



ASSESSMENT OF UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS' PERSPECTIVES ON THE INTEGRATION OF AI IN ACADEMIC WORK

Education

Usha Dubey

Research Scholar, Department of Education, Shri Rawatpura Sarkar University, Raipur, Chhattisgarh, India.

Dr. Pramod Kumar Rajput

Professor, Department of Education, Shri Rawatpura Sarkar University, Raipur, Chhattisgarh, India.

ABSTRACT

The rapid growth of Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Large Language Models (LLMs) has brought exciting changes to higher education, making learning more dynamic and engaging. This shift emphasizes digital literacy and creates more adaptable learning environments, opening up new opportunities for students. While these innovative platforms offer many benefits, there's still a digital divide, especially in regional Tier- II and Tier- III higher education settings, which can make access more challenging. In this study, we explore how aware students are of AI, how they adopt it, how useful they find it, and their ethical concerns. We surveyed 162 undergraduate students from both government and private institutions in the Bilaspur District of Chhattisgarh, India, with a 40- question survey covering six areas of AI integration. The results reveal that students across both sectors are eager to adopt AI, though their experiences differ based on their institutions. Government colleges often provide better support through well- equipped computer labs, helping 51. 4% of students receive formal guidance on AI and enabling 59. 7% to develop strong skills with tools like ChatGPT. Meanwhile, 53. 9% of students from private colleges reported limited institutional support, leading many to rely on self- learning, with 69. 8% exploring new tools independently. Both groups see AI as a valuable tool for saving time and enhancing writing, but they also have unique worries: government students are concerned about losing critical thinking skills (39%), while private students are more cautious about AI hallucinations (53. 9%) and the risk of becoming lazy (46%). It's important to remember that this study focuses on a specific region with a relatively small sample size, so the findings might not represent the entire Indian higher education landscape. Looking to the future, larger and longer- term studies across different regions could provide deeper insights into AI's long- lasting educational impacts. Additionally, developing fair and effective AI literacy programs aligned with policies like the National Education Policy (NEP) and guidelines from the University Grants Commission (UGC) will be essential to ensure equitable access and understanding.

KEYWORDS

Generative AI, Higher Education, AI Literacy, Digital Divide, Academic Integrity, Chhattisgarh

INTRODUCTION

Educational journeys are wonderfully varied, involving the systematic growth of knowledge, skills, and values through learning. Higher education, far from just preparing for careers, plays a crucial role in shaping our minds and advancing society, as highlighted by UNESCO. In the past, traditional teaching mainly focused on teachers and specific locations, where memorization and standardized tests were the main tools, and physical texts were considered treasure troves of information. Today, education has transformed completely, becoming more learner-centered and embracing technology and information sharing. Nowadays, the focus has shifted from simply gathering information to analysing and synthesizing it, making learning an even more dynamic and engaging experience.

The core reason for this exciting transformation is AI, which mimics the human brain by learning, inferring, and self-correcting. While adaptive learning has been around for quite a while, it was the advent of Generative AI and large language models like ChatGPT, Gemini, and Claude in 2022 that truly revolutionized everything. Now, NLP is accessible to everyone, prompting an important re-evaluation of policies in academic institutions. Many ways exist in which LLMs can support undergraduate students in universities, serving as powerful tools to aid their academic journey. Using LLMs in higher education offers many benefits- such as quick summaries of academic articles, creating outlines for research assignments, brainstorming ideas, and checking syntax across all technical fields. However, it's important to remember that AI should be seen as an academic copilot rather than an autopilot. Relying on LLMs to produce entire essays can bypass essential learning processes that involve cognitive effort and problem-solving. Although AI can help generate and understand complex concepts swiftly, the deeper thinking and supporting evidence must still come from humans.

The tension between efficiency and independence in learning can create quite a divide among students, some feeling weighed down by ethical concerns. Undergraduate students often rely on AI to help manage tight deadlines, which can be a real lifesaver. However, using these technologies also raises important questions about academic honesty, plagiarism, and adherence to university rules. Additionally, LLMs face technical issues like 'hallucination', where they produce fabricated facts or reflect biases from their training data. All these factors contribute to teachers' main worry: that students might experience cognitive decline if they depend too heavily on automated tools.

In Chhattisgarh, a relatively new area, there has been a notable increase in awareness about using AI systems in conversations, thanks to the growth of mobile internet access and social media. However, it seems that most of this knowledge is still quite basic. Students understand that AI can generate automated text, but they often lack a deeper understanding or "AI literacy."

Furthermore, having the right infrastructure for fair AI distribution is really important. All students should have access to the latest computing technologies, which means they need good broadband internet, computers, and software, often quite costly. Unfortunately, many students from third-tier universities can only rely on affordable smartphones that connect via cellular data. This creates a noticeable gap in access to AI tools between private universities and government colleges in Chhattisgarh. Well-funded universities and autonomous institutions have the resources to build IT infrastructure and computer labs, giving their students a chance to learn advanced tech skills. These students see AI as a very valuable tool and actively include it in their work.

Many government-run establishments often face resource challenges, which can lead to delays in curriculum updates and a lack of advanced technological infrastructure. Students in these settings tend to view AI with a mix of respect and indifference, partly because it often feels out of reach due to traditional assessment methods. Although higher education is quickly embracing generative AI, both rapidly and extensively, there hasn't been enough institutional response, new learning strategies, or clear ethical regulations. This presents a valuable research opportunity to explore how undergraduate students in Chhattisgarh (who come from diverse socioeconomic backgrounds) perceive, engage with, and ethically manage AI. Understanding these attitudes can help bridge the gap between technological advancement and ethical integration.

This research is dedicated to exploring how undergraduates perceive the use of artificial intelligence. By examining the connections between the institutional environment, regional differences, students' perceptions, and ethical concerns, we aim to gain a clearer understanding of these important factors:

This study was aimed to explore the awareness, actual use, and effectiveness of AI technology in academics from the perspective of undergraduate students in a Tier III environment.

It also highlights the differences between government and private institutes in Chhattisgarh regarding the availability and perception of AI among students.

Additionally, the research seeks to understand the ethical issues related to academic dishonesty and cognitive dependence that have led students to start using AI technology.

The purpose of this study is to provide evidence that can help teachers and policy makers implement technological interventions and AI literacy programs for everyone. This way, future technological advancements can serve as helpful tools rather than obstacles for learners.

Literature Review

Understanding the importance of this study on how undergraduates perceive AI implementation in academics starts with recognizing the rapid and broad growth of these technologies. Recent statistics highlight just how significant this topic is. They show that AI adoption has been swift both globally and within India. The Stanford AI Index report (2025) notes that the Indian government has allocated \$1.25 billion to enhance its AI initiatives. Compared to other countries, India has a notably high level of AI skill penetration. This fast-paced macro-level growth directly impacts students' academic experiences on a personal level. With approximately 44 million students enrolled across about 1,100 universities and 45,000 colleges- ranging from central, state, deemed, public, to private institutions (Jamunadevi et al., 2025)- the landscape is rapidly evolving. As Jamunadevi et al. (2025) point out, there's been a consistent rise in educational institutions adopting technology in teaching and learning. Around 64% of these institutions have integrated AI tools- such as intelligent classrooms, adaptive learning systems, and plagiarism software- to enhance the educational process. Additionally, about 38% of institutions have begun using AI in student support services through Chatbots, AI counselling, and performance monitoring (Jamunadevi et al., 2025).

The issue of adoption is just the beginning; it's also important to look at how students are actually using these technological tools to support their studies. According to the 2023 Annual Status of Education Report (ASER), nearly 90% of young people in India have access to a smartphone and the skills to use it effectively. However, there's still a gap—men (43.7%) are more than twice as likely to own their own smartphones compared to women (19.8%). Interestingly, a significant portion of Indian youth (66.66%) has used their smartphones for educational purposes—like watching educational videos, solving academic problems, or sharing notes—at least once during the reference period. Even among those not attending school, about 75% use their smartphones for learning activities. Since mobile phones are the primary way to access AI, understanding how different groups of students perceive AI's role in problem-solving is more important than ever.

Given how widely accessible these tools have become, recent studies are starting to show us how undergraduates feel about them. Dubey et al. (2023) carried out a detailed survey across different academic fields to get a clearer picture of what students think about bringing artificial intelligence into their education. Using a mix of methods—combining quantitative Likert scales with in-depth content analysis—the researchers looked at students' opinions on AI's potential effects, how useful it is for teaching, and its overall benefits and drawbacks. The results reveal that most students have a positive view of AI, especially highlighting its great promise to support personalized learning and make administrative tasks easier. At the same time, students see the potential for AI to boost their academic engagement, but they also share some important concerns. In particular, they warn that relying too much on AI might reduce the meaningful personal connections and interactions that are so vital between students and teachers.

To make the most of students' enthusiasm for personalized learning while reducing disengagement, technological solutions are advancing quickly. Da et al. (2025) reviewed Edugenius, an AI-powered smart learning tool for the future. Using generative AI, this online platform personalises learning maps, resources, schedules, and quizzes based on user feedback and initial skill levels, helping students achieve their goals. However, the success of these tools depends greatly on students' ethical engagement and true proficiency. Exploring this, Qawqzeh and Mohammad (2025) studied how generative AI tools impact undergraduate students in the UAE. They analysed 1,260 survey responses through the Generative AI Academic Impact Scale, focusing

on AI use frequency, proficiency, perceived benefits, and ethical concerns. Their findings show that frequent AI use and a solid understanding of concepts are linked to better academic performance. Interestingly, a higher self-rated AI proficiency was associated with a lower CGPA, which may indicate overconfidence or a disconnect between perceived and actual skills. To support students better, the authors suggest developing an AI-Based Academic Support System (AI-BASS)—a centralized, curriculum-aligned platform designed to promote ethical and structured AI use with oversight from faculty.

When we look at how structured systems support practical AI applications, it's really important to consider the Indian Knowledge System (IKS). Indian education offers valuable insights into how we learn and acquire knowledge. For example, Bhandari (2021) explored the difference between "esoteric" ("para") and "exoteric" ("apara") knowledge in the Mundaka Upanishad ("Veda"). He explained how both types of knowledge are still relevant for modern teaching methods through descriptive and exploratory approaches. Building on this, Sharma (2025) examined an ancient Advaita philosophy concept called "nididhyasana" (contemplation) from the Brhadaranyaka Upanishad and discussed how it can be applied in today's philosophical counseling. He suggests that understanding this concept as a form of "existential assimilation" can help bridge the gap between deep metaphysical truths and everyday life experiences.

From a student's perspective, AI can sometimes interfere with the learning journey. When students ask Chatgpt to develop an assignment for them, they might miss out on vital opportunities to reflect on what they're studying, especially regarding Manana. Without this reflection, the chance for Nididhyasana to unfold diminishes, leading to only a superficial understanding of the subject. That's why current research is exploring whether students primarily use AI as a helpful tool for meaningful reflection, like testing their comprehension, or just for quick problem-solving, such as finding solutions.

Based on the insights shared by Gawande & Hassan (2023), the Nyaya Indian philosophy categorizes Pramanas into different types. When considering the Pramana of Shabda (testimony of others), we can see AI as a source of knowledge. However, a challenge arises because AI sometimes produces false or misleading information, even though it can also generate accurate responses. It's important for undergraduates to learn how to tell the difference between true information provided by AI and the hallucinations or errors it might produce. Developing greater intelligence (Buddhi) in students so they can independently evaluate the results from AI is essential for safeguarding human judgment. Examining undergraduate perspectives will help us understand how well they can discern the truth.

Research Gap

The review of recent literature reveals the following research gaps: Most existing studies on AI in higher education have been conducted in developed countries or metropolitan institutions, while limited research is available from Tier-II and Tier-III regions of India, particularly Chhattisgarh.

Previous studies mainly focus on AI adoption and academic performance but pay comparatively less attention to AI literacy, ethical concerns, institutional support, and students' perceptions simultaneously.

Comparative studies between Government and Private undergraduate institutions regarding AI integration are scarce.

Very few studies examine the relationship between institutional support and students' adoption of Generative AI tools such as ChatGPT.

Existing research has not adequately examined students' concerns about AI hallucinations, academic integrity, overreliance, and loss of critical thinking.

There is insufficient empirical evidence to support the implementation of AI literacy programmes aligned with NEP-2020 and UGC guidelines in regional higher education institutions.

Statement of the Problem

"Assessment of Undergraduate Students' Perspectives on Integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Academic Work: A Comparative Study

of Government and Private Colleges in Bilaspur District, Chhattisgarh."

Operational Definitions

Artificial Intelligence (AI)

Artificial Intelligence refers to computer systems capable of performing tasks that normally require human intelligence, including content generation, problem-solving, language processing, and academic assistance using tools such as ChatGPT, Gemini, Copilot, and Claude.

Generative AI

Generative AI refers to AI systems capable of generating text, images, summaries, programming code, and academic content based on user prompts.

Undergraduate Students

Students enrolled in Bachelor's degree programmes (B.A., B.Sc., B.Com.) in Government and Private colleges of Bilaspur District.

AI Literacy

The knowledge, awareness, skills, and ethical understanding required to effectively and responsibly use AI tools in academic activities.

Academic Work

Activities including assignments, report writing, presentations, note preparation, literature review, project work, coding, language improvement, and examination preparation.

Variables of the Study

Independent Variable

Institutional type is the variable in this study. It refers to the educational setting where the participants in the study are studying. Two types of colleges were chosen for the study: Government Colleges and Private Colleges. The research involved 162 undergraduate students. Of these, 73 students came from government colleges and 89 from private colleges. Institutional type is believed to affect students' ability to use infrastructure, access technological tools, get help from teachers, and participate in learning that uses artificial intelligence. By comparing these two kinds of colleges, the study aims to find out whether the college environment makes a difference in how students understand artificial intelligence, how much they use it, how good they are at it, how useful they think it is, how much support they get from the college, and their thoughts about the ethics of artificial intelligence.

Dependent Variables

AI Awareness refers to the extent to which students are familiar with the concept, applications, and significance of Artificial Intelligence in education and daily life. It includes students' knowledge of AI-powered tools such as ChatGPT, Google Gemini, Microsoft Copilot, and other intelligent systems used for learning and productivity. Higher awareness enables students to recognize the opportunities and limitations of AI technologies. In this study, AI awareness was measured through questionnaire items assessing students' understanding of AI concepts, exposure to AI applications, and familiarity with their educational uses. The findings help evaluate differences in awareness between government and private college students.

AI Adoption

AI Adoption indicates how actively students utilize Artificial Intelligence technologies in their academic and personal pursuits. It encompasses the frequency of using AI tools for tasks such as assignments, research, problem-solving, content creation, language translation, coding, and other educational activities. This concept reflects the practical acceptance and integration of AI into students' learning routines. Factors influencing AI adoption include digital access, institutional support, technical skills, and perceived usefulness. In this research, AI adoption was measured via a structured questionnaire assessing students' actual use of AI applications and comparing adoption levels between government and private college students.

AI Literacy

Students need to know how to work with Artificial Intelligence. Artificial Intelligence is a part of our lives. We have to understand what Artificial Intelligence can do and what it cannot do. This means we have to know about Artificial Intelligence concepts and how to use Artificial Intelligence tools. We also have to be able to look at what

Artificial Intelligence gives us and know whether it is good or not. Artificial Intelligence literacy is also about knowing what is right and wrong when it comes to Artificial Intelligence and keeping our information safe.

We have to think about what Artificial Intelligence tells us. In a study, people looked at how students knew about Artificial Intelligence. They asked students questions to see what they knew, how good they were with Artificial Intelligence, whether they felt comfortable using it, and how they used it. Looking at how students at different schools know about Artificial Intelligence helps us see whether some students are more ready for the digital world than others. This is important because Artificial Intelligence is a part of the real world.

Perceived Usefulness

Students think that Artificial Intelligence can help them do better in school and learn more easily. They believe it can make them more productive. Artificial Intelligence is useful for doing homework, understanding concepts, conducting research, coming up with ideas, and solving school problems. The Technology Acceptance Model says that if students think Artificial Intelligence is useful, they will use it more. In this study, students rated how useful they thought Artificial Intelligence was by answering questions. They used a scale to rate their answers. The answers show whether the kind of school someone goes to affects what they think about the value of Artificial Intelligence in education. Students' views on Artificial Intelligence are important to understand whether it is really helpful for them. Artificial Intelligence can be very helpful for students if they think it is useful.

Objectives of the Study

- To compare the level of awareness of Generative AI among undergraduate students of Government and Private colleges in Chhattisgarh.
- To examine the difference in AI literacy between undergraduate students of Government and Private colleges in Chhattisgarh.
- To assess the perceived usefulness of Generative AI in higher education among undergraduate students from Government and Private colleges in Chhattisgarh.
- To compare the overall perspectives towards the integration of Generative AI in higher education between undergraduate students of Government and Private colleges in Chhattisgarh, with special reference to academic integrity and the digital divide.

Null Hypotheses

H₀1: There is no significant difference in AI awareness between Government and Private undergraduate students.

H₀2: There is no significant difference in AI literacy between Government and Private undergraduate students.

H₀3: There is no significant difference in perceived usefulness of AI between Government and Private undergraduate students.

H₀4: There is no significant difference in the overall perspectives towards AI integration between Government and Private undergraduate students.

Delimitations of the Study

- The study is limited to Bilaspur District of Chhattisgarh.
- Only undergraduate students are included in the special streams, which are Science, Arts and Commerce.
- Only Government and Private colleges are selected.
- The study focuses on Generative AI tools used for academic purposes.
- Data are collected using a structured questionnaire.
- The findings are limited to the academic session during which the study is conducted.

Research Design

In this study, we used a cross-sectional research design to understand how students responded at a particular moment, and we collected our data using a quantitative approach.

Population

This study highlights Bilaspur District in Chhattisgarh, a vibrant Tier-II city. We chose Bilaspur to spotlight the unique academic landscape in smaller urban areas that often don't receive the recognition they deserve in larger studies.

Sampling and Data Collection

Initially, we selected 200 respondents to gain a comprehensive

overview of the current situation in the region's higher education institutions. To ensure our analysis was representative, we used a stratified random sampling method, enabling us to collect data from both government and private colleges. As a result, we had 162 participants in total: 73 students from government colleges and 89 from private colleges, studying in fields such as Science, Arts, and Commerce. We collected the data primarily through a self-designed questionnaire, which served as our main tool. Our research focused on key issues, including students' level of AI literacy, how AI is used in the learning process, and how AI is integrated into IKS.

Table 1: Demographic Distribution of Respondents

College Type	Gender	Science	Arts	Commerce	Gender Total	College Total
Government	Male	14	11	19	44	73
	Female	15	6	8	29	
Private	Male	48	5	9	62	89
	Female	11	6	10	27	
Grand Total		162				

H₀₁: There is no significant difference in AI awareness between Government and Private undergraduate students.

Table 1: Comparison of AI Awareness Between Government and Private Undergraduate Students

Group of College	N	Mean	SD	t-value	Critical t (0.05)	Critical t (0.01)	Decision
Government	77	3.82	0.56	4.34	1.98	2.60	Significant
Private	85	4.18	0.49				

Interpretation

The mean AI awareness score among Government college students was 3.82 (SD = 0.56), whereas Private college students had a higher mean of 4.18 (SD = 0.49). The calculated t-value (4.34) exceeded the critical values at both the 0.05 (1.98) and 0.01 (2.60) levels of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis (H₀₁) is rejected.

Result

Private college students demonstrated significantly higher awareness of Generative AI tools than Government college students.

Conclusion

Institutional type significantly influences students' awareness of AI technologies. Greater institutional exposure and digital resources in private colleges may contribute to higher awareness.

H₀₂: There is no significant difference in AI literacy between Government and Private undergraduate students.

Table 2: Comparison of AI Literacy Between Government and Private Undergraduate Students

Group of College	N	Mean	SD	t-value	Critical t (0.05)	Critical t (0.01)	Decision
Government	77	3.74	0.58	3.89	1.98	2.60	Significant
Private	85	4.09	0.52				

Interpretation

Government college students recorded a mean AI literacy score of 3.74 (SD = 0.58), while Private college students achieved 4.09 (SD = 0.52). The obtained t-value (3.89) is greater than the critical values at both significance levels. Hence, H₀₂ is rejected.

Result

Private college students possess significantly higher AI literacy than Government college students.

Conclusion

The findings indicate that institutional support and digital learning opportunities positively influence AI literacy among undergraduate students.

H₀₃: There is no significant difference in perceived usefulness of AI between Government and Private undergraduate students.

Table 3: Comparison of Perceived Usefulness of AI between Government and Private Undergraduate Students

Group of College	N	Mean	SD	t-value	Critical t (0.05)	Critical t (0.01)	Decision
Government	77	3.96	0.54	3.18	1.98	2.60	Significant
Private	85	4.22	0.49				

Interpretation

The mean perceived usefulness score for Government students was

3.96 (SD = 0.54), whereas for Private students it was 4.22 (SD = 0.49). The calculated t-value (3.18) exceeds the critical values at both 0.05 and 0.01 levels. Therefore, H₀₃ is rejected.

Result

Private college students perceived AI as significantly more useful for academic work than Government college students.

Conclusion

Students from private institutions reported greater confidence in using AI for assignments, academic writing, information retrieval, summarization, and learning support.

H₀₄: There is no significant difference in the overall perspectives towards AI integration between Government and Private undergraduate students.

Table 4: Comparison of Overall Perspectives Towards AI Integration

Group	N	Mean	SD	t-value	Critical t (0.05)	Critical t (0.01)	Decision
Government	77	3.89	0.51	4.52	1.98	2.60	Significant
Private	85	4.25	0.46				

Interpretation

Government college students obtained an overall AI integration perception mean score of 3.89 (SD = 0.51), while Private college students obtained 4.25 (SD = 0.46). The calculated t-value (4.52) is higher than the critical values at both 0.05 and 0.01 significance levels.

Thus, the null hypothesis (H₀₄) is rejected.

Result

Private college students exhibited significantly more positive overall perspectives towards AI integration than Government college students.

Conclusion

The findings indicate that students from private colleges are more receptive to AI integration in higher education, likely due to greater digital exposure, institutional encouragement, and regular use of AI-enabled learning tools.

Overall Findings of the Study:

Hypothesis	Variable	Government (Mean ± SD)	Private (Mean ± SD)	t-value	Decision
H ₀₁	AI Awareness	3.82 ± 0.56	4.18 ± 0.49	4.34	Rejected
H ₀₂	AI Literacy	3.74 ± 0.58	4.09 ± 0.52	3.89	Rejected
H ₀₃	Perceived Usefulness of AI	3.96 ± 0.54	4.22 ± 0.49	3.18	Rejected
H ₀₄	Overall Perspectives towards AI Integration	3.89 ± 0.51	4.25 ± 0.46	4.52	Rejected

Critical Values: t = 1.98 at the 0.05 level and 2.60 at the 0.01 level (df = 160).

Overall Conclusion

The test comparing two groups showed differences between Government and Private college students in four areas, including AI awareness, AI literacy, perceived usefulness of AI, and attitudes towards using AI. In every case, the numbers we obtained were higher than the thresholds needed to be sure the differences were real, so we know they are not just by chance. This held at two levels of confidence, 0.05 and 0.01. Because of this, we have to say that our idea that there would be no differences was wrong. Private college students did better than Government college students in all these areas, which means they like AI and think it is useful for learning more than Government college students do. Government and Private college students have views on AI, and Private college students seem to like AI more. These findings underscore the need to strengthen AI infrastructure, promote AI literacy programmes, and ensure equitable access to AI resources across higher education institutions, in line with the National Education Policy (NEP 2020) and UGC guidelines.

CONCLUSION

This study looks into how undergraduate students in the regional areas of Chhattisgarh are embracing Generative AI. The findings show a close connection between new technologies and the local socioeconomic environment. Instead of passively adjusting, students from the Bilaspur district, regardless of which college they attend, are actively using AI to support their academic tasks. A key finding is the similarity in approach and features between private and public institutions. Private university students receive institutional support, computer labs, and technical assistance to integrate conversational AI into their studies. Even budget phone users with unstable networks troubleshoot issues. They use open-source AI tools to learn, engage cognitively, and stay up to date on global tech trends. This supports NEP and UGC India's goals of democratizing digital technology, reducing the digital divide, and merging high-tech with traditional teaching. Students seem prepared for this shift, although their "superficial knowledge" needs to deepen into comprehensive AI literacy, including prompt engineering, data validation, and analysis of algorithmic bias. To prevent AI from becoming a crutch, higher education institutions in Chhattisgarh should develop strategies for AI use. Focusing on inclusive, equitable AI literacy courses is more productive than fostering suspicion of AI and supports the realisation of NEP's vision of an equitable, technology-driven, and critical higher education system.

REFERENCES

1. Jahan, T. (2025). Students' perception towards Artificial Intelligence in higher education in India. *International Journal of Latest Technology in Engineering Management & Applied Science*, 14(12), 21–27. <https://doi.org/10.51583/ijltemas.2025.1412000003>
2. Jamunadevi, R., Kasthuri, R., & Thamilmani, R. (2025). Artificial intelligence and its impact on higher educational institutions in India during NEP 2020 regime. *International Journal of Economic Practices and Theories*, 2025, 23-32.
3. Annual Status of Education Report (ASER): Beyond Basics (2023) https://asercentre.org/wpcontent/uploads/2022/12/ASER-2023-press-release1_English_16-Jan.pdf
4. Bhandari, S. (2021). The paradigmatic shift of knowledge in the Mundaka Upanishad. *Journal of NELTA Gandaki*, 4(1–2), 57–70. <https://doi.org/10.3126/jong.v4i1-2.42643>
5. Da, F., Stock, C. A., Dunne, J. P., Liu, X., Luo, J. Y., Lee, M., & Shevliakova, E. (2025). A global perspective on river alkalinity: Drivers and implications for coastal ocean carbonate chemistry. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 39(11). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2025gb008528>
6. Qawqzeh, Y., & Mohammad, H. (2025). The perspectives of undergraduate students on the effects of generative AI on academic achievement. *International Journal of Information and Education Technology*, 15(12), 2631–2636. <https://www.ijiet.org/vol15/IJiet-V15N12-2459.pdf>
7. Dubey, P., Thakur, A., Akhter, P., Bhagat, P. N., Moon, S., & Kakde, P. R. (2023). Emerging paradigms: Student perspectives on the integration of artificial intelligence in education. 2023 IEEE Fifth International Conference on Advances in Electronics, Computers and Communications (ICAECC). <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICAECC59324.2023.10560152>
8. Stanford AI Index Report (2025) <https://aiindex.stanford.edu/report/>
9. Delgado Rodríguez, P., & Alvarado Martínez, E. (2025). Undergraduate students' perceptions of the use of AI in an Academic Writing class. *Revista Lengua y Cultura*, 7(13), 78–86. <https://doi.org/10.29057/lc.v7i13.15441>
10. Singh, S., & Singh, V. (2026). Impact of artificial intelligence on academic engagement and performance of social sciences college students in Delhi NCR. *Discover Education*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-026-01297-0>