consideration of contextual variables (Chiu et al., 2023; Bond et al., 2024; Wang et al., 2024). A scoping review of adaptive learning likewise identifies potential gains accompanied by resource and design constraints (du Plooy et al., 2024). At school level, Díaz and Nussbaum (2024) argue that technological development has often advanced faster than its

pedagogical grounding. This comparison suggests a mechanism through which sophisticated tools may produce disappointing classroom outcomes: an adaptive recommendation cannot compensate for a poorly designed learning task. Technology should therefore be embedded in, rather than substituted for, pedagogical reasoning.

Immersive technologies illustrate the same relationship between affordance and educational purpose. VR can make otherwise inaccessible environments available for exploration, but simulated presence is not equivalent to conceptual understanding. Maroukas et al. (2024) describe personalization and instructional uses of immersive VR, while Paulsen et al. (2024) emphasize the design requirements of collaboration in immersive environments. Reviews addressing K–12 STEM learning and professional skill development similarly identify benefits together with cost, accessibility, and implementation challenges (Jiang et al., 2025; Tusher et al., 2024). Sakr and Abdullah (2024) further connect VR/AR applications with learning analytics, suggesting possibilities for interpreting student engagement during immersive activity. The educational contribution therefore depends on the questions, interactions, and reflection that surround the simulated experience.

Teacher preparedness links these pedagogical and technological considerations to the practical realities of institutions. Digital competence includes more than basic technical operation; it also concerns the capacity to evaluate resources, structure tasks, and respond to students' needs. The reviews by Yang et al. (2023) and Smestad et al. (2023) reveal that accounts of teacher competence vary across contexts and measurement approaches. Wohlfart and Wagner (2023) frame teachers as active mediators of digitalization rather than passive recipients of technology, whereas Chen et al. (2026) distinguish systemic support from attitudinal and classroom-management barriers. Together these findings explain why a model that is workable in a well-resourced setting may require adaptation elsewhere. Professional development and infrastructure planning are complementary, not alternative, responses.

The inclusion of ethics and character education extends the discussion beyond the conventional question of whether an innovation raises test performance or engagement. Automated decisions about students, data-intensive analytics, and generative outputs raise issues of privacy, fairness, dependence, and intellectual responsibility. Mouta et al. (2024a) describe neglected ethical dimensions in AI-in-education research, while Tubella et al. (2024) consider the practical challenges of teaching responsible AI. Usher and Barak (2024) emphasize the place of ethics within science and engineering education, and Zhai et al. (2024) examine concerns about over-reliance on AI dialogue systems. These studies do not demonstrate that technology necessarily undermines character; rather, they show why ethical judgments must be made explicit in task and assessment design. Values

integration is therefore a pedagogical responsibility exercised during technology use, not a separate topic added after implementation.

Learning analytics offers a concrete example of tensions among efficiency, inclusion, and learner agency. It can provide information that teachers might use to identify learning difficulties, yet the data do not explain students' experiences without contextual interpretation. Paolucci et al. (2024) discuss both opportunities and concerns in K–12 learning analytics, including uncertainty about evidence of improved outcomes. Alfredo et al. (2024) likewise show that human-centered design requires meaningful stakeholder participation rather than nominal consultation. Related syntheses in teacher education and collaborative learning connect analytical tools with instructional decision-making, but they do not remove the need for professional judgment (Salas-Pilco et al., 2022; Tan et al., 2022). A future-oriented design should preserve students' rights to understandable, proportionate, and educationally purposeful use of their information.

The breadth of educational levels considered in this review has important implications for generalization. Evidence from higher education cannot automatically be transferred to elementary classrooms because students differ in autonomy, prior knowledge, and developmental needs. Studies of K–12 AI education highlight experiential activities, AI literacy, and ethical reflection, while also identifying needs for age-appropriate resources and stronger instructional design (Martin et al., 2024; Li et al., 2024; Liu & Zhong, 2024). Jaramillo and Chiappe (2024) similarly argue for attention to curricular structure in AI-driven learning environments. Research on generative AI in STEM education further suggests that applications need to be evaluated in relation to discipline-specific learning aims (Zhu et al., 2026). This variation supports a flexible framework with shared principles rather than a universal lesson sequence.

The principal conceptual contribution of the present synthesis is the positioning of pedagogical innovation, technology, and educational values as interdependent design dimensions. Innovation shapes the kinds of learning activities undertaken; technology modifies the available means of representation, interaction, and feedback; and values guide judgments about access, agency, and acceptable educational purposes. Their relationship is consistent with calls for more human-centered, ethical, and context-sensitive educational technology research (Bond et al., 2024; Yusuf et al., 2024). In the Indonesian Independent Curriculum discussion, this interpretation favors adaptable learning tasks and ongoing teacher development rather than one standardized technological solution. This framework is a conceptual synthesis and should not be interpreted as an experimentally validated instructional model or a quantified estimate of intervention effectiveness. Further empirical studies could examine how these three dimensions interact under different educational conditions.

CONCLUSION

The literature discussed in this review presents future-oriented learning as an interaction among pedagogical innovation, technology integration, and educational values. PjBL, the Flipped Classroom, and CBL offer different ways of structuring active and collaborative learning; AI, VR, and learning analytics can expand the available forms of support and feedback. Their educational relevance nevertheless depends on coherent task design, teacher competence, and equitable access. Ethical reasoning, character development, and learner agency should be incorporated into instructional decisions rather than treated as secondary outcomes of digital transformation.

The synthesis proposes a conceptual orientation for educators and policymakers: evaluate learning models through the alignment of pedagogical purpose, technological affordances, and humanistic values. This interpretation is particularly relevant where curriculum flexibility coexists with unequal digital resources and varying professional-development needs. As a qualitative thematic synthesis, the conclusions concern conceptual relationships rather than quantitative estimates of intervention effectiveness. Subsequent research may test the usefulness of this integrative orientation in specific school levels and instructional contexts.

REFERENCES

- Alfredo, R., Echeverria, V., Jin, Y., Yan, L., Swiecki, Z., Gašević, D., & Martinez-Maldonado, R. (2024). Human-centred learning analytics and AI in education: A systematic literature review. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 6, Article 100215. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100215>
- Almasri, F. (2024). Exploring the impact of artificial intelligence in teaching and learning of science: A systematic review of empirical research. *Research in Science Education*, 54, 977–997. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-024-10176-3>
- Bond, M., Khosravi, H., De Laat, M., Bergdahl, N., Negrea, V., Oxley, E., Pham, P., Chong, S. W., & Siemens, G. (2024). A meta systematic review of artificial intelligence in higher education: A call for increased ethics, collaboration, and rigour. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 21, Article 4. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00436-z>
- Chen, C.-H., Fei, H.-Y., & Tsai, C.-C. (2026). Hierarchical analysis of in-service teachers' barriers to technology-integrated instruction: A review of 2000–2024 publications. *Computers & Education*, 242, Article 105509. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2025.105509>
- Chiu, T. K. F., Xia, Q., Zhou, X., Chai, C. S., & Cheng, M. (2023). Systematic literature review on opportunities, challenges, and future research recommendations of artificial intelligence in education. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 4, Article 100118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2022.100118>
- du Plooy, E., Casteleijn, D., & Franzsen, D. (2024). Personalized adaptive learning in higher education: A scoping review of key characteristics and impact on academic performance and engagement. *Heliyon*, 10, Article e39630. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e39630>

- Díaz, B., & Nussbaum, M. (2024). Artificial intelligence for teaching and learning in schools: The need for pedagogical intelligence. *Computers & Education*, 217, Article 105071. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2024.105071>
- Farshad, S., & Fortin, C. (2026). An umbrella review of meta-analyses on project-based learning: Effects on academic achievement, higher-order thinking, and 21st-century skills. *Educational Research Review*, 52, Article 100809. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2026.100809>
- Galdames-Calderón, M., Stavnskær Pedersen, A., & Rodriguez-Gomez, D. (2024). Systematic review: Revisiting challenge-based learning teaching practices in higher education. *Education Sciences*, 14(9), Article 1008. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14091008>
- Hew, K. F., Bai, S., Dawson, P., & Lo, C. K. (2021). Meta-analyses of flipped classroom studies: A review of methodology. *Educational Research Review*, 33, Article 100393. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2021.100393>
- Jaramillo, J. J., & Chiappe, A. (2024). The AI-driven classroom: A review of 21st century curriculum trends. *PROSPECTS*, 54, 645–660. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-024-09704-w>
- Jiang, H., Zhu, D., Chugh, R., Turnbull, D., & Jin, W. (2025). Virtual reality and augmented reality-supported K-12 STEM learning: Trends, advantages and challenges. *Education and Information Technologies*, 30, 12827–12863. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-13210-z>
- Lampropoulos, G., & Kinshuk. (2024). Virtual reality and gamification in education: A systematic review. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 72, 1691–1785. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-024-10351-3>
- Li, L., Yu, F., & Zhang, E. (2024). A systematic review of learning task design for K–12 AI education: Trends, challenges, and opportunities. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 6, Article 100217. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100217>
- Liu, X., & Zhong, B. (2024). A systematic review on how educators teach AI in K–12 education. *Educational Research Review*, 45, Article 100642. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2024.100642>
- Marougkas, A., Troussas, C., Krouska, A., & Sgouropoulou, C. (2024). How personalized and effective is immersive virtual reality in education? A systematic literature review for the last decade. *Multimedia Tools and Applications*, 83, 18185–18233. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11042-023-15986-7>
- Martin, F., Zhuang, M., & Schaefer, D. (2024). Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence in K–12 education (2017–2022). *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 6, Article 100195. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2023.100195>
- Mouta, A., Pinto-Llorente, A. M., & Torrecilla-Sánchez, E. M. (2024a). Uncovering blind spots in education ethics: Insights from a systematic literature review on artificial intelligence in education. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, 34, 1166–1205. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-023-00384-9>
- Mouta, A., Torrecilla-Sánchez, E. M., & Pinto-Llorente, A. M. (2024b). Design of a future scenarios toolkit for an ethical implementation of artificial intelligence in education. *Education and Information Technologies*, 29, 10473–10498. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-12229-y>
- Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J. M., Akl, E. A., Brennan, S. E., Chou, R., Glanville, J., Grimshaw, J. M., Hróbjartsson, A., Lalu, M. M., Li, T., Loder, E. W., Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S., ... Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*, 372, Article n71. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71>

- Paolucci, C., Vancini, S., Bex, R. T., II, Cavanaugh, C., Salama, C., & de Araujo, Z. (2024). A review of learning analytics opportunities and challenges for K–12 education. *Heliyon*, 10, Article e25767. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e25767>
- Paulsen, L., Dau, S., & Davidsen, J. (2024). Designing for collaborative learning in immersive virtual reality: A systematic literature review. *Virtual Reality*, 28, Article 63. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10055-024-00975-4>
- Sakr, A., & Abdullah, T. (2024). Virtual, augmented reality and learning analytics impact on learners, and educators: A systematic review. *Education and Information Technologies*, 29, 19913–19962. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-12602-5>
- Salas-Pilco, S. Z., Xiao, K., & Hu, X. (2022). Artificial intelligence and learning analytics in teacher education: A systematic review. *Education Sciences*, 12(8), Article 569. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci12080569>
- Smestad, B., Hatlevik, O. E., Johannesen, M., & Øgrim, L. (2023). Examining dimensions of teachers' digital competence: A systematic review pre- and during COVID-19. *Heliyon*, 9(6), Article e16677. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e16677>
- Tan, S. C., Lee, A. V. Y., & Lee, M. (2022). A systematic review of artificial intelligence techniques for collaborative learning over the past two decades. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 3, Article 100097. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2022.100097>
- Tubella, A. A., Mora-Cantalops, M., & Nieves, J. C. (2024). How to teach responsible AI in higher education: Challenges and opportunities. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 26, Article 3. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-023-09733-7>
- Tusher, H. M., Mallam, S., & Nazir, S. (2024). A systematic review of virtual reality features for skill training. *Technology, Knowledge and Learning*, 29, 843–878. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10758-023-09713-2>
- UNESCO. (2021). *Reimagining our futures together: A new social contract for education*. UNESCO Publishing. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000379707>
- UNESCO. (2023). *Global education monitoring report 2023: Technology in education: A tool on whose terms?* UNESCO. <https://doi.org/10.54676/UZQV8501>
- Usher, M., & Barak, M. (2024). Unpacking the role of AI ethics online education for science and engineering students. *International Journal of STEM Education*, 11, Article 35. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-024-00493-4>
- Wang, S., Wang, F., Zhu, Z., Wang, J., Tran, T., & Du, Z. (2024). Artificial intelligence in education: A systematic literature review. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 252, Article 124167. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2024.124167>
- Wohlfart, O., & Wagner, I. (2023). Teachers' role in digitalizing education: An umbrella review. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 71, 339–365. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-022-10166-0>
- Xia, Q., Weng, X., Ouyang, F., Lin, T. J., & Chiu, T. K. F. (2024). A scoping review on how generative artificial intelligence transforms assessment in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 21, Article 40. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00468-z>
- Yang, L., García-Holgado, A., & Martínez-Abad, F. (2023). Digital competence of K–12 pre-service and in-service teachers in China: A systematic literature review. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 24, 679–693. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-023-09888-4>

- Yusuf, A., Pervin, N., Román-González, M., & Noor, N. M. (2024). Generative AI in education and research: A systematic mapping review. *Review of Education*, 12(2), Article e3489. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rev3.3489>
- Zhai, C., Wibowo, S., & Li, L. D. (2024). The effects of over-reliance on AI dialogue systems on students' cognitive abilities: A systematic review. *Smart Learning Environments*, 11, Article 28. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-024-00316-7>
- Zhang, L., & Ma, Y. (2023). A study of the impact of project-based learning on student learning effects: A meta-analysis study. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, Article 1202728. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1202728>
- Zhu, Y., Jiang, H., & Zhong, L. (2026). Generative artificial intelligence-assisted STEM education: A systematic review and future research agenda. *European Journal of Education*, 61(1), Article e70462. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.70462>



Unipa Surabaya