

NEUROADAPTIVE LEARNING IN ONLINE EDUCATION:
PERSONALIZING INSTRUCTION WITH BRAIN-COMPUTER INTERFACES

<https://doi.org/10.59982/18294359-26.1-nl-23>

Luiza Marabyan

PhD in Philology, Associate Professor
EUA, Chair of Applied Linguistic
marabyanliza@gmail.com

Ruzanna Adoyan

EUA, Chair of Applied Linguistic
MMU, Chair of Foreign Languages and Literature
ruzanna.adoyan@mail.ru

Abstract

This paper examines the efficiency of neuroadaptive learning systems, which combine brain-computer interfaces (BCI) to personalize instruction in real-time online learning environment. Neuroadaptive technologies detect the cognitive conditions of learners, including attention, cognitive load and mental fatigue, and dynamically modify instructional content, pacing and difficulty to improved engagement and knowledge retention. Mixed-methods experimental study was conducted with 90 participants from English House Language Center, the European University of Armenia and Mesrop Mashtots University. The participants were separated into an experimental group using a BCI-based adaptive learning platform and the control group based on the traditional online learning. Quantitative data were collected in terms of pre/post test scores, task completion rates and neural activity indicators, whereas the qualitative data were gathered using surveys and semi-structured interviews to measure perceived engagement, usability and the overall learning experience. The findings show that neuroadaptive learning increases learner attention, motivation and academic performance compared to conventional online learning setting. The members of the experimental group demonstrated greater rates of sustained engagement and better knowledge retention. The paper also presents ethical, privacy and accessibility issues in the collection and use of neural data in the educational setting. On the whole, the results indicate that neuroadaptive systems with BCI integration can be viewed as a promising solution since they allow creating highly personalized, learner-centered digital learning platforms.

Keywords: neuroadaptive learning; brain–computer interfaces (BCIs); personalized online education; cognitive state monitoring; adaptive learning systems; educational technology; learner engagement; mixed-methods research.

Introduction

The rapid expansion of online and hybrid learning has reshaped the architecture of contemporary education, extending its reach to populations and geographies that formal institutions once struggled to serve [Means et al], [Allen and Seaman]. Digital platforms have dissolved the temporal and spatial constraints that once bound learning to the classroom, granting unprecedented flexibility across professional, geographic, and socioeconomic divides. Yet this democratization of access has not, by itself, resolved a more fundamental challenge: the persistent mismatch between standardized instructional delivery and the deeply individual nature of human cognition. Research consistently documents the difficulties that online learners face in sustaining attention, managing cognitive load, and maintaining motivation across extended digital sessions with keeping students engaged, attentive, and capable of acquiring knowledge effectively [Dixon], [Martin and Bolliger]. Isolation, the absence of real-time instructor feedback, and the cognitive monotony of static content designs converge to produce disengagement, elevated dropout rates, and diminished knowledge retention [Kebritchi et al.; Artino]. Most learning management systems, despite their growing technical sophistication, continue to deliver content through a one-size-fits-all paradigm that is indifferent to whether a given learner is overwhelmed, under-challenged, or drifting toward inattention at any particular moment [Baker et al], [Shute and Ventura].

Neuroadaptive learning offers a conceptually different response to this problem. Rather than inferring a learner’s state from behavioral proxies alone, neuroadaptive systems draw on direct neural signals, captured non-invasively through electroencephalography (EEG), to detect real-time fluctuations in attention, cognitive load and mental fatigue [Zander and Kothe], [Aricò et al]. These signals feed adaptive algorithms that reconfigure instruction on the fly: simplifying tasks when overload is detected, accelerating pace when attention is strong, or providing targeted scaffolding when comprehension falters [Mühl et al], [Conati and Maclaren]. The result is a closed-loop instructional environment in which the system responds to the learner’s cognitive condition rather than imposing a predetermined sequence of content. Emergent evidence suggests that such systems can meaningfully reduce attentional lapses, ease cognitive overload and improve retention in cognitively demanding tasks [D’Mello and Graesser], [Al-Samarraie et al.].

Nevertheless, the research base contains notable lacunae. Much of the foundational work on neuroadaptive learning has been conducted in tightly controlled laboratory environments with modest samples and simplified tasks, limiting generalizability to authentic online learning contexts [Mühl et al.; Aricó et al]. Comparatively little research has examined how BCI-enabled systems perform across

diverse student populations and real institutional settings, where network variability, device heterogeneity, and complex instructional needs introduce complications absent from laboratory designs [Graesser et al]. Furthermore, the ethical dimensions of collecting and processing learners' neural data remain underexplored, raising legitimate questions about privacy, data sovereignty, informed consent and equitable access [Faller et al], [Zander and Kothe]. These are not peripheral concerns: they are constitutive of whether neuroadaptive learning can responsibly fulfill its promise at scale.

Equally important is the relative neglect of holistic learning experience variables in prior neuroadaptive research. Many existing studies focus narrowly on performance metrics such as test scores or response latencies, while overlooking motivational engagement, perceived usability, and learner wellbeing, factors robustly associated with persistence and long-term academic achievement in digital environments [Fredricks et al], [Schunk and DiBenedetto]. A system that improves scores while degrading learner autonomy or experience does not represent a genuine advance in educational design.

The present study addresses these gaps through a mixed-methods experimental investigation conducted across three Armenian higher education institutions. Ninety participants were assigned to either a BCI-assisted neuroadaptive learning platform or a conventional online learning environment over a four-week instructional period. The study measured learning outcomes, engagement, cognitive load, and neural activity indicators, while qualitative interviews illuminated learners' subjective experiences of the adaptive technology. By situating the research in authentic institutional contexts with a diverse participant pool, the study extends the empirical frontier of neuroadaptive learning beyond laboratory boundaries and contributes to the interdisciplinary conversation connecting educational neuroscience, human-computer interaction, and instructional design. The following research questions guided the inquiry:

RQ1: To what extent does BCI-enabled neuroadaptive instruction alter learner engagement in online settings relative to conventional platforms?

RQ2: How do neuroadaptive systems influence cognitive load and sustained attention during online learning activities?

RQ3: Do learners using BCI-assisted neuroadaptive platforms demonstrate measurably superior learning outcomes compared to those in standard online environments?

RQ4: How do learners perceive the usability, effectiveness, and ethical implications of neuroadaptive educational technologies?

The following hypothesis was advanced:

H1: Students engaging with a BCI-assisted neuroadaptive learning system will demonstrate significantly higher engagement, lower cognitive load, and superior learning outcomes relative to peers receiving conventional online instruction.

Literature Review

Online Learning and the Challenge of Personalization

Online learning has evolved from a peripheral supplement into a primary mode of instruction for millions of students globally [Means et al], [Allen and Seaman]. Despite this mainstreaming, decades of research affirm that digital learning environments are structurally ill-equipped for the kind of moment-to-moment instructional responsiveness that effective teaching demands. Without immediate behavioral cues, such as the furrowed brow, the audible sigh of confusion, the wandering gaze, instructors and platforms alike operate largely in the dark regarding learners' actual cognitive states [Dixson], [Martin and Bolliger]. The resulting instructional uniformity leaves cognitively diverse learners navigating content at a pace and difficulty level calibrated for a hypothetical average student who, in reality, exists in almost no individual classroom. The consequences are well-documented. Cognitive overload frequently accompanies complex online modules, particularly when content complexity exceeds learners' working memory capacity without adaptive support [Baker et al.]. Motivational erosion follows, as learners disengage from content that feels either tediously simple or impenetrably difficult. These dynamics feed elevated dropout rates that disproportionately affect first-generation students, working adults, and learners from under-resourced backgrounds, precisely the populations online education is often positioned to serve [Kebritchi et al.; Artino]. Personalization, then, is not merely a pedagogical refinement; it is a structural prerequisite for equitable digital learning.

Adaptive Learning Systems in Digital Education

Adaptive learning systems represent the field's most sustained attempt to operationalize personalization at scale. By analyzing performance data, such as response accuracy, completion time, error patterns, these systems modify content sequencing and difficulty to align with estimated learner mastery. Research on intelligent tutoring systems has produced encouraging evidence: well-calibrated adaptive feedback can improve learning outcomes relative to static instruction, particularly in domains with clear knowledge hierarchies [Conati and Maclaren], [Graesser et al.]. Yet these systems carry a structural limitation that constrains their effectiveness. They infer cognitive state retrospectively from behavioral outcomes rather than monitoring it prospectively from its neural substrates. By the time a drop in performance signals that a learner has become overloaded or disengaged, meaningful cognitive resources have already been squandered. As D'Mello and Graesser (2012) observe, observable behavior is a lagged and imperfect indicator of the underlying mental processes that actually drive learning. This has led to growing interest in incorporating physiological data into learning environments, allowing for faster and more accurate personalization based on learner data, such as performance metrics, response time, or interaction patterns [Shute and Ventura]. Research on adaptive hypermedia and smart tutoring systems has shown positive effects on learning outcomes,

especially when feedback and task complication are regulated to learner mastery [Conati and Maclaren], [Graesser et al.]. However, most adaptive systems count on behavioral or performance-based indicators, which often demonstrate learning outcomes after cognitive excess or disengagement has already taken place. Several studies suggest that relying only on observable behavior does not fully represent the learning process, because it overlooks internal mental states like attention, effort and fatigue [D'Mello and Graesser]. As a consequence, adaptive learning systems may react too slowly or inaccurately to students' needs. This shortcoming has led to increased interest in incorporating physiological and neurological data into learning environments, allowing for faster and more accurate personalization [Al-Samarraie et al.].

Neuroadaptive Learning: Concept and Foundations

Neuroadaptive learning addresses the latency problem of behavioral adaptation by drawing on direct measures of neural activity. The foundational insight, articulated by Zander and Kothe (2011), is that passive brain-computer interfaces can translate continuous streams of EEG signals into meaningful representations of cognitive state without requiring explicit action from the learner [Zander and Kothe]. The adaptive system uses these representations to adjust instructional parameters in real time, creating a closed-loop environment in which cognition and curriculum co-regulate each other. Subsequent empirical work has substantiated this framework: Aricó et al. (2016) demonstrated that passive BCI systems can decode attentional engagement and cognitive load with sufficient reliability to drive meaningful instructional adaptations, while Mühl et al. (2014) confirmed that affective and cognitive states, including fatigue, frustration, and boredom, are neurally distinguishable using non-invasive EEG equipment. These findings establish the psychophysiological credibility of the neuroadaptive approach.

Brain-Computer Interfaces in Educational Contexts

Electroencephalography-based BCIs have emerged as the most tractable non-invasive technology for educational neuroadaptation, offering temporal resolution measured in milliseconds and hardware form factors that have grown increasingly wearable and affordable [Faller et al.]. In educational settings, BCIs have been used to assess learners' attention, cognitive load, and emotional states during tasks, and BCI-based adaptations have been linked to improved task performance and reduced mental fatigue [Aricó et al], [Zander and Kothe]. Despite this promise, the ecological validity of most BCI research in education remains limited. Studies have predominantly been conducted in laboratory conditions with simplified learning tasks and carefully controlled environments, leaving open the question of how BCI systems perform when students engage with authentic coursework in variable real-world conditions [Mühl et al.]. This ecological gap is one the present study directly confronts.

Engagement, Motivation and Cognitive Load in Neuroadaptive Systems

Learner engagement encompassing behavioral, emotional and cognitive dimensions is among the strongest predictors of persistence and achievement in online learning [Fredricks et al.; Dixon]. Sustained engagement depends not only on content relevance but on moment-to-moment cognitive fluency: when learners are either overwhelmed or understimulated, disengagement follows as a rational response to a poorly calibrated environment [D'Mello and Graesser]. Neuroadaptive systems are theoretically positioned to intervene at exactly this juncture detecting attentional drift before it manifests in behavioral disengagement and adjusting instructional parameters before cognitive overload produces performance failure. Studies integrating neurofeedback with learning tasks have reported increased attentional focus and reduced fatigue [Al-Samarraie et al.], but direct empirical links between neuroadaptive interventions and motivational outcomes remain relatively sparse. The present study contributes to filling this gap.

Methodology

Research Design

A convergent mixed-methods experimental design was employed, integrating quantitative performance and physiological data with qualitative accounts of learner experience. This methodological triangulation was deliberate: neuroadaptive learning operates simultaneously at the level of measurable neural events and subjective phenomenological experience, and a design that captures only one register risks a systematically incomplete portrait of the intervention's effects. Quantitative data established the efficacy of the system in terms of learning outcomes, engagement scales, and neural activity; qualitative data illuminated the experiential and evaluative dimensions that metrics alone cannot access.

Participants were randomly assigned to one of two conditions. The experimental group engaged with a BCI-assisted neuroadaptive learning platform that continuously monitored neural signals and dynamically modified instructional pacing, task difficulty, and feedback in response to detected cognitive states. The control group completed equivalent instructional content through a standard online learning management system that delivered content uniformly without neural monitoring or adaptive modification. Both groups received identical instructional material, differing only in the presence or absence of neuroadaptive functionality.

Participants

Ninety participants were recruited from three Armenian educational institutions: English House Language Center, the European University of Armenia and Mesrop Mashtots University. This multi-site design was intentional, providing institutional diversity that strengthens the ecological validity of findings relative to single-institution studies. Participants were randomly allocated in equal proportions

across institutions and conditions, yielding 45 participants per condition overall. All participation was voluntary. Prior to data collection, participants received detailed information about study procedures, the nature of EEG-based neural monitoring, data storage and anonymization protocols, and their right to withdraw without consequence. Written informed consent was obtained from all participants.

Instruments

A combination of instruments was employed to gather quantitative and qualitative data.

Assessment of Learning Performance

Learning outcomes were measured using researcher-designed pre- and post-tests comprising multiple-choice and short-answer items aligned with the instructional objectives of the four-week curriculum. Items were developed in collaboration with subject-matter experts and reviewed for content validity prior to administration. A pilot administration with a separate cohort of eight students was conducted to identify ambiguous items and refine scoring rubrics. The assessments evaluated conceptual knowledge and applied skills across the instructional content. Items were aligned with learning objectives and **reviewed by subject-matter experts to ensure content validity**, supporting appropriate difficulty distribution. Learning improvement was measured by comparing **pre-test and post-test scores**, with greater gains indicating higher knowledge acquisition.

Brain Computer Interface System

Participants in the experimental group were equipped with non-invasive EEG headsets that continuously recorded neural signals during learning sessions. Signal processing algorithms derived real-time indices of attention engagement, cognitive load, and mental fatigue from these signals. These indices served as input to the adaptive engine, which adjusted instructional parameters in response to detected state changes. When cognitive load indices exceeded a predefined threshold, the system automatically reduced task complexity or introduced explanatory scaffolding; when attention indices indicated disengagement, pacing was modified and more interactive content elements were introduced.

Engagement and Cognitive Load Survey

Subjective engagement and perceived cognitive load were assessed using a 20-item Likert-scale questionnaire (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree) completed by all participants following each weekly learning session. The questionnaire items addressed dimensions of attention, motivation, mental effort, and perceived difficulty of the learning activities. Internal consistency was confirmed through Cronbach's alpha analysis ($\alpha > .70$ for all subscales). Survey items were adapted from

validated engagement and cognitive load measurement instruments used in educational research, supporting the construct validity of the instrument.

Semi-Structured Interviews

To capture experiential dimensions inaccessible to survey instruments, semi-structured interviews were conducted with a purposively selected subsample of 15 participants following the conclusion of the instructional period. Interview protocols covered perceived usability of the learning platform, subjective experience of engagement and cognitive effort, attitudes toward adaptive technology, and concerns regarding neural data privacy and ethical use. Interviews were audio-recorded with participant consent, transcribed verbatim, and subjected to thematic analysis.

Procedure

The intervention extended across four consecutive weeks of structured online learning. At week one, all participants completed the pre-test to establish baseline knowledge equivalence. Experimental group members received a calibration session during which EEG headsets were fitted and baseline neural profiles were established; a 30-minute orientation introduced participants to the BCI system and adaptive platform interface. Control group participants completed an equivalent orientation to the standard learning management system. Throughout weeks one through four, both groups engaged with identical learning content distributed across four thematically organized modules. Experimental participants' neural signals were monitored continuously during learning sessions, with adaptive modifications deployed in real time. At the end of each week, all participants completed the engagement and cognitive load survey. Following the final instructional week, all participants completed the post-test, and interview participants were recruited and interviewed within one week of post-test completion. The post-test was conducted, the engagement survey was conducted, and the participants were also interviewed afterwards.

Data Analysis

Quantitative analysis was conducted in three stages. First, descriptive statistics were computed for all dependent variables by group. Second, pre-test equivalence between groups was confirmed via independent samples t-test prior to inferential analysis. Third, paired-samples t-tests were used to examine within-group learning gains, while independent-samples t-tests compared post-test scores, engagement ratings, and cognitive load indices between groups. Effect sizes were calculated using Cohen's d to characterize the practical significance of observed differences. Qualitative data were analyzed using Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase thematic analysis framework, with analysis proceeding inductively to allow themes to emerge from participant accounts. Inter-rater reliability was

established through independent coding of a 20% subsample by a second researcher, yielding a Cohen’s kappa of .81.

Ethical Considerations

The study was conducted in accordance with institutional ethical guidelines and the Declaration of Helsinki. Neural data were collected exclusively for research purposes, anonymized at the point of collection, and stored in encrypted databases accessible only to the research team. Participants were explicitly informed that their neural data would not be shared with their institutions, used for assessment purposes, or retained beyond the study period.

Results

Quantitative Findings

Descriptive statistics were calculated to examine baseline knowledge and ensure comparability between the experimental and control groups. Participants were evenly distributed across three institutions, with 45 students assigned to each group. This balanced distribution minimized potential institutional bias and ensured comparable sampling conditions (See “**Table №1**”).

Table 1

Institution	Experimental Group	Control Group	Total
English House Language Center	15	15	30
European University of Armenia	15	15	30
Mesrop Mashtots University	15	15	30
Total	45	45	90

Participant distribution by institution and group assignment

Pre-test scores indicated similar baseline knowledge between the two groups. The experimental group obtained a mean score of 62.4 (SD = 8.3), while the control group had a mean score of 63.1 (SD = 7.9), suggesting comparable baseline knowledge prior to the intervention. Following the instructional period, post-test scores demonstrated substantially greater improvement in the experimental group compared to the control group. The experimental group achieved a mean score of 84.7 (SD = 7.6), whereas the control group reached a mean score of 74.5 (SD = 8.4) (See “**Table 2**”).

Table 2

Group	Pre-Test Mean	Pre-Test SD	Post-Test Mean	Post-Test SD
Experimental	62.4	8.3	84.7	7.6
Control	63.1	7.9	74.5	8.4

Descriptive statistics for pre-test and post-test scores by group

A paired-samples t-test conducted for the experimental group confirmed a significant improvement from pre-test to post-test, $t(44) = 12.47$, $p < .001$, with a very large effect size (Cohen's $d = 2.89$).

The control group also demonstrated improvement between pre-test and post-test scores, $t(44) = 7.21$, $p < .01$; however, the magnitude of improvement was smaller.

To further examine group differences, an independent samples t-test was conducted comparing post-test scores. The results revealed a statistically significant difference favoring the experimental group, $t(88) = 5.21$, $p < .001$, with a large effect size (Cohen's $d = 1.21$) (See “**Table №3**”).

Table 3

Variable	Experimental Mean	Control Mean	t	p
Post-Test Score	84.7	74.5	5.21	<.001

Independent samples t-test for post-test scores

Learner Engagement

Engagement was assessed across four dimensions: attention, motivation, participation, and interest, on a five-point Likert scale. Experimental group participants rated their engagement consistently higher than control participants across all dimensions. The overall engagement mean for the experimental group was 4.32 (SD = 0.51), compared to 3.68 (SD = 0.63) for the control group, a difference that is both statistically significant and educationally meaningful (See “**Table №4**”).

Table 4

Engagement Indicator	Experimental Mean	Control Mean	SD (Exp)	SD (Ctrl)
Attention	4.38	3.71	0.49	0.61
Motivation	4.25	3.64	0.56	0.68
Participation	4.31	3.72	0.53	0.64

ԲԱՆԱՍԻՐՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ

Interest	4.34	3.66	0.48	0.60
Overall	4.32	3.68	0.51	0.63

Engagement scores across four dimensions by group

Cognitive Load

Self-reported cognitive load ratings indicated that experimental group participants experienced meaningfully lower mental effort during learning activities. The experimental group mean was 2.91 (SD = 0.74) compared to 3.54 (SD = 0.81) for the control group, with lower scores indicating lower cognitive strain. An independent samples t-test confirmed the significance of this difference, $t(88) = -3.86$, $p < .001$, suggesting that the adaptive system's real-time modulation of task difficulty was effective in preventing cognitive overload while sustaining appropriate challenge levels. (See “**Table №5**”).

Table 5

Group	Mean Score	SD
Experimental	2.91	0.74
Control	3.54	0.81

Cognitive load ratings by group

Neural Activity Indicators

EEG-derived indices of attention, cognitive load and fatigue provided objective corroboration of the self-reported engagement and cognitive load findings. From baseline to peak learning session engagement, the attention index increased by 18% (from 0.62 to 0.73), while the cognitive load index decreased by 19% (from 0.58 to 0.47). Fatigue indicators, assessed through EEG markers associated with neural deceleration, shifted from a moderate baseline profile to a low profile by the end of extended learning sessions in the experimental group, a pattern not observed in control group participants assessed with parallel behavioral measures. (See “**Table №6**”).

Table 6

Indicator	Baseline	During Learning	Change
Attention Index	0.62	0.73	+18%
Cognitive Load Index	0.58	0.47	-19%
Fatigue Indicators	Moderate	Low	Reduction

Neural activity indicators at baseline and during neuroadaptive learning

Qualitative Findings

Thematic analysis of 15 semi-structured interviews yielded four primary themes: (1) enhanced concentration and adaptive responsiveness; (2) the experience of personalized scaffolding; (3) emotional engagement and reduced learning anxiety; and (4) privacy concerns and ethical ambivalence toward neural data collection.

Participants in the experimental group most frequently described moments when the system appeared to detect their attentional drift and respond by modifying the task. One participant articulated this experience as follows:

“The system seemed to adjust when I started losing focus, and the tasks became easier to understand.”

Others described a sense of being “seen” by the learning environment in a way that conventional online platforms had never provided. The theme of personalized scaffolding was prominent, with participants noting that adaptive adjustments to difficulty and pacing felt genuinely calibrated to their experience of the material—neither patronizing nor arbitrary. This perception aligned with survey data showing elevated motivation and participation in the experimental group.

Nevertheless, a substantial minority of participants across both groups expressed concern about the collection of neural data. These concerns centered on questions of data ownership, the potential for institutional surveillance, and uncertainty about how neural profiles might be used beyond the immediate research context. Several participants indicated that their willingness to use a neuroadaptive system in a real educational setting would depend on clear, enforceable privacy guarantees, a finding with significant implications for the ethical deployment of BCIs in education.

Discussion

The most unambiguous finding of this study is that BCI-assisted neuroadaptive instruction produced substantially superior learning gains relative to conventional online instruction. The experimental group’s post-test advantage, a mean difference of 10.2 points against a matched baseline, and the very large within-group effect size (Cohen’s $d = 2.89$) are not easily attributable to incidental factors when pre-test equivalence is established and instructional content is held constant across conditions. These results extend and strengthen the empirical case for neuroadaptive learning assembled in earlier laboratory studies [Aricó et al.; Mühl et al.], while providing novel evidence from an authentic multi-institutional online learning setting. The convergence of engagement ratings, cognitive load measures, and EEG indices forms a coherent, mutually reinforcing body of evidence considerably more compelling than any single data source alone.

The mechanism is conceptually coherent. Unlike static online platforms that expose all learners to identical content at identical pace, the neuroadaptive system generated individualized learning trajectories calibrated to each student’s moment-to-moment cognitive state. When the system detected

cognitive overload, it reduced task complexity and provided scaffolding, preventing the resource exhaustion that compromises encoding and consolidation. When attention was strong and load was manageable, it maintained or slightly increased challenge sustaining the desirable difficulty that promotes durable learning. The result was not merely more pleasant instruction but cognitively more efficient instruction. The findings align with previous research demonstrating that neuroadaptive systems improve both engagement and learning efficiency through physiological monitoring [D'Mello and Graesser]. This dynamic is the central contribution of the neuroadaptive approach: it does not merely respond to failure but anticipates it, adjusting before cognitive resources are exhausted.

The engagement findings carry their own theoretical significance. Experimental group participants reported higher attention, motivation, participation, and interest consistently across all four weeks, suggesting that the benefits were not a novelty effect concentrated in initial sessions. This temporal consistency implies that the adaptive system was genuinely maintaining engagement through content calibration. Conventional adaptive systems correct course after performance decline is detected; neuroadaptive systems intervene before attentional collapse manifests behaviorally. This temporal advantage, catching the learner drifting rather than already adrift, may account for the sustained engagement profile observed in the experimental group, consistent with D'Mello and Graesser's (2012) argument that managing attentional states preemptively is more effective than attempting recovery after disengagement has occurred [Paas et al.].

The cognitive load results deserve particular emphasis because they speak to the theoretical mechanism through which neuroadaptive systems are hypothesized to operate. The experimental group's significantly lower self-reported cognitive load, corroborated by the 19% reduction in EEG-derived load indices, suggests that the adaptive system was successfully calibrating task demands within learners' cognitive capacity envelopes. According to cognitive load theory, this calibration redirects cognitive resources from extraneous processing toward germane learning [Paas et al.], and the superior post-test scores suggest that is precisely what occurred. The EEG data also revealed declining fatigue indices across extended learning sessions, implying that the adaptive system was managing cumulative cognitive fatigue, a problem particularly acute in online environments where learners may engage in extended sessions without the natural pacing cues of face-to-face instruction [Holzinger et al.]. The qualitative findings add essential texture to the quantitative picture. The dominant experiential theme among experimental participants, a sense that the system noticed and responded to their cognitive state, aligns with theoretical accounts of learner-centered design emphasizing the importance of perceived responsiveness for motivation and engagement [Lee et al.]. When learners experience an environment as genuinely attuned to their needs, they invest more deeply in it, and the resulting engagement feeds forward into performance. The privacy concerns that emerged across both groups, however, represent a finding that no honest appraisal of neuroadaptive learning can sidestep. Learners' nervousness about neural data collection is not irrational; neural data

are qualitatively more intimate than behavioral clickstream data, and regulatory frameworks governing their educational use remain poorly developed in most jurisdictions.

Several limitations temper the scope of interpretation. First, the four-week study duration supports conclusions about short-term learning gains but cannot address long-term retention, skill transfer, or the sustainability of motivational benefits. Second, the study included a largely similar **cohort of students** from three institutions sharing certain demographic and cultural characteristics, potentially limiting cross-cultural generalizability. Third, EEG-based cognitive state estimation captures a partial signal; richer multimodal physiological monitoring would provide a more complete picture of learner state. Fourth, the study did not evaluate long-term retention or the transfer of knowledge examined short-term outcomes only. Finally, the technological and financial demands of EEG-based neuroadaptive systems remain significant, raising questions about scalability and equitable access that the present study's controlled conditions could not fully address.

The implications of this study are substantive. The use of neuroadaptive systems for online instruction enables educators to create better student engagement, cognitive load management and improved academic performance. The systems provide educational institutions with adaptive support that customizes their teaching methods according to the students' immediate requirements. The study results show educational technologists that they need to create learning platforms which use physiological monitoring and adaptive content delivery with feedback systems to achieve maximum learning results. In addition, the study demonstrates that students benefit from personalized learning paths which help them concentrate better while learning faster in online courses. The ethical management of neural data became a major issue because researchers required transparent methods to handle sensitive physiological data according to educational technology research standards [Ding].

Conclusions and Future Research

This study provides multi-level empirical evidence that BCI-assisted neuroadaptive learning produces measurable and meaningful improvements in learning outcomes, learner engagement, and cognitive load management relative to conventional online instruction. Experimental participants outperformed control participants by a substantial margin on knowledge assessments, reported higher engagement across all measured dimensions, and exhibited objectively lower cognitive load as indexed by both self-report and EEG-derived measures. Qualitative data confirmed that learners experienced the adaptive system's responsiveness positively, while simultaneously surfacing concerns about neural data privacy that carry significant implications for responsible deployment. The convergence of quantitative performance data, physiological indices, and learner accounts forms a coherent, mutually reinforcing body of evidence that positions neuroadaptive systems as a credible and consequential development in online education. The study also provides evidence that dynamically adjusting instructional difficulty based on learners' cognitive states can reduce unnecessary cognitive load while

sustaining appropriate challenge. Such adaptive mechanisms contribute to more effective and genuinely personalized online learning experiences. Despite these promising findings, the study was conducted within a limited institutional context and focused primarily on short-term outcomes. Future research should examine the long-term impact of neuroadaptive learning on knowledge retention, self-regulated learning, and skill transfer. Additional studies could explore the integration of multiple physiological indicators, investigate ethical and privacy frameworks for neural data governance in education, and employ participatory design methods to develop systems that are simultaneously more effective and more equitable.

The trajectory is clear: as BCIs become cheaper, more comfortable, and more accurate, neuroadaptive learning will move from experimental curiosity to viable educational infrastructure. Whether it fulfills its potential to transform digital learning into a genuinely learner-centered enterprise will depend not only on the quality of the algorithms, but on the ethical seriousness of the institutions that deploy them.

References

1. Allen, I. Elaine, and Jeff Seaman. Digital Learning Compass: Distance Education Enrollment Report 2017. Babson Survey Research Group, 2017,
2. Al-Samarraie, Hosam, et al. "E-learning Continuance Satisfaction in Higher Education: A Unified Perspective from Instructors and Students." *Studies in Higher Education*, vol. 43, no. 11, 2018, pp. 2003–19. Crossref, <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2017.1298081>,
3. Aricò, Pietro, et al. "Passive BCI Beyond the Lab: Current Trends and Future Directions." *Physiological Measurement*, vol. 37, no. 8, 2016, pp. R79–R99. IOP Science, <https://doi.org/10.1088/0967-3334/37/8/R79>,
4. Artino, Anthony R. "Motivational Beliefs and Perceptions of Instructional Quality: Predicting Satisfaction with Online Training." *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, vol. 24, no. 3, 2008, pp. 260–70. Wiley Online Library, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2729.2007.00258.x>,
5. Baker, Ryan S., et al. "More Accurate Student Modeling Through Contextual Estimation of Slip and Guess Probabilities in Bayesian Knowledge Tracing." *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Intelligent Tutoring Systems*, Springer, 2010, pp. 406–15. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-13388-6_44,
6. Conati, Cristina, and Heather Maclaren. "Empirically Building and Evaluating a Probabilistic Model of User Affect." *User Modeling and User-Adapted Interaction*, vol. 19, no. 3, 2009, pp. 267–303. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11257-009-9062-1>,
7. Ding, Nianliang. "Ethical Considerations in the Application of Artificial Intelligence in Education." *International Journal of Education and Humanities*, vol. 19, no. 1, 2025, pp. 178–182. <https://doi.org/10.54097/78e6gr15>,

8. D'Mello, Sidney, and Arthur Graesser. "Dynamics of Affective States During Complex Learning." *Learning and Instruction*, vol. 22, no. 2, 2012, pp. 145–57. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2011.10.001>,
9. Dixon, Marcia D. "Measuring Student Engagement in the Online Course: The Online Student Engagement Scale (OSE)." *Online Learning Journal*, vol. 19, no. 4, 2015, pp. 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v19i4.561>,
10. Faller, Josef, et al. "Regulation of Arousal via Online Neurofeedback Improves Human Performance in a Demanding Sensory-Motor Task." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 116, no. 13, 2019, pp. 6489–94. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1817521116>,
11. Fredricks, Jennifer A., et al. "School Engagement: Potential of the Concept, State of the Evidence." *Review of Educational Research*, vol. 74, no. 1, 2004, pp. 59–109. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543074001059>,
12. Graesser, Arthur C., et al. "Emotions in Adaptive Computer Technologies for Adults Improving Reading." *Emotions, Technology, Design, and Learning*, Elsevier, 2016, pp. 3–25. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-801856-9.00001-3>,
13. Holzinger, Andreas, et al. "Learning Performance with Interactive Simulations: The Impact of Cognitive Load." *Computers & Education*, vol. 101, 2016, pp. 89–98. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2016.05.009>,
14. Kebritchi, Mansureh, et al. "Issues and Challenges for Teaching Successful Online Courses in Higher Education." *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, vol. 46, no. 1, 2017, pp. 4–29. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047239516661713>,
15. Lee, Jiyoung, et al. "AI-Driven Adaptive Learning Environments: Effects on Student Engagement and Academic Achievement." *Computers & Education*, vol. 182, 2022, article 104459. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2022.104459>,
16. Martin, Florence, and Doris U. Bolliger. "Engagement Matters: Student Perceptions on the Importance of Engagement Strategies in the Online Learning Environment." *Online Learning Journal*, vol. 22, no. 1, 2018, pp. 205–222. <https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v22i1.1092>,
17. Means, Barbara, et al. "The Effectiveness of Online and Blended Learning: A Meta-Analysis of Empirical Literature." *Teachers College Record*, vol. 115, no. 3, 2013, pp. 1–47. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016146811311500307>,
18. Mühl, Christian, et al. "A Survey of Affective Brain-Computer Interfaces: Principles, State-of-the-Art, and Challenges." *Brain-Computer Interfaces*, vol. 1, no. 2, 2014, pp. 66–84. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2326263X.2014.912881>,
19. Paas, Fred, et al. "Cognitive Load Theory and Instructional Design: Recent Developments." *Educational Psychologist*, vol. 38, no. 1, 2003, pp.1–4. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15326985EP3801_1,

20. Schunk, Dale H., and Maria K. DiBenedetto. "Motivation and Social Cognitive Theory." *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, vol. 60, 2020, article 101832. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2019.101832>,
21. Shute, Valerie J., and Matthew Ventura. *Measuring and Supporting Learning in Games: Stealth Assessment*. MIT Press, 2013. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/9589.001.0001>,
22. Zander, Thorsten O., and Christian Kothe. "Towards Passive Brain–Computer Interfaces: Applying Brain–Computer Interface Technology to Human–Machine Systems in General." *Journal of Neural Engineering*, vol. 8, no. 2, 2011, article 025005. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1741-2560/8/2/025005>,
23. Zhang, Jianwei, et al. "Personalized Adaptive Learning Systems and Their Effects on Learning Outcomes." *Computers & Education*, vol. 96, 2016, pp. 152–65. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2016.02.012>.

Submitted on 18.03.2026.

Sent for review on 06.05.2026.