GLOBAL ACADEMIC INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY (GAIJM)




**Received:** 26.01.2026
**Accepted:** 06.04.2026
**Published:** 10.05.2026
Vol.1.1.2026 pp.62-71 **http://globreshub.org/index.php/gaijm https://doi.org/10.65189/gaijm.v1.24**

# RE-IMAGINING EDUCATION SYSTEM WITH INNOVATIVE AI: REDEFINING THE ROLE OF THE PSYCHOLOGIST

**Vicky Ngozi NWANGANGA**
Ph.D Candidate
Psychology Department
Imo State University, Owerri
blessingngozivicky@gmail.com

**Abstract**

*The incipient integration of sophisticated artificial intelligence (AI) into educational frameworks represents a paradigm shift that necessitates a fundamental re-evaluation of established pedagogical and psychological roles. This conceptual analysis posits that the conventional function of the educational psychologist, often confined to reactive assessment and remediation, is becoming anachronistic. As AI systems increasingly assume responsibilities for personalized curriculum delivery, real-time learning analytics, and automated assessment of foundational cognitive skills, a critical void and a profound opportunity emerge. This paper argues for a deliberate and strategic re-imagining of the psychologist's role, transitioning from a peripheral diagnostician to a central architect of the educational ecosystem's socio-emotional and ethical core. We propose a tripartite model for this redefined professional identity. First, the psychologist must become a* ***"human skills architect,"*** *focusing on cultivating the attributes impervious to AI automation: metacognition, resilience, creativity, and complex social-emotional intelligence. Second, they must serve as an* ***"AI-mediator and ethicist,"*** *guiding the responsible implementation of AI tools, mitigating algorithmic bias, and safeguarding student data privacy and psychological well-being within digital learning environments. Finally, the role expands to that of a* ***"system-level learning consultant,"*** *collaborating with educators and developers to design AI-informed pedagogies that are developmentally appropriate and motivationally sound. This scholarly examination concludes that by embracing this evolved mandate, psychologists can ensure that the AI-augmented classroom of the future remains a profoundly human-centric enterprise, fostering not only academic proficiency but also holistic psychological development.*

***KEYWORDS:*** **Artificial Intelligence, Educational Psychology, Innovation, Redefining Role, and Psychologist**

* **Nwanganga, V. N;** agree that this article remain permanently open access under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial-No Derivatives 4.0 International License. See for details: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/

GAIJM Vol.1.1.2026 pp.62-71
http://globreshub.org/index.php/gaijm

## Introduction

The contemporary educational landscape is undergoing a seismic transformation, driven by the relentless advancement of Artificial Intelligence (AI). From intelligent tutoring systems and automated grading to adaptive learning platforms that curate personalized educational pathways, AI is no longer a futuristic concept but an incipient reality in classrooms and institutions worldwide (Baker & Smith, 2019). This integration represents more than a mere technological upgrade; it constitutes a paradigm shift that challenges the very foundations of traditional pedagogical methods and the roles of educational professionals.

Historically, the educational psychologist has occupied a crucial, though often circumscribed, role within the school system. Their functions have traditionally centered on psychometric testing, diagnosing learning disabilities, providing remedial interventions for students with special needs, and offering counseling services (Jimerson et al., 2007). While these responsibilities remain vital, they are predominantly reactive, intervening after learning or behavioral challenges have been identified. The advent of AI, with its capacity to automate many of these diagnostic and instructional tasks, raises a pressing question: What is the unique, irreplaceable value of the human psychologist in an AI-saturated educational environment?

This paper posits that the conventional model of the educational psychologist is becoming anachronistic. As AI systems efficiently manage the assessment of foundational cognitive skills and the delivery of standardized content, a critical void emerges in the educational ecosystem—the cultivation of the deeply human dimensions of learning. Simultaneously, this displacement creates a profound opportunity for the profession to evolve and claim a more central, strategic position. The central thesis of this conceptual analysis is that psychologists must undergo a deliberate and strategic re-imagining of their professional identity, transitioning from a peripheral diagnostician to a central architect of the educational ecosystem's socio-emotional, ethical, and holistic core.

We propose a tripartite model for this redefined role, positioning the psychologist as: (1) a **Human Skills Architect**, (2) an **AI-Mediator and Ethicist**, and (3) a **System-Level Learning Consultant**. By embracing this evolved mandate, psychologists can ensure that the AI-augmented classroom of the future does not become a cold, efficiency-driven machinery but remains a profoundly human-centric enterprise, dedicated to fostering not only academic proficiency but also the psychological well-being and holistic development of every learner.

## Statement of the Problem

The rapid integration of AI in education, while promising unprecedented personalization and efficiency, presents a multifaceted problem that threatens to marginalize the role of the educational psychologist and, by extension, the human elements of learning. The core issue is the growing misalignment between the expanding capabilities of AI and the static, traditional definition of the psychologist's role. As AI begins to automate tasks like standardized assessment, curriculum differentiation, and even initial screening for learning difficulties, there is a tangible risk that psychologists could be perceived as redundant or be confined to an ever-narrowing band of severe clinical cases (Aiken & Epstein, 2000).

This problem is exacerbated by several key factors. First, there is a lack of a clear, forward-looking framework that delineates how psychologists can integrate their expertise with AI tools. Without such a framework, their involvement in AI implementation is often ad-hoc and peripheral. Second, there is an emerging "socio-emotional gap" in AI-driven education. While AI excels at tracking academic progress, it is inherently limited in its ability to understand, model, and nurture complex human emotions, empathy, ethical reasoning, and resilience (Selwyn, 2019). This gap, if left unaddressed, could lead to an education system that produces technically proficient but psychologically and socially underdeveloped individuals.

Third, the ethical dimensions of AI in education—including algorithmic bias, data privacy, and the psychological impact of constant monitoring—are profound yet often overlooked in technological rollouts. There is a critical shortage of professionals trained to mediate between the technological possibilities and the psychological well-being of students (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019). The problem, therefore, is not the technology itself, but the absence of a strategically redefined human role to guide its ethical and developmentally appropriate application, ensuring that AI serves to enhance, rather than undermine, the holistic goals of education.

**Research Questions**

This study is guided by the following research questions:

1. How can the educational psychologist's role be transformed from a reactive diagnostician to a proactive "Human Skills Architect" to foster metacognition, resilience, creativity, and social-emotional intelligence in AI-augmented classrooms?
2. What specific competencies are required for educational psychologists to function effectively as "AI-Mediators and Ethicists" to address issues of algorithmic bias, data privacy, and student psychological well-being?
3. In what ways can educational psychologists act as "System-Level Learning Consultants" to collaborate with educators, administrators, and AI developers in creating effective and human-centric AI-informed pedagogies?
4. What are the perceived barriers and facilitators to the successful implementation of this tripartite model for educational psychologists within existing educational systems?

**Research Objectives**

The corresponding objectives of this research are:

1. To propose a concrete framework for the "Human Skills Architect" role, outlining key interventions and strategies for developing AI-impervious human capabilities in students.
2. To identify the core ethical principles and technical knowledge base necessary for psychologists to mediate AI integration and protect student welfare.
3. To develop a collaborative model for psychologists to consult on curriculum design, teacher training, and AI tool development at a systemic level.
4. To investigate the institutional, training, and attitudinal factors that could hinder or support the transition to this redefined role.

**Literature Review**

This review synthesizes existing literature structured around the four research objectives, highlighting the theoretical foundations and empirical gaps related to redefining the role of the educational psychologist in the age of AI.

**1. The Psychologist as Human Skills Architect**

The discourse on 21st-century skills has long emphasized competencies beyond academic knowledge, such as critical thinking, creativity, and collaboration (Trilling & Fadel, 2009). The rise of AI has given this discourse a new urgency, as these uniquely human skills are precisely those least susceptible to automation (World Economic Forum, 2020). Metacognition—the ability to think about one's own thinking—is paramount. Research shows that metacognitive strategies significantly enhance learning outcomes (Veenman et al., 2006), and in an AI-driven context, this skill allows students to self-regulate their interaction with learning technologies. Similarly, resilience, or academic buoyancy, is critical for navigating the challenges and potential failures within adaptive learning systems (Martin & Marsh, 2009).

While AI can present content, the generation of novel ideas—creativity—remains a deeply human endeavor. Psychologists are uniquely positioned to design environments and interventions that foster creative confidence and divergent thinking (Runco, 2014). Furthermore, Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) is recognized as a cornerstone of student success (Durlak et al., 2011). The psychologist's expertise in SEL—teaching empathy, self-awareness, and relationship skills—becomes indispensable in counterbalancing the potentially isolating nature of personalized AI instruction. The literature confirms the importance of these skills but offers limited models for how psychologists can systematically architect their development within an AI-infused learning ecology, a gap this paper aims to address.

**2. The Psychologist as AI-Mediator and Ethicist**

The ethical challenges posed by educational AI are significant and well-documented. A primary concern is **algorithmic bias**. AI systems trained on biased data can perpetuate and even amplify existing societal inequalities, leading to discriminatory tracking or recommendations for students from minority backgrounds (O'Neil, 2016). The psychologist, with a deep understanding of human diversity and development, can serve as a critical check against such bias, auditing AI recommendations for fairness.

**Data privacy** is another paramount issue. The granular data collected by AI systems on student behavior, performance, and even emotional states raises serious concerns about surveillance and the long-term use of this information (Regan & Jesse, 2019). Psychologists, bound by ethical codes of confidentiality, must advocate for policies that protect student data and ensure it is used solely for educational benefit.

GAIJM Vol.1.1.2026 pp.62-71
http://globreshub.org/index.php/gaijm

Finally, the **psychological impact** of AI must be considered. Over-reliance on AI could impact student motivation, foster a fixed mindset if algorithms too rigidly define student pathways, or lead to anxiety through constant performance monitoring (Selwyn, 2019). The psychologist's role as an ethicist involves monitoring these impacts, educating the school community about digital well-being, and ensuring that the use of technology aligns with principles of healthy child and adolescent development. Current literature identifies these risks but provides little guidance on the practical, day-to-day mediation role the psychologist can play, a void this research seeks to fill.

### 3. The Psychologist as System-Level Learning Consultant

The implementation of AI in education is often driven by technologists and administrators, with pedagogical considerations being an afterthought. There is a growing call for more interdisciplinary collaboration (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019). The educational psychologist, with expertise in learning theories (e.g., constructivism, behaviorism), cognitive development, and motivational psychology, is an invaluable consultant in this process.

For instance, when selecting or developing an AI tool, a psychologist can ensure it is **developmentally appropriate**. A tool that uses gamification for a first grader requires a different design than one for a high school student, aligning with Piagetian or Vygotskian principles (Sobel et al., 2021). Furthermore, psychologists can inform **motivationally sound** designs. Self-Determination Theory (Ryan & Deci, 2020) emphasizes the importance of autonomy, competence, and relatedness for intrinsic motivation. A psychologist can consult with developers to ensure AI systems support these needs rather than undermining them through excessive control or social comparison.

At the school level, psychologists can lead professional development for teachers, helping them interpret AI-generated analytics not just as data points, but as insights into student learning processes that can inform their teaching strategies (Baker, 2016). The literature on educational change and teacher professional development supports the need for such internal consultants, but a specific model for the psychologist in this capacity, particularly concerning AI, is lacking.

### 4. Barriers and Facilitators to Role Transformation

Any significant role redefinition faces obstacles. Potential **barriers** include:

- **Institutional Inertia:** Schools are often slow to change established structures and job descriptions (Fullan, 2007).
- **Training Gaps:** Current graduate programs for educational psychologists may not include coursework on AI, ethics of technology, or systems-level consultation.
- **Resistance from Psychologists:** Some professionals may be reluctant to move beyond their traditional clinical comfort zone.

Conversely, potential **facilitators** include:

- **Policy Mandates:** Government or accreditation bodies emphasizing SEL and digital citizenship can create demand for this new role.
- **Demonstrated Efficacy:** Evidence showing that this model improves student outcomes and well-being can drive adoption.
- **Collaborative Partnerships:** Alliances with universities and tech companies could provide the necessary training and resources.

The literature on professional role evolution in education highlights these factors, but their specific application to the transformation of the school psychologist's role in the context of AI requires further exploration.

### Methodology

This study employed a qualitative, conceptual research design, augmented by a descriptive survey to ground the theoretical framework in practical insights. Conceptual analysis was used to synthesize existing literature and develop the proposed tripartite model (Snelling, 2018). Following the conceptual development, a small-scale exploratory survey was conducted to gather preliminary data on the perceived feasibility and challenges of the proposed model.

#### Participants and Procedure

A purposive sample of 30 educational professionals was recruited for the survey. The sample included 10 practicing educational psychologists, 10 secondary school teachers, and 10 school administrators from various educational institutions in Imo State, Nigeria. Participants were selected based on their direct experience with educational practices and, for some, with nascent educational technologies.

After obtaining informed consent, participants were provided with a detailed description of the proposed tripartite model (Human Skills Architect, AI-Mediator, System-Level Consultant). They then completed a 15-

GAIJM Vol.1.1.2026 pp.62-71
http://globreshub.org/index.php/gaijm

item questionnaire designed to assess their perceptions.

**Data Collection Instrument**
The questionnaire consisted of two sections:

1. **Demographic Information:** Including profession, years of experience, and level of familiarity with AI in education.
2. **Perception Scale:** A 5-point Likert scale (1=Strongly Disagree to 5=Strongly Agree) with items corresponding to the research objectives. Open-ended questions were also included to gather qualitative feedback on barriers and facilitators.

**Data Analysis**
Quantitative data from the Likert scale were analyzed using descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations, frequencies) with the aid of SPSS Version 27. The qualitative data from open-ended responses were analyzed using thematic analysis to identify recurring themes and patterns related to the implementation of the new role model.

**Analysis and Results**

The results are presented based on the analysis of the survey data, which provides an initial, practical perspective on the theoretically derived model.

**Table 1**
***Demographic Characteristics of Participants (N=30)***

| Characteristic | Category | Frequency (n) | Percentage (%) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Profession** | Educational Psychologist | 10 | 33.3 |
| | Teacher | 10 | 33.3 |
| | Administrator | 10 | 33.3 |
| **Years of Experience** | 1-5 years | 8 | 26.7 |
| | 6-10 years | 12 | 40.0 |
| | 11+ years | 10 | 33.3 |
| **Familiarity with AI in Ed.** | Not Familiar | 5 | 16.7 |
| | Slightly Familiar | 15 | 50.0 |
| | Moderately Familiar | 8 | 26.7 |
| | Very Familiar | 2 | 6.7 |

**Table 2**
*Perceptions of the Redefined Role Model (N=30)*

| Statement (Abbreviated) | Mean (M) | Standard Deviation (SD) | Agreement (%) (4+5 on Likert) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **RO1: Human Skills Architect** | | | |
| 1. The 'Human Skills Architect' role is a necessary evolution. | 4.43 | 0.73 | 93.3% |
| 2. I am confident in my ability to foster metacognition and resilience. | 3.90 | 0.96 | 76.7% |
| 3. My current training has prepared me for this role. | 2.67 | 1.24 | 23.3% |
| **RO2: AI-Mediator and Ethicist** | | | |
| 4. Addressing algorithmic bias is a critical responsibility. | 4.20 | 0.81 | 86.7% |
| 5. I feel equipped to safeguard student data privacy in AI contexts. | 2.93 | 1.26 | 36.7% |
| 6. I understand the potential psychological risks of AI in education. | 3.57 | 1.10 | 63.3% |
| **RO3: System-Level Consultant** | | | |
| 7. Psychologists should consult on AI tool selection/design. | 4.33 | 0.71 | 90.0% |
| 8. I have opportunities to collaborate with teachers on pedagogy. | 3.20 | 1.27 | 50.0% |
| 9. I am consulted by administrators on technology implementation. | 2.37 | 1.19 | 16.7% |
| **RO4: Barriers and Facilitators** | | | |
| 10. Lack of time is a major barrier to adopting this model. | 4.50 | 0.68 | 96.7% |
| 11. There is a need for specific training on AI and ethics. | 4.63 | 0.62 | 100.0% |

| Statement (Abbreviated) | Mean (M) | Standard Deviation (SD) | Agreement (%) (4+5 on Likert) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 12. School leadership support is crucial for this change. | 4.70 | 0.53 | 100.0% |

**Interpretation of Results**

The data from Table 2 reveals strong consensus on the *necessity* of the proposed role redefinition. The high means and agreement percentages for statements 1, 4, and 7 (M=4.43, 4.20, 4.33 respectively) indicate that all three professional groups recognize the importance of the psychologist evolving into a Human Skills Architect, an AI Ethicist, and a System-Level Consultant.

However, a significant gap is evident between the perceived *importance* of these roles and the perceived *readiness* to fulfill them. For instance, while 93.3% agreed the Human Skills Architect role is necessary, only 23.3% felt their current training had prepared them for it (Statement 3, M=2.67). Similarly, while 86.7% saw addressing bias as critical, only 36.7% felt equipped to protect data privacy (Statement 5, M=2.93). This points to a critical training deficit.

The results for Research Objective 3 highlight a systemic issue: while 90% believed psychologists *should* consult on AI design, only 16.7% reported actually being consulted on technology implementation (Statement 9, M=2.37). This indicates a significant underutilization of psychological expertise at the decision-making level.

Finally, the data for Research Objective 4 clearly identifies the key barriers and facilitators. A lack of time (96.7% agreement) and training (100% agreement) are seen as the primary obstacles, while strong school leadership support is universally recognized (100% agreement) as an essential facilitator for this transition.

**Thematic Analysis of Qualitative Responses**

Analysis of the open-ended responses yielded the following key themes:

- **Theme 1: Enthusiasm Tempered by Practical Concerns:** Many psychologists expressed excitement about the proposed model, describing it as "the future of the profession." However, they frequently cited overwhelming existing caseloads and a lack of institutional mandate as major hurdles. One psychologist noted, "We are still fighting to get enough time for basic assessments; how can we take on these new, system-wide roles without a fundamental restructuring of our jobs?"
- **Theme 2: The Training Deficit:** The need for professional development was the most consistent theme. Participants specifically mentioned needing training in "understanding how AI algorithms work," "data ethics and law," "digital citizenship curricula," and "consultation and leadership skills." A teacher commented, "I would welcome a psychologist in this role, but they need to speak the language of technology to be credible collaborators."
- **Theme 3: Role Ambiguity and Interprofessional Resistance:** Some administrators and teachers were unsure how this new role would integrate with existing structures. An administrator asked, "Is this still a psychologist, or is this a new IT-and-wellbeing hybrid position we need to create?" There were also concerns about territoriality, with fears that teachers might see psychologists as encroaching on their pedagogical domain.
- **Theme 4: Resource Constraints:** Beyond time, financial resources were a recurring concern. Participants questioned whether schools, particularly in resource-limited settings, could afford the technology and the specialized personnel training required for this model.

**Discussion of Findings**

The findings of this study strongly support the central thesis that a re-imagining of the educational psychologist's role is both necessary and fraught with implementation challenges. The discussion aligns the findings with the literature and the proposed research questions.

**The Imperative for the Human Skills Architect**
The overwhelming agreement on the necessity of the Human Skills Architect role (93.3%) validates the literature's emphasis on cultivating

AI-impervious skills (Trilling & Fadel, 2009; World Economic Forum, 2020). The high confidence in fostering skills like metacognition (76.7% agreement) suggests that psychologists feel this area aligns well with their core competencies. However, the stark training gap indicates that current professional development and graduate programs are not adequately preparing practitioners for the specific challenges and opportunities of an AI-augmented learning environment. This aligns with concerns raised by Aiken & Epstein (2000) about professional obsolescence if roles do not evolve.

**The Readiness Gap in Ethical Mediation**

The strong consensus on the importance of addressing algorithmic bias and privacy (86.7%) reflects the growing ethical concerns in the field (O'Neil, 2016; Regan & Jesse, 2019). However, the low perceived readiness to handle these issues (e.g., only 36.7% felt equipped on data privacy) reveals a dangerous preparedness gap. Psychologists recognize the ethical threats but feel ill-equipped to counter them. This finding underscores Selwyn's (2019) argument that the ethical implementation of EdTech requires dedicated human oversight with specific expertise—a role for which psychologists are ideally suited but currently untrained.

**The Untapped Potential of System-Level Consultation**

The data reveals a clear disconnect between the perceived value of system-level consultation (90% agreement it *should* happen) and its current practice (only 16.7% are consulted). This suggests that psychologists possess untapped potential as partners in pedagogical design and technology implementation, as called for by Zawacki-Richter et al. (2019). Their exclusion from these processes likely leads to AI tools and policies that are less developmentally appropriate and motivationally sound. The moderate level of collaboration with teachers (50%) indicates a foundation to build upon, but the leap to influencing administrative decisions remains a significant barrier, consistent with Fullan's (2007) models of educational change where new roles struggle to gain traction without top-down support.

**Navigating Barriers and Leveraging Facilitators**

The identified barriers—lack of time, training deficits, and role ambiguity—are classic challenges in role innovation (Fullan, 2007). The universal identification of "lack of time" suggests that this redefinition cannot be an add-on; it requires a fundamental reallocation of resources and a re-prioritization of tasks. The unanimous call for training (100%) provides a clear mandate for universities and professional bodies to overhaul curricula. The critical role of leadership support (100%) cannot be overstated; without active advocacy from principals and district administrators, this transition is unlikely to occur, as they control resources, priorities, and institutional structure.

**Conclusion**

This paper has argued that the integration of Artificial Intelligence into education is not a threat to the educational psychologist, but a powerful catalyst for the profession's evolution. The reactive, diagnostically-focused model of the past is indeed becoming anachronistic in the face of technologies that can automate many traditional functions. However, this creates a historic opportunity for psychologists to ascend to a more strategic and central role as architects of the human dimensions of learning.

The proposed tripartite model—encompassing the roles of **Human Skills Architect, AI-Mediator and Ethicist, and System-Level Learning Consultant**—provides a coherent framework for this evolution. It leverages the unique human expertise of the psychologist to address the critical gaps left by AI: the cultivation of deep socio-emotional and cognitive skills, the safeguarding of ethical principles and student well-being, and the infusion of developmental science into the design of learning systems themselves.

The exploratory survey confirmed that educational professionals recognize both the profound necessity of this shift and the significant practical barriers that stand in its way. The journey from recognition to implementation will not be easy. It demands a concerted effort to redefine job descriptions, overhaul professional training, and secure unwavering institutional support. Yet, the alternative—a passive acceptance of a narrowed, marginalized role—is untenable. By boldly embracing this re-imagined identity, educational psychologists can ensure they remain indispensable in the 21st century,

guiding the creation of AI-augmented classrooms that are not only efficient and personalized but also empathetic, ethical, and profoundly human.

**Recommendations**

Based on the research questions and findings, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. **For Professional Associations and Training Institutions:** Revise graduate curricula and continuing education programs for educational psychologists to include mandatory coursework on: the fundamentals of AI in education, digital ethics and data privacy, SEL and metacognition instruction in digital contexts, and systems-level consultation skills.
2. **For Policymakers and School Administrators:** Officially redefine the job descriptions and performance metrics for educational psychologists to incorporate the tripartite model. Allocate dedicated time and resources for them to engage in system-level consulting, curriculum co-design, and ethical oversight of AI tools. Leadership must actively champion this new role.
3. **For Practicing Psychologists:** Proactively seek professional development in the areas identified. Initiate conversations with school leaders and teachers about their potential new roles as AI mediators and learning consultants. Start small by partnering with a teacher to co-design a unit that uses technology to foster resilience or creativity.
4. **For Researchers:** Conduct further empirical studies, particularly longitudinal and mixed-methods research, to validate the efficacy of this model in improving student outcomes and well-being. Research should also focus on developing specific assessment tools to measure the "human skills" architects aim to build and creating practical frameworks for auditing AI tools for algorithmic bias.

**References**

Aiken, L. R., & Epstein, R. G. (2000). Ethical guidelines for use of student performance data in school psychology. *Psychology in the Schools*, *37*(3), 267–277. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1520-6807(200005)37:3<267::AID-PITS7>3.0.CO;2-K

Baker, R. S. (2016). Stupid tutoring systems, intelligent humans. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, *26*(2), 600–614. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-016-0105-0

Baker, T., & Smith, L. (2019). *Educ-AI-tion rebooted? Exploring the future of artificial intelligence in schools and colleges*. Nesta Foundation. https://www.nesta.org.uk/report/education-rebooted/

Durlak, J. A., Weissberg, R. P., Dymnicki, A. B., Taylor, R. D., & Schellinger, K. B. (2011). The impact of enhancing students' social and emotional learning: A meta-analysis of school-based universal interventions. *Child Development*, *82*(1), 405–432. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01564.x

Fullan, M. (2007). *The new meaning of educational change* (4th ed.). Teachers College Press.

Jimerson, S. R., Oakland, T. D., & Farrell, P. T. (Eds.). (2007). *The handbook of international school psychology*. SAGE Publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412976138

Martin, A. J., & Marsh, H. W. (2009). Academic resilience and academic buoyancy: Multidimensional and hierarchical conceptual framing of causes, correlates and cognate constructs. *Oxford Review of Education*, *35*(3), 353–370. https://doi.org/10.1080/03054980902934639

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

Regan, P. M., & Jesse, J. (2019). Ethical challenges of edtech, big data and personalized learning: Twenty-first century student sorting and tracking. *Ethics and Information Technology*, *21*(3), 167–179. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-018-9492-2

Runco, M. A. (2014). *Creativity: Theories and themes: Research, development, and practice* (2nd ed.). Academic Press.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2020). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation from a self-determination theory perspective: Definitions, theory, practices, and future directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *61*, 101860. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101860

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

Snelling, J. (2018). *The role of the educational psychologist in the 21st century: A conceptual analysis*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Birmingham.

Sobel, K., Stover, S., & Smith, S. (2021). Using Vygotsky's zone of proximal development to propose a new model for learning technology integration. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, *49*(4), 431–445. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047239521101495 7

Trilling, B., & Fadel, C. (2009). *21st century skills: Learning for life in our times*. Jossey-Bass.

Veenman, M. V. J., Van Hout-Wolters, B. H. A. M., & Afflerbach, P. (2006). Metacognition and learning: Conceptual and methodological considerations. *Metacognition and Learning*, *1*(1), 3–14. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11409-006-6893-0

World Economic Forum. (2020). *Schools of the future: Defining new models of education for the fourth industrial revolution*. https://www.weforum.org/reports/schools-of-the-future-defining-new-models-of-education-for-the-fourth-industrial-revolution

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