

Artificial Intelligence in Blended Learning: A Global Review of Effectiveness, Integration Patterns, and Emerging Challenges

Sivasankar A.¹

¹Principal
Alpha Arts and Science College
Chennai, Tamilnadu, India

Publication Date: 2026/06/06

Abstract: Across the globe, artificial intelligence is becoming more common in mixed classroom settings, changing both teaching methods and how students interact with material. Findings pulled from various research projects - in schools ranging from elementary to university level - reflect trends seen in regions like Asia and Europe, among others. These investigations looked at different AI tools: some involved smart chat systems, voice assistants driven by algorithms, data-tracking software for learning progress, adaptive course planners, even advanced text-generating models similar to ChatGPT. Results, time after time, show gains in student involvement, drive to learn, and scores on assessments - especially noticeable in picking up new languages or tackling complex technical tasks. While gaps in teacher readiness persist, concerns about ethics in leadership and reliability of assessments over time also need scrutiny. Findings unfold by theme here, shaped alongside worldwide shifts in how tech enters classrooms. Instead of quick fixes, deeper study - tracking outcomes patiently, using stronger methods - could guide wiser use of AI where digital tools meet face-to-face teaching.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Blended Learning, Educational Technology, Student Engagement, Learning Analytics, Chatgpt, Personalized Learning, Higher Education.

How to Cite: Sivasankar A. (2026) Artificial Intelligence in Blended Learning: A Global Review of Effectiveness, Integration Patterns, and Emerging Challenges. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 11(5), 3471-3476. <https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26may2020>

I. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, how people learn has shifted without much fanfare. Digital tools, smarter software, and teaching shaped by information have quietly reshaped classrooms. Blended learning - mixing live instruction with web-based activities - is now common across schools and colleges (Graham, 2006; Garrison & Kanuka, 2004). At first seen as just practical, it now reflects deeper beliefs about teaching. Flexibility matters more today. So does adapting to different ways students absorb material - all while keeping lessons organized and clear.

Looking ahead, putting AI tools into mixed learning environments creates fresh ways to teach. Instead of fixed methods, systems now adjust paths using live results - chatbots answer questions anytime, offering help outside class hours. Such changes aim to move past old models where everyone gets the same lesson, no matter their needs. Evidence is building, not just in theory but through real use across schools worldwide. Places ranging from Shanxi province in China to campuses in Japan and Spain test these

tools daily. Findings show which approaches succeed, who benefits most, and when they work best.

Still, findings across studies show little agreement. While some rely on strong methods and precise instruments, others operate within narrow fields or limited settings. Dramatic improvements in word learning or understanding spoken language appear in certain reports - yet doubts emerge elsewhere about how much students think for themselves or whether using artificial intelligence to grade work raises moral questions. Because of this split picture, a careful overview that pulls together key insights does more than help - it becomes necessary. Clarity matters when educators, leaders, and scholars face constant change without clear direction.

This piece carries out a critical overview. Mainly using seven real-world investigations found via structured queries in Semantic Scholar - details appear in the original document - it explores global uses of artificial intelligence in mixed-mode education, observed results, along with persistent systemic and moral issues. Themes guide the analysis: effects

on academic achievement come first, then learner involvement, teaching improvements follow, hurdles to rollout occupy later sections. Final remarks point toward uncharted areas in scholarship and application.

II. BLENDED LEARNING MEETS ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

➤ *Blended Learning Across Countries*

Though blending face-to-face and digital elements defines its core idea, how people apply blended learning shifts depending on location and level of schooling (Garrison & Kanuka, 2004). While universities in Europe or North America may link it closely to flipping instruction - online lectures paired with active class sessions - the practice looks different elsewhere (Bishop & Verleger, 2013). Moving toward younger learners, such as those in parts of East Asia or the Middle East, lessons often combine set online tasks with conventional teaching methods. These uses emerge partly due to rigid curricular rules shaping what teachers can do (Moskal et al., 2013).

Though different in form, each approach shares a common core - purposeful planning. Instead of viewing digital elements as afterthoughts, strong blended models weave them together with face-to-face sessions to serve clear goals. When AI enters the picture, that thoughtful setup matters even more. Performance does not stem just from the software itself. It hinges largely on how it fits into the overall teaching strategy (Selwyn, 2019).

➤ *How AI Changes Teaching*

Among educational tools, artificial intelligence appears in three distinct forms. One way it shows up is through systems that guide learners individually, adjusting material based on responses while offering tailored explanations - close to what a skilled instructor might do, yet not quite identical (VanLehn, 2011). Another path involves support behind the scenes: analyzing streams of student results to highlight patterns useful for teaching choices, easing routine tasks, or spotting those beginning to drift away from participation (Holmes et al., 2019). Then there are platforms where exploration happens directly within the technology, such as conversations with advanced language programs like ChatGPT - spaces where guidance unfolds during active engagement (Kasneci et al., 2023).

One role might shape assessment methods, whereas another defines what success looks like in education. When a chatbot lifts student satisfaction numbers, deeper understanding could remain unchanged. Teachers using dashboards may refine lesson strategies, yet test results stay flat. Seeing each effect separately leads to clearer judgments about real progress. Honest evaluation depends on untangling these differences.

III. HOW LEARNING PERFORMANCE IS AFFECTED SEEN ACROSS WORLDWIDE RESEARCH

➤ *Learning Language Through Listening*

One reason language education stands out is how well AI fits into mixed teaching setups. Not long ago, Obari and Lambacher looked at voice assistants like Google Home Mini and Alexa within an English course for Japanese undergraduates. Instead of just lectures, learners interacted during lessons plus followed guided routines at home. Their progress got checked via TOEIC, revealing clear improvements in understanding spoken English. Such results point toward machines offering repeated practice without pressure - something traditional schedules often lack.

A different look at primary education comes from Shanxi, where Wu, Abdul Halim, and Mohd Saad explored blended classrooms using artificial intelligence to shape individual learning routes, combined with game-like features for children six to twelve years old. Though not based on randomized trials, the results showed growth - vocabulary skills increased by roughly one-quarter during the observation window. Reading understanding followed a similar trend, climbing close to 30 percent across time. Such outcomes stand out, yet limitations exist due to the brief scope of data collection and the non-random setup of groups. Still hidden within these numbers is evidence that tailored AI support might reshape teaching methods even when tools are limited.

Looking at Korean middle schoolers, Yun and Maeng (2021) studied how mixing AI tools into problem-based learning affected their English growth. Results showed stronger overall performance, especially in speaking and writing - areas usually underemphasized compared to grammar or reading tasks. While traditional methods often overlook these skills, the blend of PBL and artificial intelligence seemed to shift focus. Not just test scores rose; learners also expressed greater interest, felt more motivated, and gained confidence during class activities. Because anxiety around using a new language can block progress, this emotional boost matters. The environment created by technology-supported tasks possibly made practice feel safer, less stressful. Evidence points toward not only cognitive gains but social-emotional ones too when tech meets student-centered teaching (Yun & Maeng, 2021).

➤ *Stem and Problem Solving Contexts*

Engineering education shows mixed outcomes. A study by Sanchez-Ruiz and team (2023) looked at how ChatGPT functioned within a combined math course for new aerospace undergraduates in Spain. Solving both abstract and analytical tasks, the system performed with strong precision - accuracy ranging from 90 to 98 percent - making it useful support during difficult calculations. Yet there emerged an issue echoed often elsewhere: letting artificial intelligence handle mental effort might weaken the learning that comes through working hard to grasp ideas (Sanchez-Ruiz et al., 2023). Balancing quick results against deeper skill growth continues to puzzle educators deeply.

One step past numbers, new questions emerge. According to Kasneci and colleagues in 2023, when artificial systems craft coherent answers in fields far beyond math, teaching norms begin to wobble. Because responses arrive fast - near flawless - from tools like ChatGPT, old-style homework checks lose their grip. Instead of holding tight to rules about honesty and software flags, schools might need deeper shifts. Meaning clings less to the answer now, more to how it was reached.

➤ *Teacher-Mediated Learning Outcomes*

Surprisingly, not every impact of AI in hybrid education shows up in student performance. In one case, research led by Nazaretsky in 2021 looked at Israeli secondary science classes where educators worked with an artificial intelligence system meant to analyze learning patterns. Instead of acting on learners directly, the technology helped teachers craft custom lesson flows more effectively. Those using the platform showed measurable gains in adapting instruction - results were significant at $p = 0.018$. Behind these numbers lies a shift: AI may not replace instructors but actually strengthen their role. Rather than seeing algorithms take over classrooms, this work highlights partnership - a blend of human insight and machine support shaping better teaching strategies.

IV. STUDENT ENGAGEMENT AND MOTIVATION - HOW THEY CONNECT

What stands out across recent work is how involvement in learning shows up - not just as something needed at the start but also as a result shaped by tools like artificial intelligence. A rise of 20 percent in attention levels was seen in young learners following tailored routes built by smart systems, according to Wu and colleagues in 2024 - an impact considered strong given the context. Not far off, Kobicheva's research from the same year showed that when Russian undergraduates interacted with automated conversation helpers during mixed-mode classes, they felt more positive about studying, valued their course more, and viewed tech as helpful. Where effort tends to fade under tough material or unclear teaching methods, such results offer real hope.

What drives these engagement patterns deserves attention. Central to it seems personalization: tailored material, matched to a student's current ability, combined with quick follow-up on answers, makes learning feel more fluid compared to one-size-fits-all teaching methods (VanLehn, 2011). Feedback from AI arrives without delay - instead of facing long waits before getting work back, learners reshape thinking right away, keeping effort alive while limiting irritation.

Surprisingly, Ji, Suo, and Chen (2024) looked into how AI-based grading connects with ongoing learning drive within university-level hybrid courses. Instead of acting directly, AI evaluation appears to shape motivation by way of how well it matches students' personal performance forecasts - a process known as expectation confirmation. Alongside this, the extent to which learners view the system as helpful plays a key role, almost like a quiet signal of reliability toward

the tech itself. In turn, these dynamics echo earlier frameworks on how people adopt new technologies, notably Davis (1989). Because of this alignment, there emerges a reasoned account: certain artificial intelligence tools keep users involved over time, not because they are flashy, but because they build subtle confidence through consistency and relevance once early curiosity fades.

Still, ongoing involvement differs from mere outward conformity. Some scholars warn that settings driven by AI or game-like elements might create a performance of attention - one where students seem involved yet fail to build reflective thinking skills useful beyond the immediate task (Selwyn, 2019). Younger pupils face particular risks here: drawn in by responsive technology, they may absorb content passively even while seeming fully active.

V. PEDAGOGICAL INTEGRATION PATTERNS

Not one but several approaches turned up when looking at how AI entered blended classrooms - five clear models emerged. Each model ties back to a unique idea about where tech fits in teaching. These differences matter, especially for educators weighing options before rolling out new systems.

One way schools use AI appears through supplementary integration - technology adds support without changing main teaching methods. For instance, Obari and Lambacher's 2019 research on AI speakers shows how learners kept following standard classroom lessons for grammar and word knowledge. Outside regular sessions, though, they practiced speaking with AI devices. Because it does not demand major changes, this method faces fewer barriers during setup. Still, benefits often stay limited to just one skill area shaped by the tool's design.

Starting differently each time, one approach places artificial intelligence at the heart of teaching. For instance, research on tailored education sequences - Wu and colleagues in 2024 - fits this form. So does work led by Sanchez-Ruiz using ChatGPT in engineering instruction two years prior. Rather than sitting at the edges, technology drives key activities here. When built well, it shapes how knowledge transfers; when flawed, outcomes suffer. Though capable of deeper change, misalignment with course goals or student needs can lead to weaker results.

Later in practice, artificial intelligence supports scoring and responses instead of relying solely on teachers' evaluations through code-driven analysis. Work by Ji and colleagues in 2024 observed such setups within university hybrid courses, noting how machine-generated appraisals shaped students' drive to engage further. When examining tools designed to assess written work automatically, findings indicate robotic commentary performs similarly to instructor remarks regarding grammar or spelling. Yet, when dealing with nuanced expression - like structured reasoning or persuasive depth - software judgments trail behind personal ones repeatedly, according to Warschauer and Grimes from 2008.

Later evidence from Nazaretsky and colleagues in 2021 shows how artificial intelligence helps teachers by analyzing student results and suggesting practical next steps in instruction. When class sizes grow, personal oversight often shrinks - here, automated insights become especially valuable. Such approaches fit alongside evolving work in education research that uses data to understand learning, as seen in Siemens and Baker's review from 2012.

Putting together different modes of AI, like in Yun and Maeng's 2021 project using problem-based learning, brings multiple strategies into one teaching environment. Though it could change education more than other methods, it requires advanced preparation for educators and strong technology support - resources not equally available worldwide.

VI. IMPLEMENTATION CHALLENGES AND SYSTEMIC BARRIERS

➤ *Challenges with Technology and Infrastructure*

Most studies overlook how tough it is to actually put AI into classrooms. Without stable web access, working software platforms, suitable devices, or help when things go wrong, implementation falters - unevenly across countries and inside them too (Selwyn, 2019). Places with less money, like parts of Southeast Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa, and remote areas in Latin America, often lack the basics needed for AI-supported hybrid teaching - at least for many children who attend school.

Though schools may have ample resources, problems merging new technology still emerge regularly. When AI platforms fail to work smoothly with school software, lessons can stall before they start. Content made by artificial intelligence often misses key points outlined in official course plans. Fixed class schedules add another layer of difficulty, limiting room for experimental tasks. One team, led by Nazaretsky and colleagues in 2021, built their system differently - by inviting teachers into design meetings early on. Their approach treated teacher insight not as optional feedback but as essential infrastructure for long-term success.

➤ *Teacher Training and Classroom Preparedness*

One clear challenge stands out in nearly every study examined: teachers often lack proper training. To weave AI effectively into mixed classroom settings, educators need skills beyond simply using digital devices. Grasping how these systems operate becomes essential, along with knowing which activities suit them well - and where they might fall short unexpectedly. Missing such insight can lead some instructors to trust automated results too easily, while others steer completely clear, held back by hesitation or confusion (Holmes et al., 2019).

Though scattered efforts exist, structured support for educators using artificial intelligence in classrooms stays limited. Teacher preparation often overlooks how machine-driven learning changes knowledge itself. Instead of isolated sessions, long-term training rooted in real classroom experience gains backing across research circles. Evidence grows that meaningful integration hinges on continuous

guidance, not occasional seminars. Such insight reflects findings tied to systemic backing for evolving teaching methods amid digital transformation (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019).

➤ *Student Independence and Clear Thinking*

Worry grows especially loud within universities about artificial intelligence weakening a student's ability to think critically on their own. Take the 2023 engineering research led by Sanchez-Ruiz: as ChatGPT nails math questions almost flawlessly, learners might lean toward speed instead of depth, getting right answers yet failing to grasp how those solutions unfold step by step. Because such tools deliver results so smoothly, the learning behind them often gets left behind. Though past tools sparked similar debates - calculators changing how kids learn arithmetic, spelling aids reshaping writing classrooms - the sheer power and reach of today's language systems shifts the situation into new territory. While earlier technologies nudged habits slightly, these newer forms stretch further, acting deeper across more subjects at once.

Kasneji et al. (2023) suggest teachers should shape assignments so AI cannot finish them easily, or build in steps where learners question and develop further what AI produces instead of taking it at face value. Far from being just an easy way out, technology becomes a collaborator in thought through such approaches. Such a shift relies on inventive lesson planning alongside straightforward explanations about goals, shared directly with pupils.

➤ *Privacy Equity Bias Ethics*

Though empirical studies rarely tackle ethics in AI-driven classrooms, theory and policy papers now spotlight these issues more often. Because artificial intelligence gathers detailed records on student actions, worries emerge around permission, control over information, and who gains from insights drawn out (Williamson, 2017). Where laws exist, they frequently trail behind technological advances - creating uncertainty for schools trying to manage data responsibly without solid rules to follow.

Just as pressing is the fairness of who gets access. When AI-supported hybrid teaching shows stronger results mainly for pupils equipped with dependable technology, high-speed connectivity, and solid digital skills, expanding such models - without fixing systemic imbalances - could deepen current gaps instead of closing them. According to Holmes and colleagues (2019), artificial intelligence in classrooms so far tends to help only those already ahead, a trend unsettling for anyone truly invested in equal opportunity.

VII. FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

Though findings point a certain way, flaws in how research was done hold back strong conclusions. Because assigning students randomly often feels wrong or too hard in classrooms, many projects skipped true experiments, leaning instead on less rigid setups - this weakens claims about cause and effect. Tools used to track results differ widely from one report to another, so matching apples to apples becomes

tricky. Long stretches go unmeasured; nearly all attention sticks to changes seen within just months, leaving unknown if gains fade, grow, or vanish later down the road (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019).

Looking ahead, studies ought to follow groups of students exposed to artificial intelligence across several years, using time to reveal patterns beyond test scores - such as how judgment, teamwork, handling uncertain situations, and navigating complex information evolve. Instead of isolated efforts, shared tools for assessment built through joint work could allow findings to be compared meaningfully, something today's scattered landscape blocks. Bringing numbers together with personal insights from classrooms - the voices of educators and learners woven into analysis - might finally fill a gap: context lost in most current reports.

One cannot overlook the urgency of expanding scholarly work from regions across the Global South. Most current findings emerge out of East Asia, Europe, and North America - areas where research capacity happens to be concentrated, not necessarily representative of learner diversity worldwide. To grasp what actually unfolds when AI-supported learning enters settings marked by limited connectivity, multiple languages in one classroom, or differing attitudes toward tech and hierarchy requires deeper inquiry. Without such awareness, discoveries risk being too narrow, useful only under specific conditions instead of offering broader understanding.

VIII. CONCLUSION

Though still emerging, artificial intelligence subtly alters how blended learning takes shape across classrooms today. Evidence gathered here suggests it can strengthen language skills, adapt instruction to individual needs, assist educators in making choices, while also deepening involvement - yet hurdles remain persistent. Some teachers feel unprepared; others question its impact on reasoning abilities. Unequal access surfaces repeatedly. So does concern about moral implications. Understanding continues to grow.

It stands out that artificial intelligence will not boost hybrid education just by being present. Depending on how lessons are planned, where it is used, who teaches, and whether students shape their own learning instead of simply receiving automated results, outcomes shift noticeably. In cases where integration worked well, one thing stayed consistent - AI supported defined teaching aims, never replaced them.

Though artificial intelligence grows stronger while becoming cheaper, schools worldwide now face a different kind of decision - not if they should use AI within mixed learning models, yet how best to apply it carefully, fairly, ensuring alignment with education's core mission: nurturing thoughtful, skilled people guided by ethics. Tackling this task demands ongoing teamwork between scientists, teachers, government figures, along with students who experience these systems firsthand.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Bishop, J. L., & Verleger, M. A. (2013). The flipped classroom: A survey of the research. ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition Proceedings.
- [2]. Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly*, 13(3), 319–340.
- [3]. Garrison, D. R., & Kanuka, H. (2004). Blended learning: Uncovering its transformative potential in higher education. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 7(2), 95–105.
- [4]. Graham, C. R. (2006). Blended learning systems: Definition, current trends, and future directions. In C. J. Bonk & C. R. Graham (Eds.), *Handbook of blended learning: Global perspectives, local designs* (pp. 3–21). Pfeiffer.
- [5]. Holmes, W., Bialik, M., & Fadel, C. (2019). *Artificial intelligence in education: Promises and implications for teaching and learning*. Center for Curriculum Redesign.
- [6]. Ji, H., Suo, L., & Chen, H. (2024). AI performance assessment in blended learning: Mechanisms and effects on students' continuous learning motivation. *Frontiers in Psychology*.
- [7]. Kasneci, E., Sessler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., Gasser, U., Groh, G., Günemann, S., Hüllermeier, E., Krusche, S., Kutyniok, G., Michaeli, T., Nerdel, C., Pfeffer, J., Poquet, O., Sailer, M., Schmidt, A., Seidel, T., ... Kasneci, G. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 103, 102274.
- [8]. Kobicheva, A. (2024). Students' intention to learn and academic performance in the blended learning environment: The role of artificial intelligence chatbots. *International Journal of Information and Education Technology*, 14(1).
- [9]. Moskal, P., Dziuban, C., & Hartman, J. (2013). Blended learning: A dangerous idea? *The Internet and Higher Education*, 18, 15–23.
- [10]. Nazaretsky, T., Bar, C., Walter, M., & Alexandron, G. (2021). Empowering teachers with AI: Co-designing a learning analytics tool for personalized instruction in the science classroom. *International Conference on Learning Analytics and Knowledge*.
- [11]. Obari, H., & Lambacher, S. (2019). Improving the English skills of native Japanese using artificial intelligence in a blended learning program. *Proceedings of the CALL Conference*.
- [12]. Sanchez-Ruiz, L., Moll-Lopez, S., Nunez-Perez, A., Morano-Fernandez, J., & Vega-Fleitas, E. (2023). ChatGPT challenges blended learning methodologies in engineering education: A case study in mathematics. *Applied Sciences*, 13(10), 6039.
- [13]. Selwyn, N. (2019). *Should robots replace teachers? AI and the future of education*. Polity Press.
- [14]. Siemens, G., & Baker, R. S. (2012). Learning analytics and educational data mining: Towards communication and collaboration. *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Learning Analytics and Knowledge*, 252–254.

- [15]. VanLehn, K. (2011). The relative effectiveness of human tutoring, intelligent tutoring systems, and other tutoring systems. *Educational Psychologist*, 46(4), 197–221.
- [16]. Warschauer, M., & Grimes, D. (2008). Automated writing assessment in the classroom. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, 3(1), 22–36.
- [17]. Williamson, B. (2017). *Big data in education: The digital future of learning, policy and practice*. SAGE.
- [18]. Wu, Z., Abdul Halim, H., & Mohd Saad, M. R. (2024). Artificial intelligence (AI) and gamification in blended learning: Enhancing language and literacy in Shanxi, China. *Malaysian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 9(1).
- [19]. Yun, K., & Maeng, U. (2021). The effect of PBL based blended instruction utilizing AI platforms on L2 learning. *Modern English Education*, 22(1), 14–26.
- [20]. Zawacki-Richter, O., Marin, V. I., Bond, M., & Gouverneur, F. (2019). Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education—where are the educators? *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 16(1), 39.