

AI-Supported Data Analysis Boosts Student Motivation and Reduces Stress in Physics Education

Jannik Henze^{1*}, André Bresges¹, Sebastian Becker-Genschow²

¹ Institute for Physics Education, University of Cologne, 50931 Cologne, Germany

² Digital Education Research, University of Cologne, 50931 Cologne, Germany

ABSTRACT. The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) in physics education enables novel approaches to data analysis and conceptual learning. A comparative analysis of AI-supported and traditional Excel-based methods reveals distinct strengths and limitations in fostering understanding of pendulum experiments. This study explores the integration of AI-assisted tools, such as a custom chatbot based on ChatGPT, and traditional Excel-based methods in physics education, revealing that while both approaches produce comparable quantitative learning gains, AI tools provide significant qualitative advantages. These include enhanced emotional engagement and higher motivation, highlighting the potential of AI to create a more positive and supportive learning environment. Adaptive AI technologies offer significant promise in supporting structured, data-intensive tasks, emphasizing the necessity for thoughtfully balanced integration into educational practices.

I. INTRODUCTION

The landscape of education is undergoing a significant change, increasingly shifting from knowledge-oriented approaches to equipping students with skills for future challenges [1]. This paradigm shift in education highlights the need to address subject-specific challenges, particularly in physics, where students often struggle with abstract concepts and complex problem-solving tasks [2]. As educational strategies evolve towards adaptability, the integration of artificial intelligence (AI) emerges as a pivotal factor at both school and university levels that is redefining the boundaries of teaching and learning[3][4].

Large Language Models (LLMs) represent a significant technological breakthrough, offering opportunities to revolutionize educational experiences, particularly in specialized fields like physics, by enabling more personalized and interactive learning approaches [5]. Furthermore ChatGPT simplifies the process of tackling complex physics problems, making physics more accessible [6].

The rapid advancement of AI technologies has enhanced computational accuracy and capabilities, creating possibilities for novel teaching methods [7]. However, the integration of AI into educational settings is not without complexity. Students often face analytical challenges due to a lack of understanding of the underlying physical concepts [8]. In laboratory and academic environments, while AI tools like ChatGPT can assist with tasks such as data analysis and interpretation, students often have problems with effectively leveraging these technologies [9].

These technological shifts necessitate a critical evaluation of educators' roles and pedagogical

methodologies [10]. As AI-powered applications gain growing importance in educational strategies [11] at school and university levels, institutions must develop robust frameworks to effectively incorporate these technologies while addressing potential learning barriers.

Therefore, there is an urgent need to systematically evaluate the potential of AI-enhanced tools in education, particularly in physics learning and data analysis. Understanding their precise impact on learning outcomes and student experience is crucial. This study conducts a comprehensive comparative analysis of Excel-based and AI-powered custom chatbot based data analysis methods. Specifically, this research explores three critical inquiries: First, the potential for participants to achieve significant improvements in understanding physical concepts and data analysis methods through different technological tools. Second, the comparative effectiveness of AI-supported versus traditional Excel-based approaches in facilitating learning outcomes. Third, the nuanced emotional and motivational variables that emerge when students interact with different data analysis technologies, examining aspects such as uncertainty and enjoyment. By examining these questions, this research aims to provide empirical insights into the practical implications of AI in physics education and data analysis training. Understanding how tools like ChatGPT can affect students in physics, for instance in the field of data analysis, is vital for improving learning outcomes. The study revealed detailed findings about AI and traditional learning methods. The AI group demonstrated significant improvements in analytical and data-based tasks, with higher levels of engagement, enjoyment, and perceived

* jannik.henze@uni-koeln.de

effectiveness. The Excel group showed mixed results, with improvements in data visualization but challenges in conceptual understanding. Emotionally, participants using the AI tool reported higher levels of success, enjoyment, and motivation compared to the Excel group.

II. STATE OF RESEARCH

The integration of AI into education is rapidly transforming teaching and learning experiences. Against this background of ongoing advancements in technology, AI technologies are increasingly being recognized for their potential to enhance educational outcomes. As of 2020, evidence supporting its effectiveness has been limited [12]. Nonetheless, the field of AI in education continues to develop, with growing research interest in recent years, highlighting the expanding intersection of technology and education [1][13][14] emphasizing the need for educators to understand and leverage AI to enhance teaching and learning experiences [15].

Building upon this development, an OECD report from 2020 reveals that AI adoption in education has largely been confined to individual use rather than being implemented at an institutional level [12]. To address these gaps, professional development in technology utilization can equip educators with additional teaching competencies and bolster the learning experience of students [16].

Expanding on these key insights, AI is reshaping educational practices by promoting a more integrated approach to instruction. Holistic implementation of AI avoids fragmented usage, highlighting the importance of designing cohesive and interactive learning experiences that go beyond traditional methods of acquiring theoretical knowledge, which often involve minimal personal engagement [17]. This provides a basis for specific applications and challenges of AI in education. In particular, generative AI chatbots demonstrate significant potential in physics education by supporting the explanation of complex concepts and problem-solving processes [18].

Among the notable applications, AI demonstrates particular promise in physics education and broader educational contexts through its ability to provide personalized learning opportunities facilitated by a chatbot, designed to handle content, feedback and supervision [10]. While the extent to which this feedback effectively supports students in the learning process, especially when compared to other feedback sources, remains unclear [7], compelling evidence has emerged. For instance, in physics education, ChatGPT-4 demonstrated high accuracy in solving problems regarding the concept of force (FCI). Its performance exceeded that of real engineering

students at a German university [19]. AI chatbots demonstrate significant potential in physics education by supporting the explanation of complex concepts and problem-solving processes [18] as well as adaptive learning capabilities, that allow a chatbot to tailor explanations in real-time to meet the unique needs of each student [5]. By adjusting the complexity of responses based on individual queries, it ensures that learners receive physics explanations that align with their specific strengths and learning pace [20]. These capabilities highlight AI's role in improving problem-solving competencies as it facilitates the fast and precise analysis and calculations of datasets, which otherwise, would require significant time and effort using traditional Excel-based methods [21].

Complementing its problem-solving capabilities, AI also shows significant potential in encouraging critical thinking and engagement. Research findings indicate that the use of LLMs enhances students' interaction behaviors and promotes critical thinking [22]. Tools like ChatGPT not only surpass the functionality of traditional software like Microsoft Excel [23] but also provide students with the advantage of engaging with educational materials anytime, allowing a flexible learning environment [24].

The integration of AI has further enriched learning experiences for students [14], also in higher education, where most studies on ChatGPT have been conducted [25]. Students rated AI as moderately important in physics education but viewed ChatGPT as a valuable tool for various applications [26]. However, university students have specific expectations for AI learning tools, such as user-friendliness, reliability, interactivity, and personalized learning support [27].

Despite its potential, AI – mainly in form of Chatbots like ChatGPT – presents challenges in distinguishing reliable knowledge from unverified information due to its human-like text generation. As a result, students may accept false or misleading content without critical analysis [28][29] leading to potentially creating misconceptions that may impact future learning [30]. While students rate the linguistic quality of ChatGPT's responses as comparable to sample solutions, its scientific accuracy is often rated lower than that of the sample solutions, especially for questions with lower levels of difficulty [31].

Furthermore, studies on problem-solving strategies reveal limitations in ChatGPT's impact on students, since they often rely on copying answers, showing less reflection and critical thinking [32].

Turning to the impact on learning processes, studies indicate that students were able to learn effectively through ChatGPT, leading to improved understanding and higher achievement [25]. AI learning tools significantly influence university students' learning experiences [27] and outcomes, by fostering

engagement and promoting positive attitudes toward learning [33]. While some studies did not directly measure learning outcomes, they highlight the role of AI chatbots in developing practical skills rather than specific learning achievements. Their findings suggest that the use of chatbots helps to develop and strengthen cognitive skills [34].

Of particular interest is ChatGPT's ability to significantly improve students' learning motivation [35], due to students being drawn to incorporating interactive and engaging new technologies [3]. These are examples of subjective factors influencing learning processes include emotional aspects [36]. A comprehensive analysis of various studies reveals that students' emotional engagement with a chatbot like ChatGPT is primarily influenced by the perceived benefits, performance expectations and the quality of information output. Additional factors, such as enjoyment, self-directed regulation, ease of use and the alignment of outcomes with prior expectations, further contribute to engagement with the tool [25]. However, this enthusiasm with technology coexists with significant public skepticism [37].

III. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Despite the growing interest in AI tools, there is still no conclusive empirical evidence on the impact of LLMs on learning processes. This emphasizes the urgent need for clear guidance on their role in educational practices, including their potential benefits, limitations, and challenges [11]. As tools like ChatGPT are still at an early stage of adoption, ongoing research is crucial to understanding their effectiveness and ensuring their responsible integration into education [7]. To contribute to closing this research gap, an experimental study was conducted with the following research questions. Two groups were given the same evaluation tasks on the topics of string and spring pendulums. One of the groups was able to use a chatbot (see IV. Methodology) to complete these tasks, while the other group used Excel.

Research Question 1 (RQ1): Are there significant learning gains within each group from pre- to post-measurement?

This research question aims to analyze whether participants achieve significant improvements in understanding physical concepts and applying analytical methods using different tools – Microsoft Excel or an AI-assisted tool to analyze given data from pendulum experiments. The investigation aims to determine whether statistically significant cognitive gains can be observed within the intragroup following the intervention.

Research Question 2 (RQ2): Are there significant differences in learning gains between the two groups? This question aims to investigate potential inter-group variations in learning progress between the group utilizing Excel and the group employing an AI-supported tool. The primary objective is to assess whether the implementation of an AI-based tool, compared to traditional Excel usage, results in demonstrable advantages or disadvantages regarding learning outcomes. The research will examine whether one tool provides a statistically significant benefit in terms of conceptual understanding and analytical skill development.

Research Question 3 (RQ3): Are there differences in emotional-motivational variables between using Excel and an AI tool for data analysis?

Extending beyond purely cognitive learning metrics, this research question explores the emotional experiences of participants during data analysis. The study will analyze whether working with an AI tool, compared to working with Excel, leads to different psychological responses such as increased uncertainty, enhanced enjoyment, or heightened stress levels. By examining these affective dimensions, the research seeks to provide a comprehensive understanding of tool-mediated learning experiences.

IV. METHODOLOGY

The present study used a two-stage testing procedure to evaluate participants' experience and skills in using Excel and AI, particularly a ChatGPT custom chatbot called *ExperiMentor* to analyze physical experiments. *ExperiMentor* is a custom GPT developed based on ChatGPT-4o. Its core functionality involves assisting students in analyzing experimental data using Python. When engaging with a bot, students tend to anticipate receiving direct answers rather than mere hints. [22] Nevertheless, to prevent the bot giving answers straightforwardly, it provides contextual hints, relevant formulas, and error prevention strategies, while avoiding proposing analytical procedures or delivering complete solution paths. *ExperiMentor* interacts by asking probing questions, requiring students to define the next steps in their analysis. It supports graphical analysis, responds only to specific student queries with medium-length, explanatory responses, aiming to enhance students' analytical skills, scientific reasoning, and engagement with experimental data. The tool's primary objective is to serve as a guided learning support system that encourages self-directed exploration and deeper comprehension of physics experimental methodologies, rather than functioning as a direct problem-solving tool.

Paired observations are used to evaluate and compare changes resulting from an intervention. Here, the values before and after a treatment are measured for the same individuals and compared with each other [38]. The test is carried out in a randomized pre-post control group design, in which the effect of the treatment is measured both before (pre-test) and after the intervention (post-test) [39]. In this design, both groups were assigned identical tasks, with the AI-group using *ExperiMentor* and the Excel-group working with Excel.

A. Procedure

The intervention was carried out by two different groups. Both groups evaluated one experiment on the thread pendulum and one on the spring pendulum using given data sets. Both groups were guided through the evaluation step by step with the help of identical tasks given on paper [40]. The aim of the thread pendulum experiment was to determine the magnitude of the gravitational acceleration g . The spring pendulum experiment aimed to calculate the spring constant k .

The students worked on prepared computers, whereby half of the computers were equipped with their own premium license for the ChatGPT chatbot and the other half were equipped with Excel. The participants were free to choose a seat and could not see which test group they belonged to when choosing, so that they could be randomly assigned. The pre-test was carried out by the participants before they knew which group they belonged to. The task sheets were only made available after completion of the pre-test and removed again before the start of the post-test. The participants also did not have access to their solutions when they completed the post-test.

B. Material

The pre- and post-tests focus on evaluating participants' knowledge and skills in analyzing physical experiments. Emotional experiences and motivational variables, such as engagement and perceived difficulty, are assessed through survey instruments included alongside the tests [40].

The pre-test consisted of five sections (Parts A to E) with a total of 31 items. Part A focused on demographic data collection, utilizing four items to gather fundamental participant characteristics including age, current degree program, gender identity, and academic background. This section provided essential contextual information for subsequent analysis. Part B examined participants' emotional and motivational dispositions toward technology and data evaluation. This section employed two distinct rating scales: Section B1 used seven validated questions from the short scale for

measuring technology commitment [41] with a 5-point Likert scale ranging from *Does not apply at all* to *Completely true*. Section B2 is used to measure interest and perceived ease of experimental evaluation on a 4-point Likert scale.

The post-test also consisted of five sections (Parts A to E) with a total of 39 items. However, Part A is only a query to determine which of the possible groups, Excel group or AI group, the participants belong to. Part B included 8 constructs regarding the participants' emotional and motivational responses. This part employed a 4-point Likert scale in all questions. The construct *Positive Emotional Learning Experience* (items B3.1, B3.2) measured the extent to which participants experienced positive emotions, such as fun and success, during the learning process. Conversely, *Negative Emotional Learning Experience* (items B3.3, B3.4, B3.5) captured participants' negative emotional states, such as uncertainty, stress, and frustration. The construct *Perception of Methods* (items B4) examined participants' interest in and ease of using the chosen evaluation method, as well as their perception of having learned something useful. Another construct, *Challenges* (items B5) evaluated the perceived difficulty of physical concepts, topics, and mathematical formulas encountered during the experiment. *Method Effectiveness* (items B6.1, B6.3) focused on the perceived usefulness of Excel or *ExperiMentor* in supporting data analysis and understanding of physical concepts. *Perceived Learning Gains* (items B6.2, B6.6) assessed participants' reflections on their learning progress and comprehension of physical concepts achieved using the chosen method. The construct *Motivation* (items B6.4, B6.5) evaluated whether the chosen method increased participants' motivation to engage with experimental data analysis. Finally, *Method Comparison* (items B6.7, B6.8) explored participants' beliefs about their performance, the depth of analysis, and their overall experience when comparing the AI method to Excel.

In both pre- and post-test Part C, D and E each comprised six nominal scale single-choice questions evaluating theoretical understanding of thread pendulum physics (C), spring pendulum physics (D) and fundamental data analysis competencies (E). Each of the total 18 questions has one correct answer and three incorrect answers.

The group working with Excel received an Excel spreadsheet in which the respective measured values of the experiment were already entered. They could edit the table freely and were not subject to any restrictions, except that they were not allowed to search for help outside of Excel and the task sheets.

The group using the AI tool *ExperiMentor* completed the tasks within the chat environment of the custom

GPT *ExperiMentor*. They also received an Excel spreadsheet containing the measurement results. They had the option of transferring the data manually, copying it or uploading the entire table to the chat. No instructions were given on how to proceed.

D. Data collection and analysis

After recording the pre-post data using a digital survey tool, the data were structured and analyzed using R (version 4.3.3) in R Studio [37]. For the analyses – in addition to descriptive parameters of the data, including the mean (M), median (MDN) and standard deviation (SD) [38] – the Shapiro-Wilk test was first used to check the distribution assumptions [38]. Compared to other methods for testing the normal distribution, the Shapiro-Wilk test has a particularly high test power, which makes it effective in detecting deviations from the normal distribution [35].

1. Performance Data

To answer the first research question, the learning gains within the individual groups between pre and post were examined. First, the entire questionnaire was analyzed, i.e. the sum of all correct answers in the pre-test and post-test. Then the three individual subject areas of thread pendulum, spring pendulum and evaluation methods were analyzed. Finally, the increase for each individual question was analyzed. The Shapiro-Wilk test did not detect a normal distribution at any point in the data. Subsequently, a two-sided Wilcoxon signed-rank test with significance level $\alpha \leq 0.05$ was used as a non-parametric method for testing differences between paired samples to check whether there were significant directional changes between the pre- and post-values within the groups [42]. In addition the effect size was calculated using Cohen's d in order to assess the strength of the observed differences between the pre- and post-test [38].

An analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was chosen as the method to answer the second research question. It is used to examine the impact of the intervention, while also considering the possibility of an influence from a quantitative confounder – the pre-test-data – within each intervention group [42][43]. Despite the non-normal distribution found, the ANCOVA was chosen as the method in this analysis because it is robust against violations of the test assumptions. Studies have shown that a deviation from normality does not pose an issue for the ANCOVA [43][44][45], especially if the group sizes are approximately equal [43]. With each group consisting of $n = 25$ participants this requirement is met.

As the first step of the ANCOVA, the total sum of the items was analyzed to compare the general learning gains in both groups. Here, the pre-test score served as

a covariate to ensure that differences in baseline performance between the groups were accounted for. The analysis was then specified to the three main categories of thread- and spring pendulum as well as data evaluation in order to gain differentiated insights into learning gains in each area. Each category was analyzed separately to evaluate the influence of the measurement and the group. Finally, the individual items within each category were also analyzed to gain detailed insights into specific learning gains at item level.

Furthermore, the Hake Index was calculated on a total level containing the results of both groups as well as for each group individually. The Hake index g is a measure of the average normalized learning growth in a course [46] as the proportion of the actual improvement to the maximum possible improvement [47]. In the present study, the index g was calculated using the gain of averages method to evaluate the effectiveness of the learning interventions [47]. The correlation of g with the average pre-test score is very low, indicating that g is not influenced by the students' prior knowledge. In contrast, the average post-test score and the average gain are less suitable for comparing the course success rate across different groups [48][49]. The Hake index can take on values between 0 and 1, whereby a value of $g = 1$ means that the students have achieved the maximum possible increase in knowledge in the course and a value of $g = 0$ means that no increase in knowledge has taken place [48].

2. Emotional-motivational Data

In addition to the descriptive statistics, the normal distribution was tested using the Shapiro-Wilk test for all questions, independent of whether it was the pre- or the post-test. The internal reliability of the post-test is evaluated with Cronbach's α , a coefficient that represents the average correlation among all individual items [39], therefore a lower limit for the proportion of test variance that can be attributed to shared factors across the items [50]. After that the Wilcoxon rank-sum test was applied to measure the difference between the groups on a construct level. This test checks whether the distributions of a variable in two samples match and whether this is compatible with the null hypothesis that the distributions of the variable are identical in the two conditions. In contrast to the corresponding t-test, this test does not require a normal distribution of the variable within the groups [42], which was not given after analyzing the results of the Shapiro-Wilk test.

D. Sample

The $n = 50$ participants in the study were recruited from student teachers at the University of Cologne. Of

these, 33 identified themselves as male and 17 as female. The age range of the participants is between 19 and 37 years ($M = 24.04$). 35 of the participants were studying for a Bachelor of Arts degree at the time the study was conducted, 15 participants were already studying for a Master of Education. In the Excel group ($n = 25$), the average age was $M = 24.36$ years. 17 of the 25 participants in the group were in the Bachelor of Arts program, 8 in the Master of Education. In the AI group ($n = 25$), on the other hand, 18 participants were in the Bachelor of Arts program and 7 in the Master of Education program. Here the average age is $M = 23.72$ years. All participants were studying to become teachers in various types of school.

V. RESULTS

A. Intra-Group Learning Gains (RQ1)

1. Excel Group

The analysis of the data from the pre- and post-test of the Excel group revealed significant differences in the results of the two measurement times. Overall, an increase in performance can be seen in the post-survey, both in the total sum and in several categories and individual items. The total sum, which includes all items and categories, increased on average from $M = 7.72$ ($SD = 3.27$) in the pre-survey to $M = 8.96$ ($SD = 3.51$) in the post-survey. The median value also rose from $MDN = 7$ to $MDN = 9$, which indicates a shift in the distribution towards higher values. At the same time, the slightly increased standard deviation shows that the spread of the values in the post condition became slightly larger.

Differentiated developments can be seen at category level. In the thread pendulum (ΣTP) category, performance remained largely stable. The mean value fell slightly from $M = 3.32$ ($SD = 1.80$) to $M = 3.16$ ($SD = 1.77$), while the median remained unchanged at a constant value of $MDN = 3$. In the spring pendulum (ΣSP) category, on the other hand, there was an increase in the mean value from $M = 1.56$ ($SD = 1.39$) to $M = 1.96$ ($SD = 1.54$), accompanied by an increase in the median from $MDN = 1$ to $MDN = 2$. The data evaluation (ΣDE) category showed an increase in the mean value from $M = 2.84$ ($SD = 1.31$) to $M = 3.84$ ($SD = 1.28$) and in the median from $MDN = 3$ to $MDN = 4$.




FIG 1. Boxplot of the total result of the Excel-group. The dashed line indicates the mean, and the solid line represents the median.




FIG 2. Boxplot of the result regarding Data Evaluation of the Excel-group. The dashed line indicates the mean, and the solid line represents the median.

The statistical analysis using the Wilcoxon signed-rank test and Cohen's d revealed a significant positive change in performance at the overall level with a small

effect size $d = 0.49$ across all variables. To better classify this result, a differentiation was made at the category level. There, the results of the variables were summarized and the mean change within each category was analyzed. It was found that the performance of the data evaluation category changed significantly at $p = 0.0034$ with a mean effect $d = 0.77$. The categories with the physical topics spring and thread pendulum didn't show significant changes from pre- to post-test.

TABLE I. $\Sigma TP =$ Sum Thread-Pendulum, $\Sigma SP =$ Sum Spring Pendulum, $\Sigma DE =$ Sum Data Evaluation; * indicates significant results; + or - indicate the direction of the effect, with the number of characters representing the effect size (+/- = small effect $d \geq .2$, +/- = medium effect $d \geq .5$, +/- = large effect $d \geq .8$ [38])

Item	p-Value	Cohen's d
Σ Total	.0376	.4855 +
Σ TP	.6030	
Σ SP	.3234	
Σ DE	.0034	.7746 ++

2. AI Group

Similar to the analysis of the Excel group data, the AI group also showed an improvement in performance from Pre $M = 7.64$ ($SD = 3.43$) to Post $M = 9.92$ ($SD = 2.96$). The median value also increased from MDN = 7 to MDN = 9.




FIG 3. Boxplot of the total result of the AI-group. The dashed line indicates the mean, and the solid line represents the median.

The analysis of the categories shows that the improvement is not evenly distributed across all areas. In the thread pendulum category, the mean value rose slightly from $M = 3.24$ ($SD = 1.45$) to $M = 3.72$ ($SD = 1.40$), accompanied by an increase in the median from MDN = 3 to MDN = 4. The increase is more pronounced in the spring pendulum category, where the mean value rose from $M = 1.40$ ($SD = 1.29$) to $M = 2.20$ ($SD = 1.29$) and the median increased from MDN = 1 to MDN = 2.




FIG 4. Boxplot of the result regarding the Spring Pendulum of the AI-group. The dashed line indicates the mean, and the solid line represents the median.

The data evaluation category also showed a clear improvement, with an increase in the mean from $M = 3.00$ ($SD = 1.61$) to $M = 4.00$ ($SD = 1.22$) and an increase in the median from MDN = 3 to MDN = 4. The reduction in the standard deviation in this category shows a homogenization of performance in the post-survey.




FIG 5. Boxplot of the result regarding Data Evaluation of the AI-group. The dashed line indicates the mean, and the solid line represents the median.

TABLE II. Results of the Wilcoxon signed-rank test and Cohen's d . ΣTP = Sum Thread-Pendulum, ΣSP = Sum Spring Pendulum, ΣDE = Sum Data Evaluation; + or - indicate the direction of the effect, with the number of characters representing the effect size (+/- = small effect $d \geq .2$, +/- = medium effect $d \geq .5$, +++/- = large effect $d \geq .8$ [38])

Item	p-Value	Cohen's d
Σ Total	$5.8 \cdot 10^{-5}$	1.4537 ⁺⁺⁺
Σ TP	.0501	
Σ SP	.0039	.7407 ⁺⁺
Σ DE	.0009	.9258 ⁺⁺⁺

At the overall level, a statistically significant change was found with a high effect size for performance across all variables.

At category level, the spring pendulum and evaluation categories showed positive significant changes between the measurement times with high effect sizes, whereas there were no significant differences in the thread pendulum category.

B. Inter-Group Learning Gains (RQ2)

The analysis of the differences in learning gains between the groups focuses on the change in performance between the pre- and post-measurement and uses the analysis of covariance (ANCOVA). The ANCOVA is a very robust analysis method and even though not all assumptions, foremost the non-normally

distributed data, are met, the influence on the results are slight to negligible [43][45]. Further the Hake index is used as a measure of relative learning progress, where a negative Hake Index indicates a decline, a Hake Index of less than 0.3 indicates a small increase [48].




FIG 6. Boxplot of the results of both groups compared.

TABLE III. Results of the ANCOVA and Hake Index. ΣTP = Sum Thread-Pendulum, ΣSP = Sum Spring Pendulum, ΣDE = Sum Data Evaluation

Item	p-Value	Hake g Total
Σ Total	.3924	.0188
Σ TP	.3003	.0031
Σ SP	.4494	.0120
Σ DE	1	.0208

At the level of the total of all items, calculated as the sum of the scores across all tasks, the ANCOVA showed no significant difference for the interaction between group and measurement time.




FIG 7. Mean comparison of both groups showing the differences.

The Hake index for the total indicates overall low relative learning progress. The differences in learning gains were also examined for the categories of thread pendulum, spring pendulum and evaluation, but no significant difference was found. The respective Hake indices indicate very little learning progress for the group of participants.

TABLE IV. Hake Indices for each group. $\Sigma TP =$ Sum Thread-Pendulum, $\Sigma SP =$ Sum Spring Pendulum, $\Sigma DE =$ Sum Data Evaluation

Item	Hake g AI	Hake g Excel
Σ Total	.0244	.0132
Σ TP	.0100	-.0038
Σ SP	.0162	.0078
Σ DE	.0208	.0208

The total Hake Index for the AI group is $g = 0.0244$, while for the Excel group it is 0.0132 . For the Thread Pendulum, the AI group achieved an index of $g = 0.01$, compared to $g = -0.0038$ for the Excel group. In the Spring Pendulum category, the AI group's Hake Index was $g = 0.0162$, while the Excel group scored $g = 0.0078$. Both groups recorded the same index of $g = 0.0208$ for Data Evaluation.

C. Emotional-Motivational Variables (RQ3)

1. Pre-Intervention Differences in Emotional-Motivational Attitudes

For the pre-test, Cronbach's A was not applied. The questions from section B1 were already validated in prior studies [41], ensuring their reliability without the need for further analysis. In section B2, the number of items was too small to reliably calculate Cronbach's A. As a result, the analysis focuses on the item level rather than a construct level to provide meaningful insights while accounting for the limitations of the dataset.

The descriptive statistics for question B1 show that the mean values of the answers vary between $M = 0.84$ and $M = 2.80$, with standard deviations between $SD = 0.5774$ and $SD = 1.2247$. The difference between the mean values per group of the individual questions is below 1 for each item. The medians are predominantly $MDN = 1$ or $MDN = 3$, which indicates a central tendency of the answers in these areas.

The normal distribution of the data was tested using the Shapiro-Wilk test, with all p-values below $\alpha \leq 0.05$. The data is therefore not normally distributed. The mean values for question B2 lie between $M = 1.60$ and $M = 1.92$, whereby the mean values also show only a slight difference when comparing the groups, while the standard deviations vary between $SD = 0.5$ and $SD = 0.8124$. The medians for both groups are uniformly $MDN = 2$.

The Shapiro-Wilk values indicate that the distribution of the data in both groups is not normal, which is confirmed by very small p-values.

TABLE V Results of the Wilcoxon rank-sum-test, showing no significant differences between the groups.

Item	p-Value
B1.1	.4058
B1.2	.3564
B1.3	.8471
B1.4	.3926
B1.5	.7076
B1.6	.9914
B1.7	.1746
B2.1	.5709
B2.2	.8724

The statistical analysis examines the differences between the groups of users of the evaluation with Excel and those with AI regarding their attitudes towards technology and the evaluation of experimental data.

For the items of question B1, which deals with attitudes towards technical innovations, the p-values show that none of the comparisons are significant, as

all p-values are above the threshold value of $\alpha \geq 0.05$. The effect sizes d are predominantly low, which indicates that the differences between the groups, even if they were present, are practically insignificant. Only the statement *Whether I can use modern technology successfully depends mainly on myself* (B1.7) shows a small effect size of $d = 0.37$, which indicates a slight difference in the assessment of self-efficacy between the groups. All other statements show only minimal or no effect sizes. The direction of the effect sizes varied slightly for the individual statements in B1. For example, the statement *I find dealing with new technology difficult - I usually don't succeed* (B1.5) shows an effect size of $d = 0$, which means that the groups have identical mean values here. Similarly, the effect for the statement *I am often anxious when dealing with modern technology* (B1.3) remains neutral with $d = 0$.

For category B2, which deals with the ability to evaluate experiments, the p-values also show no significant differences between the groups. The effect sizes for these statements are also very small, except for a slight negative effect for the statement *I find it easy to evaluate experiments* (B2.1) with $d = -0.16$, which indicates a minimal tendency for the AI group to rate slightly more positively than the Excel group. The second statement in B2, *I find it interesting to evaluate experiments* shows no difference between the two groups with a Cohen's d of $d = 0$.

2. Post-Intervention Differences in Emotional-Motivational Attitudes

The comparative analysis between Excel and AI-assisted learning methods revealed detailed and statistically significant differences across the eight key constructs of learning experience. These constructs were analyzed with Cronbach's α , where values above 0.9 are considered excellent, above 0.8 good, above 0.7 acceptable and above 0.6 questionable [51]. The reliability analysis revealed that the constructs *Negative Emotional Learning Experience* ($\alpha = 0.8216$), *Method Effectiveness* ($\alpha = 0.8511$) and *Method Comparison* ($\alpha = 0.8067$) achieved good levels of internal consistency. The constructs *Positive Emotional Learning Experience* ($\alpha = 0.7668$), *Perception of Methods* ($\alpha = 0.7306$), and *Challenges* ($\alpha = 0.7967$) showed acceptable levels of reliability. Additionally, the constructs *Perceived Learning Gains* ($\alpha = 0.6824$) and *Motivation* ($\alpha = 0.6199$) exhibited lower levels of internal consistency.




FIG 8. Mean differences between the groups for each construct of the post-test.

In the *Positive Emotional Learning Experience* construct, the Excel group demonstrated a mean score of $M = 1.74$, while the AI group showed a higher mean of $M = 2.26$. Normality testing indicated a normal distribution for the Excel group ($p = 0.2728$) but a significant deviation from normality for the AI group ($p = 0.0121$). The Wilcoxon rank-sum test revealed a statistically significant difference between groups ($p = 0.0156$), with a moderate effect size of $d = 0.75$.

On the contrary, the *Negative Emotional Learning Experience* construct presented a different pattern. The Excel group reported a mean score of $M = 1.56$, compared to a lower $M = 0.64$ for the AI group. Normality tests showed a normal distribution for the Excel group ($p = 0.1097$) but a significant non-normal distribution for the AI group ($p = 0.0055$). The Wilcoxon test demonstrated a highly significant difference ($p < 0.0001$) with a very large negative effect size of $d = -1.47$.

The *Perception of Methods* construct revealed intriguing differences, with the Excel group scoring a mean of $M = 1.68$ and the AI group achieving $M = 2.44$. The Excel group exhibited a normal distribution ($p = 0.2104$), while the AI group deviated from normality ($p = 0.0034$). A highly significant difference emerged in the Wilcoxon test ($p < 0.0001$), accompanied by a very large effect size of $d = 1.35$.

Challenges presented no statistical significance ($p = 0.3283$), with a small negative effect size of $d = -0.29$.

The Excel group reported a mean of $M = 1.13$, and the AI group a slightly lower $M = 0.93$. Both groups demonstrated normal distributions (Excel: $p = 0.3423$, AI: $p = 0.3812$).

Method Effectiveness showed definite differences, with the Excel group averaging $M = 1.88$ and the AI group reaching $M = 2.52$. The Excel group approached normality ($p = 0.0673$), while the AI group significantly deviated from normality ($p = 0.0016$). A significant difference emerged in the Wilcoxon test ($p = 0.0043$), accompanied by a large effect size of $d = 0.95$.

Perceived Learning Gains exhibited minimal variation, with the Excel group averaging $M = 1.26$ and the AI group at $M = 1.38$. Both groups deviated from normality (Excel: $p = 0.0277$, AI: $p = 0.0021$), and the Wilcoxon test revealed no statistically significant difference ($p = 0.6580$), with a small effect size of $d = 0.2005$.

Motivation demonstrated notable differences, with the Excel group scoring $M = 1.56$ and the AI group achieving $M = 2.28$. The Excel group approached normality ($p = 0.1518$), while the AI group showed a deviation from normality ($p = 0.0040$). The Wilcoxon test indicated a highly significant difference ($p = 0.0003$), with a very large effect size of $d = 1.17$.

The *Method Comparison* construct revealed stark contrasts, with the Excel group averaging $M = 1.89$ and the AI group at $M = 1.04$. Both groups deviated from normality (Excel: $p = 0.0449$, AI: $p = 0.0367$), and the Wilcoxon test showed a highly significant difference ($p < 0.0001$) with a large negative effect size of $d = -1.18$.

VI. DISCUSSION

A. Intra-Group Learning Gains (innerhalb der jeweiligen Gruppe Pre zu Post)

1. Excel Group

The intra-group results of the Excel-group regarding the difference from pre- to post-test indicate an overall positive development in the participants' performance. The significant increase in the total sum (Σ Total) underscores a general improvement in the measured skills after the intervention. The mean value and the median rose notably from the pre- to post-survey. This shift toward higher performance values suggests that the measures taken between the two test points were effective in enhancing the participants' competencies. At the category level, the results present a more differentiated picture. The sum of the thread pendulum (Σ TP) category did not change significantly, rather had a slight loss of 0.16 in the mean, indicating that participants' abilities in this area remained relatively stable. This stability could be attributed to the nature

of the content or the intervention not sufficiently targeting the specific challenges related to the thread pendulum tasks. In contrast, the spring pendulum (Σ SP) category showed an increase in mean and median values, although this improvement was not statistically significant. The direction of the change suggests a trend toward better handling of spring pendulum tasks. A notable change was observed in the data evaluation (Σ DE) category. Here, performance improved significantly, reflected in a statistically significant p-value and a medium to large effect size. This indicates that the training components targeting data evaluation skills were effective and that participants were able to translate what they learned into measurable performance gains. The complexity of handling and interpreting data appears to have benefited from structured guidance through the tasks and practice provided during the intervention.

In sum, while the overall improvement across all tasks is positive, the differentiated results at the category level offer insights for further refinement of the intervention. The pronounced progress in data evaluation suggests that focusing on analytical and interpretive skills yields tangible benefits. In contrast, more targeted methods, adjusted learning materials, or longer training durations might be necessary to achieve similarly strong outcomes in the physical model categories, particularly the thread pendulum tasks.

2. AI Group

The performance of the AI-assisted group exhibited significant improvement from pre- to post-test, reinforcing the potential effectiveness of AI-driven learning methods in enhancing learning outcomes. The overall increase in performance, coupled with a large effect size, highlights the robustness of this finding. The results demonstrate that the AI-based approach has successfully supported learners in achieving better outcomes, like it is also shown in other studies [25][33]. At the overall level, the statistically significant improvement with a very large effect size signals that the AI-assisted learning method is highly effective across a broad range of skills and tasks. The substantial gains in the spring pendulum and data evaluation categories further highlight the adaptability of AI-driven tools to specific areas of learning. A closer examination of individual categories reveals an uneven distribution of these improvements. In the thread pendulum category, while there was a slight increase in performance, the change was not statistically significant. This suggests that the AI intervention may not have substantially impacted this area, this may be because they require alternative instructional strategies to see meaningful improvement. In contrast, the spring pendulum

category showed a pronounced and statistically significant improvement, accompanied by a medium to large effect size. This finding indicates that the AI-assisted approach was particularly effective in addressing the challenges associated with the spring pendulum tasks. The structured feedback, visualization and problem-solving guidance provided by the AI system may have played a key role in this result. The data evaluation category also displayed significant gains, with a large effect size and a reduction in variability among participants' scores. This homogenization of performance suggests that the AI approach not only improved individual outcomes but also helped to bring participants to a more consistent level of proficiency. The success in this category underscores the potential of AI tools to support learners in acquiring complex analytical and interpretive skills. Other works, like [33] support, that AI tools play a crucial role in improving learning outcomes by encouraging active participation with a particular impact on developing critical thinking and analytical skills.

B. Inter-Group Learning Gains

The comparative analysis of learning gains between the AI-assisted and Excel-based groups revealed minimal relative progress for both methods, as indicated by the Hake Index and ANCOVA results. The analysis showed no significant interaction between group and measurement time, emphasizing the limited differences in overall effectiveness between the two instructional approaches. The Hake Index values for total performance reflect low relative learning progress across both groups. While the AI group demonstrated slightly higher values compared to the Excel group, the differences are marginal and fall below the level for meaningful progress. These results can be observed in FIG. 8, where the boxplot chart illustrates similar pre- and post-test trends for both groups.

At the category level, the findings remain consistent with the overall results. In the thread pendulum category, the AI-group showed only slight progress, the Excel group even experiencing a slight negative trend. This outcome suggests that neither instructional method effectively addressed the challenges associated with this task. In the spring pendulum category, the AI group exhibited slightly greater progress than the Excel group, but the differences were minor and lacked statistical significance. In the data evaluation category, both groups achieved identical Hake Index values, indicating that the AI and Excel methods were equally effective at enhancing analytical skills.

The consistently low Hake Index values suggest that neither instructional method facilitated considerable learning progress in contrast to the other group. Previous studies have demonstrated that ChatGPT can function as a highly effective assistant tool, providing features and capabilities that surpass those offered by traditional tools such as Microsoft Excel [23]. The slight advantage observed in this study in the AI group for total performance and certain categories indicates a similar result, though not significant.

D. Emotional-Motivational Variables

1. Pre-Intervention Differences in Emotional-Motivational Attitudes

A comparison of the attitudes at the beginning allows to identify possible differences in the initial conditions between the groups. The attitudes of the participants towards technical innovations and the evaluation of experiments provide insights into their motivation, openness and self-confidence in dealing with the technologies under investigation. These factors are not only crucial for the interaction with technology but can also influence the willingness to learn and the success in using it. By surveying these attitudes at the beginning, it is possible to understand the extent to which differences in the later results can be explained by different initial motivation or perceptions of competence.

The analysis of category B2 shows no statistically significant differences between the groups. The p-values of all items are above the significance level, indicating that there are no systematic differences in the answers between the groups. This is supported by the effect sizes (Cohen's d), which are either very small or, in the case of some statements such as *I am often anxious when dealing with modern technology* (B1.3) and *I find dealing with new technology difficult – I usually don't succeed* (B1.5), zero. These results suggest that the attitudes of the two groups towards technical innovations are very similar. The p-values also show no significant differences between the groups for the statements in category B2, which relate to the abilities and interest in evaluating experiments. The effect sizes are also low to zero. For example, Cohen's d value for statement *I find it interesting to evaluate experiments* (B2.2) is $d = 0$, which indicates that both groups have identical mean values. For statement *I find it easy to evaluate experiments* (B2.1), there is a small negative effect size of $d = -0.16$, which indicates a minimal tendency in favor of the AI-group to evaluate this statement more positively. However, this difference is so small that it has little practical relevance. The results indicate that there are no statistically verifiable differences between the Excel- and AI-group in terms of their responses. The results

suggest that the groups are similar in their attitudes towards technical innovation and the evaluation of experiments.

2. Post-Intervention Differences in Emotional-Motivational Attitudes

The results of the comparative analysis reveal a complex pattern of technological interaction in educational contexts comparing AI-assisted and Excel-based data analysis. The research goes beyond surface-level comparisons to uncover detailed insights into how different technological approaches impact learner experiences across multiple psychological and pedagogical dimensions.

The *Positive Emotional Learning Experience* emerged as a particularly compelling construct. The moderate effect size revealed that AI-based tools generated a more positive emotional response – like fun and success, potentially challenging Excel-based data analysis. In a counterpoint, the *Negative Emotional Learning Experience* unveiled a complex emotional picture. The large negative effect size highlighted inherent challenges – like stress, uncertainty and frustration – in Excel-based learning. The AI-assisted data analysis seemed to provide a sense of emotional security. Combined, these findings suggest that the AI-based approach may offer a more encouraging and less frustrating learning environment compared to the Excel-based approach. In turn, these emotional responses could influence learners' willingness to engage with the material and persist through complex tasks.

The *Perception of Methods* construct demonstrated a significant preference for AI, with a very large effect size. Participants viewed AI as more interesting, easy to use and helpful for future data evaluation. The differences in perception and in the sense of methodological effectiveness highlight that the AI-based environment is arousing more interest, is seen as more supportive, user-friendly or innovative. Such perceptions are critical, as learners who view their tools as interactive and motivating and beneficial are more likely to invest effort [3].

The *Challenges* construct associated with the tasks did not differ substantially between the two groups. With a small effect size, the findings suggest that both learning environments posed a relatively similar level of difficulty, and the more positive experiences reported with the AI approach cannot be attributed to less challenge. Instead, it appears that the AI-assisted approach provides a more motivating and emotionally supportive framework, enabling learners to cope with a given level of challenge more effectively.

Method Effectiveness presented AI's potential, with a large effect size. Participants perceived AI-assisted methods as more precise and supportive, particularly

for complex tasks. This perception could be crucial in driving broader acceptance of AI technologies in educational and professional environments.

The data for *Perceived Learning Gains* indicates that both the AI-assisted and Excel groups achieved similar levels of self-reported improvement. The AI group demonstrated a slightly higher average, suggesting a modest trend favoring AI tools in enhancing perceived learning outcomes. However, the statistical analysis revealed no significant difference between the groups and the effect size was small, indicating that the observed difference is unlikely to be practically meaningful. These results imply that while AI-assisted methods offer advantages in other areas, they do not significantly alter how participants perceive their learning progress compared to tools like Excel.

The *Motivation* construct emerged as another key area where the AI approach demonstrated advantages, with a large effect size. AI's interactive and dynamic nature appeared to intrinsically motivate learners, which is a major factor for a successful process of learning [36][20]. This finding suggests that technological innovation like AI can be a powerful tool for enhancing learner engagement and intrinsic motivation, other studies found similar conclusions [35].

The *Method Comparison* construct revealed a large difference between the groups, with AI being significantly preferred by the Excel group, stating they believed they would have completed the task faster and overall, better using the AI method.

In sum, the findings paint a consistent picture: while both Excel and AI-assisted learning approaches present learners with similar levels of challenge, the AI method appears to foster a more positive, motivating, and emotionally supportive learning environment. These qualitative advantages in perception, emotional experience, and motivation could, in the long run, support more effective learning and skill acquisition.

E. Limitations and Implications

The study's methodological approach, while providing valuable insights, is accompanied by limitations that must be carefully considered when interpreting the results. The primary constraint is the restricted sample size of 50 participants, all drawn from a single university's student teacher population. This narrow sampling inherently limits the generalizability of the findings, preventing comprehensive extrapolation to broader educational contexts or diverse learning environments. Furthermore, the intervention's short duration represents another limitation. The brief timeframe did not allow participants sufficient opportunity to fully explore or deeply adapt to the technological tools. This temporal constraint

fundamentally restricts the ability to draw definitive conclusions about long-term learning gains, skill transfer, or sustained technological effectiveness.

Measurement challenges further complicate the research's interpretative validity. The constructs of *Perceived Learning Gains* and *Motivation* exhibited lower levels of internal consistency. These statistical indicators suggest that the measurement instruments may require refinement to capture the intended dimensional nuances more reliably.

Lastly the observed emotional and motivational differences may have been significantly influenced by the novelty factor – that is often seen with new technologies [52] – of the AI method. This potential bias could have artificially enhanced participants' engagement and perceptions, particularly given the contrasting familiarity of the Excel-based approach. Such novelty effects introduce another layer of complexity in interpreting the study's findings, however, recent studies suggest, that the sense of novelty regarding AI remains intact even after longer exposure [52].

VII. CONCLUSION

Despite the limitations, the findings of this study have important implications for educational practices. The study illustrates the necessity for continued refinement of AI-assisted educational tools and highlights the potential of AI in physics education, providing critical insights into its impact on learning outcomes, emotional engagement, and motivational variables. By comparing AI-supported tools like *ExperiMentor* with traditional Excel-based approaches, the findings reveal diverse results where AI demonstrates distinct advantages in fostering positive learning experiences and motivational engagement. Participants utilizing the AI tool experienced statistically significant improvements in analytical and data evaluation tasks, coupled with higher levels of enjoyment and motivation.

While perceived learning gains did not differ significantly between groups, the motivational and emotional advantages associated with AI suggest long-term implications for learner retention and skill acquisition. As educators increasingly adopt AI in their classrooms, robust frameworks must be developed to balance its technological advantages with critical pedagogical principles, ensuring its effective application, since simply obtaining answers from a chatbot does not necessarily lead to deeper learning or higher-quality results [53]. The absence of significant differences in learning progress between the AI and Excel groups, as indicated by the ANCOVA analyses, emphasizes the need for further research. These results suggest that while AI enhances the learning experience qualitatively, its quantitative

impact on knowledge acquisition requires additional exploration. The study's findings also illuminate the importance of addressing methodological limitations, such as sample size, intervention duration, and measurement reliability, to refine future investigations.

This research contributes to the ongoing discourse on the role of AI in education, particularly within physics. It calls for sustained efforts to understand and leverage AI's capabilities to address the dual challenges of enhancing learning outcomes and fostering positive emotional-motivational engagement, thereby advancing the field of physics education in meaningful and impactful ways. Learning opportunities, that merge traditional technology competencies with AI applications, including practical exercises that engage students in using AI tools may be beneficial for leveraging AI competencies [54].

The complexity of these results emphasizes that educational technology is not about replacing traditional pedagogical methods, but about complementing and enhancing them through intelligent, adaptive approaches that remain fundamentally student-centered. Considering AI as a universal fix for educational issues could be harmful, especially regarding ethical and fair AI deployment. Developing a synergy between human efforts and technology, including AI, might be a significantly better strategy than relying exclusively on digital solutions [55]. As educational technologies continue to evolve, studies like this provide critical insights into their effective development and implementation.

VII. REFERENCES

- [1] I. Roll and R. Wylie, *Evolution and Revolution in Artificial Intelligence in Education*, Int J Artif Intell Educ **26**, 582 (2016).
- [2] J. Winkelmann, M. Freese, and T. Strömmer, *Schwierigkeitserzeugende Merkmale im Physikunterricht [Difficulty-Inducing Features in Physics Education]* (2021).
- [3] V. Kuleto *et al.*, *Exploring Opportunities and Challenges of Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning in Higher Education Institutions*, Sustainability **13**, 10424 (2021).
- [4] E. Bacia *et al.*, *Innovatives Lernen mit Intelligenten Tutoriellen Systemen. Eine Analyse der bildungspolitischen Gelingensbedingungen [Innovative Learning with Intelligent Tutoring Systems. An Analysis of the Conditions for Educational Policy Success]* (2024).
- [5] S. Küchemann *et al.*, *Large language models—Valuable tools that require a sensitive integration into teaching and learning physics*, The Physics Teacher **62**, 400 (2024).

- [6] D. Tong *et al.*, *Investigating ChatGPT-4's performance in solving physics problems and its potential implications for education*, *Asia Pacific Educ. Rev.* **25**, 1379 (2024).
- [7] M. Farrokhnia, S. K. Banihashem, O. Noroozi, and A. Wals, *A SWOT analysis of ChatGPT: Implications for educational practice and research*, *Innovations in Education and Teaching International* **61**, 460 (2024).
- [8] J. Kechel and R. Wodzinski, *Methoden zur Erfassung von Schwierigkeiten bei Schülerexperimenten [Variety of Prerequisites in Science Education]*, in *Heterogenität und Diversität – Vielfalt der Voraussetzungen im naturwissenschaftlichen Unterricht. Tagungsband Jahrestagung in Bremen 2014 [Heterogeneity and Diversity - Conference Proceedings, Annual Meeting in Bremen 2014]*, edited by S. Bernholt (2015).
- [9] A. Low and Z. Y. Kalender, *Data Dialogue with ChatGPT. Using Code Interpreter to Simulate and Analyse Experimental Data* (2023), <http://arxiv.org/pdf/2311.12415v2>.
- [10] S. A. D. Popenici and S. Kerr, *Exploring the impact of artificial intelligence on teaching and learning in higher education*, *Research and practice in technology enhanced learning* **12**, 22 (2017).
- [11] Ständige Wissenschaftliche Kommission der Kultusministerkonferenz [Standing Scientific Commission of the Conference of Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs], *Large Language Models und ihre Potenziale im Bildungssystem. Impulspapier der Ständigen Wissenschaftlichen Kommission (SWK) der Kultusministerkonferenz [Large Language Models and their potential in the education system. Impulse paper of the Standing Scientific Commission (SWK) of the Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs]* (2023), <http://dx.doi.org/10.25656/01:28303>.
- [12] S. Vincent-Lancrin and R. van der Vlies, *Trustworthy artificial intelligence (AI) in education. Promises and challenges*, OECD Education Working Papers No. 218, Vol. 218 (2020).
- [13] F. Mahligawati, E. Allanas, M. H. Butarbutar, and N. A. N. Nordin, *Artificial intelligence in Physics Education. A comprehensive literature review*, *J. Phys.: Conf. Ser.* **2596**, 12080 (2023).
- [14] L. Chen, P. Chen, and Z. Lin, *Artificial Intelligence in Education: A Review*, *IEEE Access* **8**, 75264 (2020).
- [15] O. Zawacki-Richter, V. I. Marín, M. Bond, and F. Gouverneur, *Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education – where are the educators?*, *Int J Educ Technol High Educ* **16** (2019).
- [16] S. Salas-Pilco, K. Xiao, and X. Hu, *Artificial Intelligence and Learning Analytics in Teacher Education: A Systematic Review*, *Education Sciences* **12**, 569 (2022).
- [17] X.-F. Lin *et al.*, *Teachers' Perceptions of Teaching Sustainable Artificial Intelligence. A Design Frame Perspective*, *Sustainability* **14**, 7811 (2022).
- [18] R. P. d. Santos, *Enhancing Physics Learning with ChatGPT, Bing Chat, and Bard as Agents-to-Think-With: A Comparative Case Study* (2023), <http://arxiv.org/pdf/2306.00724>.
- [19] F. Kieser, P. Wulff, J. Kuhn, and S. Küchemann, *Educational data augmentation in physics education research using ChatGPT* (2023), <http://arxiv.org/pdf/2307.14475v2>.
- [20] Y. Liang, Di Zou, H. Xie, and F. L. Wang, *Exploring the potential of using ChatGPT in physics education*, *Smart Learn. Environ.* **10** (2023).
- [21] H. A. Mustofa, M. R. Bilad, and N. W. B. Grendis, *Utilizing AI for Physics Problem Solving: A Literature Review and ChatGPT Experience*, *Jurnal. Kependidikan. Fisika* **12**, 78 (2024).
- [22] L. Krupp *et al.*, *Challenges and Opportunities of Moderating Usage of Large Language Models in Education* (2023), <http://arxiv.org/pdf/2312.14969v1>.
- [23] M. Halaweh, *ChatGPT in education: Strategies for responsible implementation*, *CONT ED TECHNOLOGY* **15**, ep421 (2023).
- [24] C. Padma and C. Rama, *A Study of Artificial Intelligence in Education System & Role of AI in Indian Education Sector*, *International Journal of Scientific Research in Engineering and Management* **06** (2022).
- [25] C. K. Lo, *What Is the Impact of ChatGPT on Education? A Rapid Review of the Literature*, *Education Sciences* **13**, 410 (2023).
- [26] P. Bitzenbauer, *ChatGPT in physics education: A pilot study on easy-to-implement activities*, *CONT ED TECHNOLOGY* **15**, ep430 (2023).
- [27] Z. Wen, E. Bai, and M. Li, *An Evaluation of the Impact of Artificial Intelligence on university Students' Learning*, *JID* **6**, 22 (2024).
- [28] E. Kasneci *et al.*, *ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education*, *Learning and Individual Differences* **103** (2023).
- [29] G. Kortemeyer, *Could an Artificial-Intelligence agent pass an introductory physics course?*, *Phys. Rev. Phys. Educ. Res.* **19**, 15 (2023), <http://arxiv.org/pdf/2301.12127v2>.

- [30] L. Ding, T. Li, S. Jiang, and A. Gapud, *Students' perceptions of using ChatGPT in a physics class as a virtual tutor*, *Int J Educ Technol High Educ* **20** (2023).
- [31] M. N. Dahlkemper, S. Z. Lahme, and P. Klein, *How do physics students evaluate artificial intelligence responses on comprehension questions? A study on the perceived scientific accuracy and linguistic quality*, *Phys. Rev. Phys. Educ. Res.* **19** (2023), <http://arxiv.org/pdf/2304.05906v2>.
- [32] L. Krupp *et al.*, *Unreflected Acceptance. Investigating the Negative Consequences of ChatGPT-Assisted Problem Solving in Physics Education* (2023), <http://arxiv.org/pdf/2309.03087v1>.
- [33] T. Gada and S. Chudasana, *Impact of Artificial Intelligence on student attitudes, engagement, and learning*, *IRJMETs* **06**, 2695 (2024).
- [34] H. B. Essel, D. Vlachopoulos, A. B. Essuman, and J. O. Amankwa, *ChatGPT effects on cognitive skills of undergraduate students: Receiving instant responses from AI-based conversational large language models (LLMs)*, *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence* **6**, 100198 (2024).
- [35] F. Hanum Siregar, B. Hasmayni, and A. H. Lubis, *The Analysis of Chat GPT Usage Impact on Learning Motivation among Scout Students*, *Int J Res Rev* **10**, 632 (2023).
- [36] S. Yu and Y. Lu, *An Introduction to Artificial Intelligence in Education* (2021).
- [37] Vodafone Stiftung Deutschland [Vodafone Foundation Germany], *Aufbruch ins Unbekannte. Schule in Zeiten von künstlicher Intelligenz und ChatGPT [Into the Unknown. Schools in Times of Artificial Intelligence and ChatGPT]* (2023).
- [38] J. Hedderich and L. Sachs, *Angewandte Statistik. Methodensammlung mit R [Applied Statistics. Collection of Methods with R]* (2016), <http://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:bsz:31-epflicht-1574102>.
- [39] N. Döring *et al.*, *Forschungsmethoden und Evaluation in den Sozial- und Humanwissenschaften [Research Methods and Evaluation in the Social and Human Sciences]* (2016).
- [40] See Supplemental Material at [Link] for the tasks, tests and data tables.
- [41] F. J. Neyer, J. Felber, and C. Gebhardt, *Kurzskala Technikbereitschaft [Short Scale for Technology Commitment]* (2016).
- [42] D. Wollschläger, *Grundlagen der Datenanalyse mit R [Basics of Data Analysis with R]* (2014).
- [43] J. Bortz and C. Schuster, *Statistik für Human- und Sozialwissenschaftler [Statistics for Human and Social Scientists]* (2010), <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/alltitles/docDetail.action?docID=10448295>.
- [44] E. Schmider *et al.*, *Is It Really Robust?*, *Methodology* **6**, 147 (2010).
- [45] G. V. Glass, P. D. Peckham, and J. R. Sanders, *Consequences of Failure to Meet Assumptions Underlying the Fixed Effects Analyses of Variance and Covariance*, *Review of Educational Research* **42**, 237 (1972).
- [46] R. R. Hake, *Interactive-engagement versus traditional methods: A six-thousand-student survey of mechanics test data for introductory physics courses*, *American Journal of Physics* **66**, 64 (1998).
- [47] S. McKagan, E. Sayre, and A. Madsen, *Normalized gain. What is it and when and how should I use it?*, 2022, <https://www.physport.org/recommendations/Entry.cfm?ID=93334>.
- [48] R. Hake, *Lessons from the Physics Education Reform Effort*, *CE* **5** (2002).
- [49] V. P. Coletta and J. J. Steinert, *Why normalized gain should continue to be used in analyzing preinstruction and postinstruction scores on concept inventories*, *Phys. Rev. Phys. Educ. Res.* **16** (2020).
- [50] L. J. Cronbach, *Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests*, *Psychometrika* **16**, 297 (1951).
- [51] M. Blanz, *Forschungsmethoden und Statistik für die Soziale Arbeit. Grundlagen und Anwendungen [Research Methods and Statistics for Social Work. Basics and Applications]* (2021), http://www.kohlhammer.de/wms/instances/KOB/appDE/nav_product.php?product=978-3-17-039818-4.
- [52] T. Long, K. I. Gero, and L. B. Chilton, *Not Just Novelty: A Longitudinal Study on Utility and Customization of an AI Workflow* (2024), <http://arxiv.org/pdf/2402.09894v2>.
- [53] M. Stadler, M. Bannert, and M. Sailer, *Cognitive ease at a cost: LLMs reduce mental effort but compromise depth in student scientific inquiry*, *Computers in Human Behavior* **160**, 108386 (2024).
- [54] F. Karataş and B. A. Ataç, *When TPACK meets artificial intelligence: Analyzing TPACK and AI-TPACK components through structural equation modelling*, *Educ Inf Technol* (2024).
- [55] I.-A. Chounta, E. Bardone, A. Raudsep, and M. Pedaste, *Exploring Teachers' Perceptions of Artificial Intelligence as a Tool to Support their Practice in Estonian K-12 Education*, *Int J Artif Intell Educ* **32**, 725 (2022).