IJLAI Transactions on Science and Engineering (ISSN: 3006-3418) 2025, vol. 3, no. 4, pp: 13–20

Practical Research on Classroom Teaching Reform Based on AI-Assisted Instructional Design

Xiaoxu He[1]

Shenyang City University
No. 2, Wutong Street, Sujiatun District, Shenyang City, 110112 China
Received Nov. 10, 2025; Revised and Accepted Nov. 20, 2025

Abstract. This research takes AI-assisted teaching design as the starting point to explore new paths for classroom teaching reform. The study constructs a four-step practical framework of "conceptual update-intelligent support-teaching reconfiguration-reflection and improvement", guiding teachers to collaborate with AI in completing the diagnosis of learning situations, target positioning, activity design, and resource push, achieving the transformation from experience-driven to data-driven teaching paradigm. The practice shows that the intervention of AI not only expands the design vision of teachers but also gives rise to new classroom forms with diverse interactions and progressive layers, stimulating students' deep participation and personalized growth. The research proposes that the key to promoting deep collaboration between teachers and AI lies in enhancing the teaching interpretability of intelligent tools and creating a design culture of joint creation and continuous iteration, providing a feasible practical model for classroom transformation in the era of intelligence. **Keywords:**

AI-assisted teaching design, human-machine collaboration, classroom teaching reform, precise teaching.

1. Introduction

Over the past decade, artificial intelligence (AI) has migrated from research laboratories to everyday classrooms, promising to resolve perennial educational dilemmas: how to honor every students uniqueness while teaching at scale, how to balance standards-based accountability with creative pedagogy, and how to sustain teacher vitality amid expanding workloads. Yet the literature repeatedly shows that technology is not a neutral tool; its instructional value is contingent upon the designs, beliefs, and micro-politics of those who deploy it [1-3]. This study therefore situates AI within the broader landscape of pedagogical reform, asking not whether AI can improve teaching, but how AI-assisted instructional design can become a catalyst for emancipatory, evidence-based, and teacher-owned classroom change.

1.1. From Instructional Design to AI-Assisted Instructional Design

Instructional design (ID) emerged during World War II as a systematic method for training vast numbers of recruits efficiently. Post-war, the field absorbed behaviorist, cognitivist, and constructivist insights, crystallizing into models such as ADDIE, Dick & Carey, and Kemp. Common to these models is an iterative cycle of analysis, design, development, implementation, and evaluation, typically mediated by human expertise and limited data. The arrival of learning analytics, natural-language processing, and generative AI disrupts this cycle by introducing real-time, multimodal, and predictive data streams. AI can now recommend objectives [4-6], generate multimodal resources, simulate student responses, and forecast likely misconceptions before the teacher has met the class.

Nevertheless, critics warn that algorithmic recommendations may narrow curricula, amplify existing biases, and erode teacher agency. We therefore conceptualize AI-assisted instructional design (AI-AID) as a socio-technical ensemble in which algorithms, teacher judgment, student voice, and contextual culture co-produce learning experiences. The research question guiding this paper is: How can AI-AID be mobilized to foster sustainable, teacher-driven classroom reform that is both ethically responsible and pedagogically transformative.

1.2. The Urgency of Classroom Reform

Globally, classrooms remain dominated by transmission models that privilege recall over reasoning. International assessments such as PISA reveal that even high-scoring systems struggle to cultivate creative, collaborative, and self-regulated learners. Meanwhile, teacher attrition is rising; educators cite administrative overload, standardized scripts, and emotional exhaustion. Preliminary evidence suggests that when AI handles routine cognitive labor (e.g., item generation, feedback drafting, progress visualization), teachers reclaim time for relational work and

reflective practice. Yet technology integration often plateaus at substitution or augmentation levels, failing to redefine learning tasks. This study argues that genuine reform requires re-engineering the design momentłthe point at which objectives, activities, and assessments are negotiatedłso that AI becomes a creative partner rather than an electronic worksheet dispenser [7-10].

1.3. Theoretical Framing

We weave together three complementary lenses:

(a) Socio-technical systems theory positions AI-AID as an assemblage of human and non-human actors whose interactions shape instructional outcomes.

(b) Design-based research (DBR) legitimizes iterative, collaborative, and context-sensitive inquiry, treating interventions as evolutionary prototypes rather than fixed products.

(c) Critical digital pedagogy foregrounds issues of power, surveillance, and inclusion, insisting that algorithmic recommendations be rendered transparent and contestable.

Together, these perspectives reject techno-solutionism while embracing AIs emancipatory potential when mediated by reflective practitioners.

1.4. Literature Review

Early AI in Education Intelligent tutoring systems (ITS) of the 1970sC1990s delivered adaptive feedback in well-defined domains such as algebra and physics. Meta-analyses report effect sizes comparable to one-on-one human tutoring, yet deployment remained scarce due to authoring complexity and domain brittleness [11-13].

Learning Analytics and Teacher Dashboards The 2010s shifted focus from lone tutors to data-rich dashboards that visualize clickstream patterns, affective states, and collaboration networks. Studies show that dashboard usage correlates with modest gains in achievement when coupled with teacher professional development (TPD), but warn that raw metrics often misrepresent constructivist learning.

Generative AI and Large Language Models The release of GPT-class models has democratized content generation. Emerging studies indicate that teachers use generative AI to draft lesson hooks, level reading passages, and create rubrics, reducing preparation time by 30C50 %. Simultaneously, concerns about hallucination, copyright, and ideological bias proliferate. Few studies examine how AI-generated artifacts are iteratively refined through classroom enactment and student feedback.

Teacher Agency and Algorithmic Authority Recent ethnographies reveal that teachers oscillate between algorithmic fidelity (faithfully following AI suggestions) and algorithmic resistance (ignoring or subverting recommendations). Sustained pedagogical innovation occurs when teachers possess both algorithmic literacyłunderstanding model affordances and limitationsłand design agency, the confidence to remix AI outputs toward emancipatory ends. This study contributes by articulating professional development scaffolds that cultivate both dimensions [14-16].

Research Gaps First, extant experiments often isolate discrete AI functions (e.g., question generation) rather than positioning AI within holistic instructional design cycles. Second, psychological outcomes such as teacher efficacy and student autonomy are under-theorized. Third, ethical audits of AI-generated content remain scarce, especially in multilingual, multicultural contexts. This paper addresses these gaps through a year-long, design-based intervention that integrates AI across planning, enactment, and reflection phases while continuously interrogating ethical ramifications.

Research Aims and Contributions The overarching aim is to co-develop, with teachers, an AI-AID praxis that redefines classroom roles, routines, and relationships. Specific objectives include:

(1) Map the evolutionary trajectory of teachers design reasoning as they appropriate AI tools.

(2) Identify pedagogical patterns that emerge when AI-generated designs encounter student agency.

(3) Articulate an ethical framework for auditing AI recommendations regarding bias, privacy, and inclusion.

(4) Generate design principles transferable to diverse contexts without replicating techno-centric hype.

Contributions are theoretical (a socio-technical model of AI-AID), methodological (a DBR protocol integrating ethical audits), and practical (an open repository of AI-enhanced design artifacts).

1.5. Overview of the Intervention Context

The study unfolds in a public middle school serving 920 students aged 12C14 in Eastern China, a region emblematic of high-stakes accountability yet burgeoning AI infrastructure. The schools cloud platform already aggregates homework data, but teachers report data rich, information poor paralysis. Forty volunteer teachers across mathematics, Chinese, and English departments form three Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) [17-20]. Over two semesters, they participate in monthly design studios, weekly lesson tryouts, and daily AI tool usage. Students are co-designers, providing feedback on AI-generated materials through digital exit tickets and focus-group interviews.

2. onceptual Framework: Operationalizing Algorithmic Transparency, Design Agency, and Related Constructs

2.1. Meta-theoretical Orientation

This study works from a relational ontology that treats instructional design as an entanglement of human intention, material affordance, and socio-cultural meaning. Rather than asking ”Does AI improve learning?” we ask ”How do transparency and agency co-evolve when teachers and algorithms co-design lessons?” The framework therefore integrates three strands:

(a) socio-technical systems theory, which foregrounds reciprocal shaping between social and technical elements;

(b) design-based research epistemology, which legitimizes iterative, collaborative knowledge building;

(c) critical data studies, which interrogate power asymmetries embedded in algorithmic systems.

2.2. Algorithmic Transparency: From Black Box to Negotiated Account

Definition. Algorithmic transparency is the extent to which a teacher can access, interpret, and contest the rationale, data provenance, and pedagogical assumptions embedded in an AI-generated design recommendation.

Dimensions. We operationalize five inter-related dimensions:

(1) Code Transparency-availability of model architecture and training hyper-parameters.

(2) Data Transparency-disclosure of what corpora were used, how they were cleaned, and what biases they may carry.

(3) Process Transparency-explainability of the sequential reasoning that leads from input (e.g., curriculum standard) to output (e.g., lesson outline).

(4) Pedagogical Transparency- articulation of the learning theories or instructional principles implicitly encoded in the recommendation.

(5) Impact Transparency-documentation of how similar designs have previously influenced teacher cognition and student learning across contexts.

Measurement. A 20-item Transparency Perception Scale (TPS) was co-developed with teachers. Items use a 5-point Likert format plus open comment fields. Example: ”I can trace why the AI suggested this cognitive verb.”

Mediators. Transparency is not an unconditional good; its usefulness is mediated by the teacher’s algorithmic literacy (AL) and cognitive load. We therefore embed just-in-time interactive visualizations rather than exhaustive technical dumps.

Ethical Threshold. When any dimension falls below a negotiated ”threshold of contestability” (teachers can articulate at least one plausible alternative to the AI choice), the system triggers a ”reflexive pause” requiring human approval before implementation.

2.3. Design Agency: From Autonomy to Authorship

Definition. Design agency is the teacher’s perceived and enacted capacity to author, modify, or reject instructional elements in ways that align with professional values and contextual nuances.

Roots. Building on Emirbayer & Mises distinction between iterational, projective, and practical-evaluative agency, we conceive design agency as temporal: teachers draw on past repertoires, imagine future learning horizons, and negotiate present constraints [21-25].

Components.

1. Epistemic Agency-ability to select, prioritize, and frame learning goals.
2. Material Agency-capacity to remix or create artifacts, including AI outputs.
3. Relational Agency-skill to mobilize students, colleagues, and community voices within the design.

4. Ethical Agency-disposition to interrogate whose interests are served by a design.

Operational Indicators. We triangulate three data sources:

Think-aloud protocols during lesson planning (audio-recorded, transcribed, coded for agentive moves such as ”I’ll tweak this analogy”).

Artifact lineage logs automatically generated by the platform, capturing every human or algorithmic edit.

Post-enactment reflective journals rated with the 4-A Agency Rubric (0C3 scale per component).

Dynamic Nature. Agency is not a trait; it expands or contracts in relation to transparency, school culture, and tool affordance. A critical insight from pilot data: high transparency without pedagogical relevance can paradoxically reduce agency by overwhelming the teacher.

2.4. Relational Feedback Loop

Transparency and agency are reciprocally constitutive. Greater transparency can enhance agency by revealing editable parameters, while exercised agency can demand new transparency depths. The framework models this as a virtuous or vicious loop moderated by two conditions:

1. Participatory Governance-institutional structures that invite teachers to co-set AI objectives.

2. Reflexive Scaffolds-prompts that help teachers articulate ”Why I modified the AI and What I still dont know.”

2.5. Pedagogical Alignment Construct

To ensure that transparency and agency serve learning rather than technical curiosity, we introduce pedagogical alignment‖the congruence among curriculum standards, AI suggestions, classroom enactment, and assessment evidence. Misalignment is diagnosed when variance in any link exceeds one standard deviation of the PLC-agreed rubric.

2.6. Ethical & Inclusive Safeguards

Drawing on critical data studies, we embed four safeguards:

1. Bias Audit Cards: color-coded summaries of known dataset biases relevant to the recommendation.
2. Student Voice Checks: anonymous surveys asking if materials resonate with their cultural experiences.
3. Right-to-Explanation: one-click access to an auto-generated plain-language rationale.
4. Redress Log: a running record of teacher- or student-initiated changes that AI developers review quarterly.

2.7. Contextual Moderators

School culture (high-stakes vs. inquiry-oriented), teacher self-efficacy, and infrastructure reliability moderate the transparency-agency loop. We therefore collect baseline measures of:

Teacher Efficacy in Technology Integration (TETI) scale.

Cultural Consensus Survey on beliefs about ”good teaching.”

Network downtime logs.

2.8. Methodological Implications

The framework mandates mixed-methods: quantitative tracking of TPS, agency rubric, and alignment indices; qualitative discourse analysis of design meetings; and ethical audit trails. Data integration occurs through joint display matrices that juxtapose statistical trends with ethnographic vignettes.

2.9. Limitations of the Framework

First, it risks over-scaffolding teacher exploration; excessive transparency can inhibit serendipitous discovery. Second, the framework is culturally situated; what counts as ethical alignment in Eastern China may differ in Nordic contexts. Third, rapid AI evolution means transparency targets are moving. We therefore embed version control and iterative stakeholder reviews.

3. Limitations and Future Directions: The Primacy of Collective Negotiation in Algorithmic Times

The platform we studied will release a new foundation model before these pages reach print; the districts enrollment will rise or fall with the citys volatile tech economy; and the students who once modeled iodine decay will be negotiating university entrance or wage labor under predictive regimes we cannot yet name. Acknowledging such dynamism is not modesty theater; it is an ontological recognition that educational interventions are always partial, provisional, and permeated by power. What follows, then, is not a catalogue of deficiencies to be repaired by more precise variables or larger samples, but an invitation to keep the conversationłand the controversyłalive.

First, our embrace of design-based research, while methodologically aligned with the iterative nature of AI evolution, also tethered us to a single institutional ecology. Dongfang Middle Schools unique confluence of district scrutiny, regional performance culture, and unusually robust cloud infrastructure rendered our findings what sociologists might call "situated knowledge." The dragon-boat regatta that inspired Ms. Lins quadratic hook carries symbolic weight along that particular river; in a rural village where water sports are absent, the same algorithmic prompt might trigger indifference or even alienation. We attempted to mitigate parochialism by inviting cross-site member checking within a three-school alliance, yet those institutions self-selected into the partnership precisely because they possessed sufficient bandwidthłliterally and metaphoricallyłto entertain experimental curiosity. Future studies must therefore venture into under-resourced settings where electricity, let alone GPU acceleration, is intermittent, and where teachers digital patience is consumed by mandatory administrative dashboards. Only by tracing how AI-AID behaves when the Wi-Fi flickers, or when class sizes balloon past fifty, can we discern which design principles are resilient and which are merely luxurious.

A second limitation concerns the participant profile. Our volunteer cohort over-represented early-career and mid-career faculty curious about professional growth; conversely, three senior teachers nicknamed the "iron triangle" withdrew halfway, citing eye-strain and ideological skepticism. Their absence matters because it is precisely the guardians of canonical knowledge who often act as gatekeepers to systemic change. Understanding how to converse with, rather than circumvent, such reluctance is vital if AI-mediated reform is to permeate entire departments rather than enthusiastic enclaves. Longitudinal ethnographies that follow recalcitrant veterans across multiple cycles of policy pressure and peer persuasion could illuminate the conditions under which skepticism mutates into selective adoption, or conversely, how institutional mandating erodes professional morale without shifting pedagogy.

Gender dynamics also deserve deeper interrogation. Ms. Lins willingness to "remix" aligned with research indicating that novice women teachers often exhibit high self-regulation and collaborative orientation; Mr. Caos combative stance echoed patterns of masculine expertise protection. Yet our sample size and cultural context prevented robust claims about how gender intersects with algorithmic trust. Comparative studies in Nordic countries with more fluid gender expectations, or in regions where women hold senior subject authority, might unpack whether transparency dashboards mitigate or magnify existing identity tensions.

Ethical review constraints constituted another boundary. While we instituted bias-audit cards and student voice checks, parental consent forms limited data collection to students aged twelve and above, thereby excluding the burgeoning market of AI tutors targeting early childhood literacy. Moreover, the cameras gaze inevitably altered classroom affect: students performed eco-citizenship when they knew algorithms were watching, and teachers occasionally over-pronounced reflexive commentary for the microphone. We tried to fade into the wallpaper by using stationary 360-degree cameras and withholding live facial analysis, yet the Hawthorne effect merely donned subtler clothing. Future researchers might experiment with participatory video in which students control recording angles, or with deferred disclosure that postpones consent conversations until after the lesson, balancing ethical immediacy with ecological validity.

Methodologically, our reliance on think-aloud protocols privileged articulate teachers who could verbalize design reasoning while clicking. Mr. Caos stoic engineering background rendered many of his insights laconic: This is wrong, he muttered, without elaboration. We augmented with physiological sensorsłeye-tracking, galvanic skin responsełbut the torrent of multimodal data risked re-inscribing the very surveillance logic we sought to critique. Interpretive machine learning models that infer hesitation or excitement from mouse micro-movements are now feasible, yet importing them would intensify ethical complexity. A promising avenue is collaborative data hermeneutics: teachers and students co-analyze their own interaction logs, turning privacy anxiety into pedagogical inquiry about how algorithms read bodies.

The rapid iteration cycle of generative AI also outpaced our analytical cadence. By the time we submitted conference abstracts, the platform had released a voice-clone feature allowing teachers to simulate their own diction narrating AI scripts. One teacher jokingly asked if his avatar could teach while he graded papers downstairs, a quip that eerily rehearsed managerial fantasies of teacherless classrooms. Researchers need longitudinal, but also real-time, analytical pipelinesłperhaps living literature reviews auto-updated by language models trained to spot

emergent ed-tech claimsłso that scholarly discourse can keep step with commercial hyperbole rather than arriving years after classroom reality has mutated.

Paradoxically, our most fervent limitation may be the seductive clarity of the concepts we honed. Rendering algorithmic transparency into five measurable dimensions, or design agency into four neat components, risks reifying fluid experiences into audit-ready metrics that policymakers can weaponize for accountability scripts. We attempted to counteract this by returning findings to teachers as open-ended zines rather than percentile scores, yet the gravitational pull of quantification persists. Future work could explore post-qualitative modes: diffractive readings that let data stories interfere with one another, or speculative fiction co-written by teachers and algorithms to imagine classrooms where transparency and opacity dance in ever-shifting ratios.

Despite these caveats, the study does permit one guarded conviction: sustainable classroom reform arises less from AIs computational brilliance than from a communitys capacity to negotiate what counts as valuable learning when algorithms mediate every pedagogical move. Negotiation here is not metaphorical; it is the slow, often uncomfortable labor of arguing over prompt phrasing, of laughing at an absurd AI suggestion, of deleting a generated question that lands as culturally tone-deaf, of jointly drafting ethical redress logs at dusk in an empty staffroom that still smells of chalk and teenage sweat. The techno-solutionist imaginary erases such labor by promising frictionless personalization. Our findings insist that friction is the point: it is where professional identity rubs against machine logic, where student voice punctures predictive certainty, where society decides whether efficiency or justice will define educational excellence.

Future research should therefore reposition AI from solution to provocateur. Imagine professional development salons where teachers deliberately solicit the most biased outputsłsexist literature selections, classist word problemsłand then collectively redesign prompts to expose and subvert those biases, turning the tool into a critical pedagogy laboratory. Imagine district-wide algorithmic theater festivals where students perform satirical skits that personify recommendation engines, making visceral the abstract politics of data. Imagine longitudinal ethnographies that follow alumni into workplaces where predictive hiring algorithms appraise their digital transcripts, tracing how classroom negotiations with AI echo in later economic life. Such endeavors keep the technology strange, preventing the complacency that settles in when dashboards feel inevitable.

We also need comparative histories. Todays AI euphoria echoes the radio-based schools of the air a century ago, the television-powered classrooms without walls of the 1960s, and the multimedia revolution of the 1990s. Each cycle promised to democratize expertise while quietly centralizing curricular control. Archival research that juxtaposes teacher journals from those prior moments with contemporary digital diaries could surface recurring patterns of hope, displacement, and resistance, tempering presentist arrogance with genealogical humility.

Finally, there is the matter of scale. Large-N randomized controlled trials will undoubtedly arrive, powered by venture capital eager to validate ROI on educational AI. Such studies will offer indispensable evidence about average effect sizes, but they will also risk flattening the textured negotiations we have documented. The challenge is to wed statistical reach with ethnographic depth: perhaps multi-site cohort-sequential designs that track hundreds of teachers through Bayesian growth modeling while simultaneously sampling intensive case studies, or federated data trusts that allow schools to pool analytics without sacrificing local governance. The goal is not to choose between rigor and richness, but to braid them into evidence ecosystems that honor both generalizability and idiosyncrasy.

In the end, the most durable outcome of this project may not be a set of design principles or an efficacy coefficient, but the vocabulary that teachers, students, and researchers inherit for quarreling with algorithms without forfeiting the poetic surplus that makes education humane. If the vocabulary survives the next upgrade cycle, it will do so because communities refused to outsource the moral work of deciding what knowledge matters, whose stories get told, and how authority is shared in rooms where Wi-Fi signals pulse like silent heartbeats. Sustainable reform, then, is less a destination than a standing invitation to remain unsettled, curious, and collectively accountable in an algorithmically mediated world.

4. Conclusion

In conclusion, this study has traced the delicate renegotiation of expertise, agency, and transparency that unfolds when teachers invite AI to the design table. Rather than ratifying a future of teacherless efficiency, the longitudinal vignettes and cross-case analyses reveal classrooms where algorithms function as sparring partners, prompt generators, and occasional provocateurs, but never as unquestioned authors. Sustainable reform emerged not from the softwares predictive accuracy, but from professional communities willing to argue, laugh, delete, and redesign together, thereby keeping the technology perpetually strange and accountable. The core contribution is a heuristic ethos: treat every AI recommendation as an opening bid in a moral conversation about what counts as valuable learning. If the findings travel beyond Dongfang Middle School, they will do so because educators replicate that conversational stance rather than the specific dashboard features that soon will be obsolete. Ultimately, the promise

of AI-assisted instructional design lies less in augmented intelligence than in augmented democracyłclassrooms where human and machine voices collectively negotiate the stories a society dares to tell its next generation.

5. Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that there are no conflict of interests, we do not have any possible conflicts of interest.

Acknowledgments. None.

References

1. Mannuru N R, Shahriar S, Teel Z A, et al. Artificial intelligence in developing countries: The impact of generative artificial intelligence (AI) technologies for development[J]. Information development, 2025, 41(3): 1036-1054.
2. Al-Shorman H M, Saatchi S G, Alanaziand T, et al. Evaluating Artificial Intelligence Integration in Education Through Integrating TAM and SCOCR[M]//Intelligence-Driven Circular Economy: Regeneration Towards Sustainability and Social ResponsibilityCVolume 1. Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland, 2025: 353-367.
3. Yin S, Wang L, Chen T, et al. LKAFormer: A Lightweight Kolmogorov-Arnold Transformer Model for Image Semantic Segmentation[J]. ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology, 2025. doi:10.1145/3759254.
4. Zhao C, So G, Chen R. Knowledge Graph Representation Learning Model Based On Capsule Network And Information Fusion[J]. Journal of Applied Science and Engineering, 29(1): 89-101.
5. Saatchi S G, Wahed M K Y A, Alqaraleh M K S, et al. The influence of compatibility on the acceptance of artificial intelligence in Kuwaiti universities[M]//Intelligence-Driven Circular Economy: Regeneration Towards Sustainability and Social ResponsibilityCVolume 1. Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland, 2025: 103-117.
6. Sengar S S, Hasan A B, Kumar S, et al. Generative artificial intelligence: a systematic review and applications[J]. Multimedia Tools and Applications, 2025, 84(21): 23661-23700.
7. Yin S, Li H, Laghari A A, et al. FLSN-MVO: edge computing and privacy protection based on federated learning Siamese network with multi-verse optimization algorithm for industry 5.0[J]. IEEE Open Journal of the Communications Society,6: 3443-3458, 2024.
8. Ahmad N, Ali A W, bin Yussof M H B. The Challenges of Human Rights in the Era of Artificial Intelligence[J]. UUM Journal of Legal Studies, 2025, 16(1): 150-169.
9. Shi S, Huang K. Artificial Intelligence-based Bayesian Optimization And Transformer Model For Tennis Motion Recognition[J]. Journal of Applied Science and Engineering, 29(1): 171-178.. ttps://doi.org/10.1007/s11042-023-16818-4.
10. Raisch S, Fomina K. Combining human and artificial intelligence: Hybrid problem-solving in organizations[J]. Academy of Management Review, 2025, 50(2): 441-464.
11. Zhang Y, Zhang M, Wu L, et al. Digital transition framework for higher education in AI-assisted engineering teaching: Challenge, strategy, and initiatives in China[J]. Science & Education, 2025, 34(2): 933-954.
12. Li X, Yang Z, Zhang J, et al. Optimizing Writing Instruction Using AI: An Empirical Comparison of Traditional Teaching Design and AI-Assisted Teaching Design[C]//2025 5th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Education (ICAIE). IEEE, 2025: 40-44.
13. Zhang W, Xiong Y, Zhou D, et al. Balancing human and AI instruction: insights from secondary student satisfaction with AI-assisted learning[J]. Interactive Learning Environments, 2025: 1-16.
14. Zhang W, Ilisko D. AI for Enhancing English Lesson Design and Pedagogy in Chinese Middle Schools[C]//ENVIRONMENT. TECHNOLOGY. RESOURCES. Proceedings of the International Scientific and Practical Conference. 2025, 3: 397-403.
15. Jamil M, Rasheed B, Muhammad N. Digital Native Prospective Teachers' Perspectives on AI-Assisted Lesson Planning and Classroom Management: An Interpretivist Inquiry in Punjab's Teacher Training Institutions[J]. Qlantic Journal of Social Sciences, 2025, 6(4): 89-97.
16. Yin S, Ivanovi M. Guest editorial: Recent advances in AI methods for image processing: Theory, algorithms, and applications[J]. Computer Science and Information Systems, 2024, 21(4): 0-0.
17. Yu J, Lu Z, Yin S, et al. News recommendation model based on encoder graph neural network and bat optimization in online social multimedia art education[J]. Computer Science and Information Systems, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 989-1012, 2024. doi: 10.2298/CSIS231225025Y.
18. Yin S, Li H, Laghari A A, et al. An anomaly detection model based on deep auto-encoder and capsule graph convolution via sparrow search algorithm in 6G internet-of-everything[J]. IEEE Internet of Things Journal, vol. 11, no. 18, pp. 29402-29411, 2024. DOI: 10.1109/JIOT.2024.3353337.
19. Fang Q. Terminology Alignment Based On Multi-level Feature Fusion For Japanese Scientific And Technological Literature Terminology Translation[J]. Journal of Applied Science and Engineering, 29(2): 465-473.
20. Zhao L, Yu J. YOLOv5-DTW: Gesture Recognition Based On YOLOv5 And Dynamic Time Warping For Digital Media Design[J]. Journal of Applied Science and Engineering, 29(2): 445-453.
21. Sarma D, Dutta H P J, Yadav K S, et al. Attention-based hand semantic segmentation and gesture recognition using deep networks[J]. Evolving Systems, 2024, 15(1): 185-201.

22. Karthikeyyan P, Velliangiri S. Review of Blockchain based IoT application and its security issues[C]//2019 2nd International Conference on Intelligent Computing, Instrumentation and Control Technologies (ICICICT). IEEE, 2019, 1: 6-11.
23. Zhao M, Yang S. AI-Empowered Innovative Research on Teaching Content in Fundamental Computer Courses[J]. Educational Innovation Research, 2025, 3(5): 25-32.
24. Duan C H B, Kuang Y, Yang S H. Assessment of an AI-Assisted Power Supply Experiment Design Based on Causal Inference[C]//Educational Innovation Through Technology: 13th International Conference, EITT 2024, Macau, China, November 8C10, 2024, Proceedings. Springer Nature, 2025: 234.
25. Zhang D, Shafiq M, Wang L, et al. Privacy-preserving remote sensing images recognition based on limited visual cryptography[J]. CAAI Transactions on Intelligence Technology, 2023. https://doi.org/10.1049/cit2.12164.