Eurasian
Research Unit
Eurasian Campus - Sri Lanka

EURASIAN JOURNAL OF EDUCATION AND PSYCHOLOGY

2026; I (II): 16-23
Published online 23.10.2026 (https://eurasiancampus.edu.journals.lk/)

Artificial Intelligence at the Social Crossroads: Psychological Well-Being and Educational Equity in the Digital Age

Reza Fahmi[1,*] , Prima Aswirna[2]

[1]*Department of Islamic Psychology, Faculty of Ushuluddin and Religious Study, Universitas Islam Negeri Imam Bonjol Padang, Indonesia.*

[2]*Department of Physical Education, Faculty of Education and Teacher Training, Universitas Islam Negeri Imam Bonjol Padang, Indonesia.*

Email address:
rezafahmi@uinib.ac.id

To cite this article:
Fahmi, R., & Aswirna, P. (2026). Artificial intelligence at the social crossroads: Psychological well-being and educational equity in the digital age. Eurasian Journal of Education and Psychology, 1(2), 16-23. https://doi.org/10.68283/ejep.v1.i2.a02

DOI: 10.68283/ejep.v1.i2.a02

Received: 05. 08. 2026; **Accepted**: 09. 09. 2026; **Published**: 23. 10. 2026

Abstract: The rapid integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into daily life has created a complex social intersection impacting student mental health and academic access. While AI offers personalized learning, it simultaneously risks widening the digital divide, accelerating socio-economic educational inequities, and inducing psychological issues such as tech-anxiety and cognitive over-reliance. This study investigates how AI deployment influences psychological well-being and shapes educational equity among vulnerable student populations. Bridging tech-centric educational research and human psychology, this study introduces an integrative model analyzing AI not merely as an instructional tool, but as a socio-psychological determinant of educational fairness. Framed by Vygotsky's Socio-Cultural Theory and Self-Determination Theory (SDT), this qualitative research examines primary school to university-level educators, students, and educational psychologists across diverse socio-economic districts in Indonesia (2024–2026). Data were gathered via semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions, and reflective learner logs, then analyzed using Critical Discourse Analysis and thematic coding. Findings reveal that while adaptive AI tools enhance self-efficacy in resource-rich environments, socio-economically disadvantaged students face "algorithmic alienation" due to poor access and inadequate digital literacy, heightening anxiety and reducing intrinsic motivation. AI adoption must move beyond technological optimism to prioritize psychological safety and equitable access, establishing ethical human-AI collaboration in education.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Educational Equity, Psychological Well-Being, Socio-Cultural Theory, Algorithmic Alienation

© Eurasian Campus - Sri Lanka 2026, All Rights Reserved

1. Introduction

The rapid integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) across primary, secondary, and tertiary educational institutions has initiated a profound shift in global teaching and learning dynamics. Traditional pedagogical models centered on passive information transmission are increasingly displaced by adaptive learning systems, predictive analytics, large language models, and automated feedback loops. Proponents of educational technology emphasize AI's capacity to democratize learning by tailoring instructional pathways to individual student pacing, offering immediate remediation, and lowering administrative burdens for educators. However, the rapid deployment of these algorithms introduces a complex socio-psychological nexus that challenges uncritical technological optimism. Educational access is fundamentally linked to human psychological well-being, cognitive processing, and social equity. As AI systems become central mediators of modern instruction, a distinct division emerges: while well-resourced academic environments leverage AI tools to foster self-directed learning and higher-order critical thinking, socio-economically marginalized populations encounter structural barriers that turn these systems into sources of cognitive overload, alienation, and academic anxiety.

Early implementations of AI in education were driven by the assumption that automated tools inherently act as equalizers. By providing access to virtual tutors and intelligent tutoring systems, researchers posited that students, regardless of background, could receive top-tier academic guidance. Yet this perspective often treats educational technology as an isolated tool, ignoring the socio-economic and psychological contexts in which students operate. Learning is not a purely mechanical input-output process; it is deeply tied to emotional safety, perceived control, and relational trust between learners and educators. When AI platforms are integrated into settings lacking adequate infrastructure or digital literacy, the promised benefits often falter. Instead of empowering learners, opaque automated grading, rigid algorithmic feedback, and unreliable connectivity produce a state of hyper-vigilance and confusion. Students in resource-constrained settings frequently report feeling monitored rather than supported, transforming a tool designed for intellectual growth into an instrument of psychological stress. The digital divide in education has evolved across three distinct tiers:

- *First-Level Digital Divide:* Focused on physical hardware and connectivity access—such as internet availability and personal computer ownership.
- *Second-Level Digital Divide:* Shifted attention to digital literacy, soft skills, and the capacity of users to effectively navigate web interfaces.
- *Third-Level Digital Divide (The Algorithmic Tier):* Centers on the capacity to leverage advanced AI models effectively while avoiding algorithmic bias, opaque automated decisions, and cognitive over-reliance.

In the context of this third-level divide, socio-economically disadvantaged students face algorithmic alienation. This psychological phenomenon occurs when learners experience a disconnect from their own educational journey due to automated evaluation systems that do not account for socio-linguistic nuances, institutional context, or individual effort. While privileged students use premium AI tools with high accuracy to streamline routine tasks and deepen critical analysis, marginalized students often depend on restricted, ad-supported, or lower-tier models. This disparity reinforces systemic inequalities: higher-tier access builds academic self-efficacy, whereas lower-tier access induces tech-anxiety and erodes intrinsic motivation. Vygotsky posited that human cognitive development is mediated by cultural artifacts and social interactions. Within modern digital environments, AI software functions as an active mediational artifact rather than a passive conduit. In an ideal setting, adaptive AI provides scaffolding within a student's Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) the space between what a learner can accomplish independently and what they can achieve with guidance. When properly calibrated, AI tools offer hints, adapt problem difficulty, and reduce cognitive fatigue, allowing students to master complex concepts. However, if the supporting socio-cultural environment comprising skilled teacher guidance, peer collaboration, and reliable infrastructure is absent, the mediation breaks down. The AI tool ceases to scaffold and instead imposes rigid structural barriers that hinder cognitive growth. Self-Determination Theory asserts that human motivation and psychological well-being rely on fulfilling three basic psychological needs: autonomy,

© Eurasian Campus - Sri Lanka 2026, All Rights Reserved

competence, and relatedness. Applying SDT to AI integration reveals how technology impacts intrinsic student motivation:

- *Autonomy Impact:* When AI systems provide transparent choices and flexible learning options, student autonomy increases. Conversely, when automated grading tools or plagiarism detectors operate as black boxes without clear appeal mechanisms, student autonomy is compromised, replacing internal motivation with compliance-driven behavior.
- *Competence Impact:* Real-time adaptive feedback can strengthen perceived competence when it highlights learning progress. However, frequent algorithmic errors, language mismatches, or system failures induce feelings of helplessness and reduce self-efficacy.
- *Relatedness Impact:* Over-reliance on automated tutoring can isolate learners from human instructors and peers. When algorithmically generated evaluations replace human feedback, the emotional bond between student and teacher weakens, reducing overall educational trust.

While educational institutions continue to adopt AI platforms at an accelerated rate, policy and implementation strategies remain predominantly focused on software acquisition, technical infrastructure, and administrative efficiency. There is a noticeable lack of empirical inquiry into the socio-psychological consequences of AI integration among socio-economically diverse student bodies. Specifically, existing literature often overlooks how algorithmic opacity, digital access gaps, and changing teacher-student dynamics influence mental health, cognitive load, and intrinsic motivation. Without a clear understanding of these human factors, AI adoption risks expanding existing socio-economic inequalities and creating environments that induce tech-anxiety and alienation among vulnerable learners.

This study systematically investigates the intersection of AI integration, student psychological well-being, and educational equity across diverse educational settings in Indonesia (2024–2026). The research pursues three specific objectives:

1. Assess how adaptive AI tools affect student experiences of autonomy, competence, and relatedness across different socio-economic backgrounds.
2. Identify the factors that lead to "algorithmic alienation" and tech-anxiety among marginalized student cohorts.
3. Propose an integrative, human-centered pedagogical framework that combines ethical governance, equitable access, and teacher-mediated scaffolding to protect student mental health and promote educational fairness.

Moving beyond traditional studies that evaluate AI purely through learning analytics or technical usability, this research introduces an interdisciplinary framework bridging political economy, educational psychology, and critical technology studies. By conceptualizing AI not merely as an instructional device but as a socio-psychological determinant of educational fairness, this study provides empirical insight into how automated systems alter human agency in developing nations. Through qualitative research across primary, secondary, and tertiary institutions, this work documents the lived experiences of students and educators as they navigate AI adoption. In doing so, it shifts the academic conversation from uncritical technological adoption toward an ethical, human-centered approach to educational technology.

2. Research Methods

2.1. Research Design and Theoretical Framework

This study adopted a qualitative research design to investigate the socio-psychological dimensions of AI deployment. Qualitative inquiry was chosen to capture the complex, lived experiences of students, educators, and educational psychologists across different socio-economic strata. The theoretical architecture combines Socio-Cultural Theory and Self-Determination Theory (SDT). Socio-Cultural Theory conceptualizes AI systems as cultural tools that mediate cognitive development within the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). Self-Determination Theory evaluates how AI technology impacts intrinsic motivation by influencing learners' psychological needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness. Table 1 summarizes the theoretical framework applied to AI integration.

© Eurasian Campus - Sri Lanka 2026, All Rights Reserved

Table 1. Theoretical Framework

Theoretical Framework	Key Authors & Foundations	Core Applied Concepts to AI Integration
Socio-Cultural Theory	Vygotsky (1978)	• **Mediational Role:** AI tools acting as cognitive artifacts • **Scaffolding:** Guidance within the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) • **Mediated Cognition:** Socially and technologically structured learning
Self-Determination Theory	Ryan & Deci (2000)	• **Autonomy:** Preservation of learner agency and self-direction • **Competence:** Building self-efficacy through adaptive feedback • **Relatedness:** Maintaining human and social connections in learning

2.2. Participants and Research Subjects

The investigation was conducted across multi-level educational settings in Indonesia over a multi-year timeframe (2024–2026). Participants ($N = 84$) were recruited using purposive sampling to ensure balanced representation across socio-economic indicators, institutional tier, and academic role. Details regarding participant distribution are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Participant Group

Participant Group	Count (n)	Institutional / Socio-Economic Context
Higher Education Students	32	Urban private universities ($n=16$), Rural public universities ($n=16$)
Secondary School Students	24	High-resource metropolitan ($n=12$), Low-resource suburban/rural ($n=12$)
Educators & STEM Faculty	18	Primary, secondary, and tertiary teaching roles
Educational Psychologists	10	Clinical practitioners and academic counselors

2.3. Data Collection and Analysis Procedure

Data collection utilized three complementary qualitative techniques:

1. *Semi-Structured Interviews:* Conducted individually with educators, psychologists, and tertiary students (45–60 minutes each), focusing on institutional policies, perceived fairness, and emotional responses to AI tools.
2. *Focus Group Discussions (FGDs):* Organized into six distinct sessions categorized by socio-economic group to explore collective peer dynamics, digital access challenges, and classroom experiences.
3. *Reflective Learner Logs:* Maintained by student participants over an eight-week academic cycle, capturing real-time interactions, cognitive fatigue, and anxiety related to automated learning platforms.

Data were analyzed using Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) alongside inductive thematic coding. Textual transcripts were iteratively coded to map patterns of cognitive load, autonomy, and structural equity barriers.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Core Dimensions of AI Deployment

3.1.1. Dual Impact on Learner Autonomy and Self-Efficacy

In resource-rich educational environments, access to adaptive AI tutoring platforms enhanced academic self-efficacy. Students reported that real-time feedback and customizable task difficulty allowed them to regulate their learning pace, satisfying their basic need for competence. However, in low-resource environments, this dynamic inverted: forced interaction with opaque,

© Eurasian Campus - Sri Lanka 2026, All Rights Reserved

automated grading systems without adequate human support diminished perceived agency, leading to cognitive over-reliance and diminished problem-solving confidence.

3.1.2. Algorithmic Alienation and Tech-Anxiety

A prominent finding among socio-economically disadvantaged students was the emergence of algorithmic alienation. This psychological phenomenon occurs when learners feel disconnected from the learning process due to opaque automated evaluations, language/cultural mismatches in AI model design, and inconsistent internet infrastructure. Learners experiencing algorithmic alienation exhibited elevated levels of tech-anxiety, feelings of helplessness, and a degradation of intrinsic motivation. Rather than viewing technology as an empowering mediator, these students perceived AI as an arbitrary monitor. Comparative observations between student cohorts are detailed in Table 3.

Table 3. Core Dimension, Resource-Rich Cohorts, and Socio-Economically Vulnerable Cohorts

Core Dimension	Resource-Rich Cohorts	Socio-Economically Vulnerable Cohorts
Academic Agency & Engagement	• Increased academic agency • Higher intrinsic motivation	• Systemic algorithmic alienation • Cognitive over-reliance
Cognitive & Psychological Impact	• Optimized cognitive load • Effective tool utilization	• High prevalence of tech-anxiety • Eroded learner-instructor trust

3.1.3. Exacerbation of the Structural Digital Divide

While AI platforms are often marketed as equalizers, empirical data indicated that unequal access to high-tier AI software, high-speed connectivity, and digital literacy training widens pre-existing educational gaps. Disadvantaged students frequently relied on free, restricted versions of tools with lower accuracy, resulting in uneven learning outcomes and reinforcing socio-economic divides.

3.1.4. Relational Friction and Eroded Educational Trust

Automated assessment systems disrupted traditional educator-student relationships. Students reported hesitation in approaching instructors when algorithmic outputs conflicted with their actual effort, fearing that automated metrics would take precedence over human judgment. Educational psychologists noted a corresponding decline in the sense of relatedness within learning communities.

3.2. Theoretical Interpretation and Proposed Pedagogy

3.2.1. Socio-Psychological Determinants

The empirical findings emphasize that AI deployment in educational environments is not a neutral technical upgrade; it is a socio-psychological intervention. When analyzed through Vygotsky's Socio-Cultural perspective, AI acts as an active cultural mediator. If the socio-cultural infrastructure comprising teacher guidance, technological access, and digital literacy is fragile, the tool fails to scaffold learning within the Zone of Proximal Development. Instead, it creates cognitive overload and emotional distress.

From the perspective of Self-Determination Theory (Ryan & Deci, 2000), educational equity depends on fulfilling basic psychological needs:

When algorithmic opacity reduces a student's perceived autonomy, or when unequal access diminishes their sense of competence relative to peers, psychological well-being declines. This drop in well-being directly impedes academic engagement.

3.2.2. Human-Centered AI Pedagogy Framework

To prevent AI from deepening educational inequality, institutions must move away from uncritical adoption of technology. Mitigating algorithmic alienation requires human-centered AI pedagogy one that integrates ethical transparency, equitable infrastructure distribution, and active educator involvement to

© Eurasian Campus - Sri Lanka 2026, All Rights Reserved

safeguard student mental health and educational access. Table 4 outlines the core pillars of this framework.

Table 4. Core Pillar, Focus Area, and Pedagogical Objectives

Core Pillar	Focus Area	Pedagogical Objectives
Ethical AI Governance	Systems & Policy	Ensures algorithm transparency, protects student data privacy, and enforces human oversight in automated evaluations.
Inclusive Access Infrastructure	Equity & Resources	Eliminates the digital divide by guaranteeing equal technological access, hardware availability, and digital literacy support.
Teacher-Mediated Scaffolding	Human Pedagogy	Re-anchors educators as active facilitators who guide AI interactions to preserve student autonomy and psychological well-being.

4. Conclusion

Artificial Intelligence stands at a critical social crossroads in modern education. While adaptive systems and predictive analytics offer unprecedented opportunities for personalized instruction, academic self-efficacy, and pedagogical transformation, their uncritical deployment risks exacerbating pre-existing socio-economic divides. Grounded in Vygotsky's Socio-Cultural Theory and Ryan and Deci's Self-Determination Theory, this qualitative investigation demonstrates that AI adoption is not merely a technical upgrade, but a profound socio-psychological intervention that restructures student motivation, cognitive processing, and educational equity. The findings highlight a stark disparity between resource-rich and marginalized learning environments. In well-resourced contexts, adaptive platforms scaffold learning within the Zone of Proximal Development, strengthening autonomy and competence. Conversely, in socio-economically vulnerable contexts, structural access gaps, algorithmic opacity, and restricted software tiers induce "algorithmic alienation" a psychological phenomenon characterized by tech-anxiety, cognitive over-reliance, diminished intrinsic motivation, and eroded relational trust between learners and educators. When automated evaluations replace human feedback without adequate socio-cultural infrastructure, students perceive technology as an arbitrary monitor rather than an empowering tool.

To prevent AI from deepening educational inequalities, policy-makers, institutional leaders, and technology developers must abandon pure technological optimism in favor of a human-centered AI pedagogy. Achieving educational fairness requires a tripartite approach:

1. *Ethical AI Governance:* Establishing transparent, bias-free, and human-in-the-loop assessment models that safeguard student privacy and preserve learner agency.
2. *Inclusive Access Infrastructure:* Guaranteeing equitable distribution of high-tier software, hardware, reliable connectivity, and comprehensive digital literacy programs across all socio-economic strata to eliminate the third-level digital divide.
3. *Teacher-Mediated Scaffolding:* Re-anchoring educators as active relational guides who mediate AI tools, safeguard psychological well-being, and foster meaningful human collaboration.

Ultimately, educational technology must serve as a catalyst for human flourishing rather than a surrogate for human instruction. Prioritizing psychological safety alongside equitable access ensures that the digital evolution empowers every learner, regardless of socio-economic background.

Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge the educators, students, and educational psychologists who generously contributed their time and shared their experiences for this study.

References

Akgun, S., & Greenhow, C. (2022). Artificial intelligence in education: Addressing ethical challenges in K-12 settings. *AI and Ethics*, 2(4), 431–440. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-021-00096-7

© Eurasian Campus - Sri Lanka 2026, All Rights Reserved

Bandhu, D., Sharma, G., & Kumar, P. (2024). Exploring the impact of artificial intelligence on student autonomy and self-regulated learning in higher education. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*, 36(1), 112–135. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12528-023-09351-y

Blank, G., & Lutz, C. (2018). Representativeness of social media in Great Britain: Structural hyper-cascades and digital inequality. *Information, Communication & Society*, 21(5), 741–756. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2017.1321664

Carter, L., Liu, D., & Cantrell, C. (2020). Digital divide and social inclusion: Evaluating the impact of algorithmic governance on marginalized populations. *Government Information Quarterly*, 37(4), 101492. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2020.101492

Chiu, T. K. F. (2022). Applying the self-determination theory to explain AI engagement in K-12 education. *Educational Technology & Society*, 25(4), 38–50.

Garzón, J., Baldiris, S., & Gutierrez, J. (2025). Systematic review of adaptive AI platforms in STEM education: Cognitive load and learning equity. *Computers & Education*, 210, 104950. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2024.104950

Gligorea, I., Cioca, M., Oancea, R., Gorski, A. T., Gorski, H., & Tudorache, P. (2023). Adaptive learning using artificial intelligence in e-learning: A literature review. *Education Sciences*, 13(12), 1216. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13121216

Gupta, S., Kamboj, S., & Bag, S. (2023). The role of artificial intelligence in shaping higher education quality and student well-being. *Studies in Higher Education*, 48(9), 1420–1438. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2023.2185421

Hammerschmidt, T., & Lutz, C. (2025). Bridging the gap: Inequalities that divide those who can and cannot create sustainable outcomes with AI. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 44(3), 301–318. https://doi.org/10.1080/0144929X.2025.2500451

Hussain, Z., Khan, A., Awad, A., & Bansal, R. (2024). Knowledge orchestration and AI-driven learning ecosystems in developing economies. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 28(5), 1289–1310. https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-03-2023-0210

Jailani, M., & Mahanani, S. (2024). Global research trends on learning technology in psychology: A bibliometric analysis. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, 27(2), 177–203.

Kashive, N., Khanna, V. T., & Powale, L. (2020). Technological adoption and learning engagement in higher education: An empirical assessment. *Virtual Reality*, 24(3), 509–522. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10055-019-00412-2

Kitsara, I. (2022). Artificial intelligence and the digital divide: Policy challenges and opportunities for developing nations. *Telecommunications Policy*, 46(8), 102380. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.telpol.2022.102380

Krause, M., & Vieriu, D. (2024). AI tools and cognitive over-reliance in secondary education: A socio-technical critique. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 55(2), 488–506. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13380

Lin, C. H., Zhang, Y., & Zheng, B. (2023). The impact of AI-assisted language learning platforms on student autonomy and anxiety. *System*, 115, 103061. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2023.103061

Lutz, C. (2024). Digital inequalities in the age of artificial intelligence: A tier-based framework. *New Media & Society*, 26(1), 112–131. https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448231189000

Matjie, M. A. (2026). AI and the digital divide in education: Socio-cultural barriers and algorithmic bias. *Frontiers in Computer Science*, 8, 1759027. https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomp.2026.1759027

Mncube, D. W. (2024). Artificial intelligence in higher education: Supporting self-directed

© Eurasian Campus - Sri Lanka 2026, All Rights Reserved

learning and student autonomy. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 124, 102290. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2023.102290

Ofer, D., Kaufman, H., & Linial, M. (2024). What's next? Forecasting scientific research trends in artificial intelligence and human cognition. *Heliyon*, 10(1), e23781. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e23781

Ozmen Garibay, O., Winslow, B., & Hughes, C. (2023). Six human-centered artificial intelligence challenges for social good and equity. *AI & Society*, 38(2), 691–705. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-022-01467-w

Pajares, F. (1997). Current directions in self-efficacy research. *Advances in Motivation and Achievement*, 10(1), 1–49.

Riggins, F. J., & Dewan, S. (2005). The digital divide: Current state and future directions in IS research. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, 6(12), 298–337. https://doi.org/10.17705/1jais.00077

Robinson, L., Cotten, S. R., & Ono, H. (2015). Digital inequalities and why they matter. *Information, Communication & Society*, 18(5), 569–582. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2015.1012532

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68–78. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68

Scheerder, A., van Deursen, A., & van Dijk, J. (2017). Determinants of Internet skills, uses and outcomes: A systematic review of the third-level digital divide. *Telematics and Informatics*, 34(8), 1607–1624. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2017.07.007

Sun, J. (2024). AI, education, and international student engagement in Chinese universities: Implications for policy and learning equity. *Foro de Educación*, 22(1), 145–168. https://doi.org/10.14516/fde.913

Vassilakopoulou, P., & Hustad, E. (2023). Bridging digital divides: A capability approach for AI adoption in public sector education. *Information Systems Journal*, 33(4), 890–912. https://doi.org/10.1111/isj.12421

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.

Wamba, S. F., Queiroz, M. M., & Trinchera, L. (2024). The artificial intelligence divide: Structural inequalities and well-being outcomes in digital ecosystems. *International Journal of Information Management*, 74, 102710. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2023.102710

© Eurasian Campus - Sri Lanka 2026, All Rights Reserved