SHIKSHA SAMVAD
International Open Access Peer-Reviewed & Refereed
Journal of Multidisciplinary Research
ISSN: 2584-0983 (Online)
Volume-02, Issue-01, September- 2024
www.shikshasamvad.com

" Impact of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Higher Education"

Dr. Girish V.
Assistant Professor (Senior Scale),
Department of Commerce,
P.E.S College of Science, Arts and Commerce,
M.C. Road, Mandya, Karnataka – 571 401.
dr.girishv6@gmail.com

Kiran A S
Assistant Professor,
Department of Commerce,
P.E.S College of Science, Arts and Commerce,
M.C. Road, Mandya, Karnataka – 571 401.
kiruaskiran@gmail.com

Abstract:

This study examines the impact of artificial intelligence (AI) integration on teaching practices, student engagement, and faculty confidence in higher education. A quantitative approach was adopted, utilizing a structured questionnaire administered to faculty members across various academic disciplines. The survey collected data on perceptions regarding AI's influence on teaching quality, personalized learning experiences for students, and faculty members' confidence in using AI tools. Statistical analyses, including one-sample t-tests and reliability assessments (Cronbach's Alpha = 0.747), were employed to analyse the data from 161 respondents. Findings indicate significant positive perceptions toward AI's role in enhancing teaching practices (mean score range: 3.5652 to 3.8261, $p < .0001$). Faculty members expressed confidence in integrating AI tools (mean score range: 3.6957 to 3.8261), affirming AI's potential to improve educational outcomes. Ethical considerations and professional development needs emerged as critical areas for future AI integration strategies in higher education. This study contributes to understanding AI's transformative potential in academia while highlighting implications for policy and practice.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence (AI), Teachers, Teaching, Higher Education

Introduction:

The novel tools and platforms made possible by artificial intelligence (AI) are causing a paradigm shift in how higher education is taught. Traditional lecture-based instruction is being supplemented with AI-driven personalized learning experiences. This shift allows teachers to meet students where they are academically by adapting lessons to their individual needs and learning styles. AI is also significantly improving administrative efficiency in higher education institutions. Automated grading systems, chatbots for student inquiries, and predictive analytics for student performance are streamlining administrative tasks. This allows educators to focus more on teaching and mentoring, while administrative processes become more efficient and responsive. In addition to transforming teaching methodologies and administrative tasks, AI is facilitating research and collaboration. AI-powered tools are aiding in data analysis, literature review, and even hypothesis generation. These advancements are enabling researchers to focus on innovative and complex aspects of their work, fostering a more collaborative and productive academic environment. Artificial intelligence (AI) has many potential benefits, but it also raises important ethical questions and creates new obstacles. We need to solve problems like algorithmic bias, data privacy, and the digital divide. The proper use of artificial intelligence (AI) in the classroom and university management requires the establishment of ethical standards and rules by educational institutions. The future of AI in higher education looks promising, with potential for further innovations in personalized learning, administrative efficiency, and research capabilities. Continuous advancements in AI technology will likely lead to more sophisticated and effective educational tools, reshaping the landscape of higher education and preparing students for a rapidly evolving job market. The impact of AI on teaching in higher education is profound, offering numerous benefits while also presenting challenges that need careful consideration. By embracing AI technologies and addressing associated ethical concerns, higher education institutions can enhance the quality of education, improve administrative efficiency, and foster a more innovative and collaborative academic environment.

Need of the Study:

Several important forces are propelling AI to change the way higher education instructors do their jobs. As educational demands evolve, understanding AI's role in delivering personalized learning, flexible teaching methods, and efficient administrative processes is essential. This

research aims to enhance student outcomes by identifying how AI can improve engagement, retention, and performance. It provides evidence-based insights for policymakers and educational institutions to make informed decisions about AI integration. Additionally, the study addresses the digital divide, ensuring equitable access to AI-driven education, and explores ethical considerations like data privacy and algorithmic bias to promote responsible AI use. Anticipating future trends, this study prepares institutions for technological advancements, ensuring they stay ahead in the rapidly changing educational landscape.

Review of Literature:

Artificial intelligence (AI) has recently been a hot topic in the world of higher education, with several research examining the pros and cons of using AI in this setting. This review synthesizes key findings from the literature, highlighting the transformative impact of AI on teaching and learning processes.

1. **AI and Personalized Learning**

AI has been shown to significantly enhance personalized learning experiences. Research by Chen, Liao, Cheng, and Dong (2020) suggests that adaptive learning systems powered by artificial intelligence may personalize course materials to each student's requirements, leading to higher levels of interest and achievement in class. Students in individualized learning platforms powered by artificial intelligence outperformed their counterparts in more conventional classrooms in terms of both happiness and academic performance.

2. **Administrative Efficiency**

AI also plays a crucial role in streamlining administrative tasks in higher education institutions. A study by **Luckin, Holmes, Griffiths, and Forcier (2016)** highlighted that AI applications, such as automated grading systems and chatbots, significantly reduce the workload of administrative staff. Educators are able to devote more time to instruction and student support as a result, which raises the bar for education overall.

3. **Research Facilitation**

The facilitation of research through AI is another important aspect explored in the literature. **Wang and Chugh (2014)** emphasized that AI tools are invaluable for data analysis, literature review, and even hypothesis generation. Their research demonstrated that AI-assisted

research processes not only increase efficiency but also promote innovative and interdisciplinary collaborations among scholars.

4. Ethical Considerations and Challenges

There are many potential advantages of using AI at universities, but there are also many obstacles and ethical considerations that must be considered. Topics covered by Williamson, Eynon, and Potter (2020) include algorithmic bias, data privacy, and the digital divide. In their view, schools and other organizations can't afford to let children and teachers fall victim to irresponsible AI use without first laying forth strict ethical standards.

5. Future Prospects

Further improvements in administrative efficiency, research capacities, and tailored learning may be possible in the future of artificial intelligence (AI) in higher education. **Holmes, Bialik, and Fadel (2019)** predict that continuous developments in AI technology will lead to more sophisticated educational tools, reshaping the landscape of higher education and better preparing students for future careers.

The literature reviewed highlights the profound impact of AI on teaching in higher education. While AI offers significant advantages in personalized learning, administrative efficiency, and research facilitation, it also presents challenges that require careful consideration. Advanced education establishments have a great opportunity to work on the nature of schooling and better prepare understudies for a world that is always changing if they take on these issues and appropriately use AI technology.

The present study investigates the effect man-made intelligence on showing in advanced education in the academic institutions in Bengaluru City. Further, the study was found undone in the mentioned city amongst the academic teachers of different disciplines.

Statement of the Problem:

Given the fast incorporation of AI technologies in educational settings, this research aims to address the need for a complete understanding of how AI affects teaching in higher education. Data privacy, algorithmic bias, and the digital divide are just a few of the major obstacles and ethical problems surrounding artificial intelligence (AI) that need careful consideration in light of its promising applications in improving research capacities, administrative efficiency,

and customized learning. To guarantee the fair and responsible use of AI at universities, this research will seek to determine the precise ways in which AI affects pedagogical practices, student results, and administrative procedures, while simultaneously tackling the ethical concerns that arise from this technology.

Objectives of the Study:

1. To investigate the extent to which AI integration has made learning more personalized for students
2. To investigate how AI affects participation and performance in college-level courses
3. To get insight into the level of confidence with which faculty members use AI technologies in their teaching methods

Research Hypotheses:

Following are testing hypotheses framed in direction with the objectives of the study.

H_{0a}= "AI integration has not made learning more personalized for students in higher education**"**

H_{0b}= "AI integration has no significant impact on student engagement and outcomes in higher education courses**"**

H_{0c}= "Faculty members are not confident in using AI tools in their teaching practices**"**

Methodology of the Study:

1. **Type of the Study:** The study employed a quantitative research design to systematically gather numerical data on the perceptions and experiences related to AI integration in higher education.
2. **Sampling:** The participants were selected through a purposive sampling technique, targeting faculty members and possibly students from various academic disciplines. Individuals from a wide range of demographics were surveyed, including those in terms of age, gender, academic rank (e.g., assistant professor, associate professor, professor), and academic specialty (e.g., business/management, engineering, medicine).
3. **Data Collection:** Based on the study's hypotheses and objectives, a structured questionnaire was created. Faculty confidence, student involvement, results, and the

perceived influence of AI on teaching quality were all included as variables. A Likert scale was used to determine the degree of arrangement or conflict with articulations on the joining of simulated intelligence. The scale may range from 1 to 5.

4. **Tools for Data Analysis:** To summarize the survey results, descriptive statistics were used, including mean and standard deviation. We compared the mean scores to a theoretical value, such a test value of 0, using one-sample t-tests to see whether there was a statistically significant difference. For data analysis, statistical software (such as SPSS) was used to guarantee the correctness and reliability of the findings.

Data Analysis and Results Discussion:

Table 1 shows the respondents' demographic characteristics.

Demographic Profile		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Age	Under 25	21	13.0	13.0
	25-34	***84***	***52.2***	***65.2***
	35-44	49	30.4	95.7
	45-54	7	4.3	100.0
	Total	161	100.0	
Gender	Male	***98***	***60.9***	***60.9***
	Female	63	39.1	100.0
	Total	161	100.0	
Academic Position	Assistant Professor	***112***	***69.6***	***69.6***
	Associate Professor	7	4.3	73.9
	Professor	7	4.3	78.3
	Other	35	21.7	100.0
	Total	161	10.0.0	
Field of Study	Commerce/Management	***126***	***78.20***	***78.20***
	Sciences	19	11.80	90
	Engineering	10	6.30	96.30
	Medical	06	3.70	100
	Total	161	100.0	

Source: Primary Data

It seems that a rather youthful population was participated in the poll, as 52.2% of the respondents are in the 25-34 age division. A significant portion (30.4%) is aged between 35-44 years. A smaller percentage of respondents are under 25 years (13.0%) or between 45-54 years (4.3%). There were more men than women that took part in the poll (60.9% vs. 39.1%). A large proportion of respondents hold the position of Assistant Professor (69.6%), indicating

that a substantial number of participants are at a junior faculty level. A smaller percentage is either Associate Professors (4.3%) or Professors (4.3%). About 21.7% of respondents fall under the category labelled as "Other," which could include roles such as adjunct faculty, instructors, or other academic positions. The majority of respondents (78.2%) are from the field of Commerce/Management, suggesting a predominant representation from business-related disciplines. A smaller percentage of respondents are from Sciences (11.8%), Engineering (6.3%), and Medical fields (3.7%). This demographic breakdown provides insights into the composition of the survey respondents. It indicates a predominantly young, male population, with a significant number holding the position of Assistant Professor and coming from Commerce/Management backgrounds. Understanding these demographics helps contextualize the survey results and may influence interpretations related to AI integration in higher education teaching based on different demographic perspectives.

Reliability Statistics:

Table:2- Showing Reliability Statistics

Reliability Statistics	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.747	10

Source: Primary Data

A Cronbach's Alpha of 0.747 is generally considered acceptable for most research purposes, indicating that the items in your study are sufficiently consistent in measuring the variables of interest.

Testing of 1st hypothesis:

Following null and alternative hypotheses are framed to test the 1st hypothesis in connection with 1st objective of the study.

> **H_0= "**AI integration has not made learning more personalized for students in higher education**"**
>
> **H_a= "**AI integration has made learning more personalized for students in higher education**"**

To test the above hypotheses, one sample t-test is employed with other descriptive statistics. Following is the output of the analysis.

Table:3- showing one sample t-test of the respondents on AI integration of personalized learning for students in higher education

One-Sample Test									
	Test Value = 0								
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
V1	161	3.8261	1.05217	46.140	160	**.000**	3.82609	3.6623	3.9899
V2	161	4.0000	.66144	76.733	160	**.000**	4.00000	3.8971	4.1029
V3	161	4.1739	.70325	75.309	160	**.000**	4.17391	4.0645	4.2834
V4	161	3.8696	.85243	57.599	160	**.000**	3.86957	3.7369	4.0022

Sources: Primary Data

The mean score (3.8261) for Variable V1 significantly differs from the test value of 0, as indicated by the very low p-value (< .0001). The 95% confidence interval suggests that the true population mean for V1 falls between 3.6623 and 3.9899. The mean score (4.0000) for Variable V2 is significantly different from the test value of 0, with a very low p-value (< .0001). The 95% confidence interval indicates that the true population mean for V2 is between 3.8971 and 4.1029. The mean score (4.1739) for Variable V3 significantly differs from the test value of 0, with a very low p-value (< .0001). The 95% confidence interval suggests that the true population mean for V3 falls between 4.0645 and 4.2834. The mean score (3.8696) for Variable V4 is significantly different from the test value of 0, with a very low p-value (< .0001). The 95% confidence interval indicates that the true population mean for V4 is between 3.7369 and 4.0022. All four variables (V1, V2, V3, V4) show highly significant differences from the test value of 0, with very low p-values indicating strong evidence to reject the null hypothesis. Hence, null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis stating ***"AI integration has made learning more personalized for students in higher education"*** is accepted**.**

Testing of 2nd hypothesis:

Following null and alternative hypotheses are framed to test the 2nd hypothesis in connection with 2nd objective of the study.

> **H_0= "**AI integration has no significant impact on student engagement and outcomes in higher education courses**"**

H_a= "AI integration has a significant positive impact on student engagement and outcomes in higher education courses**"**

To test the above hypotheses, one sample t-test is employed with other descriptive statistics. Following is the output of the analysis.

Table:4- showing one sample t-test of the respondents on impact of AI on student engagement and outcomes in higher education courses

One-Sample Test									
Variables	Test Value = 0								
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
V1	161	3.8261	.76293	63.633	160	.000	3.82609	3.7073	3.9448
V2	161	3.6957	.85909	54.584	160	.000	3.69565	3.5619	3.8294
V3	161	3.5652	.97328	46.479	160	.000	3.56522	3.4137	3.7167

Sources: Primary Data

The mean score for V1 is 3.8261, significantly different from the test value of 0. There is significant evidence that the null hypothesis is false, as shown by the t-value of 63.633, 160 degrees of freedom, and very low p-value (p <.0001). The 95% confidence interval suggests that the true population mean for V1 is likely between 3.7073 and 3.9448. The mean score for V2 is 3.6957, significantly different from the test value of 0. We may strongly reject the null hypothesis due to the very low p-value (p <.0001) and the t-value of 54.584 with 160 degrees of freedom. The 95% confidence interval suggests that the true population mean for V2 is likely between 3.5619 and 3.8294. The mean score for V3 is 3.5652, significantly different from the test value of 0. We may strongly reject the null hypothesis due to the very low p-value (p <.0001) and the t-value of 46.479 with 160 degrees of freedom. The 95% confidence interval suggests that the true population mean for V3 is likely between 3.4137 and 3.7167. All three variables (V1, V2, V3) show highly significant differences from the test value of 0, with very low p-values indicating strong evidence to reject the null hypothesis. Therefore, we support the alternative hypothesis that states "AI integration has a significant positive impact on student engagement and outcomes in higher education courses" and reject the null hypothesis**.**

Testing of 3rd hypothesis:

Following null and alternative hypotheses are framed to test the 3rd hypothesis in connection with 3rd objective of the study.

H_0= "Faculty members are not confident in using AI tools in their teaching practices**"**

H_a= "Faculty members are confident in using AI tools in their teaching practices**"**

To test the above hypotheses, one sample t-test is employed with other descriptive statistics. Following is the output of the analysis.

Table:5- showing one sample t-test of the respondents on impact of AI on student engagement and outcomes in higher education courses

One-Sample Test									
Variables	Test Value = 0								
	t	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
V1	48.080	161	3.8261	1.00974	160	.000	3.82609	3.6689	3.9832
V2	78.101	161	3.7391	.60747	160	.000	3.73913	3.6446	3.8337
V3	61.518	161	3.7826	.78019	160	.000	3.78261	3.6612	3.9040

Source: Primary Data

The mean score for V1 is 3.8261, significantly different from the test value of 0There is significant evidence that the null hypothesis is false, as shown by the t-value of 48.080 with 160 degrees of freedom and a very low p-value (p <.0001). The 95% confidence interval suggests that the true population mean for V1 is likely between 3.6689 and 3.9832. The mean score for V2 is 3.7391, significantly different from the test value of 0. There is significant evidence that the null hypothesis is false, as shown by the t-value of 78.101 with 160 degrees of freedom and a very low p-value (p <.0001). The 95% confidence interval suggests that the true population mean for V2 is likely between 3.6446 and 3.8337. The mean score for V3 is 3.7826, significantly different from the test value of 0. The t-value of 61.518 with 160 degrees of freedom and a very low p-value (p < .0001) indicates strong evidence against the null hypothesis. The 95% confidence interval suggests that the true population mean for V3 is likely between 3.6612 and 3.9040. All three variables (V1, V2, V3) show highly significant

differences from the test value of 0, with very low p-values indicating strong evidence to reject the null hypothesis. Therefore, the alternative hypothesis, which states that "Faculty members are confident in using AI tools in their teaching practices," is supported and the null hypothesis is rejected.

Findings of the Study:

The main conclusions drawn from the research are as follows.

1. The survey respondents were predominantly young, with a substantial representation from mid-career professionals. There is a majority of male respondents, and a significant number hold junior faculty positions such as Assistant Professors.
2. The majority of respondents were from Commerce/Management backgrounds, suggesting a focus on business-related disciplines in the survey.
3. The findings support the acceptance of the alternative hypothesis (1st) that "AI integration has made learning more personalized for students in higher education." This suggests that according to the survey data, AI technologies have had a statistically significant impact on enhancing personalized learning experiences for students.
4. The findings support the acceptance of the alternative hypothesis (2nd) that "AI integration has a significant positive impact on student engagement and outcomes in higher education courses." This indicates that, in the opinion of the people polled, AI technologies have improved student involvement and results. These results demonstrate the potential for AI to enhance instruction and learning in higher education via its many prospective applications.
5. The findings also support the acceptance of the alternative hypothesis (3rd) that "Faculty members are confident in using AI tools in their teaching practices." This suggests that according to the survey data, faculty members perceive themselves as confident users of AI tools, indicating a positive reception and readiness to integrate AI into teaching practices. These findings highlight the promising role of AI in improving pedagogical approaches and practices in the academic setting.

Conclusion:

Conclusions drawn from a thorough examination of survey data indicate that the use of AI in higher education has had a substantial effect on pedagogical approaches, student involvement, and faculty self-assurance. The findings indicate that AI technologies have led to more

personalized learning experiences for students, improved student engagement and outcomes, and increased confidence among faculty members in using AI tools. Despite these positive outcomes, considerations regarding ethical implications, professional development needs, and potential inequalities among students remain critical for future AI integration in higher education. This research emphasizes the ways in which AI has the ability to revolutionize academic teaching and learning in the future, while also drawing attention to the areas that will need constant improvement.

Limitations of the Study:

The following were constraints which might affect the study.

1. The study was limited to the respondents randomly chosen from Colleges of Bengaluru city.
2. The study acknowledged potential limitations related to sample size and generalizability of findings.
3. Respondent bias and subjectivity in self-reported perceptions could impact the results.

References:

Chen, X., Liao, Y., Cheng, Z., & Dong, Z. (2020). The impact of AI-based personalized learning on student engagement and performance. Journal of Educational Technology Development and Exchange, 13(2), 1-15.

Holmes, W., Bialik, M., & Fadel, C. (2019). Artificial intelligence in education: Promises and implications for teaching and learning. Center for Curriculum Redesign.

Luckin, R., Holmes, W., Griffiths, M., & Forcier, L. B. (2016). Intelligence unleashed: An argument for AI in education. Pearson Education.

Wang, Q., & Chugh, R. (2014). Integrating AI in higher education: Insights from data analysis and research collaboration. International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education, 24(1), 1-28.

Williamson, B., Eynon, R., & Potter, J. (2020). Pandemic politics, pedagogies and practices: Digital technologies and AI in the COVID-19 crisis. Learning, Media and Technology, 45(3), 257-267.

SHIKSHA SAMVAD

An Online Quarterly Multi-Disciplinary
Peer-Reviewed or Refereed Research Journal
ISSN: 2584-0983 (Online) Impact-Factor, RPRI-3.87
Volume-02, Issue-01, Sept.- 2024
www.shikshasamvad.com
Certificate Number-Sept-2024/21

Certificate Of Publication

This Certificate is proudly presented to

Dr. Girish V. & Kiran A S

For publication of research paper title

" Impact of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Higher Education"

Published in 'Shiksha Samvad' Peer-Reviewed and Refereed Research Journal and E-ISSN: 2584-0983(Online), Volume-02, Issue-01, Month September, Year- 2024, Impact-Factor, RPRI-3.87.

Dr. Neeraj Yadav
Editor-In-Chief

Dr. Lohans Kumar Kalyani
Executive-chief- Editor

Note: This E-Certificate is valid with published paper and the paper must be available online at www.shikshasamvad.com