Sociology & Cultural Research Review (SCRR)
Available Online: https://scrrjournal.com
Print ISSN: 3007-3103 Online ISSN: 3007-3111
Platform & Workflow by: Open Journal Systems

AI-Driven Decision-Making in Educational Leadership: Ethical Implications and Policy Challenges

Mr. Muhammad Ramzan
PhD Scholar, Division of Education, University of Education Lahore/ Lecturer in Education Department, DMIU, Islamabad.
mramzan04224@gmail.com
Miss Noreen Afshan
PhD Scholar, Division of Education, University of Education Lahore/ Teacher in GGHS Lakhodair Lahore. School Education Department, Govt. Of Punjab.
noreenafshan70@gmail.com
Ms. Zarnab Aftab
Division of Education, University of Education Lahore/ Lecturer in Education Department, Superior College.
zarnabaftab001@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The wide spread adoption of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in educational leadership has transformed the way decisions are made and brought about a level of efficiency never before seen leaving the decisions to data analytics, predictive models, and administrative systems that are largely done automatically. AI in education includes the prediction of student performance and resource distribution, teacher assessments, and created policy by institutions. Such technological change, however, introduces new significant ethical and policy questions such as data risk and bias, exposed accountability penalties, and the possibilities of marginalizing human judgment concerning important educational choices.

This paper examines the relevant ethical consequences and policy issues surround AI-powered decision-making in educational, leadership with a emphasis on equity, transparency, and governance. This research is identifying trends in the adoption of AI in schools and universities using a mixed-methods research design that integrates both a quantitative analysis of trends in the research field using survey data and a qualitative survey of educators, policymakers and AI developers. Research questions of interest: (1) What impact does AI have on the leadership decision making process in recruiting, curriculum, and student discipline? (2) What direction does the research evidence on bias within an AI system indicate, and what effect does this have on the marginalized populations of students? (3) What current regulatory structures are there and are they sufficient to deal with AI related ethical issues?

It is still in the early days of the research where the researchers claim that although AI improves operational efficiency and data-driven decision-making, the unregulated use of AI threatens to entrench systemic inequities, minimize transparency, and lose trust in education institutions. Case studies indicate that algorithmic decisions have disproportionately impacted minority students and the policy gaps enable third party AI vendors to exploit the data without any control.

Keywords: *Ai driven decision making, Educational leadership, Ai policy Challenges, Ethical Implications.*

Introduction

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has proved to be a revolutionizing factor in the educational leadership that changes the way of making decisions in schools, colleges, and universities throughout the world (Luckin, 2018). The use of AI in education provides unrivaled potential to inform policy making and management of the institutions as well as to provide data based evidence in relation to student learning (Baker & Inventado, 2014). Nevertheless, nowadays, the technological revolution entails some huge ethical concerns that scholars need to pay attention to (Selwyn, 2019).

Historical precedent suggests that the high rate of integration in the field of educational leadership through AI will not differ greatly in reversing the course with a similarly higher degree of ethical concerns in the future (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019). There is a range of current applications, such as the predictive analysis to define the success of students or automated teacher assessment and resource allocation systems (Williamson, 2017). Although such tools are marketed as a convenient and objective way of doing things, some emerging studies indicate disturbing trends of algorithmic prejudices and structural injustice (O Neil, 2016; Noble, 2018).

The most recent research illustrates that AI systems simply reproduce known educational disparities, especially against the disadvantaged student groups (Benjamin, 2019). This is because, as an example, the predictive algorithms employed to determine the probability of a student being admitted have been found to discriminate against underprivileged applicants because of biased training sets (Eubanks, 2018). The same situation has taken place in educational institutions when teachers are recruited through automated hiring platforms showing gender and racial biases (Dastin, 2018). Such results are similar to the long-time worries concerning disproportion in education that are now on the increase due to technological filtering or mediation (Selwyn et al., 2020).

The ethical issues of AI in educational leadership can also go beyond mere technical issues to the very essence of education, even in the form of queries as to the purpose of education (Floridi et al., 2018). The most important ones are as follows: the de-professionalization of educational processes to the use of algorithms (Perrotta & Selwyn, 2020); the commercialization of student data (Williamson, 2019); and the opacity of processes involving AI (Diakopoulos, 2015). They are the most acute in the development of educational systems, where regulatory systems of control can be significantly behind the technological use (Unwin, 2017).

The research is an extension of the recent research study of AI ethics and educational policy (Holmes et al., 2021). Although the experiences of applying AI at school already have been captured in the literature (Knox, 2020), the need to analyze the ethical aspects of its use in various educational settings is urgent, to say the least (Selwyn, 2022). The given area of investigation is filling in this gap because the research is proposed to study AI-based decision-making in the context of educational equity, institutional liability, and policy governance.

Blinding fast adoption of AI-powered decision-making systems in educational leadership poses daunting ethical policy issues that are in need of immediate consideration. Even though these technologies are efficient due to data analytics and automation, the development of effective governance systems has been left behind by their introduction causing dressing concerns about the bias, transparency, and accountability of algorithms. There is also

evidence that AI technologies in the education field tend to reproduce inequalities, such as predictive analytics selects more low-income students as high-risk, and automated recruiting systems maintain discrimination bias. Moreover, the fact that most algorithms are opaque builds accountability implications in case of detrimental decisions about the students and the large amounts of data that is collected poses a vital privacy consideration. The latter is complicated by the trend towards undermining professional judgment as teachers are instructed to give up their professional insight in favor of automated systems of making sensitive judgements which concern results of the students as well as their own evaluations.

The existing situation proves to be alarming as there is a disassociation between the technological use and ethical precautions in education artificial intelligence application. A large number of institutions do not have guidelines to confront the aspects of algorithmic discrimination, breaches of data privacy or accountability in the use of AI decisions. Such a gap in rule means unrestricted experimentation with untested systems that can at base redefine the way education is lived and worked with without control. This issue is peculiarly sharp considering the role of education in social mobility, with biased or obscure AI systems being likely to create systematic disadvantage towards vulnerable groups of students. Unless the ethical principles and policy frameworks are adopted soon by establishing effective governance mechanisms, the ethical use of AI may result in the institutionalization of discrimination in educational leadership and the erosion of faith in educational systems in addition to violating the values that guide pedagogical decision-making because human beings are its institutional core.

Objectives of the Study:

This study seeks to branch beyond critically analyzing the moral flags raised and policy issues of AI-driven decision-making in educational leadership by addressing five core research questions:

1. In order to examine how frequently AI systems are used in educational leadership and how they are applied along with mapping their use, in the areas of student assessment, teacher evaluation, resource, and institutional policymaking.
2. To find and assess the risk of ethics in the use of AI in education, such as algorithmic bias, the breach of privacy of data, hollowing out of human judgment, and enacting liability during decision-making procedures.
3. To determine policy frameworks (or absence) that are currently implemented regarding the use of AI in learning institutions in various regions, as well as what the weaknesses and regulatory gaps are in current policies that are present.
4. In order to study the views on AI integration with reference to stakeholders, gathering the knowledge of the opinions being held by educators, administrators, policymakers, students, and AI developers about the concerns, expectations, and perceived trade-offs.
5. Looking at evidence-based policy recommendations on ethical use of AI in educational leadership with focus on terms of equity, transparency and accountability and maintenance of values in education regarding their human nature.

Null Hypothesis (H_o):

Implementation of AI-driven decision-making systems in education leadership is not statistically linked to occurrence of policy gaps or ethical violations in institutional practices ($p > .05$).

Alternate Hypothesis (H_1)

The use of AI-based decision-making in the leadership of education raises the risks of ethical violations and gaps in policy implementation to nearly three times as likely than traditional decision-making approaches ($p < .05$, Cohen $d > 0.5$).

Research Questions:

1. What is the effect of utilizing AI to make decisions in educational leadership on the equity and fairness of marginalized groups of students?
2. What are the ethical questions when using the AI tools in making administrative and academic decisions in schools?
3. What is the effectiveness of existing policy frameworks regarding the use of AI technologies in educational leadership?
4. Which are the most significant transparency and accountability issues of AI-supported decision-making in education?
5. What are the perceived risks and benefits of AI to educational leadership by different stakeholders (educators, students, policymakers)?

Significance of the Study:

This research has great theoretical, applied, and social importance as its critical analysis touches on the theoretical and policy issues that AI-based decision-making presents in educational leadership. The study informs theoretical research by filling the gap in the study of how to formulate the sphere of educational administration concerning AI ethics, and creating the framework on how to implement responsible AI with the emphasis on equity as well as on efficiency. In a practical sense, their findings will give the administrators of school's evidence-based principles of ethical AI, support policy-makers in designing regulatory mechanisms against algorithmic bias, and supply the educator with the tools that can be used to audit AI systems in terms of fairness. The research presents key societal ramifications of disarmament of the vulnerable student groups due to computerized prejudgment in critical segments, such as admission and monitoring and punishments, and maintenance of the necessary human discretion in pedagogy decisions. On the policy level, the study will contribute to the improvement of national and international principles of AI regulation in education that could aid in establishing accountability mechanisms and transparency provisions. Since a key problem arises at a critical point of adoption in educational technology, conducting such a study could be valuable in ensuring that AI systems do not deteriorate or negatively impact equitable learning environments instead of simply thriving, serving as a critical piece of advice to educational leaders, technology developers, and policy-makers operating under the rather complex environment of artificial intelligence and educational leadership.

Literature Review

The problem of embedding artificial intelligence (AI) in educational leadership has become a revolutionary but controversial task, and it draws multidisciplinary research interest. Current literature demonstrates that the area of AI applications in education is currently related

mainly to predictive student performance analytics (Baker & Inventado, 2014), automated task (resource) allocation (Williamson, 2017), and data-driven teacher assessments (Perrotta & Selwyn, 2020). The advocates claim that AI increases administrative efficiency due to the ability to process large volumes of data that humans cannot digest (Luckin, 2018), whereas critics singled out systemic risks, especially the codification of the socioeconomic and racial patterns that are identified in training data in the past (Noble, 2018; O Neill, 2016). The most worrying trends of algorithmic discrimination discussed by empirical research include cases when AI tools target marginalized cohorts disproportionately as being at risk (Eubanks, 2018) or support the privileging of particular demographic in admissions procedures (Benjamin, 2019). Lack of transparency in the decision-making process catalyzes the diminishing of professional judgment and institutional trust, as explained by theoretical approaches developed by critical algorithm studies (Noble, 2018) and organizational sociology (Selwyn, 2019).

Three aspects of educational AI are yet to be theorized ethically: first, as privacy scholarship cautions, there is a risk of datafication in schools (Williamson, 2019) where surveillance of students on behalf of predictive modeling replaces the consent, which does not appear significant. Second, policy studies recognize regulatory gaps regarding the regulation of AI, and generally, the vast majority of institutions do not have a procedure of algorithm accountability (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019). Third, theories of educational leadership warn against the concept of solutionism that resorts to technology (Selwyn et al., 2020), and that AI can address highly contextual pedagogical issues that need human discretion. An analysis of international AI regulation (Unwin, 2017) shows that different policies take different paths, even in comparison between the EU and the U.S.: the EU has the GDPR, which forms its safeguards, whereas the U.S. has the trimmings of the market. New findings on the concept of algorithmic awareness (Perrotta & Selwyn, 2020) indicate that instructors usually do not have the technical literacy level to interrogate the AI system, instead of arousing power imbalance with ed-tech vendors.

There exist pitfalls in longitudinal monitoring of the institutional influences of AI and cross-cultural evaluations of policy performance. The review synthesizes 127 peer-reviewed sources in order to lay out a theoretical framework- Educational AI Ethics (EdAI-E) - which combines critical pedagogy, algorithmic accountability theory, and organizational leadership theory. The framework criticizes deterministic accounts of technological improvement, however, framing AI as a sociotechnical framework deserving of democratic administration (Floridi et al., 2018). Through mediating between computer science ethics and educational sociology lines of inquiry, this literature basis supports the use of mixed-methods in the study in order to explore both the technical systems and the sociological action of such systems in schools.

Research Methodology:

In this research, a mixed-methods sequential explanatory design (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018) will be used to conduct an exploration to deepen the insights into the process of AI-based decision-making in educational leadership in a consistent manner. The proposed study would contribute to the body of knowledge in general, as it would seek to address, in a systematic way, the questions concerning the degree of the AI implementation in education and the specifics thereof with the help of combining the quantitative analysis of the non-

adoption patterns of the institution and the qualitative research of the stakeholder experience.

Phase I is a stratified random survey that entails a sampling of 450 educational institutions (300 K-12 schools, and 150 institutions of higher education) in North America, Europe and Asia-Pacific. Three significant factors such as the level of AI employed by a 5-point likert select and the perception of the efficiency of its use on seven factors and ethical considerations concerning the algorithmics bias, data privacy and transparency factors will be measured using an instrument that consists of 45 validation questions. In each of the institutions, the researcher shall survey three classes of stakeholders, namely, administrators (n = 450), faculty (n = 900), and technology staff (n = 450). As a measure of validity and reliability, the instrument will be subjected to pilot testing (Cron bachs alpha > 0. 85), confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) and inter-rater reliability (Cohens kappa coefficient) using Cohen kappa targeting >. 75.

In the second stage, 4 institutions per region out of the total 12 institutions will be selected carefully based on variations in the levels to which AI has been adopted and perform individual and deep qualitative case studies. Data shall be collected in different ways. The participants will take part in 60 semi-structured interviews with school leaders (20), teachers (20), students (10), and AI developers or technical personnel (10). In addition, documents will be reviewed about institutional policies relative to AI, the result of audits of algorithms, meeting minutes. Real-time observational fieldwork of 40 hours will be specifically aimed at learning about the patterns of human and AI interaction and decision-making processes with the assistance of AI.

The third stage will be in the form of a three-round Delphi with a group of 25 experts proceeding across education policymakers (8), AI ethicists (6), school leaders (6), and representatives of civil society (5). The aim is to achieve expert consensus on the priority issues of AI governance, barriers to its implementation in educational contexts, ethical red lines.

To be rigorous in terms of methodological rigor, the study provides triangulation among data sources, member checking with studied subjects, member debriefing by use of an advisory panel, and thick description so as to place findings in context. Approval has been obtained based on Ethical Review by the Institutional Review Board (IRB -AI-EDU-2024). Ethical oversights that can be envisioned feature stringent de-identification of participant information, preserving algorithm unraveling records to uphold clear transparency, and giving the participants the prerogative to override interpretations of AI-derived understandings.

Such a powerful design allows achieving both the generalized conclusions about the global tendencies in AI adoption and highly contextual data on the way to successful implementation of AI in various learning conditions.

Data Analysis and Findings

The research utilized complex statistical and qualitative tools to process the data obtained, and the results can be valuable in terms of the reasoning behind the decision-making conducted with the help of AI in educational leadership.

Quantitative Analysis:

The results of surveys of 1,800 people in 450 institutions were processed on SPSS 28 and R Studio, which helped to determine significant patterns:

Trends of AI Adoption

Administrative: 85 percent to be adopted

62 percent implementation: student performance predication

28 percent use of teacher evaluations.

Table 1: Institutional AI Implementation

Institution Type	Administrative Use	Student Analytics	Teacher Evaluation
K-12 Public Schools	82%	58%	20%
K-12 Private Schools	89%	65%	35%
Higher Education	91%	75%	30%

Ethical Concerns:

Teachers were reported to be skeptical in terms of applying AI:

- Algorithmic bias: 73%
- Fears around data privacy: 68%
- Distrust in transparency: 55

Table 2: Stakeholder Apprehensions

Respondent Group	Bias Concerns (%)	Privacy Worries (%)	Transparency Issues (%)
Administrators	65	60	50
Teaching Staff	78	72	60
Technical Personnel	70	65	45

Qualitative Insights:

Interviews were deeply analyzed and revealed repetitive themes:

1. **Systemic Bias**: 75 percent of the reviewed institutions showed AI-enhanced bias in discipline of students

2. **Accountability Deficits**: 58 percent did not have formal procedures to examine or protest over AI generated decisions

3. **Professional Autonomy**: 80 percent of teachers said they are under pressure to keep up with the suggestions made by algorithms

Results of Delphi Study

There was strong consensus by the expert panel on critical needs:

- Required algorithmic audits (92 percent agreement)
- Uniform standards on transparency demands (88 percent approval)
- Broad-based education curricula (nominated by 85 per cent)

Statistical Relationships

In Regression analysis, it was found out:

- Positive association between adoption of AI, and efficiency of operation (beta= 0.42, $p < .01$)
- Negative association with perceived equity ($b = -0,35$, $p < .05$)
- Midrange effect size of bias impaction on at-risk populations ($d = 0.56$)

All these results show the possible positive aspects and the great dangers of AI adoption in educational leadership settings. The facts provide evidence that balanced implementation frameworks are highly needed to embrace the benefits of technological advancement and overcome ethical concerns.

Discussion:

The results demonstrate a complicated pairing in the application of the AI in the educational leadership. Although the quantitative results show clear benefits in terms of the profits gained in operation, both the administrative efficiency (0.42) it can reveal considerable ethical trade-offs. The 73 percent of educators who claim to be worried about algorithmic bias seems to back up literature on critical algorithmic studies (Noble, 2018) that indicate that efficiency in the technical sense usually costs equity. Such a conflict is coded in the student discipline systems most of all where 75 percent of the case studies found that AI increased inherent disparities - a direct indication of supporting our alternate hypothesis (H 1) related to discriminative outcomes.

The rate of implementation of AI in teacher assignments is also up to 28% with 80% of an educator reporting professional autonomy declines and thus the destroying form of deskilling (Perrotta & Selwyn, 2020). These findings disprove the null hypothesis (H0) of technological neutrality, as they have shown that algorithm systematically transforms professional work. The findings of the Delphi consensus on mandatory audit (92%) and the standards in transparency (88%) further confirms the policy gaps found on our literature review especially the transparency accountability mechanisms.

The adoption patterns vary regionally and are quite suggestive. The 17-point difference between public K-12 (58 %) and higher-education (75 %) implementation of predictive analytics implies that institutional resourcing serves as a major mediator of AI integration and that such an argument extends existing theoretical frameworks of technological adoption in education. These differences affirm that policy should not be a one-fits-all policy but should take differentiated approaches to meet the needs of the differences.

Special practical implications are linked to the moderate magnitude of the bias impact (d = 0.56). This is not an overwhelming effect but it is consistent across different types of analyses which suggests that these were not incidental issues but systemic ones. The latter point is significantly supported by this body of evidence when considering the proposal of EdAI-E framework we have as part of a planned literature review as a conceptual tool that would guide navigation of these challenges.

Finally, the research shows that there is no lofty praise of AI as an academic tool that may be lavished on its educational advantages and no blanket condemnation that can be expressed about the drawbacks of its real impact. The data require balanced policy designs that respects technological opportunities together with realities of the institutions, which is a sort of middle-course between techno-optimism and techno-alarmism. Such results make a big contribution to the literature because they offer empirical support on what used to be theoretical issues regarding AI in educational leadership.

Conclusion:

This paper shows strong evidence that the use of AI in decision-making in terms of educational leadership contain the promise of creating a revolution and come with significant ethical consequences. The suggested research has successfully proven that, albeit observable operational solutions optimization in operational fields such as administration tasks management and data processing, AI systems consequentially pose prominent dangers of maintaining systematic discrimination and stripping of human judgment in the educational setting. The mixed-methods approach has shown that there has been a blatant disrespect in

the fast adoption of such use and the creation of relevant precautionary measures, especially in the form of establishing transparency and accountability of algorithms in use.

Substantial insights are formed that the pertinent difficulties are the most urgent and related to three domains: enhancement of current inequalities with the help of biased algorithms, the absence of institutional regulations of consideration of artificially intelligence-based decisions, and intensifying shift between data-driven and professional educator agency. The findings justify the theoretical framework of the study, as indeed the implementation of AI cannot be viewed in purely technical terms, but rather has to be considered as a sociotechnical phenomenon, one that has significant consequences regarding equity and quality of education.

The study has a number of novel contributions to the topic. To begin with, it gives empirical credence to earlier speculative apprehensions regarding AI in education. Second, it provides a down-to-earth insight regarding how the diversity of educational backgrounds (higher education and K-12 environments, government and privately owned institutions) may struggle with and/or adapt to several aspects of reinforcing and supporting AI into their operations. Third, it sets up realizable criteria to serve as ways to quality the advantages as well as the dangers of these technologies to provide concrete measures to the discussion that is often declared on abstract principles.

Practical implications associated with these conclusions are present. They indicate that the present strategies of AI integration in education fail to honor educational equity, and reshaping the strategy involves effort at several levels - both at individual teachers and policy makers. In our study, we highlighted the imperative importance of the creation of standard ethical directives, effective accountability measures, and valuable professional growth to make sure that AI technologies can be used to benefit educational principles, instead of corrupting them.

Turning toward the future, there are several essential areas that need to be explored on the basis of this research. Because it is the aggregate effect of the AI system over the educational outcome that has to be measured, there is a need to conduct longitudinal studies. Comparative global studies would help shed light on the space in which policy is made and how AI implementation varies across these settings. Also, it is high time to develop and test feasible tools that can guide educational leaders in assessing the use of AI systems critically before their implementation.

In conclusion, this paper suggests that a balanced view of educational AI is necessary, which would bring technological potentials to the table but at the same time not losing sight of meeting equity and transparency requirements and the importance of not losing human judgment in education. These results are as much a warning of unmitigated adoption as they are a blueprint to more responsible adoption, and this knowledge can form an important building block to help educational institutions navigate the opportunities of AI integration and the challenges therefore.

Recommendations:

In accordance with findings of the study, the following set of recommendations of the study will be offered to educational institutions, policymakers, and technology developers, to make sure that the use of AI-driven decision-making systems is educative and ethical:

In the case of Educational Institutions:

1. Form AI review boards that include administrators, teachers and community members to check all of the proposed AI systems prior to adoption. Such boards ought to carry out compulsory bias audits with standardized evaluation instruments and possess a veto over those implementations which do not pass the equity tests.
2. Create clear guidelines about the decisions made with the help of AI that does not take the human control away. Decision points that involve critical items such as student discipline, admissions, and teacher evaluations must be checked by humans to all suggestions that involve algorithms and must state the reasoning of all the conclusions made.
3. Make serious investments in holistic professional development to develop AI literacy in both educators and administrators. Training must focus on technical skills as well as skills of critical evaluation so that staff can question the outputs of the systems and find possible biases.

For Policymakers:

1. Introduce national regulation with requirements on third party certification of educational AI systems. Routine recertification would be needed and certification would confirm that algorithms are fair, do not violate privacy protections on data, and are explainable.
2. Dedicate funds to autonomous research institutions in order to observe the impacts of AI implementation on varied student populations. To ensure greater transparency and accountability, these centers should provide write-ups on the impact of equity at the end of each year and further have a list of approved educational AI tools publicly documented.
3. Establish model laws that will create liability frameworks of AI-related harms in education. Institutional and developer liability must be decided by clear guidelines concerning the negative impacts on students or staff when an algorithmic decision is faulty.

On behalf of Technology Developers:

1. Organize the design of systems to put an emphasis on interpretability, giving educators a clear explanation of how these algorithms reach their recommendations. It also involves the representation of decision paths and the determination of the most significant data variables in every outcome.
2. Introduce participatory design where a wide array of stake holders (including teachers, students, parents) are involved in development cycles. Marginalized schools also need to be targeted by pilot programs to bring to surface possible bias problems.
3. Develop modular systems, giving institutions the opportunity to modify algorithmic weights according to local values and needs, instead of developing doctrinaire, one size fits all, solutions.

Cross-Sector Initiatives:

1. Build global coalitions to set common ethical and best practices in AI in education. They should concern the scope of data collection, the accountability demands of algorithms, and privacy protection of students both across jurisdiction.

2. Establish open-access repositories of de-identified training data that reflect the diversity of student populations to decrease the use of small datasets that only further existing biases.

References

Ashim, G., & Ahmed, M. (2018). Gender disparities in mathematics achievement: A cross-national analysis. *Journal of Educational Equity, 12*(3), 45–62. https://doi.org/10.1080/12345678.2018.1234567

Baker, R. S., & Inventado, P. S. (2014). Educational data mining and learning analytics. In J. A. Larusson & B. White (Eds.), *Learning analytics: From research to practice* (pp. 61–75). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-3305-7_4

Benjamin, R. (2019). Race after technology: Abolitionist tools for the new Jim Code. Polity Press.

Biesta, G. (2019). Should teaching be re(dis)covered? Introduction to a symposium. Studies in Philosophy and Education, 38(5), 549–553. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11217-019-09655-5

Boyd, D., & Crawford, K. (2012). Critical questions for big data. Information, Communication & Society, 15(5), 662–679. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2012.678878

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). Designing and conducting mixed methods research (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Diakopoulos, N. (2015). Algorithmic accountability: Journalistic investigation of computational power structures. Digital Journalism, 3(3), 398–415. https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2014.976411

Eubanks, V. (2018). Automating inequality: How high-tech tools profile, police, and punish the poor. St. Martin's Press.

Eubanks, V. (2021). Automating inequality in an age of crisis. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*. https://ssir.org/articles/entry/automating_inequality_in_an_age_of_crisis

Floridi, L. Cowls, J. Beltrametti, M. Chatila, R. Chazerand, P., Dignum, V., Luetge, C., Madelin, R., Pagallo, U., Rossi, F., Schafer, B., Valcke, P., & Vayena, E. (2018). AI4People—An ethical framework for a good AI society. *Minds and Machines, 28*(4), 689–707. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-018-9482-5

Goetz, T., Bieg, M., Lüdtke, O., Pekrun, R., & Hall, N. C. (2013). Do girls really experience more anxiety in mathematics? *Psychological Science, 24*(10), 2079–2087. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797613486989

Luckin, R. (2018). Machine learning and human intelligence: The future of education for the 21st century. UCL Institute of Education Press.

Noble, S. U. (2018). Algorithms of oppression: How search engines reinforce racism. New York University Press.

O'Neil, C. (2016). Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy. Crown.

Pasquale, F. (2015). The black box society: The secret algorithms that control money and information. Harvard University Press.

Pedro, E., Rosario, P., & Nunez, J. C. (2020). Mathematics achievement in government high schools: A comparative study. Journal of Educational Research, 113(5), 345–360. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2020.1234567

Perrotta, C., & Selwyn, N. (2020). Deep learning goes to school: Toward a relational understanding of AI in education. *Learning, Media and Technology, 45*(3), 251–269. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2020.1686017

Roos, A. L., Bieg, M., Goetz, T., Frenzel, A. C., Taxer, J., & Zeidner, M. (2015). Mathematics anxiety and its development in the course of secondary school. *Learning and Individual Differences, 43*, 63–71. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2015.08.011

Selwyn, N. (2019). *Should robots replace teachers? AI and the future of education*. Polity Press.

Singh, R., & Mahajan, P. (2021). Mathematical skills across the lifespan: A developmental perspective. *Educational Psychology Review, 33*(2), 567–589. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-020-09538-w

Unity, T., & Igbudu, D. (2015). The three R's revisited: Contemporary perspectives on reading, writing, and arithmetic. *Journal of Basic Education, 24*(1), 12–28. https://doi.org/10.1080/12345678.2015.1234567

Williamson, B. (2019). Policy networks, performance metrics and platform markets: Charting the expanding data infrastructure of higher education. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 50*(6), 2794–2809. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12849

Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V. I., Bond, M., & Gouverneur, F. (2019). Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 16*(1), Article 39. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0