Canadian Journal of Marketing Research
ISSN: 0829-4836
https://canadian-jmr.com/index.php/cjmr

Research Article

# AI-Driven Learning Platforms vs. Traditional Instruction and Digital LMS: Comparative Analysis of Academic Performance, Student Engagement, and Equity Outcomes in Indian Higher Education

Ayushi Arora[1]*, Dr Ambika Bhatia[2] & Dr Chhavi Kiran[3]
[1]Research Scholar, Punjabi University, Patiala, India & Assistant Professor Chandigarh College of Technology, CGC, Landran, India
[2]Professor, Punjabi University Centre for Emerging and Innovative Technology, Mohali, India.
[3]Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce and Management,Sanatan Dharma College, Ambala Cantt., Haryana, India

***Corresponding Author**
Ayushi Arora
(*arorasayushi@gmail.com*)

**Article History**
Received: 28.02.2026
Accepted: 23.03.2026
Published: 09.04.2026

**Abstract:**
This systematic review assesses the effectiveness of AI-based learning systems, conventional face-to-face education, and digital learning management systems (LMS) in Indian higher education, focusing on academic performance, student engagement, and equity outcomes. Analysis of literature from 2023-2025 reveals that AI-based adaptive learning significantly enhances individualized learning and academic results (30% improvement in standardized tests), while traditional education fosters critical thinking and social interaction. Digital LMS helps bridge the digital divide by enhancing accessibility and collaboration. A hybrid approach combining AI personalization, conventional methods, and digital tools proves most effective. The review highlights challenges like inadequate digital infrastructure and teacher digital literacy and advocates for adaptable hybrid pedagogies and policy reforms to ensure that AI in education promotes equity rather than exacerbating existing disparities.

**Keywords**: AI-driven learning, adaptive learning platforms, digital learning management systems, traditional instruction, student engagement, academic performance, educational equity, Indian higher education.



## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Context and Significance

The Indian higher education is experiencing a fundamental paradigm shift of technology innovation and post-pandemic changes in education. The Indian higher education system has been struggling to address the following issues: there are major discrepancies in the quality of education offered in urban and rural institutions, the level of student dropout in the country is high (around 20-25 percent of all undergraduate programs), and the number of instructors is not sufficient to give personalized learning opportunities to the student body of a large scale (Kumar and Patel, 2024). At the same time, the breakthrough of artificial intelligence, cloud-based learning management systems, and digital pedagogies has never offered so many opportunities to eliminate these systemic issues.

Digital learning innovation takes place in a unique setting in the Indian higher education system where it will be both an opportunity and a challenge. India is on the one hand a global leader in AI research and EdTech entrepreneurship with an estimated 4,500+ EdTech startups and a market of AI-based learning platforms that are expected to reach about 2.4 billion value[1]. Conversely, India has had long-standing digital infrastructure inequalities, with only 64 percent of its population connected to the internet, and most of the rural regions are still severely under connected, posing a threat of an even larger digital divide, which will widen educational disparities, unless technology adoption plans are well-tuned[2].

In this respect, instructors and administrators are facing a severe choice: how to streamline teaching strategies on the continuum between the traditional in-person teaching, digital LMS platforms, and sophisticated AI-informed adaptive learning systems. This is not a technical or pedagogical question but it is one of access, equity, and quality of higher education in the landscape of higher education in India that is diverse.

### 1.2 Definitional Clarity and Conceptual Framework

In order to have some common terminology, this review delineates three major approaches to pedagogy:
Traditional instruction involves in-person learning, emphasizing direct interaction between instructors and students through lectures and discussions [3]. Digital Learning Management Systems (LMS) are technology platforms that organize learning materials and enable asynchronous communication and progress tracking, focusing on instructor-led content[4]. AI-driven adaptive learning platforms utilize machine learning to personalize student learning experiences by adjusting content in real-time based on performance data. This review adopts a socio-technical perspective, highlighting the influence of institutional settings and instructor capabilities on the implementation of these educational methodologies within Indian higher education [5].

### 1.3 Research Scope and Research Questions.

This review will cover three main research questions:

- Academic Performance: What is the difference in the outcome of academic performance with AI-based learning solutions, digital LMS, and traditional instruction among Indian higher education students?
- Student Engagement: What processes bring about student engagement in these 3 pedagogical models, and which models are most effective in sustaining learner motivation and retention?
- Equity Outcomes: What are the educational accessibility and equity through these types of pedagogies to lower socioeconomic status student populations underrepresented in Indian higher education, including rural students, students with disabilities, and lower socioeconomic status students?

The review will include peer-reviewed studies, empirical case studies, and policy analysis of 2023-2025 with special focus on studies carried out in Indian institutional setting or directly applicable to Indian higher education situation.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1 AIDLs: Adaptive Learning in AI Mechanisms and Evidence.

#### 2.1.1 The operation of the AI-Driven Systems.

Adaptive learning systems utilizing AI function through several mechanisms: Continuous performance analytics track student engagement, error trends, and proficiency to highlight learning gaps [6].

Real-time dynamic content adaptation adjusts instructional approaches based on student performance, offering more support or advanced material accordingly[7].

Customized learning plans cater to individual preferences in content challenge and delivery methods, enhancing learning experiences[8].

Lastly, formative feedback is provided instantly, allowing students to quickly adjust their strategies and minimize frustration due to knowledge gaps[9].

#### 2.1.2 Impact of the Academic Performance in Indian Contexts Evidence.

A distinction in academic performance between large-scale empirical studies of AI-driven learning systems in learning systems in India is compelling evidence of success. Indian state school systems documented in-depth analysis of AI implementations with more than 400,000 students . It included:

- 30 percent elevation in standardized assessment ratings in learners studying on AI-influenced platforms in comparison to customary control groups in instructing activities[10].
- 18 percent narrowing of under-grade-level students, which means that the achievement gap is compressed.
- Rapid learning schedule where students move at 1.3-1.5x the speed of normal students through the content and retain or surpass the understandings.
- The gains were found in different institutional settings, diverse students as well as different subjects (mathematics, science, languages), implying effective efficacy as opposed to artifact in particular implementation settings[11].
- In the context of higher education, specifically, the studies that compare AI-adaptive learning with traditional instruction in the university setting report:
- 7.3% mean change in overall GPA in the group of undergraduate students using adaptive learning systems, Particularly strong improvements by struggling learners, where students in the lowest 40th percentile of performance are improved by 15-22 percent improvements, and classrooms reduce performance gaps[13].

Improved retention in STEM subjects, where the attrition is usually the focal point, and retention rates increase by 8-12% among students who use AI-adaptive systems[14].

#### 2.1.3 Performance Improvement Mechanisms.

There are several theoretically-based descriptions of these empirical advantages:
Management of cognitive load: AI systems intelligently manage complexity to minimize cognitive load and optimize learning, aligning with Vygotsky's theory of the zone of proximal development. Traditional teaching methods can either overwhelm with complexity or be excessively simplistic and repetitive[15].

Metacognitive support: With the analytics dashboards visualizing the learning patterns of students, AI platforms build up the metacognitive awareness of students, who learn how they learn. This self-knowledge allows the independent learning strategy to be adjusted outside the use of the platform[16].

Individualized pacing: Various concepts take different periods of time by different learners. Artificial, orchestrated timing that exists in the traditional classroom is abolished by AI, where the speed of the content is generally coordinated to the average of the students, leaving some behind and others under stimulated[17].

Error correction at the time: Cognitive psychology studies have established that errors corrected immediately after they happen will ensure that they are not consolidated and incorrect mental models do not form. The use of AI platforms can make such error-correction timing scalable, and in a traditional setting, the feedback provided by the instructor usually takes days to be received after evaluation[18].

**2.2 Face-to-Face Instruction Traditional: Values and Limitations.**

2.2.1 Theoretical Bases and Pedagogical Faculties.

The traditional face-to-face teaching, which is based on the constructionist and social learning theories, focuses on the idea that knowledge is constructed by involving and participating in communities of practice, meaningful discussions, and negotiating meaning with others [19]. The interaction between the teacher and the student, in the relational aspects of learning, is a social presence that allows learning outcomes in addition to knowledge transfer [20].

**The traditional instruction has specific pedagogical affordances that include:**

- ❖ Live interactivity and responsiveness Instructors can monitor non-verbal cues (confusion, engagement, disengagement) and change the explanations, pacing, and emphasis based on real-time observation. This responsiveness is dynamic and less machine-like than AI algorithms but contextual sensitivity is uniquely human [21].
- ❖ Real-life interaction with peers: Small group discussions, argument, and cooperative problem-solving in real life promote the growth of critical thinking, communication skills, and social learning that studies have shown to be applicable to professional settings [22].
- ❖ Scaffolding via modeling: Master practitioners engage in problem solving processes, epistemic practices and disciplinary thinking, i.e. thinking aloud, in ways that other learners can monitor and eventually internalize via a process of legitimate peripheral engagement[23].
- ❖ Motivation and social belonging: Physical attendance within academic groups, faculty mentoring, and peer social adjustment are huge predictors of retention and mental prosperity, especially among first-generation and underrepresented scholars [24].
- ❖ The gains were found in different institutional settings, diverse students as well as different subjects (mathematics, science, languages), implying effective efficacy as opposed to artifact in particular implementation settings[11].
- ❖ In the context of higher education, specifically, the studies that compare AI-adaptive learning with traditional instruction in the university setting report:
- ❖ 7.3% mean change in overall GPA in the group of undergraduate students using adaptive learning systems, 7.3
- ❖ Particularly strong improvements by struggling learners, where students in the lowest 40th percentile of performance are improved by 15-22 percent improvements, and classrooms reduce performance gaps [13].
- ❖ Improved retention in STEM subjects, where the attrition is usually the focal point, and retention rates increase by 8-12% among students who use AI-adaptive systems [14].

**2.1.3 Performance Improvement Mechanisms**

There are several theoretically-based descriptions of these empirical advantages:

- ❖ Cognitive load management in AI systems effectively balances complexity and difficulty, aligning with Vygotskian learning theories[15].
- ❖ These systems also enhance metacognitive support, enabling students to understand their learning styles and adjust strategies independently[16].
- ❖ Unlike traditional classrooms, AI allows for individualized pacing, preventing the issues of both overstimulation and under-stimulation. Furthermore, AI facilitates immediate error correction, preventing the formation of incorrect mental models, a significant improvement over the delayed feedback typical in traditional education settings[17].

**2.2 Face-to-Face Instruction Traditional: Values and Limitations**

### 2.2.1 Theoretical Bases and Pedagogical Faculties

The traditional face-to-face teaching, which is based on the constructionist and social learning theories, focuses on the idea that knowledge is constructed by involving and participating in communities of practice, meaningful discussions, and negotiating meaning with others [19]. The interaction between the teacher and the student, in the relational aspects of learning, is a social presence that allows learning outcomes in addition to knowledge transfer [20].

**The traditional instruction has specific pedagogical affordances that include:**

- Immediate interactivity and responsiveness in educational settings involve instructors adapting their explanations, pace, and emphasis in real time, demonstrating a uniquely human contextual sensitivity[21].
- Real-life interactions, such as small group discussions and cooperative problem-solving, foster critical thinking, communication skills, and social learning, which are beneficial in professional environments[22].
- Scaffolding through modeling allows learners to engage in problem-solving processes and internalize disciplinary thinking through observation. Furthermore, physical attendance, faculty mentoring, and peer interactions significantly influence retention and mental well-being, particularly among first-generation and underrepresented students[23].

### 2.3.3 LMS as Infrastructure for Hybrid and Blended Learning

LMS platforms are increasingly not being used as substitutes to traditional teaching, but as platforms that can be used as infrastructure facilitating the blended learning processes that may include face-to-face and online learning. Studies of blended learning in contexts of Indian higher education report:

Increased flexibility but not presence: Blended models allow students to engage in asynchronous online learning, and still have access to synchronous peer and instructor interaction, especially important to working students and those studying at resource-intensive institutions[36].

Enhanced capacity of instructors: LMS allows instructors to standardize routine activities (quizzes, attendance, simple feedback) and use their time on high-value activities that need human involvement and interpersonal presence[37].

Scaffolded transition of instructor-mediated to self-mediated learning: Blended models supported by LMS can be designed to engage in gradual release of responsibility, so that initial face-to-face instructional content offers relationship-building and complex modelling, whereas the online content offers independent practice and mastery[38].

### 2.4 Comparative Effectiveness: Overlapping Evidence within Pedagogical Approaches

### 2.4.1 Comparative Analysis of the Academic Performance.

Recent meta-analysis of comparative effectiveness of AI-driven learning, digital LMS and traditional instruction in studies through higher education settings (and also involving studies with Indians) indicates the subtle patterns of performance:
Mean achievement scores: AI-adaptive platform users have the highest mean achievement scores ($M = 78.4\%$, $SD = 6.2\%$), next in line are blended LMS models ($M = 74.6$, $SD = 7.8\%$), and traditional instruction ($M = 72.9$, $SD = 8.4\%$) [39].

Achievement gap compression: The ability to compress achievement gaps is the most significant in the AI-adaptive systems, which decrease the standard deviation of results by 25-35 percent in comparison with conventional instruction. This implies that although both methods yield an educational process, AI systems especially have a positive impact on underperforming students, which leads to a more equal distribution of outcomes[40].

Domain-specific differences: An AI system is most likely to realize its performance benefits in the maths, quantitative sciences, procedurally-defined task domain and other learning domains that can be broken down into mastery of pre-requisite skills. The less impressive AI benefits and the persistence of instructor expertise and peer discussion are found in language arts, humanities, and those disciplines that focus on interpretation and critical discourse[41].

Temporal dynamics: AI advantages are greater in the first semester (effect size $d = 0.65$), and advantages decline over the course of time (effect size $d = 0.38$ by third semester). This trend implies that although AI can offer first order performance scaffolding, long term learning needs to be combined with extended skill building and enculturation into a discipline[42].

### 2.4.2 Student Interaction and Motivation Comparative Analysis

In addition to the achievement indicators, engagement, or the extent to which students put cognitive and emotional effort, persevere in the face of difficulties, and feel motivated, is also a fundamental measure.

Definition and measurement of engagementEngagement is divided into behavioral (time-on-task, participation rates), emotional (enthusiasm, enjoyment), and cognitive (depth of processing, self-regulation) dimensions[43].

AI-based platform engagement: A study reports two-way interactions enacted by AI platforms. About 70 percent of students note that they feel more motivated through the personalized pace and real-time response, and the policy is less frustrating and more affirming in their experience[44]. Nevertheless, twenty-five percent to thirty percent of learners complain of social isolation, lack of socializing with peers, and the feeling that learning is an individual endeavor, rather than a collaborative effort[45].

Conventional interaction of instruction: Face-to-face learning sustains its benefits in promoting social affiliation, relational interaction with instructors, as well as peer association. The rates of retention and the measures of psychological well-being are more often higher in the traditional environments and especially with the vulnerable student groups (first-generation students, students of color)[46]. But the access to intellectual material is not easy with large lectures with students being passive consumers of instructor speeches[47].

Digital LMS interaction: The interaction patterns in LMS-mediated learning generate intermediate levels of engagement. Online infrastructure leads to discussion forums where some students feel liberated (they can do asynchronous reflection and performance anxiety is low with regard to real-time talk), and others feel less fulfilled by this mediated interaction than they do by talking face-to-face[48].

Comparative meta-analysis Recent synthesis of engagement research in relation to pedagogical approaches: Recent synthesis of engagement research in relation to pedagogical approach per se as well as whether students find learning personally meaningful, effort-congruent and socially connected indicates that patterns of engagement differ by whether students find learning personally meaningful, effort-congruent and socially connected[49]. Such an observation implies that the comparison of the engagement differences between pedagogies does not include essential contextual variables, specifically AI platform offers high engagement when used by self-directed learners who need flexibility and low engagement when used by students who need to socialize their learning process.

**2.4.3 Personal Dissimilarities and Moderating Factors.**

There is no one pedagogical practice, which turns out to be universally the best. Instead, performance is a variable that is dependent on the attributes of learners, the school settings, and the quality of implementation. Given that there are key moderating factors, these are:

- Previous academic preparation: Students who have good background knowledge and learn on their own have to gain significantly when AI-adaptive systems and self-directed learning (LMS-supported) are used. On the other hand, poorly prepared students need more scaffold which implies that they need conventional teaching or the use of in-between methods involving human involvement and technology[50].
- Learning preferences and styles: Although the frameworks of learning styles have little empirical backing as predictors of an optimal modality of instruction, studies report significant differences in student preferences of pace control, level of social interaction, and modality. Other students can be successful using AI personalization, some always want the traditional training with human instructors[51].
- Occupational context and previous experience: Since it has been determined under the recent qualitative research on adult learning, the previous work experience influences pedagogical preference of an individual[52]. Direct implications of this finding can be applied to the Indian higher education system where students are becoming more employable and having diverse educational background. Students with hierarchical workplace settings (military, government) might be more content with more formalized guidance, whereas self-employed or highly independent professionals use a more exploratory and self-directed one.
- Institutional infrastructure: The quality of implementation and infrastructure support critically moderate effectiveness of all approaches. A traditional classroom that is well-resourced with low ratios between instructors and students can be individualized that over-resourced LMS implementation cannot. On the other hand, ineffective AI platforms that lack proper technical support and training of instructors have adverse experiences[53].

**2.5 Implications of Equity Outcomes and Access**

**2.5.1 Digital Divide and Inequality in infrastructures**

The key issue in the comparative test of pedagogical methodology is the impact of every side of educational equity and access in India. The digital landscape in India comes with a paradox, that is, the extreme geographic and socioeconomic inequalities are being accompanied by fast rates of digital connectivity. The urban internet penetration as of 2024 stands at 74 with rural being at 47 percent[54]. Also, access is not homogenous some students have access to high-speed fixed broadband and there are those who rely on expensive mobile data with varied connectivity.

AI-inspired platforms and digital equity: AI-driven adaptive systems offer opportunities of educational democratization to students who have historically had limited access to personalized-instruction by offering them intelligent-tutoring-at-scale. This has been shown to be possible in large-scale Indian implementations (serving 400,000+ students) which have yielded learning gains to students in under-resourced rural institutions who would otherwise be unable to obtain qualified teachers with a focus on specific subjects[55].

Nevertheless, AI platforms are also a threat of increasing digital divides. Adaptive systems need highly stable internet connections and equipment. Lack of continuous access prevents students who do not have access to it on a regular basis to reap the full advantages of the individualized algorithms that demand continuous contact and real-time adjustment. Furthermore, AI systems require large training sets; in Indian situations where local education data is scarce, algorithms are not necessarily tuned to local curricula and student groups[56].

LMS and equity: Digital learning management systems are not the exception, and equity has two implications. LMS allow an asynchronous access and it may have a positive impact on students who have transportation, employment, or caregiving limitations. Nonetheless, the implementation of LMS without parallel investment in the internet infrastructure and internet access creates a digital divide gap: institutions acquire LMS platforms, and many students lose access to them with high reliability. Rural Indian institutions show that the implementation of LMS is not enough without the improvement of broadband networks to reach the poorest students[57].

Traditional teaching environment and equity: Traditional in-person teaching does not need any digital services and, therefore, it does not face technology access issues. Nevertheless, conventional teaching in deprived settings is usually of low quality, because of lack of a sufficient number of teachers, overpopulation, and lack of learning resources. Traditional teaching in most Indian rural institutions is not equitable because students attend school, but they get poor educational opportunities[58].

**2.5.2 Systemic Non pedagogical Barriers.**

There is strong evidence to the effect that, pedagogical innovation will be ineffective in defeating systemic inequities in Indian higher education without structural reforms that accompany it. Critical barriers include:

Digital literacy of instructors: A large number of faculty in Indian higher education, especially in less-resourced institutions have not received training to use AI platforms or LMSs or hybrid pedagogical designs [60]. The application of technology without teacher development leads to frustrations and surface integration [61].

Student digital literacy: Students are also quite different in terms of digital literacy skills. There are students who are intuitively able to navigate in digital classroom settings, especially those who have privileged educational backgrounds and have an early exposure to technology. There are those that need to be scaffolded and others that need to be scaffolded in the use of technology, adding an extra learning load to course material [62].

Misalignment between curriculum and assessment: Learning technology application is usually implemented in curricula and assessment systems that are tailored to conventional education. In the conditions of high-stakes, standardized, and knowledge-based assessments, even a high-technology-level pedagogical innovation might fail to bring substantial improvements in learning outcomes [63].

Economic sustainability: Indian institutions of higher learning have low institutional budgets. The financial resources needed to launch large-scale AI platforms and even powerful LMS implementation are not sustainable by many institutions [64].

# COMPARATIVE FRAMEWORK AND SYNTHESIS

**3.1 Strengths and Limitations Across Approaches: Summary Table**

**Table 1: Comparative characteristics of pedagogical approaches in Indian higher education contexts**

| Dimension | AI-Driven Systems | Digital LMS | Traditional Instruction. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Academic Performance | Highest (78.4) | Moderate (74.6) | Baseline (72.9) |
| Achievement Gap Compression | Strongest Weak. | Moderate | Weak |
| Personalization at Individual level. | High | Medium | Low |
| Social Presence & Belonging | Weak | Moderate | Strong. |
| Development in Critical Thinking | Moderate | Moderate | Strong. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Equity of Access (Infrastructure-dependent) | High (when there is infra) | Moderate | Universal. |
| Scalability | High | High | Limited |
| Price per Student | Average | Lower-average | Expensive. |
| Skill Requirement of the Instructor | High (technical) | Moderate | Varies. |
| Sustainability in Resource-Limited Contexts | Challenging | Moderate | Sustainable. |

**3.2 Theoretical Integration: Toward a Comprehensive Model**

Educational effectiveness emerges not from pedagogical purity but from strategic combination of the complementary strengths of approaches and curbing individual weaknesses. The contextual model of higher education in India must be comprised of:

Personalization to consolidate knowledge, adaptive pacing, and immediate feedback- Scale-based content personalization using AI comparative advantages in interpreting the behaviors of individual learners and scaling personalized knowledge to learners[65].

Conventional relational training of complexity thinking, disciplinary enculturation and social-emotional learning- maintaining instructor role in mentoring, modeling professional thinking, and developing communities of practice[66].

Enabling platforms of hybrid integration, i.e. digital infrastructure and LMS, offer accessible communication channels, flexible asynchronous learning flexibility, and systematic learning analytics[67].

Such an incorporation complies with the constructivist theory of learning idea that knowledge is learned through healthy interaction with purposeful issues, communal discussion and reflection-which can only be met by tactical integration of human guidance, peer group interaction, and smart technological assistance[68].

Policy and practice implications on Indian Higher Education policy and practice

**4.1 Institutional and Pedagogical Recommendations**

According to the synthesis of evidence findings, the following implementation strategies should be taken into consideration in Indian higher education institutions:

- ❖ Find a way to develop a hybrid pedagogic framework as opposed to adhering to a particular approach. The institutional models are to strategically integrate AI guided learning analytics and adaptive learning materials to master skills, conventional, and learning components to think and learn complexly, and LMS infrastructure to allow flexible access [69].
- ❖ Create a focus on instructor training as the pre-condition of the integration of technology. The faculty development should be highly invested in institutions, with a high focus on:
- ❖ Critical analysis of AI platform operations and weaknesses.
- ❖ Informed LMS application (not just content dumping) pedagogically.
- ❖ High-tech course design Hybrid course design that allows technology to complement but not substitute human expertise [70].
- ❖ Adopt universal design of learning (UDL) concepts in every model of pedagogy. UDL models of multiple means of representation, engagement, and expression generate truly accessible learning conditions that are mediated by technology or traditional teaching [71].
- ❖ Develop student digital literacy support by clarifying the use of support services, understanding that one will need technical and informational competency that is beyond academic training [72].
- ❖ Invest in infrastructure as precondition of technology-enabled pedagogy. An IT planning of the institution must focus on broadband connectivity, device access programs and strong technical support since pedagogical innovation needs infrastructural underpinnings [73].

**4.2 Recommendations at the System Level on Policy**

In addition to institutional action, policies at national and state level need to work on the systemic impediments to effective, equitable pedagogical innovation:

- ❖ Revise the policy of curriculum and assessment in accordance with the modern learning sciences. The evaluation systems ought to consider learning beyond content knowledge reproduction that allows pedagogical practices that focus on critical thinking, collaboration and application of knowledge. The existing paradigms of assessment tend to promote traditional, passive types of learning[74] inadvertently.

- Devise data governance systems of educational artificial intelligence. With the proliferation of AI-based learning systems, institutions and systems should have transparent policies that safeguard student privacy and ensure transparency and equity in the algorithms and that the learning analytics will not be misused to conduct surveillance or discrimination[75].
- Funding in the area of rural and underserved institutional broadband access, device initiatives, and technical assistance should be supported in an equitable way to encourage equitable development of infrastructure. Equity imperative[76] requires that national policies on digital infrastructure should put an emphasis on educational access.

Introduce the standards of AI platform evaluation to inform institutional procurement. AI systems should be evaluated on the basis of independent evaluation schemes that include:

- Effectiveness of learning outcomes in various students groups.
- Mitigation of algorithmic bias and fairness.
- Protection of data security and privacy.
- Indianization to local curricula and learners[77].
- Design faculty incentive systems in pedagogical innovation. The performance evaluation and promotion policies must encourage an evidence-based pedagogical experimentation, institutional encouragement of the developing hybrid models and scholarship of teaching and learning[78].
- Research and Evaluation Agenda
- The research and evaluation agenda find their way to the company in different ways.

There is still a great knowledge gap on how best to integrate pedagogical approaches in contexts of Indian higher education. Research areas of priority are:

- Longitudinal effectiveness designs that explore the effect of pedagogical strategies on the long-term effect of learning outcomes in more than one semester and a variety of student groups on Indian institutional settings[79].
- Implementation quality research examining the moderating role of the variation in implementation, in terms of instructor proficiency, institutional support, student preparation, on the effectiveness of various methods[80].
- Research that is equity-oriented that specifically looks at the impact of pedagogical practices on learning outcomes among underrepresented groups of students (rural students, low-income students, first-generation students, students with disabilities)[81].
- Audits of AI-based learning systems (Indian contexts) on the basis of algorithmic fairness, i.e. whether the systems reproduce or reduce biases in identifying students, recommending content, and forecasting performance[82].
- Qualitative researches on student experiences of various pedagogical methods, including how students construct meaning, negotiate challenges and build agency in various learning conditions[83].

# Discussion And Conclusions

This systematic review has analyzed the evidence on comparative effectiveness of AI-based learning platform, digital learning management system, and traditional face to face instruction in the context of Indian higher education with specific attention to academic performance, student engagement and equity outcomes.

### 5.1 Key Findings

The document presents five key findings regarding pedagogical methodologies in education.
Firstly, it emphasizes that no single superior teaching method exists; AI-based adaptive systems improve performance, particularly in STEM fields, but traditional teaching remains crucial for developing critical thinking and social belonging. Secondly, the effectiveness of teaching is context-dependent, necessitating customized and evidence-based policies instead of universal strategies.

Thirdly, while technology can democratize education, equity outcomes depend on investments in digital infrastructure and support, as disparities may widen without proper resources.

Fourthly, hybrid models combining AI personalization and conventional training are most promising for Indian higher education. Lastly, the balance between technology quality and human factors, such as instructor expertise and curriculum relevance, is critical, challenging the notion that innovation relies solely on technology.

### 5.3 Limitations

**A number of limitations are there in the present study:**

Institutional context variation: The Indian higher education has a vast diversity: it involves not only well-endowed research universities but also under-endowed privates, as well as remote education colleges, so it is hard to make generalizations across contexts. Evidence of one type of institution might not be transferred to another [84].

Limitations to evidence base: Although there has been increasing research on EdTech in India, there has been a significant gap in it. Experimental evidence that compares pedagogical processes in Indian settings has hitherto been rigorous as compared to the Western research in education. Most of the insights are based on research that was carried out in other national settings which might not be applicable to the situation in India[85].

Lack of long-term outcome data: The vast majority of studies explore short-term (single semester) outcomes. Long-term effects of sustained learning, the ability to apply skills in new settings, and effects that are relevant to professional careers would not be possible without longitudinal research that is mostly lacking in the literature[86].

Problems with measurement and outcome : Various studies define academic performance with various tests (standardized tests, course grades, concept inventories) which makes it hard to compare them directly. Moreover, most educationally significant results (critical thinking, creativity, professional competence) cannot be easily valued[87].

## CONCLUSION

The Indian higher education is in a crossroad. The demands and the possibilities co-exist due to the fast technological innovation, digital transformation since the pandemic, and the existing inequity in education. Pedagogical affordances of adaptive learning platforms using AI, digital learning management systems and traditional instruction are distinctive. Not one of them emerges as being the better on the whole.

Rather than explaining this as a game with no winners -the traditional instruction versus technology based learning, it has been revealed that it is actually in the best interest to engage in strategic blending of teaching methods, with scale manipulated to institution levels and student needs. Such integration requires:

- Investment in teacher enhancement in order that they are able to make evidence-based pedagogical choices.
- Investment in infrastructure that will facilitate equitable access to technology.
- Institutional flexibility that permits local sensitive hybrid models.
- Pedagogical innovation within the Indian higher education should be largely geared towards the educational equity and quality. These ends should not be displaced by the technology adoption. With institutions trying to find their way through the complicated world of AI-based platforms, digital infrastructure, and the overall changing needs of students, the key question must not be: what is the best pedagogic approach? but not how we can best learn and develop our students using a combination of methods in our particular institutional context?

The approaches to contextual decision-making presented in this review have evidence that can be used to inform the context of the implementation of multiple pedagogical approaches in the name of educational excellence and equity in the diverse system of higher education in India.

## REFERENCES

1. Statista. Indian educational technology market value and growth projections [Internet]. 2024.
2. Ministry of Education, Government of India. Digital infrastructure and internet access in Indian higher education: status report and gap analysis [Internet]. 2024.
3. Biggs J, Tang C. *Teaching for quality learning at university: what the student does*. 4th ed. Open University Press; 2011.
4. Basak SK, Wotto M, Bélanger P. E-learning, M-learning and D-learning. *J Educ Learn*. 2018;7(2):1–17. doi:10.5539/jel.v7n2p1
5. Baker RS, Hawn A. Algorithmic fairness in education. *Int J Artif Intell Educ*. 2022;32(4):834–847.
6. Siemens G, Long PD. Analytics in learning and education. *EDUCAUSE Rev*. 2011;46(5):30–40.
7. Koskela M, Mäkelä T, Whitehouse D. Adaptive learning and outcomes. *J Educ Res Online*. 2022;14(2):58–77.
8. Vandewaetere M, Desmet P. Adaptive learning in classrooms. In: *Handbook of Educational Technologies*. Springer; 2015. p. 89–106.
9. Shute VJ. Formative feedback. *Rev Educ Res*. 2008;78(1):153–189.
10. Chakraborty S, Patel R, Kumar A. AI implementation in Indian education. *J Educ Technol Res*. 2024;45(3):234–256.
11. Dhanraj V, Sharma P, Desai N. Adaptive learning scalability. *Int Rev Educ Res*. 2024;28(1):45–62.
12. Chen X, Wang Y, Liu J. Adaptive learning systems meta-analysis. *Comput Educ*. 2020;156:103124.
13. Merrill MD. Supporting struggling learners. *Educ Technol Soc*. 2019;22(1):123–135.
14. Freeman S, Eddy SL, McDonough M, et al. Active learning improves performance. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 2014;111(23):8410–8415.
15. Sweller J, Ayres P, Kalyuga S. *Cognitive load theory*. Springer; 2011.
16. Winne PH, Nesbit JC. Academic achievement psychology. *Annu Rev Psychol*. 2010;61:653–678.
17. Corno L, Randi J. Self-regulated learning design. In: Wang MC, Walberg HJ, editors. *Handbook on teaching students*. 2000. p. 193–217.

18. Hattie J, Timperley H. Power of feedback. *Rev Educ Res*. 2007;77(1):81–112.
19. Vygotsky LS. *Mind in society*. Harvard University Press; 1978.
20. Garrison DR, Anderson T, Archer W. Online learning inquiry. *Internet High Educ*. 2000;2(2-3):87–105.
21. Van Dijk L, Hausfeld R. Online collaboration learning. *Rev Electron Investig Educ*. 2008;10(1):1–20.
22. Johnson DW, Johnson RT, Smith KA. Cooperative learning. *J Excell Coll Teach*. 2014;25(3-4):85–118.
23. Lave J, Wenger E. *Situated learning*. Cambridge University Press; 1991.
24. Tinto V. *Completing college*. University of Chicago Press; 2012.
25. Ministry of Education, Government of India. Higher education statistics report [Internet]. 2023.
26. Acharya B, Srivastava R. Undergraduate education quality in India. *Contemp Educ Dialogue*. 2020;17(2):153–172.
27. Dumont H, Istance D, Benavides F. *The nature of learning*. OECD; 2010.
28. Ministry of Education, Government of India. Working students in higher education [Internet]. 2024.
29. Freeman S, Eddy SL, McDonough M, et al. Active learning improves performance. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 2014;111(23):8410–8415.
30. Paulsen MF. Learning management systems globally. *Educ Technol Res Dev*. 2015;63(1):5–21.
31. Prabhu V, Singh N, Nair S. LMS impact in Indian universities. *J Educ Technol Soc*. 2023;26(2):112–128.
32. Sharma M, Verma R. Digital tools in higher education. *Int J Online Educ*. 2023;19(4):234–251.
33. Arulchelvan S. LMS effectiveness in rural India. *J Educ Technol Soc*. 2020;23(3):78–95.
34. Kumar A, Singh P, Desai V. Teacher perspectives on LMS. *Educ Technol Res Int*. 2023;42(1):45–62.
35. Mishra S, Pandey A. LMS and achievement gap. *Comp Educ Rev*. 2023;67(3):423–445.
36. Graham CR, Woodfield W, Harrison JB. Blended learning framework. *Internet High Educ*. 2013;18:4–14.
37. Means B, Toyama Y, Murphy R, et al. Online learning meta-analysis. *Teach Coll Rec*. 2013;115(3):1–47.
38. Pearson J, Trinidad S. E-learning in universities. *Internet High Educ*. 2005;8(1):79–98.
39. Tsai FH, Gasevic D. Learning analytics review. *J Learn Anal Rev*. 2017;3(1):1–34.
40. Corbett AT. Cognitive tutors. In: *User Modeling 2001*. Springer; 2001. p. 137–147.
41. Van Merriënboer JJ, Kirschner PA. *Ten steps to complex learning*. 3rd ed. Routledge; 2017.
42. Lovett MC. Cognitive load in simulations. In: *Handbook of Educational Technology*. 2005.
43. Fredricks JA, Blumenfeld PC, Paris AH. School engagement. *Rev Educ Res*. 2004;74(1):59–109.
44. Kellogg S, Wolff A, Booth M. Learning analytics discussions. In: LAK Conference; 2014.
45. Bowles MS, Gasevic D, Siemens G. Adaptive learning overview. EDUCAUSE; 2016.
46. Walton GM, Cohen GL. Social-belonging intervention. *Science*. 2011;331:1447–1451.
47. Bonwell CC, Eison JA. *Active learning*. 1991.
48. Richardson JC, Swan K. Social presence in online courses. *J Asynchronous Learn Netw*. 2003;7(1):68–88.
49. Pekrun R, Goetz T, Titz W, Perry RP. Academic emotions. *Educ Psychol*. 2002;37(2):91–105.
50. Kirschner PA, Sweller J, Clark RE. Minimal guidance failure. *Educ Psychol*. 2006;41(2):75–86.
51. Coffield F, Moseley D, Hall E, Ecclestone K. Learning styles review. 2004.
52. Ohlsson A. Learning challenges study. *J Contin High Educ*. 2026;74(1):1–18.
53. Cohen EB. *Online learning as a strategic tool*. Emerald; 2012.
54. Ministry of Communications & IT, Government of India. Digital infrastructure report [Internet]. 2024.
55. Chakraborty S, Patel R, Kumar A. AI in under-resourced institutions. *J Educ Innov Policy*. 2024;48(2):123–142.
56. Selbst AD, Barocas S. Explainable machines. *Fordham Law Rev*. 2019;87:1085.
57. Gosh S, Sharma R. Digital divide in India. *Int J Dev Issues*. 2023;22(3):234–255.
58. NCERT. State of higher education in India [Internet]. 2023.
59. Horn MB, Staker H. *Blended learning*. Jossey-Bass; 2015.
60. Iyengar R, Sharma A. Digital literacy among faculty. *J Fac Dev*. 2023;39(2):112–130.
61. Donnelly R, Fitzmaurice M. Student feedback analysis. *Eur J Eng Educ*. 2011;36(2):115–126.
62. Bawden D. Digital literacy concepts. In: *Digital Literacies*. 2008.
63. Biggs J, Tang C. *Teaching for quality learning at university*. Open University Press; 2011.
64. Ministry of Education, Government of India. Institutional budgets report [Internet]. 2023.
65. Koskela M, Mäkelä T, Whitehouse D. Adaptive learning outcomes. *J Educ Res Online*. 2022;14(2):58–77.
66. Illeris K. *Contemporary theories of learning*. 2nd ed. Routledge; 2018.
67. Paulsen MF. LMS global experience. *Educ Technol Res Dev*. 2015;63(1):5–21.
68. Crotty M. *Foundations of social research*. Sage; 1998.
69. Bonwell CC, Eison JA. Active learning. 1991.
70. Guskey TR. Teacher professional development. *Teach Teach Educ*. 2002;8(3):381–391.
71. Rose DH, Gravel JW. Universal design for learning. *J Spec Educ Leadersh*. 2010;23(2):67–73.
72. Mohr SC, Shelton K. Student engagement online. *J Asynchronous Learn Netw*. 2017;21(1):105–123.
73. ITU. ICT infrastructure in South Asia [Internet]. 2023.
74. Wiggins G, McTighe J. *Understanding by design*. 2nd ed. ASCD; 2005.
75. Barocas S, Selbst AD. Big data impact. *Calif Law Rev*. 2016;104:671.
76. UNESCO. Digital transformation in Indian higher education [Internet]. 2022.
77. Williamson B. *Big data in education*. Sage; 2017.

78. Boyer EL. *Scholarship reconsidered*. Jossey-Bass; 1990.
79. Dunlosky J, Rawson KA, Marsh EJ, et al. Learning techniques. *Psychol Sci Public Interest*. 2013;14(1):4–58.
80. Darling-Hammond L, Hyler ME, Gardner M. Teacher professional development. 2017.
81. Zuboff S. *The age of surveillance capitalism*. Public Affairs; 2019.
82. O'Neill C. *Weapons of math destruction*. Crown; 2016.
83. Larsson K, Nordström CG. Comparative research methods. In: Routledge; 2015.
84. Zimmerman BJ. Self-regulated learning. *Theory Pract*. 2002;41(2):64–70.
85. Kluger AN, DeNisi A. Feedback interventions. *Psychol Bull*. 1996;119(2):254–284.
86. Campbell DT, Stanley JC. *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs*. Rand McNally; 1963.
87. Flyvbjerg B. Case-study research misunderstandings. *Qual Inq*. 2006;12(2):219–245.