

LB/TH/46/2025  
TH6061

# **The Impact of Personalized Educational Recommender Systems on Learning Efficiency in Higher Education**

J.A.H. Perera

239170V

Master of Science in Data Science and Artificial Intelligence

Department of Computer Science and Engineering  
Faculty of Engineering

University of Moratuwa  
Sri Lanka

April 2025

# **The Impact of Personalized Educational Recommender Systems on Learning Efficiency in Higher Education**

J.A.H. Perera

239170V

Thesis/Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree  
Master of Science in Data Science and Artificial Intelligence

Department of Computer Science and Engineering  
Faculty of Engineering

University of Moratuwa  
Sri Lanka

April 2025

## DECLARATION

I declare that this is my own work, and this thesis/dissertation does not incorporate without acknowledgement any material previously submitted for a degree or diploma in any other University or Institute of higher learning and to the best of my knowledge and belief it does not contain any material previously published or written by another person except where the acknowledgement is made in the text. I retain the right to use this content in whole or part in future works (such as articles or books).

Signature:

Date: 30.04.2025

The above candidate has carried out research for the ~~PhD/MPhil~~/Masters thesis/dissertation under my supervision. I confirm that the declaration made above by the student is true and correct.

Name of Supervisor: Dr. Buddhika Karunaratne

Signature of the Supervisor:

Date: 30/06/2025

## **DEDICATION**

This work is dedicated to my parents, whose unwavering support, guidance, and encouragement have been instrumental in my academic and personal growth. Their values and perseverance have been a constant source of inspiration, shaping the foundation of my achievements.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my research supervisor, Dr. Buddhika Karunaratne, for his exceptional guidance, insightful feedback, and steadfast support throughout this research. His expertise and mentorship have been invaluable in the successful completion of this work.

I extend my special thanks to my friends in the MSc program for their intellectual and moral support during this academic journey. Their encouragement and collaboration have been a source of great motivation.

I am profoundly grateful to my parents and sister for their unwavering support, patience, and belief in my abilities. Their encouragement has been the foundation of my personal and academic achievements. Additionally, I would like to acknowledge my friends and colleagues at Octave – John Keells Holdings for their understanding and assistance, specially Mr. Ruwan Wickramaratne who have greatly supported my efforts during this endeavor.

This research would not have been possible without the collective support and contributions of everyone mentioned above, for which I am deeply appreciative.

## ABSTRACT

In today's academic landscape, university students face challenges in identifying relevant and high-quality educational resources due to the overwhelming availability of digital content. The process of locating specific materials or answers to academic queries often requires navigating vast and irrelevant information, leading to inefficiencies in learning. This research addresses these challenges by developing a personalized educational recommender system that integrates machine learning techniques with the advanced capabilities of Large Language Models (LLMs).

Unlike traditional recommender systems that focus solely on suggesting materials, the proposed solution is designed to deliver personalized recommendations and provide precise answers to students' specific inquiries. This approach aims to align recommended resources with students' academic modules and research objectives, fostering a more tailored and effective learning experience.

The primary objectives of this study include designing the recommender system to support personalized learning and evaluating its impact on students' learning outcomes, engagement, and motivation. By simplifying access to relevant materials and addressing individual learning needs, this system seeks to enhance the efficiency and quality of the academic experience. Ultimately, the research contributes to advancing learning technologies, making it easier for students to achieve their academic goals while addressing the growing challenges of information overload.

**Keywords:** Personalized educational recommender system, Large Language Models, Educational Domains, Precise query-based answers

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Declaration .....	1
Dedication .....	2
Acknowledgement.....	3
Abstract .....	4
Table of Contents .....	5
List of Figures .....	9
List of Tables.....	10
Chapter 1 .....	11
Introduction.....	11
1.1 Digital Technology Integration in Education.....	11
1.1.1 Key Focus Areas in Research.....	11
1.2 Application Across Domains .....	12
1.3 Necessity of the personalised system in education .....	13
1.3.1 Diverse Learning Needs and Styles .....	14
1.3.1.1 Individualized Learning Paths.....	14
1.3.1.2 Use of Multimedia and Interactive Content .....	14
1.3.1.3 Personalized Feedback Mechanisms.....	16
1.3.1.4 Data-Driven Customization.....	17
1.3.1.5 Flexible Learning Environments.....	17
1.3.1.6 Collaboration and Social Learning.....	18
1.4 Use of GenAI & large language models for recommendation systems.....	19
Chapter 2 .....	20
Literature review .....	20
2.1 Role of Educational Recommender Systems in Modern Education .....	20
2.2 Educational Recommender Systems.....	21
2.3 Matching Students for Collaborative Work .....	22
2.4 Mechanism of developing traditional recommendation systems.....	23
2.4.1 Data Collection.....	23
2.4.2 User Profiling in Personalized Education Systems.....	25

2.4.3 Item Profiling in Personalized Education Systems .....	26
2.4.4 Matching Algorithm.....	27
2.4.4.1 Collaborative Filtering .....	28
2.4.4.2 Content-Based Filtering .....	28
2.4.4.3 Hybrid Recommendation Systems .....	29
2.4.4.4 Knowledge-based recommender methods .....	30
2.4.5 Recommendation Generation.....	30
2.4.6 System Implementation.....	32
2.4.7 Evaluation .....	33
2.5 The Role Of Generative Ai In Recommendation Systems .....	34
2.5.1 Short Comings Of Traditional Methods.....	34
2.5.2 Benefits Of Indulging Generative Ai For Recommendation Systems.....	36
2.5.3 Technologies Used .....	36
Chapter 3 .....	39
Methodology .....	39
3.1 Development Of Knowledge Base.....	39
3.2 Fine-Tuning The Gpt-4 Model.....	41
3.2.1 Fine-Tuning Process .....	41
3.2.1.1 Why Fine-Tuning Is Needed? .....	41
3.2.1.2 Dataset For Fine-Tuning .....	41
3.2.1.3 Comparison Between Different Fine-Tuning Approaches .....	41
3.2.2 Fine-Tuning Rag With Lora.....	42
3.2.2.1 How RAG Helps With Fine-Tuning? .....	42
3.2.2.2 How Can Lora Be Incorporated With RAG? .....	42
3.2.2.3 Usage Of LoRA In Fine-Tuning .....	42
3.3 Development of Recommendation System.....	43
3.3.1 Core Features And Functionalities.....	43
3.3.1.1 System Architecture .....	43
3.3.1.2 Document Storage and Preprocessing.....	44
3.3.1.3 Functionalities of recommendation system.....	45
3.4 Development Of Support Assistant.....	47
3.4.1 Core Features And Functionalities.....	47

3.4.1.1 Document Management .....	47
3.4.1.2 Automated Assessment Generation .....	48
3.4.1.3 User Interface .....	48
3.4.2 Technical Architecture .....	49
3.4.2.1 Frontend Architecture .....	49
3.4.2.2 Backend Framework .....	49
3.4.2.3 Semantic Search and Retrieval.....	49
3.4.2.4 Assessment Generation and Evaluation .....	50
3.4.2.5 Evaluation Pipeline .....	51
3.5 Key Design Decisions .....	52
3.5.1 System Architecture .....	52
3.5.1.1 Data Storage and Management: Azure Blob Storage .....	52
3.5.1.2 High-Performance Semantic Search: FAISS & OpenAI Embeddings .	53
3.5.1.3 Interactive Visualization: Streamlit .....	55
3.5.1.4 Selection of AI models.....	56
3.5.1.5 Language Model Workflow Management: LangChain .....	57
3.5.1.6 Data Validation and Integrity: JSON Schema Validation.....	57
Chapter 4 .....	59
Implementation And Results.....	59
4.1 Knowledge Base.....	59
4.2 Data Collection.....	59
4.2.1 Questionnaire Design .....	59
4.2.2 Insights Through Data Collection .....	60
4.3 Functionalities Of The Sections .....	63
4.3.1 Reccomendation System .....	63
4.3.2 Support Assistant .....	65
4.3.3 Self Evaluation .....	66
4.4 Results.....	67
4.4.1 Results And Comparison.....	67
4.4.2 Support Assistant- Results Comparison.....	68
4.4.3 Self Assessment- Results Comparison.....	68
Chapter 5 .....	71

Discussion, Conclusion And Possible Future Work .....	71
5.1 Discussion .....	71
5.1.1 Key Findings .....	71
5.1.1 Comparisons With Existing Research.....	72
5.2 Conclusion .....	72
5.3 Possible Future Works .....	73
REFERENCES.....	74

## LIST OF FIGURES

<b>Figure</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Page</b>
Figure 3.1	Architecture of Recommendation System	44
Figure 3.2	Architecture of chat assistant and evaluation	47
Figure 3.3	Technical Architecture	52
Figure 4.1	Screenshot of the sample PDF files stored	59
Figure 4.2	Snapshots of the questionnaire	60
Figure 4.3	Pie Chart of Respondent Rate Variation	61
Figure 4.4	Pie chart: Materials reference variation	61
Figure 4.5	Box plots of GPA vs use of supporting materials	62
Figure 4.6	Bar chart: variation of modules supported by materials	62
Figure 4.7	Bar chart: different reasons for not using materials	63
Figure 4.8	Interface of Home page	63
Figure 4.9	Initial interface of recommendation system	64
Figure 4.10	Second interface of recommendation system	64
Figure 4.11	Interface where recommendations are given	65
Figure 4.12	Initial Interface of the Support Assistant	65
Figure 4.13	Interface-support assistant when retrieving answers	66
Figure 4.14	Interface of MCQ questions	66
Figure 4.15	Interface of Open-ended Questions	66
Figure 4.16	Interface of Answer Evaluation	67
Figure 4.17	Histogram of ratings on personalized experiences	70

## LIST OF TABLES

<b>Table</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Page</b>
Table 3.1	Comparison of different fine-tuning approaches	31
Table 3.2	Performances of RAG fine-tuning	32
Table 3.3	Performance comparison of different metrics	33
Table 3.4	Accuracy variation with the number of epochs	36
Table 3.5	Accuracy metrics with different recommendation approaches	37
Table 3.6	Technical highlights of data storage and management	42
Table 3.7	Comparison chart of document storage	43
Table 3.8	Document processing time with each storage method	44
Table 3.9	Retrieval time in different semantic search methods	44
Table 3.10	Technical highlights of semantic search methods	44
Table 3.11	Technical highlights of interactive visualization	45
Table 3.12	Question generation time with each AI model	46
Table 3.13	Technical highlights of language model workflow management	47
Table 3.14	Technical highlights of data validation	48
Table 4.1	Students' rating based on the used AI model	53
Table 4.2	Students' feedback for GPT models in chat assistant	55
Table 4.3	Students' feedback for GPT models for question generation	56
Table 4.4	Students' feedback for GPT models feedback generation	56