Influence of AI TOOLS on Student's Learning Process

L Vinay Kumar Reddy(2347126)   Pratham M(2347138)   S Alankritha(2347146)

CHRIST
(DEEMED TO BE UNIVERSITY)
B A N G A L O R E · I N D I A

Introduction

In the era of technological advancement, Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools have emerged as transformative agents in education. This survey delves into the dynamic relationship between students and AI tools, exploring how these technologies influence the learning process. By capturing student perspectives on usage, impact, and satisfaction, we aim to unravel the multifaceted role AI plays in shaping modern education

Research Questions

1. H0: The average satisfaction with the overall use of AI tools in education is neutral ($\mu = 4$).
Ha: The average satisfaction with the overall use of AI tools in education is different from neutral ($\mu \neq 4$).

2. H0: There is no significant difference in satisfaction with AI tools between Postgraduate and Undergraduate students ($\mu\_postgraduate = \mu\_undergraduate$).
Ha: There is a significant difference in satisfaction with AI tools between Postgraduate and Undergraduate students ($\mu\_postgraduate \neq \mu\_undergraduate$).

3. H0: There is no significant difference in satisfaction with AI tools among different age ranges ($\mu\_18\text{-}24 = \mu\_Above\ 24 = \mu\_Under\ 18$).
Ha: There is a significant difference in satisfaction with AI tools among different age ranges (At least one mean is different).

Data PreProcessing

1. Changed the larger column names into smaller variable names.
2. Dropped Unwanted columns like timestamp, username and comments.
3. Checked for null values using is.na.
4. Converted character data to factors for better analysis (Age, education, gender).
5. Converted columns in Demographic Info, Usage Info, Impact Info, and Satisfaction Info to ordered factors with specified levels.

Data Set

Aspect	Observation
Satisfaction	78% highly satisfied, 20% moderately satisfied, 2% dissatisfied
Learning Impact	85% positive impact, 12% neutral impact, 3% negative impact
Privacy Concerns	Varied opinions: 40% neutral, 30% disagree, 30% agree
Assessment Effectiveness	72% effective, 18% moderately effective, 10% ineffective
Integration Challenges	Diverse experiences: 45% seamless, 30% moderate challenges, 25% significant challenges
Age Influence	Consistent satisfaction; 18-25 age group has 5% higher privacy concerns
Gender Patterns	No significant differences observed
Educational Levels	Postgraduates more critical: 62% critical, 28% neutral, 10% supportive

Informations Based on DataSet

| Categories	Insights
Technology Adoption	55% of respondents actively use AI tools in other areas outside of education
Learning Preferences	60% prefer a blend of AI and traditional teaching methods
Future Outlook	70% believe AI will play a significant role in future education
Training and Proficiency	48% feel adequately trained to use AI tools in education
Adoption Hurdles	42% cite lack of awareness as a barrier to AI tool
Preferred AI Applications	50% express interest in AI for personalized learning
Accessibility Concerns	55% emphasize the importance of ensuring AI tools are accessible to all students

Result Analysis

| Question	Test	Result
Q1	One-sample T-test	p-value = 0.00856
Q2	Two-Sample T-test	p-value = 0.8828
Q3	One-way ANOVA	P-value=0.635

Findings

1. Since the p-value (0.00856) is less than the common significance level (e.g., 0.05), there is enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis. We can conclude that the average satisfaction with the overall use of AI tools in education is significantly different from neutral.

2. Since the p-value (0.8828) is greater than the common significance level (e.g., 0.05), there is insufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis. We do not have enough evidence to conclude that there is a significant difference in satisfaction with AI tools between Postgraduate and Undergraduate students.

3. Since the p-value (0.635) is greater than the common significance level (e.g., 0.05), there is insufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis. We do not have enough evidence to conclude that there is a significant difference in satisfaction with AI tools among different age ranges.

Exploratory Analysis

Histogram of No Privacy Concerns by Education Level

Correlation

One-way ANOVA: Influence of Age ranage on Recalling The Information'

Jitter Plot: Frequency of using AI tools vs. Recalling The Information

Conclusion

- **Overall Satisfaction:** There is significant evidence (p-value = 0.00856) to reject the null hypothesis, indicating that the average satisfaction with the overall use of AI tools in education is significantly different from neutral ($\mu \neq 4$).
- **Student Categories:** There is insufficient evidence (p-value = 0.8828) to reject the null hypothesis, suggesting no significant difference in satisfaction with AI tools between Postgraduate and Undergraduate students.
- **Age Groups:** Similarly, there is insufficient evidence (p-value = 0.635) to reject the null hypothesis, indicating no significant difference in satisfaction with AI tools among different age ranges.
- **Technology Adoption:** 48% of respondents feel adequately trained to use AI tools in education, reflecting a moderate level of readiness among students.
- **Accessibility Concerns:** A majority (55%) emphasize the importance of ensuring AI tools are accessible to all students, highlighting a collective concern for inclusivity.

Limitations

Data Quality: Limitations in the quality of the data, such as missing values, outliers, or inaccuracies, can impact the reliability of your analysis.

Sample Size: The size of the dataset can affect the statistical power of the analysis. Small sample sizes may limit the generalizability of the findings and reduce the ability to detect subtle patterns or effects.

Scope of Analysis: The scope of the analysis and the variables included may be limited. Consideration of additional variables or alternative methodologies could provide a more comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon under study.

Scan For FeedBack