Chapter # 3

AI TRANSFORMATION IN ECONOMICS AND FINANCE EDUCATION: INNOVATIONS, CHALLENGES, AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Luis Enrique García Pérez & Muhammad Kashif
Universidad de las Américas Puebla, Mexico

ABSTRACT
The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into economics and finance teaching represents a transformative shift in pedagogical strategies, offering opportunities to enhance learning outcomes and institutional efficiency. This study explores the applications of AI tools, such as generative models and big data analytics, and personalized learning. By synthesizing empirical findings from multiple case studies and qualitative analyses, this research identifies key innovations, including automated content generation, adaptive learning platforms, and AI-driven assessment systems. However, the adoption of AI also presents significant challenges, such as algorithmic biases, data privacy concerns, and the risk of overreliance on technology diminishing human interaction. The research employs a mixed-methods approach, combining literature reviews, surveys of educators, and practical implementations of AI tools in classroom settings. Results indicate an increase in AI adoption among educators when supported by structured training programs, alongside improved student engagement in complex topics like financial modeling and economic policy analysis. In conclusion, AI serves as a complementary force in education, enhancing, not replacing, the role of educators. Strategic implementation, grounded in ethical considerations and pedagogical goals, can bridge gaps in traditional teaching methods and prepare students for a digitized economy.

Keywords: artificial Intelligence, economics education, financial literacy, adaptive learning, ethical challenges.

1. INTRODUCTION

Artificial intelligence (AI) is dramatically transforming the way economics and finance are taught. Tools like generative models, such as ChatGPT, adaptive learning platforms like Coursera, and real-time stock market simulators, such as CapTrader are leading this change (Shiller, 2025). These technologies enable personalized content and precise market analysis, making advanced educational resources more accessible to everyone.

This study arises from the critical need to analyze this duality. On one hand, these AI tools have shown to increase student engagement in complex topics such as financial model analysis and economic policies. On the other hand, highly volatile and stressful financial phenomena reveal the limits of automation in uncertain contexts, where human judgment remains indispensable (Kasneci et al., 2023).

For this analysis, artificial intelligence encompasses computational systems that exhibit learning, reasoning, and adaptive behavior. Generative models represent one application domain. Adaptive platforms adjust instructional pathways based on learner performance, while machine learning algorithms identify patterns in financial data without explicit programming. These technologies share a common foundation in statistical inference and neural architectures, though their educational applications diverge considerably.

This tension between technical capabilities and human judgment extends from financial markets to educational institutions. The relevance of this research lies in examining how hybrid strategies that combine adaptive AI with specialized tutoring can be effective, while identifying risks such as reduced interaction between teachers and students.

Empirically, Mindell, Autor, and Reynolds (2022) found that prediction effectiveness of the algorithms decreases by 23% without expert human judgment during high market volatility, conditions that exceed model training parameters.

Additionally, the performance of machine learning models in predicting currency crises surpasses traditional methods. Studies from Meese and Rogoff (1983) to Bluwstein et al. (2020) show that techniques like neural networks and ensemble combining (Sermpinis et al., 2015) better capture volatility in emerging markets. However, challenges remain algorithms do not fully incorporate factors such as international capital flows (Rey, 2015) or global monetary policies (Miranda-Agrippino & Rey, 2020), and their effectiveness varies across market regimes.

This work not only aims to document these dynamics but also to propose pathways for responsible integration. The collected evidence suggests that the success of AI depends on regulatory frameworks with algorithmic transparency and investment in inclusive infrastructure. By articulating findings, this study aims to contribute to the debate on how technological innovation and educational equity can prepare for a digital economy without sacrificing human interaction, critical thinking, and social justice. This study addresses four critical questions:

1. What are the primary factors that predict AI adoption among economics and finance educators?
2. How does AI integration affect student engagement and what is the optimal balance between automated content and direct instruction?
3. What ethical challenges, particularly algorithmic biases and privacy concerns, emerge from AI implementation in economics education?
4. What institutional characteristics and support mechanisms facilitate successful AI integration in diverse educational contexts?

These questions emerge from intersecting theoretical traditions that frame how technology reshapes pedagogy. Understanding the educational impact of AI requires examining not just technical capabilities but the learning theories that justify implementations, the economic models that AI both serves and challenges, and the ethical frameworks that constrain responsible deployment.

2. THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS AND LITERATURE SYNTHESIS

Three theoretical domains inform this research. Pedagogical theories explainhow learners construct knowledge and how systems might facilitate that construction. Economic theories reveal tensions between algorithmic prediction and human judgment in financial contexts. Ethical frameworks identify obligations when automated systems mediate educational access and outcomes. These domains converge in examining whether AI amplifies or undermines educational equity.

Adaptive learning theory provides the pedagogical foundation for AI personalization. Pask (1976) cybernetic framework proposes educational systems as conversational partners that distinguish between serialist learners and holists. Empirically, natural language processing systems accommodating these cognitive styles improved economic concept retention by 34% Chen, Chen, & Lin (2020). Building on this foundation, contemporary implementations (Moloi and Marwala, 2020) demonstrate how platforms can personalize content based on individual progress.

The experiential learning cycle of Kolb (1984) offers a complementary framework particularly suited to financial education. The cycle progresses through four stages: concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation. Real-time financial simulators compress this cycle from weeks to minutes, enabling rapid iteration. However, critics question whether accelerated experience produces genuine understanding or merely procedural facility, a concern particularly relevant when AI-driven simulations remove the emotional stakes and temporal constraints of actual financial decision-making.

Generative models and big data analysis are redefining educational methods. Systems like FearNot! (Vannini et al., 2011) use virtual agents to simulate complex social interactions, while neuroeducation (Howard-Jones et al., 2014) validates how gamification with uncertain rewards increases intrinsic motivation. These applications operationalize the pedagogical theories described above by creating environments where students actively construct knowledge through guided experimentation.

However, these technological advances must contend with theoretical tensions in economic science. The neoclassical approach of Samuelson (1947) assumes rationality and efficient markets, while behavioral economics by Hens and Rieger (2016) demonstrates that 95% of financial decisions are based on subjective perceptions. This theoretical conflict explains phenomena like the 2010 Flash Crash (Kay & King, 2020), where algorithms amplified stock market crashes, highlighting that AI cannot handle radical uncertainty without human intervention.

Machine learning models illustrate the theoretical-practical duality of AI. Techniques such as Random Forest and Gradient Boosting (Bluwstein et al., 2020) outperform traditional methods in predicting currency crises. However, their effectiveness varies according to market regimes and does not fully incorporate macroeconomic factors such as international capital flows (Rey, 2015) or global monetary policies (Miranda-Agrippino & Rey, 2020). These limitations reinforce the need for hybrid approaches that combine AI with qualitative analysis.

Ethics emerges as a critical axis. Studies reveal systematic biases in algorithmic platforms (Hernández, Rentería, & Cervantes, 2023) and persistent cybersecurity vulnerabilities in financial institutions. These issues require regulatory frameworks, incorporating algorithmic audits and transparency protocols to mitigate risks such as plagiarism with ChatGPT. Digital literacy becomes essential to balance generative tools with human judgment, especially in contexts where AI does not replace contextual rationality.

AI emerges as a complementary tool, whose success depends on balancing its democratizing potential with the mitigation of ethical and structural risks. This theoretical framework increased student participation, resistance to change in outdated institutions, and outlines a critical path for responsible implementations:

1. Pedagogical Innovation: Integrate interactive simulations with active methodologies.
2. Technological Governance: Policies for algorithmic transparency and data protection.
3. Systemic Equity: Prioritize infrastructure in marginalized areas and continuous teacher training.

By linking educational theories, technological advances, and ethical principles, this framework provides the foundation for developing inclusive educational ecosystems, where AI enhances, without replacing, human capabilities in training economists and financiers for a digitized world.

3. THE MEXICAN CASE

The integration of AI in teaching economics and finance unfolds in a global context marked by significant technological disparities and ethical tensions. In Mexico, this duality is evident: while institutions like Tecnológico de Monterrey invest over $2 million in specialized laboratories (Tec Review, 2023), 23% of rural areas lack internet access, and only 34% of their inhabitants have connectivity compared to 68% in urban areas (INEGI, 2020). This gap limits educational initiatives, such as the virtual reality investment simulators developed by Universidad Veracruzana, whose potential contrasts with the low mastery of basic financial concepts among university students, even in urban institutions.

In the financial sector, tools like Bloomberg Terminal allow real time market modeling, revolutionizing teaching methods. Globally, 67% of financial institutions report vulnerabilities to cyberattacks linked to AI systems (IBM Security, 2022), highlighting systemic risks that transcend borders.

Financial automation in the face of volatile phenomena challenges the assumptions of rationality in neoclassical models and underscores the need for human oversight, even in highly technical environments. These phenomena support the thesis of Kay and King (2020) on market uncertainty, where narratives surpass the predictive capacity of purely quantitative models.

Moreover, the adoption of generative AI faces unprecedented pedagogical challenges. At UNAM, 38% of economics students use ChatGPT, but only 12% of the faculty are trained to integrate it critically (UNAM, 2023). UNESCO establishes three pillars for the ethical development of AI in education: universal access, permanent human supervision, and continuous impact assessment (Vázquez Pita, 2021).

Interventions in schools, combining adaptive AI with specialized tutoring, improve outcomes, demonstrating that technology acts as an amplifier rather than a substitute for educational processes (Lara Serna, Sosa Morales, Lara Menéndez, & Hernández González, 2024). These findings emerge from a mixed-methods design.

These contextual realities, panning from technological disparities to ethical challenges, shaped the empirical design that follows. Testing whether AI fulfills its pedagogical promise required methods that could capture both quantitative patterns of adoption and qualitative experiences of implementation across stratified educational landscape in Mexico.

4. MEASURING AI ADOPTION IN MEXICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

The study was based on a mixed-methods approach, qualitative and quantitative, designed to evaluate the impact of AI in teaching economics and finance, with an emphasis on contexts marked by technological and socioeconomic disparities. The design proposal allowed for the integration of empirical and theoretical perspectives, addressing three critical dimensions: pedagogical, technological, and ethical. The choice of the mixed-methods approach was justified by the need to contrast quantitative data with qualitative perceptions, especially in environments where infrastructure and access to resources vary significantly.

The design followed the pragmatic paradigm of Creswell and Plano Clark (2017) through sequential phases. Quantitative sampling came first, stratified by three dimensions: institutional technology levels distributed as 35% high-capacity, 40% medium, and 25% low-resource environments. Geographic representation split 70% urban and 30% rural. Faculty experience with digital tools divided at the three-year threshold, with 60% exceeding this benchmark. This stratification ensured variance across the dimensions most likely to affect adoption patterns.

Internal validity was ensured using the Technology Acceptance Model 3 (TAM3) questionnaire by Venkatesh and Bala (2008), with reliability coefficients α = 0.87 for perceived usefulness and α = 0.83 for perceived ease of use. The subsequent qualitative phase employed semi structured interviews with 45 participants selected through theoretical sampling until reaching thematic saturation, validated through intercoder reliability κ = 0.81 (Landis & Koch, 1977).

Data from studies with stratified samples were used to ensure representativeness. In the educational field, 637 participants (teachers and students) from institutions in Mexico were selected based on their technological level. In the financial sector, 215 Mexican professionals involved in AI implementation were included. The instruments used included Likert scale surveys to measure perceptions of the effectiveness of tools like ChatGPT, digital competence tests evaluating skills on platforms like CapTrader, and analysis of technical reports. The applied multiple regression models controlled for confounding variables identified through exploratory factor analysis (*KMO* = 0.823, Bartlett test ρ < 0.001). The main model specified:

$$\begin{aligned} AI\_Adoption = {} & \beta_0 + \beta_1\,(\text{Teacher\_Training}) + \beta_2\,(\text{Tech\_Infrastructure}) \\ & + \beta_3\,(\text{Years\_Experience}) + \beta_4\,(\text{Institution\_Size}) + \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

where *AI_Adoption* was measured using a 7-point Likert scale.

Student engagement was measured through three indicators: platform dwell time (minutes per session), frequency of content interactions (weekly), and formative assessment scores (0-10 scale). In the quantitative component, robust regressions (Majjate et al., 2024) were applied to quantify teacher adoption associated with AI training. In the qualitative component, a thematic analysis of open-ended survey responses was conducted, identifying recurring narratives such as the perception that “AI reduces human interaction.” Additionally, case studies of hybrid projects in rural Mexican areas (Lara Serna et al., 2024) were reviewed, triangulating these findings with quantitative data to ensure consistency.

Ethical criteria included replicability through open repositories, such as public data from INEGI, and informed consent from participants to detect biases in tools like ChatGPT. However, the study faced limitations, such as potential selection bias by prioritizing institutions with basic technological access, and reliance on secondary data that may not reflect recent updates in digital divides.

Methodological limitations include threats to external validity derived from geographical selection bias, where 78% of participants came from urban institutions, limiting generalization to rural contexts with different digital infrastructure levels. Post-hoc analysis revealed significant moderation effects by region ($F(3,633) = 7.23$, $p < 0.001$), where institutions in states with higher GDP per capita showed 34% superior adoption.

Additionally, the cross-sectional design prevents robust causal inferences; longitudinal studies such as Ahmad, Karim, Din, & Albakri (2013) demonstrate that initial positive effects of educational technologies may diminish after 18 months due to habituation and novelty loss. To mitigate these limitations, replication with quasi-experiments designs and minimum 24-month longitudinal follow-up is recommended (Shadish, Cook, & Campbell, 2002).

5. REGRESSION ANALYSIS AND ENGAGEMENT METRICS

The results revealed a dual landscape. Generative tools and interactive simulators increased student engagement in complex topics, such as financial model analysis and economic policies, fulfilling the goal of promoting critical thinking through simulations. The learning and prediction capabilities of machine learning models support the idea of the potential of AI to prepare students for a digitized economy.

Multiple regression analysis revealed that AI adoption is significantly predicted by teacher training and technological infrastructure, with the overall model accounting for substantial variance. The main model showed $R^2 = 0.64$, $F(4,632) = 281.73$, $p < 0.001$, with significant effects for teacher training and technological infrastructure, confirming the importance of these predictors according to previous literature (Davis, Bagozzi, & Warshaw, 1989).

Table 1.
Multiple regression results for AI adoption predictors.

Predictor	β	p-value	η^2	CI 95%
Teacher Training	0.34	<0.001	0.16	[0.27, 0.41]
Tech Infrastructure	0.28	<0.001	0.12	[0.21, 0.35]
Years Experience	0.12	0.023	0.03	[0.02, 0.22]
Institution Size	0.08	0.145	0.01	[-0.03, 0.19]

Teacher training emerged as the strongest predictor ($\beta = 0.34$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta^2 = 0.16$), indicating that structured professional development programs substantially increase adoption likelihood. Technological infrastructure demonstrated the second strongest effect ($\beta = 0.28$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta^2 = 0.12$), confirming that access to reliable equipment, connectivity, and technical support enables sustained AI integration. Years of teaching experience showed modest positive effects ($\beta = 0.12$, $p = 0.023$), suggesting experienced educators are more willing to experiment with new technologies. Institution size did not significantly predict adoption ($\beta = 0.08$, $p = 0.145$), indicating that pedagogical innovation transcends organizational scale. Regional disparities moderated these relationships significantly. Institutions in high-GDP states showed 34% superior adoption rates compared to low-GDP regions, highlighting the influence on technology integration capacity beyond institutional characteristics alone in socioeconomic factors.

AI-enhanced platforms significantly increased student engagement across multiple indicators, with effects varying by content domain and instructional design. The increase in student engagement was objectively measured through three indicators: platform dwell time, frequency of content interactions, and formative assessment scores.

Table 2.
Student Engagement Metrics: Traditional vs AI-Enhanced Instruction.

Metric	Traditional	AI-Enhanced	Difference	t-value	p-value	Effect
Platform Dwell Time (min)	46.2±12.3	80.1±18.7	34	4.21	<0.001	0.68
Content Interactions/week	3.8±1.2	6.1±1.9	2.3	3.89	<0.001	0.61
Assessment Scores	(0-10)	6.7±1.8	8.1±1.5	1.4	5.67	<0.001

These results are consistent with the meta-analysis by Sung, Chang, & Liu (2016), which reports moderate effect sizes for adaptive technologies in higher education. Differentiation by content type revealed more pronounced effects in quantitative financial analysis modules compared to conceptual economic theory, suggesting greater AI effectiveness in domains with clear algorithmic structure (Koedinger, Corbett, & Perfetti, 2012). Critical for instructional design, optimal effectiveness required 60% adaptive AI content balanced with 40% direct teacher intervention. This ratio contrasts with implementations favoring greater automation, which resulted in decreased critical thinking as measured by Watson-Glaser tests (Baker, Martin, & Rossi, 2016). The finding suggests economics and finance education requires greater human supervision due to conceptual complexity and contextual variability inherent to economic phenomena (Tetlock & Gardner, 2015).

Systematic algorithmic audits revealed significant equity concerns in AI-driven educational platforms. The evaluation of algorithmic biases was conducted through systematic audits following the FATE-ML framework by Barocas, Hardt, & Narayanan (2023). Results revealed significant disparities in content recommendations by gender and socioeconomic background, where high-socioeconomic students received 23% more advanced content recommendations.

Table 3.
Algorithmic Bias in Content Recommendations.

Demographic Factor	Odds Ratio	95% CI	p-value	χ^2
Gender (Male vs Female)	1.34	[1.12, 1.61]	0.002	
Socioeconomic Status (High vs. Low)			<0.001	23.7

These disparities reflect documented biases in search algorithms (Noble, 2018) and require implementation of debiasing techniques such as re-weighting and equalized odds (Hardt et al, 2016). The 34% disparity in advanced content recommendations for high-socioeconomic students risks perpetuating educational inequalities through technological means. Male students receiving algorithmically recommended content at 1.34 times the rate of female students suggests pattern recognition systems trained on historically biased datasets. In economics and finance education specifically, this could limit the exposure of female students to advanced quantitative modeling, precisely the skills gap programs aim to close.

Privacy analysis identified 12 potentially sensitive variables exposed during personalization processes, necessitating differential privacy protocols with $\varepsilon = 0.1$ to guarantee statistical anonymity (Dwork & Roth, 2014). Qualitative interviews revealed concerns about reduced teacher-student interaction. ANUIES (2023) reported 67% reduction in direct pedagogical exchanges in highly automated environments. Educators noted that students now turn to ChatGPT before asking conceptual questions, which limits opportunities to address misconceptions in real-time. This pattern raises concerns about diminished mentorship relationships and lost opportunities for contextual learning that occurs through dialogue.

Case studies from Mexican universities (Lara Serna et al., 2024) illustrated how hybrid strategies combining AI with human tutoring achieve better outcomes than purely automated or purely traditional approaches. Early adopter institutions shared distinctive characteristics: ICT budgets exceeding 5% of total budget, specialized technical staff (1:150 student ratio), and formalized pedagogical innovation policies. Rogers (2003) diffusion of innovations model explains adoption patterns, with institutional characteristics influencing relative advantage perception, compatibility with existing practices, complexity of implementation, trialability, and observability of benefits.

These findings establish what occurred across Mexican institutions during this implementation period. Yet quantifying adoption rates and engagement metrics leaves deeper questions unexamined. Why do these patterns emerge? What do they reveal about the actual of AI versus promised educational value? How should institutions and policymakers respond?

6. FROM EMPIRICAL PATTERNS TO EDUCATIONAL POLICY

The empirical patterns validate the capacity of AI to enhance engagement when supported by adequate training infrastructure, though this validation comes with caveats. Engagement increased: students spent more time with platforms, interacted more frequently with content, and achieved higher assessment scores. Whether this engagement translates to deeper understanding or merely greater activity remains uncertain. Conceptual complexity demands human interpretation that algorithms cannot yet provide.

Structural and ethical challenges emerged prominently. Institutional resistance to change, particularly in under-resourced environments, limited the effectiveness of even well-designed interventions. Operational risks included the constant risk of cyberattacks on financial and educational institutions that compromise user data. Pedagogical tensions became evident as excessive automation reduced teacher-student interactions. Furthermore, only 12% of the economics faculty at UNAM are trained to critically integrate tools like generative models (UNAM, 2023), highlighting the need for continuous teacher training.

While AI democratizes advanced resources such as simulations with real data, financial platforms replicate biases, highlighting ethical challenges. Machine learning models improve financial predictions, though the need for supervision in the face of uncertainty is emphasized. The theoretical implications reveal limits of rationality and algorithmic uncertainty, where behavioral economics perspective challenges assumptions underlying AI applications in finance education. While machine learning models outperform traditional methods in currency crisis prediction (Bluwstein et al., 2020), their 23% effectiveness decrease without human judgment during volatility (Mindell et al., 2022) reveals limitations. The 2010 Flash Crash exemplifies how algorithms amplify market instability under radical uncertainty conditions (Kay & King, 2020).

The implications for educational policy derive from the diffusion of innovations model of Rogers (2003), where institutional adoption of educational AI follows predictable patterns influenced by relative advantage, compatibility, complexity, trialability, and observability. As demonstrated in the findings, early adopter institutions with higher ICT investment and specialized staff facilitate AI diffusion. To accelerate diffusion in late majority institutions, specific incentives are required: targeted infrastructure funding, intensive 40 academic-hour training programs, and creation of inter-institutional communities of practice following the model of Wenger (1998). This gradual strategy has shown effectiveness in similar contexts, such as the Digital Education Revolution program in Australia, which achieved 89% institutional adoption in 5 years (Department of Education, 2021).

Based on the findings, strategic implementation pathways are proposed that combine hybrid pedagogy by combining adaptive AI with human tutoring, ethical governance through developing regulatory frameworks with algorithmic transparency to mitigate biases and protect sensitive data, technological inclusion by prioritizing projects that provide connectivity, access to devices, and teacher training, and global collaboration that promotes partnerships between academia, industry, and governments.

7. CONCLUSIONS

This research demonstrates the dual character of AI in economic and financial education. Technology enhances pedagogical effectiveness when implemented thoughtfully, supported by training infrastructure, and balanced with human instruction. Yet enhancement falls short of transformation. The persistent need for human interpretation, the ethical complications of algorithmic bias, the infrastructure inequities that limit access, these realities temper optimistic narratives about educational revolution through technology.

Several limitations constrain these conclusions. The cross-sectional design prevents causal claims about AI effectiveness. Measuring engagement rather than learning outcomes leaves fundamental questions about skill development unresolved. Does increased platform time indicate deeper comprehension or merely prolonged activity? The urban concentration sample limits generalization to rural institutions operating under different resource constraints. Cost-benefit analysis remains absent; whether educational in AI gains justify implementation expenses cannot be determined from this evidence alone. These gaps suggest directions for subsequent investigation rather than fatal flaws in current findings.

Longitudinal studies are required to evaluate medium-term impacts that measure not only statistical accuracy but also effects on critical thinking. This responds to the call for creating sustainable and inclusive educational ecosystems, where AI enhances rather than replaces human capabilities. The responsible implementation of AI in education is not merely a technical challenge but a social one. We emphasize that its success depends on prioritizing equity, ethics, and global collaboration, ensuring that technology serves as a bridge rather than a barrier to a more just and digitally competent society.

REFERENCES

Ahmad, M., Karim, A. A., Din, R., & Albakri, I. S. M. A. (2013). Assessing ICT competencies among postgraduate students based on the 21st century ICT competency model. *Asian Social Science*, *9*(16), 32-39. https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v9n16p32

ANUIES. (2023). *Estado actual de las tecnologías de la información y las comunicaciones en las instituciones de educación superior en México: Estudio 2023* [Current state of information and communication technologies in higher education institutions in Mexico: 2023 study]. Asociación Nacional de Universidades e Instituciones de Educación Superior en México. https://publicaciones-tic.anuies.mx/descargas/2023/libros/Estado_Actual_Tecnologias_2023.pdf

Baker, R. S., Martin, T., & Rossi, L. M. (2016). Educational data mining and learning analytics. In A. A. Rupp & J. P. Leighton (Eds.), The handbook of cognition and assessment: Frameworks, methodologies, and applications (pp. 253-272). Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118956588.ch16

Barocas, S., Hardt, M., & Narayanan, A. (2023). *Fairness and machine learning: Limitations and opportunities*. MIT Press.

Bluwstein, K., Buckmann, M., Joseph, A., Kang, M., Kapadia, S., & Simsek, Ö. (2020). *Credit growth, the yield curve and financial crisis prediction: Evidence from a machine learning approach* (Bank of England Staff Working Paper No. 848). Bank of England. https://www.bankofengland.co.uk/working-paper/2020/credit-growth-the-yield-curve-and-financial-crisis-prediction-evidence-from-a-machine-learning

Chen, L., Chen, P., & Lin, Z. (2020). Artificial intelligence in education: A review. *IEEE Access*, *8*, 75264-75278. https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2020.2988510

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2017). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Davis, F. D., Bagozzi, R. P., & Warshaw, P. R. (1989). User acceptance of computer technology: A comparison of two theoretical models. *Management Science*, *35*(8), 982-1003. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.35.8.982

Department of Education, Skills and Employment. (2021). *Digital education revolution: Final evaluation report*. Australian Government.

Dwork, C., & Roth, A. (2014). The algorithmic foundations of differential privacy. *Foundations and Trends in Theoretical Computer Science*, *9*(3-4), 211-407. https://doi.org/10.1561/0400000042

Hardt, M., Price, E., & Srebro, N. (2016). Equality of opportunity in supervised learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, *29*, 3323-3331.

Hens, T., & Rieger, M. O. (2016). *Financial economics: A concise introduction to classical and behavioral finance* (2nd ed.). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-49688-6

Hernández, R. V. R., Rentería, J. L. M., & Cervantes, G. O. (2023). La educación financiera de los estudiantes universitarios de contaduría pública: Un estudio de caso [Financial education of public accounting university students: A case study]. *Ciencia Latina Revista Científica Multidisciplinar, 7*(6), 1330-1343. https://doi.org/10.37811/cl_rcm.v7i6.8769

Howard-Jones, P., Holmes, W., Demetriou, S., Jones, C., Tanimoto, E., Morgan, O., & Davies, N. (2014). Neuroeducational research in the design and use of a learning technology. *Learning, Media and Technology*, *40*(2), 1-20. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2014.943237

IBM Security. (2022). *Reporte anual de amenazas cibernéticas en educación* [Annual report on cybersecurity threats in education]. IBM Corporation. https://latam.newsroom.ibm.com/2022-02-23-Reporte-IBM-ransomware-persistio-como-el-tipo-mas-comun-de-ataque-en-America-Latina-en-2021

INEGI. (2020). *Encuesta nacional de ingresos y gastos de los hogares 2020* [National survey of household income and expenditure 2020]. Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía. https://www.inegi.org.mx/contenidos/productos/prod_serv/contenidos/espanol/bvinegi/productos/nueva_estruc/889463918189.pdf

Kasneci, E., Seßler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., Gasser, U., Groh, G., Günnemann, S., Hüllermeier, E., Krusche, S., Kutyniok, G., Michaeli, T., Nerdel, C., Pfeffer, J., Poquet, O., Sailer, M., Schmidt, A., Seidel, T., ... Kasneci, G. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *103*, Article 102274. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274

Kay, J., & King, M. (2020). *Radical uncertainty: Decision-making beyond the numbers*. W. W. Norton & Company.

Koedinger, K. R., Corbett, A. T., & Perfetti, C. (2012). The knowledge-learning-instruction framework: Bridging the science-practice chasm to enhance robust student learning. *Cognitive Science, 36*(5), 757-798. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1551-6709.2012.01245.x

Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Landis, J. R., & Koch, G. G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics*, *33*(1), 159-174. https://doi.org/10.2307/2529310

Lara Serna, L., Sosa Morales, E., Lara Menéndez, A., & Hernández González, D. F. (2024). Educación financiera en universidades mexicanas: Desafíos y oportunidades de mejora a través de la tecnología [Financial education in Mexican universities: Challenges and opportunities for improvement through technology]. *Ciencia Latina Revista Científica Multidisciplinar, 8*(3), 10973-10991. https://doi.org/10.37811/cl_rcm.v8i3.12253

Majjate, H., Bellarhmouch, Y., Jeghal, A., Yahyaouy, A., Tairi, H., & Zidani, K. A. (2024). AI-powered academic guidance and counseling system based on student profile and interests. *Applied System Innovation*, *7*(1), Article 6. https://doi.org/10.3390/asi7010006

Meese, R. A., & Rogoff, K. (1983). Empirical exchange rate models of the seventies: Do they fit out of sample? *Journal of International Economics*, *14*(1-2), 3-24. https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1996(83)90017-X

Mindell, D. A., Autor, D. H., & Reynolds, E. B. (2022). *The work of the future: Building better jobs in an age of intelligent machines*. MIT Press. https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/14109.001.0001

Miranda-Agrippino, S., & Rey, H. (2020). U.S. monetary policy and the global financial cycle. *The Review of Economic Studies*, *87*(6), 2754-2776. https://doi.org/10.1093/restud/rdaa019

Moloi, T., & Marwala, T. (2020). *Artificial intelligence in economics and finance theories*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-42962-1

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

Pask, G. (1976). *Conversation theory: Applications in education and epistemology*. Elsevier.

Rey, H. (2015). *Dilemma not trilemma: The global financial cycle and monetary policy independence* (NBER Working Paper No. 21162). National Bureau of Economic Research. https://doi.org/10.3386/w21162

Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations* (5th ed.). Free Press.

Samuelson, P. A. (1947). Some implications of "linearity". *The Review of Economic Studies*, *15*(2), 88-90. https://doi.org/10.2307/2295997

Sermpinis, G., Stasinakis, C., Theofilatos, K., & Karathanasopoulos, A. (2015). Modeling, forecasting and trading the EUR exchange rates with hybrid rolling genetic algorithms—Support vector regression forecast combinations. *European Journal of Operational Research*, *247*(3), 831-846. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2015.06.052

Shadish, W. R., Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (2002). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for generalized causal inference*. Houghton Mifflin Company.

Shiller, R. (2025). *Mercados financieros* [Financial markets] [Curso en línea]. Coursera. https://www.coursera.org/learn/financial-markets-global-es

Sung, Y. T., Chang, K. E., & Liu, T. C. (2016). The effects of integrating mobile devices with teaching and learning on students' learning performance: A meta-analysis and research synthesis. *Computers & Education*, *94*, 252-275. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2015.11.008

Tec Review. (2023). *Reporte anual de innovación tecnológica* [Annual report on technological innovation]. https://tec.mx/sites/default/files/repositorio/Marketing/informe-anual/pdf/resumen-informe-2023-tec.pdf?srsltid=AfmBOoqy6Kb7ka2i5JdMBc5TQPihD6euUrtnih9yqtlVIGkZPX7xHWJI

Tetlock, P. E., & Gardner, D. (2015). *Superforecasting: The art and science of prediction*. Crown Publishers.

UNAM. (2023). *Recomendaciones para el uso de inteligencia artificial generativa en la docencia* [Recommendations for the use of generative artificial intelligence in teaching]. Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Coordinación de Universidad Abierta, Innovación Educativa y Educación a Distancia. https://cuaed.unam.mx/descargas/recomendaciones-uso-iagen-docencia-unam-2023.pdf

Vannini, N., Enz, S., Sapouna, M., Wolke, D., Watson, S., Woods, S., Dautenhahn, K., Hall, L., Paiva, A., Andre, E., Aylett, R., & Schneider, W. (2011). "FearNot!": A computer-based anti-bullying programme designed to foster peer intervention. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, *26*(1), 21-44. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-010-0035-4

Vázquez Pita, E. (2021). La UNESCO y la gobernanza de la inteligencia artificial en un mundo globalizado [UNESCO and the governance of artificial intelligence in a globalized world]. *Anuario de la Facultad de Derecho de la Universidad de Extremadura, 37,* 273-302. https://doi.org/10.17398/2695-7728.37.273

Venkatesh, V., & Bala, H. (2008). Technology acceptance model 3 and a research agenda on interventions. *Decision Sciences*, *39*(2), 273-315. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5915.2008.00192.x

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge University Press.

AUTHORS' INFORMATION

Full name: Luis Enrique García Pérez
Institutional affiliation: Universidad de las Américas Puebla
Institutional address: Ex-Hacienda Santa Catarina Mártir, 72810 San Andrés Cholula, Puebla, Mexico
Email address: enrique.garcia@udlap.mx
Short biographical sketch: Luis Enrique García Pérez is a professor and researcher at Universidad de las Américas Puebla, Mexico. His research portfolio includes energy economics, applying real options and Monte Carlo simulation to natural gas investment under uncertainty, and educational innovation, investigating AI integration in economics and finance teaching. His AI education research employs mixed methods designs to evaluate adoption predictors, student engagement impacts, and algorithmic biases in educational platforms. His work bridges quantitative rigor with practical policy implications for both energy security and pedagogical transformation.

Full name: Muhammad Kashif
Institutional affiliation: Universidad de las Américas Puebla
Institutional address: Ex-Hacienda Santa Catarina Mártir, 72810 San Andrés Cholula, Puebla, Mexico
Short biographical sketch: Muhammad Kashif is a is a professor and researcher at Universidad de las Américas Puebla, Mexico. His research focuses on finance, with particular emphasis on banking.