



# INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

## Determinants Of Social Learning Among University Students In Lucknow: Role Of Academic Stream And Economic Status

<sup>1</sup>Ankita Sharma, <sup>2</sup>Dr. Victoria Susan Ijjina

<sup>1</sup>M.Ed. Student, <sup>2</sup> Assistant Professor Department of Education,

<sup>1</sup> Department of Education, Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University (A Central University),  
Lucknow- 226025. U.P.

Correspondence Author: Ankita Sharma

Department of Education, Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University (A Central University) Lucknow-  
226025 U.P.

### ABSTRACT:

The present study investigates the determinants of social learning among university students in Lucknow, with specific reference to their academic stream and economic status. A sample of 200 students was selected from various universities using an appropriate sampling technique. The study aimed to examine whether differences in social learning exist across study streams (such as arts and sciences) and across varying economic backgrounds. Data were collected using a self-made social learning scale and analysed using appropriate statistical techniques. The findings revealed a significant difference in social learning among students with respect to both academic stream and economic status. Students from different streams exhibited varying levels of transformative, associative and learning through artificial intelligence, while economic status also influenced access to learning resources and social exposure. The study highlights the importance of socio-academic factors in shaping social learning and suggests the need for inclusive educational practices.

**KEYWORDS-** Social Learning, Economic Status, Academic Stream

### INTRODUCTION:

Social learning has emerged as a fundamental process through which individuals acquire knowledge, attitudes, and behaviours within a social context. Rooted in Albert Bandura's Social Learning Theory, learning is understood as a dynamic interplay among personal, behavioural, and environmental factors, with observation, imitation, and modelling playing central roles (Firmansyah & Saepuloh). Contemporary perspectives further extend this view by integrating cognitive and behavioural

dimensions, emphasizing that learning is not merely a response to external stimuli but also involves internal processes such as attention, memory, and motivation. These processes are significantly influenced by social environments, peer interactions, and individual self-regulation (Rachmad, 2022). Recent research highlights the critical role of social interaction in enhancing learning outcomes. For instance, De Felice et al. (2023) argue that learning “with and from others” is more effective than isolated learning, as it involves joint attention, communication, and perspective-taking. Similarly, social support systems and peer influence have been found to shape learning behaviours and academic engagement among students. Khan et al. (2015) demonstrated that inadequate social support contributes to higher academic stress and negative psychological outcomes among Indian students, underscoring the importance of socio-cultural and economic contexts in shaping learning experiences. In the context of higher education, factors such as academic stream and economic status play a crucial role in determining the nature and extent of social learning. Students from different academic disciplines often experience varied pedagogical practices, interaction patterns, and collaborative opportunities, which influence their learning styles. Moreover, economic status affects access to resources, technological tools, and social exposure, thereby impacting students’ participation in social learning environments. Studies also suggest that students from lower socio-economic backgrounds may face greater challenges due to limited support systems and learning opportunities (Khan et al., 2015). With the growing influence of digital technologies and Artificial Intelligence in education, the social dimension of learning is undergoing a significant transformation. While AI has the potential to enhance personalised and collaborative learning, scholars like Ben Williamson (2024) caution against overestimating its impact without considering ethical concerns, biases, and social inequalities. Furthermore, research indicates that peer influence continues to play a vital role in technology adoption and learning behaviours among university students (Korchak et al., 2025). Against this backdrop, the present study focuses on understanding the determinants of social learning among university students in Lucknow, with particular emphasis on academic stream and economic status. By examining these variables, the study aims to provide insights into how socio-academic factors shape students’ learning experiences in a diverse educational setting. This investigation is expected to contribute to the development of more inclusive and context-sensitive educational practices that promote effective social learning among university students.

## REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE:

Korchak, A., Al Murshidi, G., Getman, A., Raouf, N. et.al. (2025). *The role of social influence in generative artificial intelligence ChatGPT adoption intentions among undergraduate and graduate students* studied the importance of social influence in students’ decision to use generative AI, and in particular tools such as ChatGPT. Empirically grounded in the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology, the paper investigates the impact of peer influence on behavioral intention to use GenAI among undergraduate and graduate students. The results based on the responses of 271 university students indicate that social influence has positive effect on the intention to adopt AI technologies. Interestingly, under- graduate students are more susceptible to peer influence than graduate students,

which can be attributed to the fact that they have less autonomy, tighter peer networks, and are in some sense caught between voluntary and non-voluntary academic life. In contrast, graduate students tend to be more autonomous in technology use. This study extends UTAUT by transposing the social influence construct to the context of both voluntary and involuntary use situations. In general, the literature points to the importance of peer interactions in influencing students' adoption of cutting-edge AI technologies in higher education.

Williamson, B. (2024).in his paper *The social life of AI in education* studied about the development of the discourse of Artificial Intelligence in Education, undermining the dominant narrative that AI would bring revolutionary changes to higher education. Drawing on contributions to Times Higher Education, the article reveals that prevailing narratives too often fail to consider the ambiguities and constraints associated with AI adoption. Williamson, with the help of Meredith Broussard, condemns “techno-chauvinism,” the idea that technology is inevitably the best answer. The literature also suggests that these systems, particularly natural language generation models, can exhibit biases, hallucinate, and have a disparate impact on marginalized groups. Although enthusiasm is rising, the evidence-based support for the transformative effects of AI in education is still scarce. The review highlights a potential for developments towards a more socially and historically situated AI research and practice in educational contexts. In light of these findings, the authors suggest that the widespread celebration of AI should be met with a dose of criticality, if we are to gain a deeper understanding of its multifaceted place in education.

Akintayo, O. T., Eden, C. A., Ayeni, O. O., & Onyebuchi, N. C. (2024).in their paper *Integrating AI with emotional and social learning in primary education: Developing a holistic adaptive learning ecosystem* The paper investigates Artificial Intelligence in Education with social and emotional learning (SEL) to enhance and evolve the learning ecosystem in primary education. The literature identifies that the integration of AI and SEL can positively influence children's holistic development, improving not only their academic outcomes but also their emotional regulation, their interpersonal skills, and social competence. AI-based adaptive platforms are recognized as an instrument that can customize the learning path, provide on-line feedback, increase motivation and learning by doing. Nevertheless, the paper outlines formidable challenges, including ethical issues such as data privacy, algorithmic bias, and differential access to technology. Furthermore, insufficient digital skills among teachers place a ceiling on implementation effectivity. The writers call for co-ordinated work between educators, policy-makers and technologists, with investment in focused training and robust ethical frameworks, to secure an equal and effective integration of AI in supporting students' social and emotional growth.

De Felice, S., Hamilton, A. F. D. C., Ponari, M., & Vigliocco, G. (2023). In their paper *Learning from others is good, with others is better: the role of social interaction in human acquisition of new knowledge* studied that sharp human learning is rooted in social engagement from infancy through adulthood. Contrary to traditional views in Cognitive and Neuroscience that tend to consider learning in isolation, we outline here what it means to learn “with and from others” as a fundamental mechanism of

knowledge learning. They integrate behavioral and neuroimaging findings to describe how people develop semantic knowledge through interaction in both developmental and adult populations. Moreover, it highlights essential cognitive processes such as joint attention, communication, and perspective-taking and their neural substrates that facilitate social learning. Informed by a two-person neuroscience paradigm, the article advocates a move towards real-life social investigations of learning. Overall, the literature clearly points to the fact that social interaction is not an add-on, but rather the core driver in the way humans gather and generate knowledge.

Sharples, M. (2023).in the paper *Towards social generative AI for education: theory, practices and ethics*. Studied about AI in Education (AIED) as a social and interactive process model not a series of discrete prompt and response interactions. The literature reveals that learning happens in the ongoing conversations and interaction among learners, AI systems, and digital resources in the distributed human - AI environment. Within this model, participants jointly construct knowledge as they pursue goals, make sense of information, negotiate meaning, and transfer learning. It also highlights the necessity for more evolved generative AI systems that can meaningfully converse, generate knowledge representations, and serve as mentors or guides. Nevertheless, it introduces profound ethical issues, such as responsibility, transparency, as well as respect for human expertise. Sharples stresses the necessity of designing socially responsible AI systems which are aware of their own limitations and protect educational values. In sum, the paper calls for a socially grounded and ethically informed approach to the use of generative AI in education.

Firmansyah, D., and Saepuloh, D.,(2022) in their paper *Social learning theory: Cognitive and behavioral perspective* studied about social learning as a combination of cognitive and behavioral perspective. The paper also discussed the important aspects of social learning such as observational learning, imitation, modeling, reinforcement, cognitive process-where an individual learn from observing and interpreting behaviors of others. Behavior is not just the response to stimuli and reinforcements from outside, but also from the internal thinking process such as attention, memory and motivation. Also stated that environment, interaction with society and self-regulation have effects toward the learning process.

Rachmad, Y.E. (2022) in his paper *Social behavioural Theory* Studying the people's actions in complicated social arrangements. The theory suggests that behavior is fluid and determined by the interaction of internal elements, including cognition, beliefs, and emotions, with external elements, such as social norms, expectations from peers, and environmental factors. Based on aspects of social learning theory, it focuses on observation, imitation and interaction among its constituents to influence behavioral maturation. The literature also suggests that mechanisms such as reinforcement and social influence are key to changing behaviour and achieving positive outcomes. In addition to participation rates and intensity of participation, as well as the duration of participation, Rachmad also introduces quantifiable criteria such as whether individuals conform to norms within a community and quality of interaction to measure changes in conduct. The theory has been found to have wide-ranging applications

in education, psychology, and organizational leadership. Overall, a novel conception of social context was incorporated in the findings to stress the need for context-related, adaptive and empowering intervention strategies and social support to enable sustainable behavioural change and long-term social impact.

Khan, A., Hamdan, A.R., & Ahmad, R. (2015), et.al. In their paper titled *Problem solving coping and social support as Mediators of Academic stress and suicidal Ideation among Malaysia and Indian Adolescents examines* whether productive coping style and social support significantly mediate the relationship among emotional mental condition of adolescents. They took quantitative approach with cross sectional survey. The participants were 300 Malaysian and 300 Indian students through random sampling method from the two colleges of Malaysia and India, with the range of age between 18-25 years of age. Their findings show great inclination of Indian students towards the academic stress and suicidal ideation than Malaysian students. This due to the lack of social support provided to Indian students than that of Malaysian students. The study also says that the males with low socio-economic status have higher level of academic stress and suicidal ideation. Their findings suggest that the problem solving coping strategies and increasing social support and help to reduce the academic stress on suicidal ideation among the adolescents. The emphasis more lie towards the culturally tailored intervention that will have more positive impact towards this, and will help adolescents to come out of these thoughts.

### **OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY:**

The Objectives for the study are as follows –

1. To study the social learning of students in the universities of Lucknow with respect to their stream of study
2. To study the social learning of students in the universities of Lucknow with respect to their economic status

### **HYPOTHESIS OF THE STUDY:**

The Null Hypothesis for the study are as follows –

- There will be no significant difference in the Economic status of male and female students.
- There will be no significant difference in the stream of study between male and female students.

### **METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY:**

#### **1. Research Approach**

The study follows a quantitative research approach, as it focuses on numerical data and statistical analysis to examine differences in social learning among university students.

## 2. Research Method

A descriptive survey method was adopted to study the existing status of social learning and its variation with respect to academic stream and economic status.

## 3. Population of the Study

The population of the study consists of all university students studying in Lucknow, across different streams such as Arts and Science.

## 4. Sample and Sampling Technique

A total sample of 200 university students was selected for the study. The random sampling technique was used to ensure fair representation of students from different academic streams and economic backgrounds.

## RESULT AND INTERPRETATION:

**Objective 1. To study the social learning of students in the universities of Lucknow with respect to their stream of study.**

**H<sub>01</sub>: There will be no significant difference in the stream of study of social learning in male and female students**

To test the above hypothesis, the following calculations were done

STREAM	N	MEAN	SD	MD (MEAN DIFFERENCE)	t
SCIENCE	106	49.462	5.56	-5.123	1.97
ARTS	94	54.585	2.92		

**Table 1. There will be no significant difference in the stream of study of social learning in male and female students**

### Interpretation:

The calculated 't' value -8.28 is less than the table value 1.92 at the 0.05 level of significance, hence the null hypothesis is retained

**H<sub>02</sub>: There will be no significant difference in the course of study of artificial intelligence in male and female students**

To test the above hypothesis the following calculation were done

STREAM	N	MEAN	SD	MD (MEAN DIFFERENCE)	T
SCIENCE	106	62.792	12.676	-2.41	1.972
ARTS	94	65.202	10.699		

**Table 2 – There will be no significant difference in the course of study of artificial intelligence in male and female students**

**Interpretation:**

The calculated ‘t’ value -1.457 is less than the table value 1.92 at the 0.05 level of significance, hence the null hypothesis is retained.

**Objective 2. To study the social learning of students in the universities of Lucknow with respect to their economic status.**

**H<sub>03</sub>: There will be no significant difference in the Economic status of associative learning in male and female students**

To test the above hypothesis the following calculation were done

ANOVA

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	86.2542	2	43.1271	0.995797	0.371281	3.041753
Within Groups	8531.901	197	43.30914			
Total	8618.155	199				

**Table 3. There will be no significant difference in the Economic status of associative learning in male and female students**

**Interpretation:**

The calculated ‘F’ value 0.99 is less than the ‘F’ critical value 3.04 at 0.05 level of significance. Hence the null hypothesis is retained

**H<sub>04</sub> : There will be no significant difference in the Economic status of artificial intelligence in male and female students**

To test the above hypothesis the following calculation were done

ANOVA

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	682.0483	2	341.0242	4.073826	0.018466	3.041753
Within Groups	16491.07	197	83.71102			
Total	17173.12	199				

**Table 4. There will be no significant difference in the Economic status of artificial intelligence in male and female students**

**Interpretation:** The calculated ‘F’ value 4.07 is greater than the ‘F’ critical value 3.041 at 0.05 level of significance. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected. Further post-hoc analysis using Duncan’s test is as follows:

**Table 5: This data has been taken from table 2.**

ECONOMIC STATUS	M	SD	t
Low	64.35	8.93	1.99 <sup>NS</sup>
Average	65.21	9.37	
Average	65.219	9.37	2.04*
High	70.888	10.26	
High	65.21	10.26	2.085*
Low	70.888	8.93	

\* Significant at 0.05 level

## NS Not Significant

### Interpretation:

The t values in table no indicate that there is significant difference between average economic status and high economic status. Further there is significant difference between high economic status and low economic status. However there is no significant difference between low and average economic status.

### DISCUSSION:

The present study examined the determinants of social learning among university students in Lucknow with respect to academic stream and economic status. The findings indicate that there is no significant difference in social learning between students of different academic streams such as Arts and Science. This suggests that social learning is a universal process that operates similarly across disciplines, regardless of differences in curriculum or pedagogical approaches. This finding supports the theoretical perspective of Albert Bandura, who emphasized that learning occurs through observation, interaction, and shared environments rather than being confined to specific subject areas. It is also consistent with the findings of De Felice et al. (2023), which highlight that learning through social interaction is a fundamental mechanism across all learning contexts. Similarly, the study found no significant difference in overall social learning and associative learning with respect to economic status. This indicates that students, irrespective of their economic background, engage in social learning processes such as interaction, observation, and peer learning in comparable ways. However, a significant difference was observed in the case of learning through Artificial Intelligence, where students from higher economic backgrounds showed greater engagement than those from low and average economic groups. This difference can be attributed to unequal access to technological resources, digital tools, and learning opportunities. These findings are in line with the study of Khan et al. (2015), which emphasized that socio-economic status influences access to support systems and learning opportunities. Furthermore, the findings support the arguments of Williamson (2024), who cautions that technological advancements in education may reinforce existing inequalities if issues of access and equity are not addressed. The results also align with Akintayo et al. (2024), who highlighted that while AI can enhance learning experiences, disparities in access can lead to unequal participation in technology-mediated learning. Overall, the study underscores that while social learning is broadly consistent across academic streams and economic groups, the digital dimension of learning introduces disparities linked to socio-economic status. Peer interaction, social exposure, and access to resources remain key factors influencing students' engagement in social learning.

### CONCLUSION:

The study concludes that social learning among university students in Lucknow is not significantly influenced by academic stream, indicating that students across different disciplines engage in similar

patterns of social interaction and learning. Likewise, economic status does not significantly affect overall social learning and associative learning. However, it plays a crucial role in shaping students' engagement with technology-based learning, particularly Artificial Intelligence, where students from higher economic backgrounds demonstrate greater access and participation. These findings highlight the importance of ensuring equitable access to technological resources in higher education institutions. While traditional forms of social learning remain accessible to most students, the increasing integration of digital tools requires institutions to address socio-economic disparities to prevent unequal learning opportunities. Therefore, it is essential for policymakers and educators to promote inclusive strategies, provide adequate digital infrastructure, and support students from disadvantaged backgrounds. In conclusion, social learning is a shared and essential process among university students, but its evolving digital dimension calls for greater attention to equity and accessibility in modern educational practices.

## REFERENCES:

1. Akintayo, O. T., Eden, C. A., Ayeni, O. O., & Onyebuchi, N. C. (2024). Integrating AI with emotional and social learning in primary education: Developing a holistic adaptive learning ecosystem. *Computer Science & IT Research Journal*, 5(5), 1076-1089.
2. De Felice, S., Hamilton, A. F. D. C., Ponari, M., & Vigliocco, G. (2023). Learning from others is good, with others is better: the role of social interaction in human acquisition of new knowledge. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, 378(1870), 20210357.
3. Firmansyah, D., & Saepuloh, D. (2022). Social learning theory: Cognitive and behavioral approaches. *Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Holistik (JIPH)*, 1(3), 297-324.
4. Korchak, A., Al Murshidi, G., Getman, A., Raouf, N., Arshe, M., Al Meheiri, N., ... & Costley, J. (2025). The role of social influence in generative artificial intelligence ChatGPT adoption intentions among undergraduate and graduate students. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 62(5), 1559-1573.
5. Khan, A., Hamdan, A. R., Ahmad, R., Mustaffa, M. S., & Mahalle, S. (2016). Problem-solving coping and social support as mediators of academic stress and suicidal ideation among Malaysian and Indian adolescents. *Community Mental Health Journal*, 52(2), 245–250. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10597-015-9937-6>
6. Kim, E., Jang, G.-Y., & Kim, S.H.(2022).How to apply artificial intelligence for social innovation. *Applied Artificial Intelligence*, 36(1), 1–20 <https://doi.org/10.1080/08839514.2022.2031819>
7. Rachmad, Y. E. (2022). Social Behavioral Theory.
8. Sharples, M. (2023). Towards social generative AI for education: theory, practices and ethics. *Learning: Research and Practice*, 9(2), 159-167.
9. Saikia, S., Asif, M., & Sultana, Y. (2024). Investigating socially mediated educational communication through WhatsApp and Telegram: Perception and preference of students and

- teachers. *Indian Journal of Educational Technology*, 6(II), 10–21. <https://journals.ncert.gov.in/IJET/article/view/284>
10. Shang, S., Yi, T., & Lyv, W.(2024). Effects of learners' course network characteristics on continuous online learning: moderation roles of social learning and social exposure. *Asia Pacific Education Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-03432-4>
  11. Wang, S., Li, X., & Gao, H. (2024). A study on the social interaction characteristics of college student peers in science museums and their impact on learning outcomes: Based on an analysis of the conversation. *Research in Science Education*, 56(6), 1173–1197 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-024-10181-6>
  12. Whiten, A., Allan, G., Devlin, S., Kseib, N., Raw, N., & McGuigan, N. (2016). Social learning in the real-world: 'Over-imitation' occurs in both children and adults unaware of participation in an experiment and independently of social interaction. *PLOS ONE*, 11(7), e0159920. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0159920>
  13. Williamson, B. (2024). The social life of AI in education. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, 34(1), 97-104.
  14. Xu, W., Dai, W.,(2024) You are good annotators: Investigating how social reading based on social annotations and role assignment strategies facilitate learners' social interaction and knowledge construction. *Education and Information Technologies*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-13268-9>

