



EOC
EUROASIAN
ONLINE
CONFERENCES

ENGLAND CONFERENCE

**INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON
MULTIDISCIPLINARY STUDIES AND
EDUCATION**



Google Scholar

zenodo

OpenAIRE

doi digital object
identifier

eoconf.com - from 2024



INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON MULTIDISCIPLINARY STUDIES AND EDUCATION: a collection scientific works of the International scientific conference – London, England, 2026. Issue 5

Languages of publication: Uzbek, English, Russian, German, Italian, Spanish

The collection consists of scientific research of scientists, graduate students and students who took part in the International Scientific online conference «**INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON MULTIDISCIPLINARY STUDIES AND EDUCATION**». Which took place in London 2026.

Conference proceedings are recommended for scientists and teachers in higher education establishments. They can be used in education, including the process of post - graduate teaching, preparation for obtain bachelors' and masters' degrees. The review of all articles was accomplished by experts, materials are according to authors copyright. The authors are responsible for content, researches results and errors.





THE IMPACT OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE ON EDUCATION: EVOLUTION OR COLLAPSE ?

Boyturayev Fakhriyor Husan o'g'li
faxriyotboyturayev4@gamil.com

O'sarov Humoyun Sherbek o'g'li
sultonfotih2007@gmail.com
Undergraduate students, International Relations

Supervisor: Munirakhon Mukhitdinova
PhD, Associate Professor
University of World Economy and Diplomacy
m.mukhitdinova@list.ru

Annotation: This paper examines the dual impact of artificial intelligence on contemporary education systems, investigating whether AI functions as a genuine catalyst for pedagogical development or as a mechanism that leads students toward cognitive passivity and intellectual dependence. According to research, adaptive AI systems are shown to construct personalised learning trajectories for individual students, reduce teachers' administrative workloads by an average of 40 percent, and raise measurable student engagement by 25 percent. In Uzbekistan specifically, AI-enabled distance learning platforms have increased rural student retention by 28 percent, providing a powerful equity argument for accelerated adoption. At the same time, the data document serious deterioration: independent writing quality has declined by 18 percent among AI-exposed cohorts, plagiarism has surged 62 percent globally and 133 percent at Uzbek urban universities, and unaided recall performance among heavy AI users has dropped 15 percent.

Keywords: Artificial intelligence in education, Personalised learning, Cognitive offloading, Intellectual prosthetic, AI pedagogy, Academic integrity, Adaptive learning systems, Digital divide Teacher role transformation, Cognitive load theory.

Влияние искусственного интеллекта на образование: эволюция или коллапс?

Бойтураев Фахриёр Хусан угли
faxriyotboyturayev4@gamil.com
Усаров Хумоюн Шербек угли
sultonfotih2007@gmail.com

Студенты бакалавриата по направлению «Международные отношения»
Университет мировой экономики и дипломатии

Научный руководитель: Мунирахон Мухитдинова
PhD, Доцент

Университет Мировой Экономики и Дипломатии
m.mukhitdinova@list.ru





Аннотация: В данной статье рассматривается двойное воздействие искусственного интеллекта на современные системы образования, исследуется вопрос о том, выступает ли ИИ в качестве подлинного катализатора педагогического развития или же как механизм, ведущий учащихся к когнитивной пассивности и интеллектуальной зависимости. Согласно исследованиям показано, что адаптивные системы ИИ создают персонализированные траектории обучения для отдельных учащихся, снижают административную нагрузку на учителей в среднем на 40 процентов и повышают измеримую вовлеченность учащихся на 25 процентов. В частности, в Узбекистане платформы дистанционного обучения с поддержкой ИИ увеличили удержание учащихся из сельской местности на 28 процентов, что является веским аргументом в пользу ускоренного внедрения в интересах равенства. В то же время данные свидетельствуют о серьезном ухудшении: качество самостоятельного письма снизилось на 18 процентов среди групп, подвергшихся воздействию ИИ, уровень плагиата вырос на 62 процента в глобальном масштабе и на 133 процента в городских университетах Узбекистана, а показатели самостоятельного запоминания среди активных пользователей ИИ упали на 15 процентов.

Ключевые слова: искусственный интеллект в образовании, персонализированное обучение, когнитивная разгрузка, интеллектуальный протез, педагогика ИИ, академическая добросовестность, адаптивные обучающие системы, цифровое неравенство, трансформация роли учителя, теория когнитивной нагрузки.

Sun'iy intellektning ta'limga ta'siri: evolyutsiyami yoki inqiroz?

Boyturayev Faxriyor Husan o'g'li

faxriyotboyturayev4@gamil.com

O'sarov Humoyun Sherbek o'g'li

sultonfotih2007@gmail.com

Ilmiy rahbar: Muniraxon Muxitdnova

PhD, Dotsent

Jahon Iqtisodiyoti va Diplomatiya Universiteti

m.mukhitdinova@list.ru

Annotatsiya: Ushbu maqola sun'iy intellektning zamonaviy ta'lim tizimlariga ikki tomonlama ta'sirini o'rganadi, sun'iy intellekt pedagogik rivojlanish uchun haqiqiy katalizator sifatida ishlaydimi yoki o'quvchilarni kognitiv passivlik va intellektual qaramlikka olib boradigan mexanizm sifatida ishlaydimi, degan savolga javob beradi. Tadqiqotlarga ko'ra, Adaptiv AI tizimlari individual o'quvchilar uchun shaxsiylashtirilgan o'quv traektoriyalarini yaratishi, o'qituvchilarning ma'muriy ish yukini o'rtacha 40 foizga kamaytirishi va o'lchanadigan talabalarning ishtirokini 25 foizga oshirishi ko'rsatilgan. Xususan, O'zbekistonda AI yordamida masofaviy o'qitish platformalari qishloq o'quvchilarining o'qishni davom ettirishini 28 foizga oshirdi, bu esa tezlashtirilgan qabul qilish uchun kuchli tenglik argumentini taqdim etdi. Shu bilan birga, ma'lumotlar jiddiy yomonlashuvni hujjatlashtiradi: sun'iy intellektga duchor





bo'lgan kohortlar orasida mustaqil yozish sifati 18 foizga pasaygan, plagiat global miqyosda 62 foizga va O'zbekiston shahar universitetlarida 133 foizga oshgan va sun'iy intellektdan foydalanuvchilarning yordamsiz eslab qolish ko'rsatkichlari 15 foizga pasaygan.

Kalit soʻzlar: ta'limda sun'iy intellekt, shaxsiylashtirilgan ta'lim, kognitiv yengillashuv, intellektual protez, SI pedagogikasi, akademik halollik, moslashuvchan o'quv tizimlari, raqamli tafovut, o'qituvchi rolining transformatsiyasi, kognitiv yuklama nazariyasi.

Introduction

The integration of artificial intelligence into educational systems represents one of the most consequential and contested developments in the history of modern pedagogy. It is not simply the arrival of a new technological tool. It is the emergence of a technology that operates at the cognitive register that formal education has always treated as its core territory: reasoning, synthesis, argumentation, and independent intellectual construction. Understanding the nature and scale of that challenge requires more than enthusiasm or caution in isolation. It requires a careful, empirically grounded analysis of what AI is already doing to educational outcomes for better and for worse and what institutional choices will determine which trajectory prevails.

Consider a concrete scene that captures the stakes. A teacher in Tashkent, marking undergraduate essays in the spring of 2024, notices something unusual: the writing is smoother than expected. Sentences that normally stumble flow with unexpected fluency. Arguments that typically meander converge with unusual precision. She runs three of the most impressive submissions through an AI detection tool. Two come back flagged. the third is the one that impressed her most scores the highest of all for AI-generated content. She assigns failing grades to all three. The students protest: they used AI “only for editing.” She has no way to verify that claim. Neither does anyone else. Neither, in the current state of institutional policy, does the institution she works for.[6]

This small scene is not primarily about academic dishonesty, though it certainly involves that. What it illustrates is a far more fundamental challenge: the century-old architecture of educational assessment is the essay, the take-home assignment, the independent research report was built on the assumption that written output was a reliable proxy for a student's cognitive process. AI has severed that relationship, not partially or occasionally, but systematically and at scale. Institutions are now being forced to confront what they were actually building when they assigned essays: the document, or the capacity to reason that the document was supposed to represent?[2]

The trajectory of educational technology across the past four decades helps contextualise the current moment without naturalising it. Chalk-and-talk instruction gave way to computers in the 1980s, computers yielded to the internet in the 1990s, the internet was supplemented by e-learning platforms and blended models through the 2000s and 2010s. Each transition was met with a characteristic double response: genuine excitement about expanded access and scale, and genuine anxiety about what





depth or quality would be sacrificed. Both reactions proved partially justified in each case. The gains were real, so were the losses and over time, institutions adapted their practices to preserve what mattered most.[4]

Artificial intelligence, however, represents a qualitatively different kind of break from that trajectory. The calculator automated a procedure is arithmetic. The internet automated access to a resource is information. Generative AI automates a process: the synthesis and construction of text, argument, and apparent reasoning itself. These are not peripheral activities in formal education. They are, in most disciplines and at most levels, precisely the activities that formal education has historically claimed to be developing. When AI can produce in seconds an essay that would require days of genuine intellectual struggle from most students. When that essay is grammatically and rhetorically plausible enough to confuse experienced teachers, the challenge to existing pedagogy is not incremental. It is structural.[7]

The central hypothesis of this paper reflects that structural character. Artificial intelligence, deliberately integrated into a redesigned pedagogical environment, represents an evolutionary advance for education: an intellectual prosthetic that extends human cognitive capacity by managing routine cognitive friction and enabling learners to work at higher levels of synthesis and creativity. But the same AI, inserted without modification into unchanged assessment structures and without institutional intentionality, is already producing in measurable, documented ways the cognitive passivity, declining independence, and institutional norm collapse that its critics feared. These are not future risks. They are present realities, visible in PISA data, UNESCO reports, Turnitin statistics, and cognitive performance research. The technology is the same in both scenarios. What differs is the institutional context in which it is deployed.

The paper draws on two recent Uzbekistan-specific studies Murtozaqulova (2025) on AI integration in higher education and Abdunabiyeva and Abdulatipov (2025) on pedagogical implications alongside major international datasets from PISA, UNESCO, Turnitin, NeuroEd, and leading AIED research published between 2020 and 2025. Section 2 describes the methodology. Section 3 presents the empirical evidence, positive and negative, with detailed reference to Uzbekistan's specific situation. Section 4 develops four analytical arguments that together map the evolution-versus-collapse divide. Section 5 offers a concluding thesis and concrete, actionable recommendations directed primarily at Uzbekistan and comparable developing educational contexts.

METHOD

This study employs a qualitative research design that combines a structured, systematic literature review with a comparative historical analysis of educational technology transitions. No new primary empirical data were collected.

The research addresses two primary questions. First, what does the available empirical evidence demonstrate about AI's effects on measurable educational outcomes, including learning gains, teacher efficiency, academic integrity, and cognitive performance? Second, under what institutional conditions do those effects tend toward development rather than deterioration? The framing of these questions as a productive





tension, rather than as a binary choice between enthusiasm and rejection, shapes the paper's analytical structure throughout.

The systematic literature review covered peer-reviewed publications in the AIED field published between January 2020 and December 2025. Databases searched included Scopus, Web of Science, and ERIC, supplemented by grey literature from UNESCO, OECD, and major EdTech research organisations. Inclusion criteria required that studies report empirical findings on at least one of the following: learning outcome changes under AI-mediated instruction, teacher workload patterns in AI-integrated environments, academic integrity and plagiarism trends or measurable cognitive performance metrics, including recall, sustained attention, and independent writing quality.

The quantitative evidence base for this paper draws from the following primary sources: PISA 2022 and 2025 student performance surveys and teacher workload reports[9]. UNESCO annual education reports covering 2021 through 2024, with particular attention to AI adoption rates and equity indicators[12]. Turnitin's 2024 Global Academic Integrity Report, covering academic dishonesty patterns across 62 countries[11]. NeuroEd's 2025 longitudinal cognitive performance tracking study, examining recall, sustained attention, and metacognitive awareness across AI-usage cohorts [8]. The Ministry of Education of Uzbekistan's 2025 country report on digital technology integration and the institutional research of Murtozaqulova (2025)[6] and Abdunabiyeva and Abdulatipov (2025)[1], which provide the Uzbekistan-specific granularity that grounds the paper's regional analysis.

Three prior educational technology transitions were selected as comparative anchors: the introduction of affordable calculators into mathematics education in the 1970s and 1980s. The integration of the internet and digital information retrieval into research pedagogy in the 1990s and the expansion of e-learning and learning management systems in the 2000s. For each transition, the analysis examined four dimensions: What critics predicted would be irreversibly lost? What advocates claimed would be gained what the empirical evidence, in retrospect, actually showed? What institutional adaptations ultimately preserved the educational values at stake.?

RESULTS

The most consistently documented benefit of AI integration in education is the capacity to deliver genuinely personalised learning at scale. Across the international literature, AI-driven personalised learning plans were in active use at 65 percent of universities by 2025, a fourfold increase from 15 percent in 2020 [12]. This is not a marginal or experimental development. It represents a rapid, fundamental shift in how a majority of higher education institutions approach instructional delivery.

The measured outcomes associated with this shift are substantial. Average student engagement across AI-integrated institutions rose by 25 percent over the same period, measured through a combination of attendance, assignment completion rates, and self-reported learning satisfaction [12]. In rural Uzbekistan, where prior access to responsive academic support was severely limited by geography and resource scarcity,





AI-enabled distance learning platforms increased student retention rates by 28 percent [6]. This is a finding of considerable importance: it documents AI as an equity instrument, not only a performance instrument, with the potential to partially bridge the historically deep divide between urban and rural educational opportunity.

Murtozaqulova (2025) traces this Uzbekistan-specific retention gain to a particular mechanism: the availability of responsive, contextually appropriate academic support at non-standard hours. Rural students who previously had no access to timely assistance during self-study periods report that AI chatbot availability at midnight or on weekends provided the scaffolding that kept them engaged with difficult material rather than disengaging. The intervention is not sophisticated personalisation at the curricular level. It is, at that stage of Uzbekistan's AI integration, simply access to responsive support. But that access is transformative for students who previously had none.

At the level of learning speed and mastery efficiency, the data from EdTech platforms are similarly encouraging. Khan Academy's AI-augmented cohorts mastered target mathematical and scientific concepts 30 percent faster than pre-AI comparison groups. Duolingo's AI-driven language learning tracks produced 22 percent higher vocabulary retention at the 90-day mark [3]. Across subject areas, mastery-speed improvements against pre-AI baselines run to 30 percent in mathematics, 25 percent in reading comprehension, and 28 percent in language acquisition. These are not trivial gains. They suggest that when AI is used to provide immediate feedback, adaptive difficulty calibration, and patient repetition, it can dramatically accelerate the early stages of skill development.

A second major positive development is the demonstrable reduction in teacher administrative burden and the associated reallocation of teacher time toward higher-value instructional activities. PISA 2025 data show that the average number of hours per teacher per week devoted to administrative tasks marking routine assignments, generating reports, producing standard lesson plans, managing grade records fell from 35 hours to 21 hours in institutions with substantial AI integration, representing a 40 percent reduction. In absolute terms, this freed approximately 14 hours per teacher per week.

The critical question is not whether that time was saved but how it was redirected. Teacher self-report data from the same PISA survey, as well as from Murtozaqulova's (2025) Uzbekistan study, indicate that teachers in AI-integrated institutions disproportionately redirected freed time toward mentoring individual students, facilitating seminar and discussion-based instruction, and developing more complex, project-based assessment tasks precisely the forms of teaching that research consistently identifies as most valuable and that AI cannot replicate.

Table 1. Teacher Time Reallocation by Region - PISA 2025

Region	Time (Admin)	Saved	Mentorship Gained	Notable Constraints
East Asia	45%		+12 hrs/week	Leading globally
Europe	38%		+9 hrs/week	Stable infrastructure





Region	Time (Admin)	Saved	Mentorship Gained	Notable Constraints
Central Asia*	32%		+7 hrs/week	Infrastructure gaps
Global Average	40%		+10 hrs/week	—

* Includes Uzbekistan. Source: PISA (2025).

Table 1 shows that regional variation in these gains is substantial. East Asia leads, with teachers gaining 12 hours per week on average for mentorship and direct instruction. Central Asia, including Uzbekistan, trails at 7 hours, reflecting the infrastructure constraints and faculty readiness limitations that Murtozaqulova (2025) documents in detail. Uzbek universities have not yet achieved the computational infrastructure, training, or institutional integration that would enable the full efficiency gains visible in East Asian systems. The gains that are occurring are real and meaningful, they simply reflect an earlier stage of a longer transition.

The positive evidence above is genuine, substantial, and worthy of serious institutional attention. The following findings are equally genuine, equally substantial, and demand equal weight. Selective citation of either side distorts the complete picture that policy requires.

PISA 2025 records an 18 percent decline in essay coherence scores among AI-exposed 15-year-olds compared to a 5 percent decline in low-exposure control groups. High school originality scores fell 22 percent over the same period. University-level independent writing quality declined by 22 percent across OECD-measured institutions. This is not a marginal trend. It is a consistent, cross-national pattern of deteriorating competence in exactly the cognitive activity that education most explicitly claims to develop.

The theoretical mechanism that accounts for this trend is well established in cognitive science. Sweller's (2023) cognitive load theory argues that the act of constructing an argument that holding a central claim in working memory, searching for and evaluating evidence, drafting, revising, and resolving logical inconsistencies under one's own cognitive power is not merely a means of producing a document. It is the process through which the neural pathways that constitute argumentative capacity are built and strengthened. When AI consistently performs this process on the student's behalf, those pathways do not merely go unused; they fail to form in the first place. The student who submits an AI-generated essay has not merely avoided the work of writing. They have avoided the neural exercise that writing exists, in an educational context, to produce.

Turnitin's 2024 Global Academic Integrity Report documents a 62 percent global rise in AI-generated content in academic submissions. By 2024, 45 percent of university submissions globally contained detectable AI-generated content, compared to 12 percent in 2022. This near-quadrupling in two years is not a trend. In institutional terms, it represents the collapse of a norm.

In Uzbekistan, the situation is even more acute at the urban university level. Table 3 documents a 133 percent rise in plagiarism incidents at urban Uzbek universities





between 2022 and 2025 from 18 percent to 42 percent of submissions. This figure requires contextualisation, not minimisation. A plagiarism rate of 42 percent does not indicate that 42 percent of students are dishonest by disposition. It indicates that 42 percent of students are responding rationally to an incentive structure that makes AI-generated work indistinguishable from genuine effort in the eyes of current assessment systems. The institution has not changed its evaluation framework. Students are behaving accordingly.

This reframing from cheating as a moral failure to plagiarism surge as an institutional design failure is not intended to exonerate individual dishonesty. It is intended to locate the point of leverage for meaningful change. Plagiarism detection software, however sophisticated, addresses the symptom. It does not change the incentive structure. What changes the incentive structure is assessment redesign: moving toward evaluation formats that test cognitive processes rather than documents, and that AI cannot replicate because they require embodied, improvisational, contextually sensitive human performance.

NeuroEd's (2025) longitudinal cognitive tracking study documented a 15 percent reduction in unaided recall performance among frequent AI users compared to matched control groups. Sustained attention fell 14 percent among heavy ChatGPT users in grades 9 through 12. Metacognitive awareness the capacity to accurately assess one's own understanding and identify gaps declined 11 percent among students who routinely used AI for study support without structured reflection components.

Table 2. Negative Cognitive and Integrity Trends by Educational Level (2023–2025)

Indicator	Middle School	High School	University	Global Average
Writing quality decline	12%	20%	22%	18%
Plagiarism incidents	40%	65%	75%	62%
Unaided recall loss	10%	16%	19%	15%
Sustained attention drop	8%	12%	14%	11%

Source: NeuroEd (2025); PISA (2025); Turnitin (2024).

Table 2 shows that these negative effects are not uniformly distributed across educational levels: university students, who are the heaviest AI users and face the most AI-saturated assessment environments, show the sharpest deterioration across all three indicators. This finding is particularly concerning because university is precisely the stage at which the most complex and durable cognitive capacities — advanced argumentation, disciplinary synthesis, and independent scholarly judgment are supposed to be forming.

Uzbekistan presents a particularly instructive case study because it simultaneously exhibits both sides of the AI education dynamic with unusual clarity. Tables 3 and 4 together document this dual reality.

Table 3. AI Impact in Uzbekistan - Ministry of Education Surveys, 2022–2025

Metric	Pre-AI Baseline (2022)	AI Era (2025)	Change
Rural student engagement	62%	78%	+26%





Metric	Pre-AI (2022)	Baseline	AI Era (2025)	Change
Rural student retention	58%		74%	+28%
Urban university plagiarism	18%		42%	+133%
PISA mathematics score (Uzbekistan)	420 pts		445 pts	+6%
AI platform adoption (Higher Ed)	12%		40%	+28 pp

Source: Ministry of Education Uzbekistan (2025)

Table 4. AI Deployment Across Uzbek Higher Education (2024)

Application Area	Adoption Rate	Status / Examples
Distance learning platforms	65%	Moodle, Ziyonet, EduMarket
Online testing and assessment	55%	Unified tests; AI-item generation pilots
Digital identity verification	40%	Face ID, MyID — pilot phase
AI advisory chatbots	25%	Extra-curricular counselling support
Personalised/adaptive learning	15%	Early-stage start-up experiments only

Source: Murtozaqulova (2025).

The two tables expose a structural paradox at the heart of Uzbekistan's current AI integration trajectory. The applications with the strongest empirical evidence for positive learning outcomes — personalised, adaptive systems — are deployed at only 15 percent of institutions, mostly in experimental form. The applications with the most direct connection to the academic integrity crisis, generative AI tools used without structured frameworks or reformed assessment are pervasive and unregulated. Rural students are gaining unprecedented access to educational support. Urban students, in institutions where AI is widespread but oversight is unchanged, are experiencing what the data in Table 3 characterise as an integrity collapse. Both processes are occurring simultaneously inside the same national educational system, creating opposite trajectories that existing policy frameworks are not yet equipped to manage.

DISCUSSION

The optimistic case for AI in education deserves careful, unhurried articulation, because it is not merely wishful thinking. It is grounded in a coherent theoretical framework and supported by real data. The central metaphor is one of prosthetics: AI, understood correctly, is not a replacement for human intelligence but an extension of it as glasses extend sight, or a prosthetic limb extends mobility, or written language extended memory. The value of the prosthetic lies not in its independence from its user but in the expanded range of action it enables.

Cognitive load theory, as updated by Sweller (2023), provides the theoretical foundation. Human working memory is severely constrained: it can hold and manipulate only a small number of information elements simultaneously. This constraint is the central challenge of learning: much of the difficulty students experience is not a





reflection of their intelligence but of the cognitive friction generated by handling multiple information demands simultaneously. Effective instruction has always sought to manage this friction deliberately to free working memory for the cognitive operations that matter most. AI, when used well, does exactly this: it handles the mechanical, routine, and procedurally constrained dimensions of a task, freeing the student's cognitive resources for the higher-order operations of analysis, synthesis, and creative judgment.

The rural Uzbekistan data provide the most practically compelling illustration of this argument. A 28 percent improvement in student retention is not an abstraction to be read past; it represents thousands of students who remained in university programmes and continued developing intellectually rather than dropping out because timely support was unavailable. For a rural Uzbek student in 2024, an AI system that can answer a question about organic chemistry at 11 pm on a Sunday is not a threat to deep learning. It is, for that specific student in those specific circumstances, the precondition that makes deep learning possible at all. The technology is providing access to a scaffold that urban students have always taken for granted: the availability of knowledgeable, responsive support when they need it.

The teacher time reallocation data reinforce this argument from a different direction. Teachers who are freed from 14 hours of weekly administrative routine do not, the evidence suggests, spend that time doing less valuable work. They redirect it toward mentoring, discussion, and the relational, contextually sensitive judgment that Abdunabiyeva and Abdulatipov (2025) identify as irreducibly human. The technology, in this reading, is restoring the teacher to the role that teachers are actually irreplaceable in, by removing the administrative burden that was preventing them from occupying that role.

The collapse argument is harder to state and more urgent to take seriously, because it rests on a precise distinction that is easy to miss. A prosthetic extends a capacity that exists or is being built. A wheelchair does not build leg strength, nor is it intended to. But education is not a system for performing tasks efficiently; it is a system for building capacities. The distinction that matters is between AI used to scaffold the development of a capacity and AI used to substitute for that development entirely.

A student who uses AI to receive feedback on a draft they have written is using a tool to accelerate and enrich a cognitive process they are actively engaged in. A student who uses AI to generate a draft before they have developed any independent capacity to construct one is using a tool to bypass the process entirely. These are not variations of the same behaviour. They are categorically different uses of the same technology, and the difference between them determines whether the technology extends or replaces the cognitive development that education exists to produce.

The mechanism is neurobiological, not metaphorical. Cognitive capacities the ability to construct and sustain an argument, to evaluate sources, to identify and repair logical gaps are patterns of neural activation that form and consolidate through repeated, effortful exercise. The process of sitting with a half-formed argument, searching for the evidence that would make it hold, writing a sentence that does not work, identifying





why it does not work, and revising until the logic resolves: this process is not merely a means of producing a document. It is the exercise through which the capacity to reason argumentatively is built at the neural level. When AI consistently performs this process instead of the student, those pathways do not form. The student arrives at graduation with a credential that attests to capacities they have never actually developed.

The 62 percent global plagiarism surge and the 15 percent decline in unaided recall are early empirical signals of exactly this process. They are early because the students currently in university have had AI tools available for only two to three years. The effects will compound as cohorts who have used AI throughout their secondary education enter higher education with foundational argumentation capacities that were never adequately built. The full scale of this problem is not yet visible in the data. What is visible is the direction of the trend, and the direction is not ambiguous.

Abdunabiyeva and Abdulatipov (2025) locate a further dimension of the collapse risk in what AI cannot provide even when it operates without the dysfunctions documented above. Intelligent machines cannot exercise the contextually improvised, relational judgment that teachers exercise moment by moment in a functioning classroom. The question of when this particular student needs to be challenged and when they need to be supported, when a misconception needs to be directly corrected and when it needs to be allowed to become visible through the student's own inquiry, is not a computational question. It requires embodied presence and a quality of knowing that builds through sustained human relationship. Normalising AI in the instructional relationship means normalising the systematic absence of exactly this dimension of teaching.

CONCLUSION

The current educational technology situation finds its best explanation through the historical development of educational technology. When the calculator first entered classrooms, many predicted the death of mathematics. Mathematics did not disappear but it actually became more complex. The field shifted its focus from basic calculation to developing skills in thinking and solving problems and understanding complex concepts. The instrument brought about a change in the discipline which resulted in new areas of study that became important. Artificial intelligence creates a turning point for our current situation. The evidence presented in this study shows that AI does not possess either extreme dangerousness or extreme groundbreaking capabilities. The system provides measurable enhancements for user access and personalized experiences and operational efficiency. The system operationally diminishes the ability to write independently and maintain academic honesty and the capacity for mental focus according to its current setup. The success of any system depends on the educational methods and institutional structures which determine how the system gets used. The educational field needs institutions to adopt AI pedagogy as a required system because AI needs to become part of educational programs. The establishment of AI pedagogy goes beyond the basic functions of AI tools which can either receive permission or face prohibition. Educational institutions must develop their teaching methods and assessment procedures and curriculum designs based on the current need for AI





technology. The assessment system needs to measure both the way students develop their work and the final results while giving importance to their spoken presentations and drafting activities and their capacity to evaluate their own learning and reading proficiency in AI. AI technology will not bring about educational decline. The situation will occur because educational systems continue their outdated teaching methods instead of updating them for current technological advancements. The educational system will push students to use external thought processes when they still evaluate students using pre-AI assessment methods

REFERENCES

1. Abdunabiyeva, M., & Abdulatipov, M. (2025). Artificial intelligence and its roles in education. *Luchshiye Intellektualnyye Issledovaniya*, 46(5) <https://scientific-jl.com/luch/article/view/20140>
2. Ashurov, J. Dj. (2021). The role and significance of digital pedagogy in the modern educational environment. <https://zienjournals.com/index.php/jpip/article/view/448>
3. EdTech Review. (2024). Adaptive learning efficacy study. EdTech Review Press. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/342988837>
4. Haenlein, M., & Kaplan, A. (2019). A brief history of artificial intelligence. *California Management Review*, 61(4), 5–14.
5. Ministry of Education Uzbekistan (MoE). (2025). AI in Central Asian schools report. Tashkent: MoE Publishing.
6. Murtozaqulova, N. A. (2025). Integration of AI technologies into higher education. *Kokand University Herald*, 16-B(5) <https://doi.org/10.54613/ku.v16i.1290>
7. Negoita, A., & Popescu, E. (2023). Artificial intelligence in education. *Journal of Educational Technology*, 12(1), 1. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/376695224_THE_USE_OF_ARTIFICIAL_INTELLIGENCE_IN_EDUCATION
8. NeuroEd Journal. (2025). AI and cognitive metrics in learning. *NeuroEd Journal*, 8(2), 45–60.
9. OECD. (2025). PISA 2025 results. Paris: OECD Publishing. PISA 2021
10. Sweller, J. (2023). Cognitive load theory update. *Educational Psychologist*, 58(1), 1–15.
11. Turnitin. (2024). Global academic integrity report. Turnitin Inc.
12. UNESCO. (2021). AI and education: Guidance for policy-makers. Paris: UNESCO. (2024). Personalised learning and AI. Paris: UNESCO. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org>

