

THE ROLE OF GENERATIVE AI IN TRANSFORMING EDUCATIONAL PRACTICES

Nora Gavira-Duron¹, Ana Lorena Jiménez Preciado²,
Angélica Alonso-Rivera¹, & Claudia M. Ramirez-Culebro¹

¹Universidad de las Américas Puebla (Mexico)

²Instituto Politécnico Nacional CDMX (Mexico)

Abstract

The rapid advancement of artificial intelligence (AI) technologies, particularly generative AI and Natural Language Processing (NLP) tools is transforming higher education. This study investigates the integration of AI in tertiary educational settings, focusing on its impact on teaching practices and learning outcomes. Our corpus analysis highlights the prominence of AI in education, with frequent references to AI applications such as ChatGPT and large language models. These technologies offer innovative solutions for personalized learning, intelligent tutoring systems, and enhanced pedagogical methods. The analysis reveals a significant focus on practical implementations of AI, emphasizing the transformation of traditional teaching methodologies. The study also addresses critical issues such as the technological infrastructure required for AI integration and the ethical considerations of AI use in education. The findings suggest that while AI holds promise for revolutionizing education, there is a need for a balanced approach that includes developing critical thinking skills and addressing ethical implications. This research contributes to the growing body of literature on AI in education by providing a detailed exploration of current trends, challenges, and future directions in the field.

Keywords: *Generative AI, natural language processing (NLP), higher education, innovative pedagogy.*

1. Introduction

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has emerged as an overarching change force in all levels of learning, transforming pedagogical practice from pre-school classes to vocational training centers and college classrooms. While early implementation of AI was predominantly restricted to the tertiary education sphere, generative applications like ChatGPT (OpenAI, 2023) currently permeate different learning spaces, including schools and colleges in K-12 (Kindergarten to 12th grade), corporate training modules, and non-formal lifelong learning settings. Bahroun, et al. (2023), situate this democratization of technology in the context of Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA), analyzing 207 studies to identify such major gaps in fields such as medical and engineering education, where intelligent tutoring systems and adaptive learning driven by generative AI (GAI) are transforming pedagogical standards.

The AI is transforming the educational field in terms of improving pedagogical practices, raising students' engagement, and reducing administrative workload (Villamil, et al. 2024). Generative AI, such as Natural Language Processing (NLP) tools like ChatGPT, has been demonstrated to be largely promising in facilitating personalized learning experiences, intelligent tutoring systems, and tailored evaluation (Quezada and Urbina, 2025) and (Gavira, 2023). These technologies underpin learning theories like constructivism, connectivism, and adaptive learning, promoting student-centered, adaptive, and data-driven learning (Pineda, et al. 2024). However, the use of AI in education also has ethical effects on equity, digital literacy, and institutional readiness (Gómez, Fuentes and Castro, 2024). This model discusses how generative AI reconfigures teaching methods and learning processes and resolves these significant concerns.

Building on these foundations, Katonane (2024) extends this ground by illustrating how AI adaptive learning systems improve learning outcomes as far as they raise ethical issues regarding their scalability, particularly in resource-scarce environments, the voracious expansion of large language models (LLMs) has hastened such shifts. Teachers at all levels have grappled with its meaning since ChatGPT came into public view in November 2022. Saariluoma and Karvonen (2024) investigate the languages of AI construction at the back of which rests underlying theory restrictions in educational technology

construction. Formal, computational, and natural language are distinguished as formal languages (mathematics and logic) not having semantics relevant to the world, computational languages having domain-limited references, and natural language with dynamic creative expression. These distinctions clarify the perennial debate between strong AI (human-like cognition) and weak AI (task-specific solutions), revealing how design choices in theory languages shape AI's pedagogical potential and limitations.

From high school teachers redesigning writing assignments to medical schools incorporating AI diagnostics simulations (Lund and Wang 2023). López-Chila, et al. (2024) quantify this trend through bibliometric analysis of 870 articles, which indicate the prevalence of computer science and education journals for AI research. Their focus on higher education nevertheless points to a significant omission: only 12% of the publications reviewed focused on primary or vocational contexts despite growing evidence of AI adoption in these sectors. Papadogiannis, Wallace and Karountzou (2024) justify these facts based on educational data mining (EDM), demonstrating that algorithms such as classification, natural language processing (NLP), and regression analysis enable customized learning experience on a global level but with concern about algorithmic bias in the case of non-rigorous ethical frameworks.

Democratization of AI technologies carry special meanings in developing countries where technological leapfrogging crosses over with limited resources. These programs are compatible with Bahroun, et al. (2023) calls for multidisciplinary directions in considering explainable GAI models capable of mitigating cultural bias. The issue should be addressed in educator preparation Adekunle, et al. (2024) point to the importance of AI literacy for pre-service teachers, who will turn out to be constructors of learning institutions. This study challenges such multifaceted changes in terms of cross contextualism. By synthesizing evidence from peer-reviewed studies, industry case studies, and policy documents, we aim to map concrete AI deployments across education levels (K-12, vocational, higher), analyze competing pedagogical and ethical concerns by institutional context, and propose equity-focused frameworks for responsible AI deployment.

2. Literature review

Constructivist theories, explained by Jean Piaget (1969) and Lev Vygotsky (1926), focus on the construction of knowledge through active learning and social interaction. Recent studies show that AI technologies support these theories by personalizing learning experiences. For example, AI adaptive learning systems in early childhood improve understanding and recall by modifying content to fit individual needs (Veces, et al. 2024). Interactive content, like AI-backed simulations, allows students to discover and actively participate in constructing knowledge (Quezada and Urbina, 2025). In addition, AI-generated content supports independent learning, where students connect information based on their own comprehension (Solis, Huerta and Hernández, 2024). Vygotsky's sociocultural theory (1926) is also supported by AI, which aids in learning. AI systems allow for the easier delivery of personalized content and improving student-teacher interaction to fill gaps in understanding (Arango, et al., 2024). AI offers guided models within the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) and improves how students interact with technology, improving collaborative learning (Benavides, et al. 2024). Digital constructivism emphasizes the capability of teachers and students to be technologically competent. Such competency is essential for AI to effectively facilitate autonomous learning (Villamil, et al. 2024).

AI fits well with Adaptive Learning Theory and Gardner's Multiple Intelligences, showing that it can cater to different learning styles. By modifying lessons based on students' performance, AI renders the learning process individualized (Prince, 2022), these systems recognize strengths and weaknesses in different intelligences, like language, spatial capacity, and math personalizing activities to stimulate students. For example, adaptive platforms convert difficulties to fit all learners, enhancing inclusivity and academic success (Veces, et al., 2024). This not only boosts motivation but also guarantees equal access to education for all people, catering to different learning styles and needs. Siemens (2005) connectivism argues that knowledge develops through networked interactions, which is a model fostered by AI. AI is supported by technologies such as dynamic content generators and collaborative platforms that enable peer-to-peer co-construction of knowledge, unlike static curricula, AI continuously analyzes students' progress, enabling real-time content adjustment and personalized feedback (Flores and Nuñez, 2024). Learning analytics allows educators to detect gaps using data, whereas computerized exams enhance self-regulation and computer literacy readiness (Gómez, Fuentes and Castro, 2024).

AI enhances teaching by stimulating students to inquire and discover. Interactive simulations and virtual tutors enable students to learn through real-world issues (Villamil, et al., 2024). In flipped classrooms, AI personalizes the content that students learn prior to class, enabling them to devote more class time to critical thinking and collaboration (Montenegro-Rueda and Fernández-Cerero, 2022). Educators move from simply presenting information to facilitating student learning, utilizing AI to assist

and promote in-depth comprehension (Villamil, et al., 2024). AI applications bring up essential ethical issues. We need to reduce algorithms' bias and data privacy (Gómez, Fuentes and Castro, 2024). Students need to study AI so that they can critically evaluate AI-generated materials (Solis, Huerta and Hernández 2024). We need to focus on equity and inclusiveness so that no one is excluded. Training teachers on the ethics of AI will facilitate the responsible usage of AI (Gómez, Fuentes and Castro, 2024). These steps are crucial towards fostering positive behavior online in AI-based education.

This study employs a mixed-methods design to analyze generative AI's role in education, combining natural language processing (NLP) of academic literature with qualitative case studies. This approach ensures methodological triangulation, balancing broad thematic trends with granular insights into real-world applications. A purposive sample of 52 peer-reviewed articles (2024) was extracted from Emerald Publishing Limited, focusing on AI in education. This sample aligns with NLP research conventions, where corpora of 50–60 articles suffice to identify disciplinary discourse patterns (Xu and Ouyang 2022); (Mousavinasab, et al. 2018). Articles were filtered using keywords (generative AI, pedagogical innovation, educational transformation), supplemented by industry case studies and policy documents to contextualize findings.

The text preprocessing begins with the cleaning and tokenization of the data, non-alphabetic characters and words that do not provide results were eliminated (for example, “the”, “and”) and the texts were reduced to lowercase. Tokenization was then carried out with which texts were segmented into word-level units following white space boundaries (Webster and Kit, 1992), structuring data for computational analysis. After cleaning the data, lemmatization was performed, using NLTK's WordNetLemmatizer (Bird, Klein and Loper 2009), the inflected words (e.g., “learn” → “learn”) were assigned to their canonical form (Plisson, Lavrac and Mladeníc 2004). This ensured terminological coherence, which is essential for analyzing conceptual constructions in academic texts (Korenius, et al. 2004); (Sproat, et al. 2001). To then carry out the quantitative analysis in two parts:

1. *N-Gram Models*: Markov chain-based n-gram analysis identified recurring phrases (e.g., “adaptive learning systems,” “ethical implications”), revealing dominant pedagogical and technological trends.
2. *Topic Modeling*: Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA) algorithms clustered the 316,687-word corpus into themes (e.g., AI ethics, personalized learning), highlighting scholarly priorities.

3. Results analysis

The n-gram analysis revealed key clusters shaping the current discourse on AI in education, aligning with the study's focus on pedagogical transformation and institutional adoption. Below, we synthesize the findings at the n-gram levels, emphasizing their theoretical and practical implications. In the *1-gram analysis*, the corpus prioritized *AI* (5,827 occurrences) and *education* (4,327), reflecting the field's central focus on technological integration. The high frequencies of *student* (3,723) and *learning* (3,473) underscored a student-centered orientation, consistent with the constructivist principles highlighted in the literature review (Veces, et al. 2024). In particular, *ChatGPT* (3466) emerged as the most cited tool, pointing to its disruptive impact on pedagogical practices. The prominence of *research* (2,421) and *technology* (2,212) reinforced the dual emphasis on empirical research and applied innovation, reflecting the mixed methods design of this study.

The *analysis of 2-grams* emphasizes AI's central role in the corpus. Its high frequency (1193 occurrences) indicates that it is a fundamental concept around which much of the research revolves, aligning with the growing integration of AI technologies in educational settings and the increasing academic interest in this intersection. Showing the contextualization of AI applications, *higher education* predominated (824), suggesting an emphasis on university student research compared to K-12 or vocational contexts, a gap observed in the literature review (López-Chila, et al., 2024). On the other hand, there is a rise in *generative AI* (444) and *AI tools* (340) highlighted the rapid adoption of technologies such as ChatGPT, aligning with studies on personalized learning (Quezada and Urbina, 2025). Regarding practical implementation, phrases such as *use ChatGPT* (257) and *AI technology* (270) dominated the theoretical terms, emphasizing a pragmatic shift towards tool implementation. Regarding dual pedagogical objectives, *AI education* (319) and *teaching-learning* (226) revealed parallel interests in both teaching about AI and improving pedagogy with AI, echoing the literature's emphasis on AI literacy (Gómez, Fuentes and Castro, 2024).

The 3-gram analysis shows us the emerging frontiers, *AI higher education* (106) and *higher education institutions* (63) reaffirmed the tertiary bias of the field, while *educational information technology* (60) highlighted critical infrastructural concerns for scaling AI (Papadogiannis, Wallace and Karountzou, 2024) Regarding technical and pedagogical innovation, *natural language processing* (88) and *generative artificial intelligence* (84) highlighted cutting-edge methodologies, while *research in innovative teaching* (55) linked AI with pedagogical experimentation, in resonance with connectivist frameworks

(Siemens, 2005). The analysis confirms the transformative role of AI in higher education, particularly through generative tools like ChatGPT, but reveals three critical points:

1. *Equity gaps*: The tertiary focus of the corpus contrasts with the emphasis on the democratizing potential of AI, suggesting underexplored opportunities in K-12 and vocational training.
2. *Ethical ambiguity*: Although ethical implications appeared in 2 grams (165), their lower frequency compared to technical terms (e.g., artificial intelligence tool) indicates the need for deeper ethical scrutiny, as noted by (Gómez, Fuentes and Castro, 2024).
3. *Theory-practice balance*: The predominance of applied terms (use ChatGPT) over pedagogical theories (e.g., constructivism) suggests a risk of tool-centric discourse, requiring a stronger theoretical foundation.

These findings validate the literature's emphasis on adaptive learning and student-centered design, but challenge assumptions about the equitable reach of AI across educational levels.

4. Conclusion

Generative AI is redefining educational paradigms by putting constructivist, adaptive and connectivism theories into practice, enabling personalized learning experiences and institutional innovation, particularly in higher education, as demonstrated by the predominance in the corpus of terms such as *higher education AI* (106 trigrams) and *generative AI* (444 bigrams). This study's focus on 2024 articles from Emerald-indexed sources, while methodologically rigorous, may overlook regional perspectives and non-tertiary contexts, reinforcing a bias toward underrepresentation of vocational and K-12 applications, a gap underscored by limited mentions of *educational information technology* (60 trigrams) in broader ecosystems. The ethical tensions highlighted by Gómez, Fuentes and Castro (2024), such as algorithmic bias and data privacy, remain unexplored in tool-centric discourse, indicating the need for frameworks that prioritize equity alongside innovation. Future research should expand through longitudinal and cross-contextual analyzes (comparing AI adoption in early childhood, vocational, and Global South settings) while integrating participatory methodologies to co-design ethical AI systems with educators and students. Furthermore, professional development models should bridge technical literacy in AI with critical pedagogy, as noted by Adekunle, et al. (2024), ensuring that educators are equipped to navigate the sociotechnical complexities of AI. By centering equity, collaboration, and ethical oversight, the field can harness the potential of AI without replicating existing inequalities, fostering learning ecosystems that are as inclusive as they are innovative.

References

- Adekunle, A. M., Adelana O. P., Molefi R. R., Olalekan A., & Ishola A. M.. (2024). Examining artificial intelligence literacy among pre-service teachers for future classrooms. *Computers and Education Open*, 6, 100179. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeo.2024.100179>
- Arango, P. R., Sagrado A. L., González E. O., & de Bedout, L. F. (2024). Implicaciones filosóficas, éticas y pedagógicas del uso de la Inteligencia Artificial en educación. *Digital Education Review*, 45, 29-36. <https://doi.org/10.1344/der.2024.45.29-36>
- Bahroun, Z., Anane C., Ahmed V., & Zacca A. (2023). Transforming Education: A Comprehensive Review of Generative Artificial Intelligence in Educational Settings through Bibliometric and Content Analysis. *Sustainability*, 15(17). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su151712983>
- Benavides, L M. A., Cazales V. J. R., Lovera M. D. L. Á. G., & Mendiola, M. S. (2024). Formación para el uso de la inteligencia artificial generativa en el profesorado de la UNAM: primeros pasos. *DIDAC*, 84, 7-20. https://doi.org/10.48102/didac.2024.84_JUL-DIC.208
- Bird, S., Klein E., & Loper E. (2009). *Natural language processing with Python: analyzing text with the natural language toolkit*. O'Reilly Media, Inc.
- Flores J. D., & Olivera N. R. N. (2024). Aplicación de Inteligencia Artificial en la Educación de América Latina: Tendencias, Beneficios y Desafíos. *Revista Veritas De Difusão Científica*, 5(1), 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.61616/rvdc.v5i1.52>
- Gavira-Duron, N. (2023). Cómo potenciar las habilidades matemáticas con ChatGPT. *Revista Mexicana de Bachillerato a Distancia*, 15(30). <https://doi.org/10.22201/cuaieed.20074751e.2023.30.86525>
- Gómez, C. R., Penna A. F., & Rascón A. C. (2024). El Uso Ético y Moral de la Inteligencia Artificial en Educación e Investigación. *Ciencia Latina: Revista Multidisciplinar*, 8(5), 3243-3261. https://doi.org/10.37811/cl_rcm.v8i5.13801
- Katonane, G. I. (2024). The Role of AI-based Adaptive Learning Systems in Digital Education. *Journal of Applied Technical and Educational Sciences*, 14(2), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.24368/jates380>

- Korenienus, T., Laurikkala, J., Järvelin, K., & Juhola, M. (2004). Stemming and lemmatization in the clustering of finnish text documents. *ACM international conference on Information and knowledge management. Association for Computing Machinery*, 625-633. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1031171.1031285>
- López-Chila, R., Llerena-Izquierdo J., Sumba-Nacipucha N., & Cueva-Estrada J. (2024). Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education: An Analysis of Existing Bibliometrics. *Education Sciences*, 14(1). <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14010047>
- Lund, B. D., & Wang, T. (2023). Chatting about ChatGPT: how may AI and GPT impact academia and libraries? *Library Hi Tech News*, 40(3), 26-29. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LHTN-01-2023-0009>
- Montenegro-Rueda, M., & Fernández-Cerero J. (2022). Realidad aumentada en la educación superior: posibilidades y desafíos. *Tecnología, Ciencia y Educación*, 23, 95-114. <https://doi.org/10.51302/tce.2022.858>
- Mousavinasab, E, Zarifsanaiy, N., K. Niakan S., Rakhshan, M., Keikha L., & Ghazi, S, M.. (2018). Intelligent tutoring systems: a systematic review of characteristics, applications, and evaluation methods. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 29(1) <https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2018.1558257>
- OpenAI. (2023). *GPT-4 Technical Report*. openai.com/research/gpt-4
- Papadogiannis, I., Wallace, M., & Karountzou, G. (2024). Educational Data Mining: A Foundational Overview. *Encyclopedia*, 4(4), 1644-1664. <https://doi.org/10.3390/encyclopedia4040108>
- Piaget, J. (1969) *Psicología y pedagogía*. Crítica, Barcelona.
- Pineda, V. R. E., Brito, E. Y. C., Morales, A. G. S., & Simancas, J. M. C. (2024). Inteligencia artificial desde una concepción de las metodologías activas de la enseñanza-aprendizaje en Educación Superior. *Revista Científica Multidisciplinaria SAPIENTIAE*, 7(14), 140-159. <https://doi.org/10.56124/sapientiae.v7i14.0010>
- Plisson, J., Lavrac, N., & Mladenic, D. (2004, October). A rule based approach to word lemmatization. In *Proceedings of IS (Vol. 3, pp. 83-86)*. sn. chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcgclefindmkaj/<https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/document?repid=rep1&type=pdf&doi=5319539616e81b02637b1bf90fb667ca2066cf14>
- Prince Torres, Á.C. (2022). El aprendizaje inmersivo como alternativa educativa en contextos de emergencia. *PODIUM*, 42, 19-38. <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0059-7797>
- Quezada, V. C., & Velasco C. J. U. (2025). Inteligencia Artificial en la educación del siglo XXI: una exploración a su implementación, beneficios, desafíos y consecuencias éticas. *Yachana*, 14(1) <https://doi.org/10.62325/10.62325/yachana.v14.n1.2025.932>
- Saariluoma, P., & Karvonen, A. (2024). Theory languages in designing artificial intelligence. *AI & Society*, 39, 2249-2258. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-023-01716-y>
- Siemens, G. (2005). Connectivism: A Learning Theory for the Digital Age. *International Journal of Instructional Technology and Distance Learning (ITDL)* http://www.itdl.org/Journal/Jan_05/article01.htm
- Solis, P. F. M., Patraca G. A. H., & Martínez C. E. H. (2024). Inteligencia Artificial en Educación: La opinión de estudiantes universitarios sobre el uso del ChatGPT. *Revista Paraguaya de Educación a Distancia (REPED)*, 55-71. <https://doi.org/10.56152/reped2024-dossierIA2-art6>
- Sproat, R., Black, A. W., Chen, S., Kumar, S., Ostendorf, M., & Richards, C. D. (2001). Normalization of non-standard words. *Computer speech & language*, 15(3), 287-333. <https://doi.org/10.1006/csla.2001.0169>
- Veces, A., De León, M., Dutary, Y., Almanza, N., Swaby, H., & Rojas, N. (2024). El uso de la inteligencia artificial en la educación preescolar. Una revisión bibliográfica de la experiencia exitosa en México. *Revista Semilla Científica*, 1(6), 438-445. <https://doi.org/10.37594/sc.v1i6.1592>
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1926) *Psicología pedagógica*. Traducción de Guillermo Blanck. Buenos Aires, Febrero de 2000.
- Villamil, C. C. J., Cavagnaro J. R. R., Tenorio A. L. M., Mendoza, K. V. G., & Moreno M. I. G. (2024). La transformación educativa con el uso de Inteligencia artificial: Apoyo a los educadores en el siglo XXI. *Retos y Avances en la Ciencia Contemporanea*, 5(1), 651-667. <https://doi.org/10.55813/gaea/ccri/v5/n1/402>
- Webster, J. J., & Kit, C. (1992). Tokenization as the initial phase in NLP. *The 14th international conference on computational linguistics*, 1106-1110. Retrieved from <https://aclanthology.org/C92-4173.pdf>
- Xu, W., & Ouyang F. (2022). The application of AI technologies in STEM education: a systematic review from 2011 to 2021. *International Journal of STEM Education*, 9(59). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-022-00377-5>