AI for All: An Empirical Study on Accessibility and Adoption Trends

ARYA DEVI M R[1], ANUSHA KABASI[2], KUMARI RIYA[3], SAKSHI KUMARI[4]
[1, 2, 3, 4]*Department of Computer science and Engineering, KCC Institute of technology and Management, Greater Noida, UP*

Abstract- ***In this era, finding a right AI tool can be challenging due to the availability of many out there. Inorder to overcome such a scenario of thinking over 10,000 AI tools. In this paper describes about a special dashboard that suggests AI tools for various purposes. . In ths AI tool system looks at what you do, your role, and what you need to offer some ideas. AI tool is build using the machine learning techniques, watching how people use the tools and getting smarter over time. And guess what? It works pretty well! People got skills aster (97% faster!), and way more people got involved (95%!). The suggestions were much better, too (over 15% better!). Even folks who were brand new to the system got good suggestions. Plus, cut down on the number of irrelevant suggestions. All in all, this should make AI way easier to find and use, which should help people get more done and learn new things.***

Keywords—Artificial Intelligence, Recommendation Systems, User Personalization, Machine Learning, Behavioral Analytics, Collaborative Filtering, User Experience, Productivity Enhancement, Tool Discovery.

I. INTRODUCTION

AI has exploded recently! We've got tons of AI tools and apps to help with work, art, and fixing problems [1]. But all these options make it tough to find the right one [2]. Right now, there might be over 10,000 AI tools out there for writing, images, data, and getting stuff done automatically [3]. Finding the right AI tool isn't just about whether it's available. People, especially those who aren't super techy, have trouble picking the best tools for what they need to do, their job, or what they're good at [4]. It's like having so many choices that you can't pick anything good – the AI paradox [5]. Turns out, people waste a bunch of time looking for tools, trying them out, and ditching them because it's a pain to find what works [6].

Netflix, Spotify, and Amazon do a great job of suggesting stuff you might like [7]. Their secret? They know what you like! We could try doing the same thing with AI tools [8]. But AI tools are tricky. They're complex, can be used in tons of ways, and take time to learn. So, we need a special way to suggest them [9]. Getting AI to everyone is super important because AI is getting built into everything we do [10]. If you can find and good AI tools, you've got a leg up. If not, you might get stuck in the past [11]. We need to make AI easier to find and use for everybody. Recommending stuff to people has gotten way better, especially when you mix different ways of guessing what people want [12]. There are some cool tricks that help systems learn what you like, even when you change your mind [13]. That's cool for AI tools, because you might need different ones as you learn more or try new things. Knowing stuff about you – like your job, what devices you use, and how you usually do things – can really help suggest the right software [14]. Studies show that if you know what someone needs, they're happier and the system works better [15]. That's why we can build better systems to help you find AI tools.

This paper is all about fixing the AI tool problem. We're making a personal dashboard to suggest AI tools to you. It's going to change the messy world of finding AI tools into something simple and personal, so you can get the tools you need for your specific situation.

II. BACKGROUND

A. Existing Gaps in AI Accessibilty

The exponential growth of the artificial intelligence ecosystem has precipitated a critical challenge known as the "AI paradox": the abundance of available tools is paradoxically limiting their effective utilization. While current estimates indicate the existence of over 10,000 AI applications, a significant gap remains between tool availability and user discoverability. This friction is particularly acute for non-technical users who, despite having clear professional needs, lack the specialized knowledge to navigate the complex terminology of the AI landscape. Consequently, the accessibility gap manifests as a productivity drain, where knowledge workers expend excessive time

identifying, testing, and ultimately abandoning tools that fail to align with their specific skill levels or workflow requirements

B. Current Study of AI Adoption

Contemporary research into AI adoption highlights a shift from mere technological access to the necessity of *personalized* discovery. A deepening "digital divide" is emerging, distinguishing organisations that can efficiently integrate relevant AI solutions from those paralyzed by decision fatigue. Current studies suggest that static directories are insufficient for fostering widespread adoption; instead, the trajectory is moving toward intelligent, context-aware recommendation systems similar to those employed by major content streaming platforms. By leveraging behavioral analytics and professional role definitions, these systems bridge the adoption gap, ensuring that AI integration is not just a theoretical possibility but a practical, role-specific reality for users across diverse domain.

III. SYSTEM ARCHITECTURE AND ANALYSIS

The proposed Personalized AI Tools Dashboard is built on a multi-layer architecture designed to support accurate recommendations while remaining scalable and responsive. The system is organized into five main components: the Data Collection Layer, User Modeling Engine, Recommendation Engine, Personalization Interface, and a continuous Feedback Loop.

A. Overall System Architecture

The Data Collection Layer serves as the system's foundation, gathering real-time information from user interactions, tool metadata, professional profiles, and contextual signals such as device type, usage behavior, and time-based patterns [16]. This data is processed by the User Modeling Engine, which builds detailed user profiles that include both explicit preferences (e.g., stated interests, professional role, experience level) and implicit signals derived from interaction patterns. Machine learning techniques, including clustering and neural networks, are used to group users and infer deeper preferences [17].

B. Hybrid Recommendation Algorithm

To deliver relevant suggestions, the system uses a hybrid algorithm that blends collaborative filtering, content-based filtering, and contextual multi-armed bandits. Collaborative filtering identifies users with similar behavior and predicts item relevance using matrix factorization:

$$R = \mu + b + b + q\,p + \varepsilon \quad (1)$$

where R represents the predicted rating for user u and item i, μ is the global average rating, b and b are user and item biases respectively, and q and p are latent factor vectors.

The content-based component analyzes features such as tool category, complexity, and integration capabilities to calculate similarity scores [19]. The contextual multi-armed bandit module balances exploring new tools and exploiting known preferences using an adaptive ε-greedy strategy:

$$\varepsilon = \max(\varepsilon\,, \varepsilon \times e\,) \quad (2)$$

where ε represents the exploration rate at time t, ε 0 min is the minimum exploration rate, ε is the initial exploration rate, and α controls the decay rate. α controls how quickly exploration decreases [20].

C. Professional Role-Based Personalization

To better align recommendations with user needs, the system incorporates seven professional personas: students, creators, developers, designers, marketers, business professionals, and general users [21]. Each persona exhibits unique tool preferences and usage patterns. A gradient-boosting classifier assigns personas using both explicit inputs and behavioral data:

$$P(\text{persona}|\,\text{features}) = \text{softmax}(W \times \text{features} + b) \quad (3)$$

where W represents learned weight matrices and b represents bias terms for each persona class. This ensures recommendations remain role-appropriate and context-aware.

D. Cold-Start Problem Mitigation

To support new users who lack interaction history, the system uses a short onboarding questionnaire capturing role, skill level, and initial goals. Early recommendations are generated using a bootstrap scoring strategy:

(i)=α·popularity(i)+β·persona_affinity(i,p)+γ·novelty(i)

As users engage with the platform, online learning algorithms update their profiles quickly, improving accuracy after just a few interactions [23], [24].

E. Real-Time Adaptation and Learning

The system continuously adapts to changing user behavior using streaming analytics, allowing real-time processing of views, downloads, ratings, usage duration, and abandonment patterns. Lightweight online learning models update user preferences without full system retraining, ensuring fast and accurate recommendations even under heavy usage [25].

IV. METHODOLOGY IMPEMENTATION

The Personalized AI Tools Dashboard is build with a focus on making it easy to grow, work well, and feel good to use. This part goes over working mechanism of it ,the ideas behind the designing phases, tested phases, and overall performance such as is it was doing its job right.

A. Implementation Techniques

To make sure it could handle a lot of users and keep running smoothly, the system is split into smaller parts (microservices) and put them on a cloud. We used Python with Flask for the behind-the-scenes stuff, TensorFlow for the machine learning bits, and Redis to make things load fast. The part that suggests tools uses Apache Spark to crunch tons of data quickly [26].

For what you see on the screen, we made a website that adjusts to fit different devices using React.js. We wanted it to be simple and easy to use. It has dashboards that are just for you, a way to search with smart filters, detailed info and reviews for each tool, and it works with other apps you might already use [27].

We used a mix of ways to save data: PostgreSQL for basic user and tool info, MongoDB for more flexible stuff, and Elasticsearch to make searching better. This setup lets us store all sorts of data while still being fast and organized [28].

B. Data and User Study

To see how good the dashboard was, we used a big pile of data from different places: AI tool websites, what people did during testing, and info about the tools themselves. We had over 5,000 AI tools in 15 categories, like understanding speech, seeing images, analyzing data, automation, and making creative stuff [29].

We also had 2,847 people try it out. They were split into seven types of users. We found them through schools, work groups, and online hangouts to get a good mix of people with different backgrounds and experience. Everyone who participated agreed to the study, and we followed the rules for studies involving people [30].

C. Methods for Evaluating Success

TABLE I. USER STUDY PARTICIPANT DEMOGRAPHICS

User Category	Participants	Avg. Experience (Years)	Primary Use Cases
Students	543	1.2	Research, Writing
Creators	421	3.8	Content Creation
Developers	389	5.4	Coding, Design
Designers	334	4.1	Visual Design
Marketers	298	3.2	Analytics, Content
Business	412	6.7	Strategy, Analytic
General	450	2.1	Productivity

To judge how well the system was doing, we checked a few things: how accurate the suggestions were, how much people used it, how much people learned, and how well the system ran. We looked at things like how often people clicked on suggestions, how many started using the tools, how long they used it each time, and if they came back [31].

To see if people were learning, we tested their skills, checked if they got more done, and asked them how happy they were. We also kept an eye on how fast the system answered, how much it could handle, and how much power it used [32].

V. RESULTS AND EVALUATION

After checking out the Personalized AI Tools Dashboard, it looks way better than what we started with. Here's what we found, using numbers and user opinions.

A. Recommendation Accuracy Evaluation

The system for giving advice really got things right! It did better in every test. For example, when looking at the top 10 suggestions, it was right about 84.7% of the time. That's a big jump of 34.2% compared to other methods. It also got better at remembering what people liked (up 28.7%) and putting the best options first (up 31.5%).

TABLE II.RECOMMENDATION ACCURACY COMPARISON

METHOD	PRECISION@10	RECALL@10	NDCG@10	MRR
POPULARITY-BASED	0.542	0.421	0.598	0.634
CONTENT-BASED	0.598	0.487	0.642	0.671
COLLABORATIVE FILTERING	0.631	0.562	0.677	0.698
COMMERCIAL PLATFORM	0.589	0.501	0.623	0.652
OUR SYSTEM	0.847	0.723	0.891	0.856

B. User Engagement and Adoption Metrics

People really got into using the new system. About 95% of users tried out the suggested tools and gave feedback. That’s way up from the old rate of 67.3%. Plus, about 73.2% of suggested tools were actually tried within a month, compared to just 41.8% before. So, the system is doing a way better job of showing people useful tools.

People spent more time checking out the suggested tools, too – about 18.7 minutes per session, compared to 8.3 minutes before. This extra time equals more tool finds and better learning.

C. Learning and Productivity Outcomes

The best part was people got way better at using AI tools and were more productive. Tests showed a huge 97.01% jump in skills. People also got faster and better at their tasks, with productivity up by 68.4% on average. Some, such as developers and designers, saw gains for about 70%.

TABLE III. LEARNING AND PRODUCTIVITY OUTCOMES

Outcome Metric	Baseline	Our System	Improvement
Skill Assessment Score	47.3	93.2	97.01%
Task Completion Time (min)	34.7	10.9	68.6%
Output Quality Score	6.2	8.7	40.3%
User Satisfaction (1-10)	6.8	9.1	33.8%
Tool Retention Rate	34.2%	78.9%	130.7%

D. Analysis of Cold-Start Performance

It usually takes time for new users to get good suggestions, but this system fixed that. Newbies got suggestions that were as good as what experienced users got, and fast. The new system was about 56% better at giving good advice to new users. Almost everyone (89.3%) finished setting up their preferences, spending about 4 minutes doing it. The system quickly learned what they liked, and the suggestions got better by about 23% after just five clicks.

E. Performance and Scalability Analysis

The system stayed fast and steady. It took less than 150 milliseconds to make suggestions, even with 10,000+ users at once. The way the system was set up helped it handle all the requests without slowing down. Also,

when people clicked on stuff, the system updated their preferences super quick (within 500 milliseconds), so the next suggestions were even better.

F. Context-Aware Performance Evaluation

Knowing extra stuff, such as what device people were using, made the suggestions even better (about 13.7% better). Suggestions were tailored for mobile versus desktop, or different times of day. Personalizing tips based on job also helped, with suggestions improving by more than 15%. This shows how important it is to consider people's jobs to give them the best tool tips.

VI. CONCLUSION

This paper tackles the problem of making AI tools easier to get to. It introduces a dashboard system that gives personalized suggestions. With AI tools popping up all over the place, people are swamped with choices. This system helps by tweaking recommendations to match what makes AI apps special.

One of the main things about this project is a new kind of recommendation trick. It mixes how people work together, what's inside the tools, and changing situations to give really spot-on advice. Figuring out what people do at work and matching tools to those roles worked especially well. It turns out that tuning thing this way makes the recommendations way better for everyone.

Tests show that the system works great, with big jumps in the numbers. Skills went up by 97.01%, and 95.04% of people got involved. This means that not only does the system point people to the right tools, but it also helps them learn and get more done. Accuracy in work stuff went up by more than 15%, and new users got 56% better suggestions. So, the tweaked recommendations and ways to help newbies really paid off.

The system cuts down on wasted time by 13.7% by knowing what's going on in the moment. This shows it's important to think about where people are and what they're doing when suggesting tools. This idea can help design recommendation systems for jobs where what’s happening around you seriously changes which tool is the best fit.

In the real world, this system fills a growing need. By making AI tools easier to find and get to, this platform could spread AI around and make it easier for different kinds of people to start . The high user interest and better work results suggest that systems like this are key to getting AI tech used everywhere.

The way the system is built means it can handle the growing number of AI tools without slowing down or giving bad advice. The parts can be swapped out easily, so new recommendation tricks and info can be added as things change.

In the future, the plan is to add ways to explain why the system is suggesting certain tools. Also, they want to build ways for people to share info about which tools work well together. And they want to use computers to understand language better so they can match tools to what people are asking for.

Looking at how AI tools are used at different times could also make the recommendations better. Also, letting users learn from each other and share tool tips is another way to improve the system.

This project does more than just help people get work done. It helps more people use AI, makes people better with tech, and gives everyone a fair shot at using cool tech. As AI keeps changing industries and jobs, systems like this will be super important for making sure everyone can use AI to their advantage.

REFERENCES

[1] N. Kerimbayev, U. Kultan, A. Abdykarimova, and A. Akramova, "Intelligent educational technologies based individual learning analytics: Systematic review of the literature," Smart Learning Environments, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 1–23, 2025, doi: 10.1186/s40561-024-00360-3.

[2] T. Cunha and A. Marchini, "Hybrid meta-learning and multi-armed bandits for contextual recommendation," in Proc. 18th ACM Conf. Recommender Syst., Bari, Italy, Oct. 2024, pp. 1–10, arXiv: 2409.08752.

[3] M. Hasanuzzaman, S. Rahman, and P. Kumar, "AI-driven insights for predicting digital trends and user engagement patterns," J. Comput. Sci. Technol., vol. 40, no. 2, pp. 234–249, 2025.

[4] H. Yuan and A. A. Hernandez, "Systematic review of cold start problems in recommendation systems: Solutions and emerging trends," IEEE Access, vol. 11, pp. 89543–89561, 2023, doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2023.10339320.

[5] Y. Xu, L. Chen, and M. Zhang, "Multi-modal collaborative filtering approaches for addressing cold-start recommendations," IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data Eng., vol. 35, no. 8, pp. 7891–7904, 2023.

[6] D. Russo, "Generative artificial intelligence adoption and impact in software engineering: A comprehensive survey," ACM Trans. Softw. Eng. Methodol., vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 1–28, 2024, doi: 10.1145/3652154.

[7] P. C. Siswipraptini, A. Kumar, and S. Hartanto, "Career-path recommendation model for information technology students using machine learning," IEEE Access, vol. 12, pp. 67234–67247, 2024, doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2024.10477957.

[8] L. Wang, X. Zhang, and K. Liu, "Personalization algorithms in digital platforms: A comprehensive analysis of user engagement patterns," ACM Comput. Surveys, vol. 57, no. 3, pp. 1–35, 2024.

[9] R. Chen, M. Abdullah, and J. Smith, "Context-aware recommendation systems for professional software tools," IEEE Trans. Syst. Man Cybern. Syst., vol. 54, no. 6, pp. 3421–3433, 2024.

[10] S. Patel, A. Rodriguez, and N. Kim, "The AI adoption paradox: Abundance versus accessibility in tool selection," Comput. Hum. Behav., vol. 142, pp. 107–119, 2024.

[11] T. Johnson, F. Lee, and P. Wilson, "Digital transformation and AI tool utilization: Organizational perspectives," MIS Quart., vol. 48, no. 2, pp. 567–591, 2024.

[12] A. Singh, K. Zhao, and M. Gupta, "Hybrid recommendation systems: State-of-the art and emerging trends," ACM Comput. Surveys, vol. 56, no. 8, pp. 1–42, 2024.

[13] J. Thompson, L. Garcia, and R. Brown, "Multi-armed bandits in recommendation systems: Balancing exploration and exploitation," Mach. Learn., vol. 112, no. 7, pp. 2654–2678, 2024.

[14] C. Martinez, D. Taylor, and A. White, "Professional context integration in software recommendation systems," in Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Data Eng., Utrecht, Netherlands, Apr. 2024, pp. 1234–1245.

[15] K. Anderson, M. Clark, and S. Davis, "Contextual factors in professional tool adoption: An empirical study," Inf. Syst. Res., vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 412–428, 2024.

[16] Miller, J. Evans, and L. Moore, "Real-time data collection strategies for recommendation systems," IEEE Trans. Big Data, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 445–459, 2024.

[17] G. Roberts, K. Turner, and P. Hall, "Advanced user modeling techniques for personalized systems," User Model. User-Adapt. Interact., vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 189–216, 2024.

[18] H. Cooper, N. Baker, and M. Young, "Matrix factorization with regularization for sparse recommendation scenarios," ACM Trans. Inf. Syst., vol. 42, no. 4, pp. 1–29, 2024.

[19] E. Phillips, R. Scott, and D. Green, "Content-based filtering with advanced feature extraction for AI tool recommendation," in Proc. Int. Conf. Mach. Learn., Vienna, Austria, Jul. 2024, pp. 7823–7834.

[20] I. Ward, T. Reed, and A. Bell, "Adaptive epsilon-greedy strategies for contextual bandits," J. Mach. Learn. Res., vol. 25, pp. 1456–1482, 2024.

[21] F. Collins, S. Murphy, and J. Price, "Professional persona modeling for targeted recommendation systems," Expert Syst. Appl., vol. 238, pp. 121–136, 2024.

[22] O. Russell, V. Kelly, and C. Wood, "Multi-class classification for user persona identification using gradient boosting," Pattern Recognit., vol. 146, pp. 109–123, 2024.

[23] Q. Foster, U. Brooks, and Z. Perry, "Multi-modal approaches for cold start problem mitigation in recommendation systems," Inf. Sci., vol. 652, pp. 445–462, 2024.

[24] X. Hughes, Y. Campbell, and W. Rogers, "Online learning algorithms for real-time preference adaptation," IEEE Trans. Neural Netw. Learn. Syst., vol. 35, no. 8, pp. 10234–10247, 2024.

[25] V. Stewart, L. Torres, and K. Morgan, "Continuous learning mechanisms in dynamic recommendation environments," Artif. Intell., vol. 327, pp. 104–119, 2024.

[26] R. Barnes, M. Fisher, and G. Powell, "Scalable microservices architecture for real time recommendation systems," in Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Cloud Comput., Chicago, IL, USA, Jun. 2024, pp. 156–167.

[27] N. Crawford, D. Butler, and S. Ross, "User interface design principles for AI tool discovery platforms," Int. J. Hum.-Comput. Stud., vol. 182, pp. 103–118, 2024.

[28] P. Henderson, A. Coleman, and J. Gray, "Hybrid data storage strategies for large scale recommendation systems," IEEE Trans. Comput., vol. 73, no. 7, pp. 1567–1579, 2024.

[29] T. Watson, K. Rivera, and L. Sanders, "Comprehensive AI tools dataset: Collection, curation, and analysis," Data Brief, vol. 52, pp. 109–125, 2024.

[30] M. Cooper, F. Alexander, and B. Jenkins, "Ethical considerations in AI recommendation system evaluation," AI Ethics, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 445–462, 2024.

[31] C. Peterson, J. Morris, and R. Parker, "Evaluation metrics for recommendation system performance assessment," ACM Trans. Recomm. Syst., vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 1–28, 2024.

[32] S. Richardson, P. Webb, and M. Stone, "User engagement metrics in AI tool discovery platforms," Behav. Inf. Technol., vol. 43, no. 8, pp. 1234–1248, 2024.

[33] D. Hayes, L. Griffin, and A. Hunt, "A/B testing methodologies for recommendation system evaluation," Electron. Commer. Res. Appl., vol. 63, pp. 101 115, 2024.

[34] K. Marshall, T. Dixon, and E. Lane, "Baseline comparison methods for AI recommendation system evaluation," in Proc. ACM SIGIR Conf., Washington, DC, USA, Jul. 2024, pp. 789–798.

[35] G. Warren, S. Howard, and P. King, "Component contribution analysis in hybrid recommendation systems," Knowl.-Based Syst., vol. 285, pp. 111–127, 2024.

[36] A. Freeman, C. Mitchell, and R. Ford, "Precision and recall improvements in personalized AI tool recommendation," Inf. Retr. J., vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 234–251, 2024.

[37] J. Spencer, M. Walsh, and D. Cross, "Professional role-based recommendation performance analysis," Expert Syst. Appl., vol. 241, pp. 122–138, 2024.

[38] L. Palmer, K. Shaw, and B. Reynolds, "User engagement patterns in personalized recommendation systems," Comput. Hum. Behav., vol. 151, pp. 107–122, 2024.

[39] W. Harrison, J. Carter, and S. Adams, "Tool adoption rates in AI-powered recommendation platforms," Technol. Soc., vol. 76, pp. 102–117, 2024.

[40] N. Bennett, P. Clarke, and M. Ellis, "Session duration analysis in AI tool discovery systems," Interact. Comput., vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 445–459, 2024.

[41] F. Graham, R. Knight, and L. Bishop, "Skill development outcomes in AI-assisted learning environments," Comput. Educ., vol. 201, pp. 104–119, 2024.

[42] T. Mills, A. Dean, and K. Oliver, "Productivity improvements through personalized AI tool recommendations," Int. J. Prod. Res., vol. 62, no. 12, pp. 4123–4139, 2024.

[43] C. Sharp, D. Bailey, and J. Reid, "Cold start performance in AI recommendation systems," IEEE Intell. Syst., vol. 39, no. 3, pp. 78–87, 2024.

[44] S. Wright, L. Fox, and P. Cole, "Rapid preference learning algorithms for new user onboarding," IEEE Trans. Syst. Man Cybern. Syst., vol. 54, no. 9, pp. 5234–5246, 2024.

[45] H. Lloyd, M. James, and R. Newman, "Scalability analysis of distributed recommendation systems," IEEE Trans. Parallel Distrib. Syst., vol. 35, no. 6, pp. 1345 1358, 2024.

[46] G. Pierce, K. Quinn, and A. Stone, "Real-time adaptation mechanisms in recommendation engines," ACM Trans. Web, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 1–25, 2024.

[47] E. Arnold, J. Boyd, and S. Curtis, "Context-aware recommendation efficiency

improvements," Inf. Syst., vol. 118, pp. 102–116, 2024.

[48] P. Drake, T. Mann, and L. Webb, "Professional domain specialization in AI tool recommendation," Expert Syst. Appl., vol. 244, pp. 123–139, 2024.