INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH CULTURE SOCIETY
Monthly Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Indexed Journal
Volume - 9, Issue - 12, December- 2025
ISSN(O): 2456-6683
[Impact Factor: 9.241]
IJRCS

DOIs:10.2017/IJRCS/202512005 --:-- Research Paper / Article / Review

Impact of AI on School and College Education

Dr. Md Shahjahan
Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, Goenka College of Commerce and Business Administration, Kolkata, WB
Email - 786msj@gmail.com

Abstract: Artificial Intelligence (AI) — especially generative AI and adaptive tutoring systems — is reshaping schooling and higher education worldwide. This paper synthesizes theoretical perspectives and empirical evidence on how AI affects teaching practices, learning outcomes, assessment integrity, equity, and the role of teachers. Drawing on systematic reviews, meta-analyses, policy reports, and recent empirical studies, the paper finds that: (1) AI-powered intelligent tutoring systems and adaptive learning tools can measurably improve learning outcomes when well-designed and scaffolded; (2) generative AI (large language models) offers powerful assistive capacities for research, feedback, and personalized instruction but poses acute challenges for academic integrity and assessment design; (3) equity impacts are mixed — AI can support differentiated learning and access, but risks entrenching existing gaps where infrastructure, teacher capacity, or digital literacy are inadequate; and (4) successful integration requires teacher professional development, clear policy on acceptable AI use, robust assessment redesign, and ethics/transparency safeguards. The paper closes with research priorities and policy recommendations for schools, colleges, and policymakers.

Key Words: Artificial intelligence; generative AI; intelligent tutoring systems; education policy; academic integrity; equity; assessment redesign.

1. INTRODUCTION

AI technologies — ranging from intelligent tutoring systems (ITS) to large language models (LLMs) such as ChatGPT — have moved rapidly from research labs into mainstream educational settings. Educators now leverage AI for automated feedback, personalized learning pathways, grading assistance, and instructional design; students use AI as a study aid and writing assistant. The rapid adoption has provoked optimism (personalized learning at scale) and concern (cheating, deskilling, biased models). This paper provides a structured review of evidence on the impacts of AI on school and college education, synthesizes what we know about benefits and risks, and offers practical recommendations for policymakers and institutions. (UNESCO)

2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK: CHANNELS OF IMPACT

AI influences education through several overlapping channels:

1. **Instructional augmentation:** AI assists teachers with lesson planning, generating explanations, and producing formative feedback.
2. **Personalized learning:** Adaptive systems diagnose learner states and tailor content, pacing, and scaffolding.
3. **Assessment and feedback:** Automated grading, rubric-based scoring, and formative analytics accelerate feedback loops.
4. **Student assistance:** Generative AI supports drafting, summarization, problem-solving, and content scaffolding.
5. **System-level analytics:** Aggregated learning data enables early-warning systems and resource targeting.
6. **Risks/negative channels:** academic dishonesty, misinformation, bias amplification, teacher deskilling, over-reliance, and digital divides.

This framework guides the literature review and the interpretation of empirical studies that follow.

3. LITERATURE REVIEW

3.1 Intelligent Tutoring Systems and adaptive learning

A long tradition of ITS research shows positive effects on learning when systems provide immediate, tailored feedback and scaffolded practice (for both K–12 and higher education). Recent systematic reviews and meta-analyses conclude that ITS and well-designed adaptive platforms can produce **small-to-moderate positive effects** on achievement, especially in STEM domains where stepwise problem-solving and feedback are central. Success factors include close alignment with curriculum, high-quality pedagogical models, and teacher integration of system outputs into classroom activity. (PMC)

3.2 Generative AI (LLMs) and higher-order learning

Meta-analytic work and systematic reviews on ChatGPT and other LLMs report mixed effects: when used as a tutor or scaffold they can improve understanding and productivity (e.g., summarizing literature, scaffolding arguments), but their outputs can be inconsistent or hallucinated, requiring careful vetting. A recent meta-analysis covering studies through early 2025 finds that LLM-assisted learning can improve performance on certain tasks and support higher-order thinking when prompts are framed to encourage explanation and reflection rather than merely producing final answers. (Nature)

3.3 Academic integrity and assessment challenges

Generative AI has materially changed the feasibility of producing high-quality written work with limited student input. Systematic reviews focusing on academic integrity report increasing incidents of AI-assisted cheating and call for reassessment of assessment design (open-book authentic assessments, oral defenses, process-based submissions, and AI-detection complemented by pedagogical redesign). Institutions that pair AI policy with assessment redesign fare better at preserving learning objectives. (MDPI)

3.4 Equity and inclusion impacts

Policy reviews from OECD and UNESCO emphasize that AI has the potential to **reduce gaps** (by providing personalized supports) but also to **widen them** where infrastructure (devices, broadband), teacher training, and language-appropriate models are lacking. The net effect depends on policy choices: investments in blended teacher-AI models, device access, and localized content increase positive equity outcomes. (OECD)

3.5 Teacher role and professional development

Multiple studies highlight that the teacher's role shifts from content-delivery to facilitation, curriculum design, and critical evaluation of AI outputs. However, effective deployments require substantial teacher training in AI pedagogy, prompt engineering basics, and ethical considerations. Top-down tech rollouts without teacher buy-in often fail to translate into learning gains. (SpringerLink)

3.6 Literature Review Table of different authors:

Author(s)	Year	Focus / Title (short)	Method / Data	Key findings	Relevance to paper
Bloom, B. S.	1984	Mastery learning / 2-sigma problem	Review / theoretical & empirical school studies	One-to-one tutoring produces very large learning gains (the "2-sigma" effect) compared with conventional instruction.	Benchmarks the potential of ITS/AI tutoring to approximate personalized human tutoring.
VanLehn, K.	2011	Effectiveness of intelligent tutoring systems	Meta-analysis / literature synthesis of ITS RCTs	ITS produce learning gains often comparable to human tutors in constrained domains (problem-solving tasks), especially when feedback is targeted.	Empirical foundation for expecting ITS to improve outcomes in STEM and rule-based learning.
Létourneau, A.	2025	Systematic review of AI-driven ITS	Systematic literature review / meta-analysis	Adaptive ITS show small-to-moderate positive effects on achievement when integrated with teacher instruction. Implementation fidelity matters.	Provides recent aggregated evidence on ITS impact across K–12 and higher-education settings.

Author(s)	Year	Focus / Title (short)	Method / Data	Key findings	Relevance to paper
Wang, J.	2025	Meta-analysis on ChatGPT effects	Meta-analysis of LLM-assisted learning studies	LLM assistance can boost task performance when used with metacognitive prompts; results heterogeneous by task and domain.	Synthesizes emerging evidence on generative-AI educational impacts—useful for policy and assessment redesign discussion.
Bittle, K.	2025	Generative AI & academic integrity	Systematic review / institutional reports synthesis	Rapid rise in AI-assisted academic incidents; best-practice responses combine assessment redesign + clear AI policy.	Directly informs the assessment and integrity sections and recommended institutional responses.
Kofinas, A. K.	2024	LLMs and assessment design	Conceptual analysis + case studies	Argues for authentic, process-based assessments (portfolios, oral defenses) to preserve learning objectives in the LLM era.	Practical guidance for colleges redesigning assessment in response to generative AI.
Rejeb, A.	2024	ChatGPT in education	Empirical pilots + surveys	Students commonly use ChatGPT for drafting and brainstorming; scaffolded prompting improves deeper learning outcomes.	Evidence on student behavior and how prompt design mediates learning effects.
Abbas, M.	2024	ChatGPT adoption consequences	Mixed-methods (surveys, experiments)	Generative AI helps productivity but can reduce learning when used as a substitute for effort; scaffolding and instruction mitigate harm.	Supports argument that pedagogical framing determines whether AI helps or harms learning.
OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation & Development)	2024	AI, equity and inclusion in education	Policy review, cross-country policy evidence	AI can narrow or widen inequities depending on access to devices, teacher capacity, and local-language resources. Recommendation: invest in infrastructure and teacher training.	Provides system-level policy recommendations; useful for equity & policy sections.
UNESCO	(ongoing)	AI in education — guidance & frameworks	Policy guidance, global syntheses	Emphasizes ethical AI use, data-protection, teacher capacity-building, and inclusive deployment.	Frames ethical and governance recommendations in the paper.
Heffernan & Heffernan (ASSISTments research stream)	2014–2020 (selected)	ITS and blended classroom pilots	Multiple RCTs and quasi-experimental classroom studies	Adaptive feedback platforms improve homework performance and help teachers target instruction; gains vary with teacher integration.	Concrete examples of blended ITS implementation and teacher-AI interaction.
Various ed-tech vendors / case studies (e.g., Carnegie	2000s–2020s	ITS deployed at scale in schools	Field trials, RCTs, district implementations	Sustained gains in math attainment where curricular alignment and professional development	Real-world lessons on scaling AI tools and importance of PD & curriculum fit.

Author(s)	Year	Focus / Title (short)	Method / Data	Key findings	Relevance to paper
Learning Cognitive Tutor)				provided; implementation matters.	

4. METHODOLOGY

This paper synthesizes peer-reviewed studies, systematic reviews, policy reports (UNESCO, OECD), and meta-analyses published through 2024–2025. Where possible, we emphasize causal designs (randomized controlled trials, quasi-experimental evaluations) and meta-analytic summaries that aggregate across heterogeneous settings. When discussing generative-AI impacts on academic integrity, we rely on systematic literature reviews and recent cross-institutional incident reporting to triangulate findings.

5. EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE AND ILLUSTRATIVE CASE STUDIES

5.1 Intelligent Tutoring Systems — evidence of learning gains

Several randomized controlled trials and meta-analyses demonstrate that ITS (e.g., Carnegie Learning's Cognitive Tutor, ASSISTments-style platforms) improve problem-solving outcomes in math and programming, with effect sizes ranging from small ($d \approx 0.2$) to moderate ($d \approx 0.5$) depending on subject, age group, and fidelity of implementation. Reviews emphasize that systems yield the largest gains when blended with teacher guidance rather than used in isolation. (PMC)

Case: A tertiary-level study implementing an AI tutoring module for introductory programming reported improved assignment scores and lower dropout rates when instructors integrated AI feedback into weekly tutorials.

5.2 Generative AI in homework, research, and formative tasks

Surveys and controlled experiments show students commonly use LLMs for draft generation, brainstorming, and summarization. Experiments that combine LLM use with reflective prompts or explain-your-answer tasks show improved higher-order performance, while use as a shortcut for finished answers undermines learning. (SpringerLink)

Case: An experiment in a university writing course found that students given LLMs plus scaffolded reflection prompts produced essays of higher analytic depth than students using LLMs to generate full drafts without reflection.

5.3 Assessment integrity: institutional responses

Universities report rising AI-related integrity cases; many responses include AI-use policies, detection tools, and assessment redesign (oral exams, staged drafts, portfolios). Systematic reviews recommend combining detection with pedagogical redesign rather than relying solely on forensic tools. (MDPI)

Case: A college implemented process-based assessment (proposal → draft → peer review → oral defense). While students used generative AI at stages, the multi-step process preserved learning goals and reduced successful academic dishonesty incidents.

5.4 Equity: potential and pitfalls

Policy analyses show promising pilots where AI-driven remediation closed small reading/math gaps for struggling students; conversely, under-resourced schools without devices fell further behind when AI tools became part of curricula in wealthier schools. Language-model biases and lack of local-language training data also limit usefulness in multilingual settings. (OECD)

Case: An adaptive reading-assessment pilot in a mixed-income district improved comprehension for bottom-decile readers when paired with teacher coaching and after-school device access. The same platform underperformed in schools lacking reliable internet.

6. BENEFITS AND RISKS — SYNTHESIS

6.1 Benefits

- **Personalization at scale:** AI tailors content and pacing to individual learner needs, increasing time-on-task relevance.
- **Faster feedback loops:** Automated grading/feedback gives students immediate corrective signals.
- **Teacher augmentation:** AI reduces administrative burden and supports differentiated instruction when teachers interpret outputs pedagogically.

6.2 Risks

- **Academic integrity threats:** Generative AI makes certain forms of cheating easier, demanding assessment redesign.
- **Hallucination & misinformation:** LLMs sometimes produce confident but incorrect outputs; reliance without verification harms learning.
- **Equity gaps:** Unequal access to devices, bandwidth, and teacher capacity risks widening achievement gaps.
- **Data privacy and surveillance:** Student data used for personalization raises privacy and governance concerns requiring clear consent and security frameworks.

7. POLICY AND PRACTICE RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 For schools and colleges

1. **Assessment redesign:** Shift toward authentic, process-based, and oral/portfolio assessments to align incentives with learning.
2. **Teacher professional development:** Invest in training on AI pedagogy, prompt literacy, and ethical use. Teachers should co-design AI workflows.
3. **AI-use policies:** Establish clear, communicated policies on acceptable AI use, with transparent rationale grounded in pedagogy rather than punishment alone.
4. **Blend AI & human judgment:** Use AI as a tutor/assistant with teacher oversight to validate outputs and contextualize learning.

7.2 For policymakers and system leaders

1. **Equity investments:** Provide devices, connectivity, and localized AI resources (language models, curricula) for under-resourced schools.
2. **Data governance frameworks:** Protect student data with clear consent, retention limits, and standards for vendors.
3. **Evaluation & evidence:** Fund RCTs and large-scale pilots that rigorously evaluate AI tools across diverse contexts (including cost-effectiveness).
4. **Standards & transparency:** Require vendors to disclose model limitations, training-data provenance (where feasible), and provide auditing access for bias and safety checks.

8. LIMITATIONS

- **Heterogeneity of evidence:** Studies vary by domain (math vs writing), age group, and fidelity of implementation; effect sizes are context-dependent.
- **Rapidly evolving models:** LLM and AI tool capabilities change quickly — evidence can age fast; ongoing evaluation is essential.
- **Measurement gaps:** More causal studies are needed on long-term learning outcomes, socio-emotional impacts, and the economics of scale for AI solutions. Priority research areas: (1) RCTs of blended teacher-AI models in low-resource settings; (2) longitudinal studies of AI effects on critical thinking and creativity; (3) effective assessment redesign models preserving learning integrity.

9. CONCLUSION

AI presents a once-in-a-generation opportunity to personalize learning and augment teacher capacity, but realizing these benefits requires deliberate policy, teacher training, equitable infrastructure investment, and assessment redesign. Generative AI, when scaffolded, can support higher-order thinking; when misused, it threatens academic integrity and learning. Policymakers and educational leaders should adopt a balanced approach: encourage innovation while instituting protections — pedagogical, ethical, and technical — that preserve educational aims and equity.

REFERENCES

1. Bittle, K. (2025). *Generative AI and academic integrity in higher education: A systematic literature review.* Information, 16(4), 296. (MDPI)
2. Gruenhagen, J. H. (2024). *The rapid rise of generative AI and its implications for education.* [Article]. (ScienceDirect)
3. Kofinas, A. K. (2024). *The impact of generative AI on assessment and academic integrity.* British Educational Research Journal. (Bera Journals)
4. Létourneau, A. (2025). *A systematic review of AI-driven intelligent tutoring systems.* Journal of Educational Technology. (PMC)
5. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2024). *The potential impact of artificial intelligence on equity and inclusion in education.* OECD Policy Paper. (OECD)
6. Rejeb, A. (2024). *Exploring the impact of ChatGPT on education.* Computers in Human Behavior Reports. (ScienceDirect)
7. UNESCO. (n.d.). *Artificial intelligence in education.* UNESCO Digital Education. (UNESCO)
8. Wang, J. (2025). *The effect of ChatGPT on students' learning performance: A meta-analysis.* Humanities and Social Sciences Communications. (Nature)
9. Abbas, M. (2024). *Is it harmful or helpful? Examining the causes and consequences of ChatGPT adoption in higher education.* International Journal of Educational Technology. (SpringerLink)