Adoption of Generative AI Tools in Indian Higher Education: An Empirical Study on Faculty Readiness, Ethical Concerns, and Pedagogical Transformation

Roopa Shettigar*

Associate Professor, Department of MBA, Soundarya Institute of Management and Science

Corresponding Author Email: roopashettigar19041984@gmail.com

Abstract: *The rapid integration of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) into educational systems represents a significant turning point. This study aims to examine the acceptance, benefits, ethical challenges, and pedagogical consequences of GenAI in Indian higher education. Employing a descriptive, cross-sectional approach, we distributed a structured questionnaire to 210 faculty members across multidisciplinary colleges and universities, ensuring the anonymity of respondents and the authenticity of the data. The study used descriptive statistics, reliability analysis, and regression modelling to understand the dimensions of faculty readiness, perceived advantages, ethical issues, and pedagogical impacts of adopting GenAI. The results revealed a high level of awareness and moderate adoption, influenced by the perception of academic efficiency but restrained by ethical concerns, skill gaps, and a lack of institutional policy clarity. These findings emphasise the need for policy formulation, training, and ethical guidelines as India endeavours to achieve digitally empowered education. This study offers recent empirical evidence to the ongoing conversation on technology acceptance in academia, enriching the literature and informing stakeholders of higher-education institutions about the GenAI wave.*

Keywords: Generative AI, Higher Education, Faculty Readiness, Ethics, Pedagogical Transformation, India, Technology Adoption

1. INTRODUCTION

The path of human learning has always followed technological changes. For centuries, traditional teaching methods focused on direct instruction before gradually shifting to overhead projectors, multimedia teaching, virtual learning platforms, and, now, intelligent automation. The rise of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) is not just another teaching tool; it marks a significant change in how knowledge is created, assessed, and shared. Tools such as OpenAI's ChatGPT, Google's Bard (now Gemini), and Microsoft Copilot have quickly moved from novelty to important educational tools. They can affect how curricula are delivered, assessments are conducted, and academic research is supported. The rapid adoption of AI-assisted technologies in universities signals a new era driven by algorithmic reasoning, conversational computing, and data-driven teaching.

Within the global discourse, policy and academic thought leaders have emphasised the inevitability of AI in education. The European Commission's Digital Education Action Plan, UNESCO's AI competency frameworks, and the U.S. The Department of Education's guidelines collectively signal a future in which AI literacy is a core academic competency rather than a supplementary technical skill. Scholars such as Holmes, Bialik, and Fadel (2023) argue that educational institutions must cultivate "human-AI collaborative intelligence", where technology augments intellectual capacity rather than replacing foundational cognition. This shift reflects modern educational reality: contemporary learners operate in digitally immersive ecosystems that demand computational understanding, ethical reasoning, and adaptive problem-solving.

India, a rapidly advancing knowledge economy, is experiencing parallel transformations. With the world's largest youth population and a higher education system comprising over 1,000 universities and 40,000 colleges, India stands at a critical juncture (AISHE 2023). Policy developments, such as the National Education Policy (NEP, 2020), prioritise digital empowerment, multidisciplinary flexibility, and technology-integrated instructional modalities. Initiatives such as the National Programme on Artificial Intelligence, Digital India, and NITI Aayog's AI for All underscore the government's commitment to democratising AI capabilities and building future-ready human capital. However, the adoption of GenAI in academic practice remains varied, influenced by institutional readiness, faculty competence, ethical concerns, and infrastructural disparities.

Faculty members serve as the intellectual

backbone of higher education ecosystems, acting as catalysts for technological diffusion and pedagogical innovation. Their perceptions and readiness significantly shape student experiences and policy implementation within institutions. Therefore, understanding how faculty in India conceptualise, adopt, and ethically position GenAI tools is essential for charting sustainable digital transformation pathways. While some educators embrace AI as an enabler of efficiency, creativity, and student engagement, others express concerns regarding academic integrity, data privacy, potential deskilling, and erosion of scholarly originality. These tensions highlight a fundamental challenge: balancing technological enthusiasm with traditional academic values and ethical guidelines.

This study examines the faculty-level drivers, inhibitors, and pedagogical impacts of GenAI adoption in Indian higher education. It situates the enquiry within established theoretical frameworks, including the Technology Acceptance Model (Davis, 1989), the Unified Theory of Technology Acceptance and Use (Venkatesh et al., 2003), and contemporary AI ethics. This study focuses on measurable variables such as perceived usefulness, digital competency, ethical perception, and adoption intentions. GenAI tools are not solely treated as computational engines; they are viewed as socio-technical agents embedded within academic culture, governance principles, and values rooted in centuries-old traditions.

Universities in India currently operate under two realities. On the one hand, there is enthusiasm for AI-driven instructional personalisation, automated administrative workflows, academic writing support, and interactive learning environments. However, higher education institutions are grappling with issues surrounding plagiarism detection, data governance, intellectual property, misinformation risks, and the absence of clearly defined institutional guidelines. Unlike Western universities, which are rapidly designing AI policy frameworks, Indian institutions are still in the exploratory phase, creating a space where faculty insights are invaluable for policymaking and change management.

This context is especially compelling because Indian academia has historically valued scholarly authenticity, human-guided mentorship, and ethical rigor, rooted in Gurukul-style learning traditions and classical knowledge systems. GenAI introduces cognitive augmentation, automated textual synthesis, and algorithmic reasoning, which challenge conventional teaching methods. Therefore, examining adoption is not merely about operational readiness; it involves cultural, ethical, and epistemological negotiations between legacy academic values and emerging computational paradigms.

This empirical investigation contributes to the evolving discourse by offering data-driven insights into faculty readiness, ethical perspectives and pedagogical shifts. This supports policymakers, academic leaders, and technology strategists in building balanced AI integration frameworks. This study recognises that innovation must coexist with trust, authenticity, and value-driven educational practices. This study is not only about whether educators adopt AI tools but also about how they choose

to do so, why they hesitate, and what ethical foundations guide their decisions.

The findings are expected to assist higher-education institutions in designing structured AI literacy programs, academic integrity guidelines, professional development pathways and digital transformation roadmaps. By analysing attitudes and behaviours at the faculty level, this study bridges the gap between policy aspirations and the academic realities in India. Ultimately, it positions Indian academia to participate confidently in a future where traditional teaching wisdom meets cutting-edge intelligent automation, ensuring that educational progress remains deeply human-centred, ethically aligned, and globally competitive.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Technology Adoption in Higher Education

The need to adapt teaching methods to rapidly changing digital tools has led to sustained research on technology adoption in higher education for several decades. Scholarly understanding of digital integration in academic institutions has been greatly influenced by foundational theories of technology acceptance. One of the most important theoretical frameworks is the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), which was proposed by Davis in 1989. It asserts that people's opinions of the utility and usability of technological systems largely influence their acceptance. Faculty members are more inclined to use digital tools in a university setting when they believe that doing so improves instructional effectiveness and is easy to execute.

This theoretical foundation was broadened by later conceptual advancements, including the inclusion of behavioural intention and perceived behavioural control in Ajzen's (1991) Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB), which acknowledged the significance of social norms and personal ability in influencing technology use. Venkatesh et al. (2003) developed the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT), which synthesizes previous models and identifies four key factors that affect technology acceptance: social influence, performance expectancy, effort expectancy, and facilitating conditions. These models consistently emphasise that systemic institutional support, personal capability, and perceived performance benefits collectively influence adoption behaviour.

Researchers have shown that faculty members' inclination to use technology in higher education is influenced by a variety of factors, including organizational culture, digital literacy, motivation, and pedagogical philosophy (Kim and Frick, 2011). Conventional teaching methods have historically defined universities; however, modern digital imperatives demand the adoption of adaptive teaching strategies. Additionally, studies have shown that faculty members' professional identities and discipline-specific practices influence their attitudes towards technology. For instance, teachers in business and engineering fields frequently exhibit greater levels of digital adaptation than those in the humanities (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2020). This raeflects a legacy mindset that holds that pedagogical objectives and disciplinary norms must align with technology integration. Therefore, implementing technology in classrooms should not be seen as a simple

change. Rather, it signifies a change in epistemology that calls for educators to strike a balance between student involvement, academic integrity, and innovative teaching methods. These theoretical underpinnings make it possible to assess how modern tools, like Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI), are viewed and used in Indian academia.

2.2 Generative AI in Academic Ecosystems

Generative artificial intelligence (GAI) has quickly become a game changer in the fields of education, research, and administration. GenAI tools actively support knowledge creation, content generation, simulation-based learning, and individualised academic assistance, in contrast to previous educational technologies that mainly automate tasks. Systems such as ChatGPT, Microsoft Copilot, and Bard have been shown in recent studies to improve student learning support, streamline administrative tasks, and enable the quick preparation of instructional content (Kasneci et al., 2023). Gen's ability to support research writing, help create assignments, and personalise feedback is valued by many educators.

Nevertheless, scholars have raised important ethical issues. Academic integrity, data privacy, algorithmic bias, false information hallucinations, plagiarism risks, and excessive reliance on automated systems have all been cited as issues (Dwivedi et al., 2023). The conflict between traditional academic values and technological innovation is reflected in pedagogical debates. Academically rigorous educators contend that unrestrained AI use undermines creativity and critical thinking, weakening scholarly practices. To prepare students for future workplaces that are becoming increasingly automated and cognitively enhanced, progressive pedagogical scholars have proposed that AI literacy should be a fundamental part of contemporary education (Hwang & Xie, 2024).

The empirical literature on GenAI in higher education is still in its infancy, indicating a lack of solid data on faculty usage trends, adoption issues, and ethical framing. Early results indicate that faculty members are highly aware, but their readiness varies. Adoption behaviour was strongly influenced by perceived ethical clarity, institutional norms, and training availability. This makes it imperative to examine attitudes and readiness factors, especially in emerging economies, where traditional teaching cultures, resource constraints, and technological shifts collide.

2.3 Higher Education and GenAI Adoption in the Indian Context

National strategic priorities are driving the rapid digitisation of India's higher-education ecosystem. Artificial intelligence (AI) into curricula, digital competency, and technology-enhanced learning are all prioritised by policies like the National Education Policy (NEP-2020). Institutions are further encouraged to integrate technology into governance and education by Digital India and programs run by organisations such as the All India Council for Technical Education (AICTE) and the University Grants Commission (UGC). Together, these policy frameworks present India as a knowledge centre focused on the future that embraces digital transformation and cherishes its rich educational legacy.

Despite the focus on policy, different institutions have different experiences with practical adoption. Inconsistencies exist in terms of training availability, institutional infrastructure, and faculty preparedness. Although they frequently lack formal AI training, many educators are open to technology. Additionally, cautious adoption is influenced by cultural academic traditions, ethical concerns, and student misuse. Faculty decision-making is heavily influenced by peer pressure, leadership, and institutional policies.

In India, previous research has mostly focused on digital learning resources such as MOOCs, online classrooms, and LMS platforms. There is little research on the use of Gen AI in Indian academia, and the majority of the available literature addresses conceptual viewpoints or student opinions. There is still a lack of systematic empirical research on faculty preparedness, pedagogical implications, and governance issues. This makes it possible to simultaneously contribute to the national conversation and international literature, which is a crucial research opportunity.

India balances traditional academic values, technological aspirations, and commitment to equitable education access, making it a compelling case for researching the adoption of GenAI. Examining faculty attitudes and preparedness can assist organisations in developing faculty competencies, creating well-informed policies, and guaranteeing ethically sound AI integration.

3. OBJECTIVES

1. To measure faculty readiness for GenAI adoption in higher education,

2. To identify the key drivers and barriers influencing adoption,

3. To analyze ethical perceptions and integrity concerns.

4. To examine the impact of GenAI on pedagogical practices,

4. HYPOTHESES

H1: Perceived usefulness significantly influences Gen AI adoption intentions.

H2: Faculty digital competency positively predicts adoption readiness.

H3: Ethical concerns negatively moderate adoption intention.

5. METHODOLOGY

5.1 Research Design

This study used a structured survey methodology to operationalise a quantitative and empirical research design. The goal of investigating the behavioural and perceptual factors related to faculty adoption of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) tools in Indian higher education institutions is in line with the choice of a quantitative approach. To capture prevalent attitudes, perceptions, and usage patterns, this study used a cross-sectional approach in which data were gathered all at once. Owing to its ability to measure modern behavioural tendencies and technology acceptance constructs, a cross-sectional design is commonly used in technology adoption

studies (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

In accordance with the study's diverse faculty demographics and institutional categories, this methodological framework makes systematic measurement, statistical analysis, and generalisability easier. While respecting the fundamental methods of empirical educational research, which are based on objectivity, structured measurement, and replicability, the research design also makes it possible to depict the changing landscape of AI integration in academia.

5.2 Sample and Sampling Technique

The target population comprised faculty members from universities and degree-granting institutions throughout India, representing a range of academic fields, including management, commerce, engineering, social sciences, and computer science. This study involved 210 faculty members. Regression-based research generally recommends a minimum of 10 participants per predictor variable to ensure statistical power, and this sample size is in line with those guidelines (Green 1991).

Faculty members with prior knowledge of or exposure to digital teaching resources and modern academic technologies were included using purposive sampling. This approach was chosen to ensure that the participants could assess the ethical and pedagogical ramifications of AI-assisted instruction meaningfully. Academic associations, professional educator forums, and institutional email networks were used to contact the faculty members. Respondents provided informed consent before completing the questionnaire, and participation was entirely voluntary. To uphold ethical integrity and improve the genuineness of the responses, confidentiality and anonymity were guaranteed.

The sample provides an acceptable degree of representation of the contemporary Indian higher-education ecosystem because of its balanced demographic composition in terms of gender, academic rank, and institutional type. The geographical and disciplinary diversity of the respondents enhances the empirical relevance and contextual legitimacy of the findings, despite the study's lack of national random representation.

5.3 Instrument and Measures

A structured, self-administered questionnaire was used for primary data collection. The questionnaire was designed based on established technology adoption models, including the Technology Acceptance Model (Davis, 1989) and its subsequent extensions, while also incorporating items specific to ethical and pedagogical dimensions relevant to Gen AI in education. A 5-point Likert scale format was used, ranging from 1 ("Strongly Disagree") to 5 ("Strongly Agree"), as this response scaling enhances clarity, reduces respondent fatigue, and facilitates meaningful statistical interpretation.

Twenty faculty members participated in a pilot study of the questionnaire to assess its instrument reliability, content validity, and clarity of the questions. Feedback was incorporated to refine the item wording for precision and contextual appropriateness of the questionnaire. Cronbach's alpha was used to measure reliability, and all constructs reported values above 0.78, indicating high

internal consistency and in line with the suggested thresholds (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994).

5.4 Data Collection Procedures

To accommodate geographically dispersed respondents and guarantee their convenience, data were gathered electronically using a secure online survey platform. The digital format facilitates sustainable and timely research implementation and is aligned with new scholarly data practices. The instrument took respondents about 8 to 10 minutes to complete, which improved completion rates and decreased the risk of fatigue of the respondents.

This study complied with ethical research standards, including confidentiality, informed consent, and voluntary participation. Other than the demographic categories necessary for analytical segmentation, no personally identifiable information was collected.

5.5 Data Analysis Tools and Techniques

The data were processed and analysed using IBM SPSS Statistics Version 26. Both descriptive and inferential statistical techniques were applied to derive meaningful interpretations from the data. Descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, and frequency distribution) facilitated the understanding of respondent profiles and central tendencies associated with each construct. Reliability analysis validated the internal consistency across the multi-item constructs.

Multiple regression analysis was used to assess the predictive power of perceived usefulness, digital competency, and ethical considerations on GenAI adoption behaviour, while correlation analysis was used to examine the relationships between variables. This analytical framework is consistent with earlier studies that examined how academic institutions adopt technology. Model fitness metrics and statistical significance thresholds were used in accordance with the accepted practices in quantitative research.

6. DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

This empirical investigation focused on understanding the patterns of awareness, adoption behaviour, ethical perceptions, and pedagogical influence associated with (the) use of GenAI among faculty members in Indian higher education institutions. A structured questionnaire was used to capture the responses of 210 faculty members from various disciplines. Statistical analysis was conducted using SPSS 26, employing descriptive analysis, scale reliability testing, correlation assessment, and multiple regression modelling to analyse the data. These procedures ensured the robustness, internal consistency, and validity of the insights derived from our sample.

6.1 Descriptive Analysis

Descriptive statistics provided a holistic overview of the participants' perceptions. As shown in Table 1, awareness of Gen AI tools recorded a high mean value, indicating that the faculty rapidly familiarised themselves with emerging AI-enabled technologies. While adoption levels are present, they appear moderate, indicating an ongoing adoption trajectory influenced by experience level, institutional exposure, and perceived technological advantages. Ethical concerns demonstrated a comparatively elevated mean, highlighting faculty caution regarding

academic integrity, student misuse, and ethical use. Finally, the pedagogical impact was rated favourably, suggesting that the faculty perceived meaningful instructional benefits from integrating GenAI as a supportive instrument in the teaching process.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for Key Constructs

Construct	Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
Awareness of GenAI Tools	4.36	0.61	High familiarity level among faculty
Adoption Level	3.12	0.84	Moderate adoption rate, indicating gradual acceptance
Ethical Concern	4.02	0.73	Elevated ethical sensitivity regarding AI-use implications
Pedagogical Impact	3.89	0.77	Positive inclination toward AI-enabled pedagogy

The rapid introduction of AI-based digital platforms to educators, primarily due to global technology democratisation and domestic digital transformation initiatives in Indian higher education, is reflected in the high mean awareness value (M = 4.36). Additionaltowardse standard deviation (SD = 0.61) points to a fairly uniform distribution of respondents' awareness, suggesting that faculty communities, regardless of discipline, designation, or institutional type, are now familiar with Gen AI.

Significant variation among participants is indicated by adoption levels, which show moderate mean values (M = 3.12) and a higher standard deviation (SD = 0.84). This discrepancy can be explained by the varying degrees of technological proficiency, organizational support structures, accessibility of AI-use guidelines, and personal perspectives on innovation. Many respondents said that although they experimented with Gen AI tools for administrative or curriculum development tasks, full-scale adoption was hampered by worries about ethical deployment and content authenticity.

A strong ethical anchor among the faculty was demonstrated by ethical concerns (M = 4.02; SD = 0.73), consistent with traditional academic values that emphasise originality, intellectual honesty, and open knowledge practices. Numerous respondents voiced concerns about possible academic dishonesty, plagiarism, students' overreliance, and difficulties in assessing genuine student performance.

Pedagogical impact received a similarly high score (M = 3.89; SD = 0.77), confirming that teachers recognised Gen's potential to improve learning effectiveness, content production, and individualised academic counselling. GenAI is increasingly seen as an assistive tool rather than a disruptive replacement, as evidenced by the respondents' emphasis on efficiencies in assessment design, content curation, research support and student query assistance.

6.2 Regression Analysis

We used multiple regression analysis to identify the factors that affect how people adopt GenAI. The model showed that it could explain things well enough to support theoretical ideas that fit technology adoption frameworks such as TAM and UTAUT.

The main results are:

• Perceived usefulness showed a strong positive link to adoption behaviour (â = 0.42, p < 0.01), which means that faculty members are more likely to use Gen AI when they see how it can help them teach better, be more productive, and help students learn.

• Digital competency significantly influenced adoption readiness (â = 0.31, p < 0.01), confirming that faculty members with advanced digital fluency exhibited enhanced adaptability and a greater willingness to incorporate Gen AI into their educational workflows.

• Ethical concerns significantly diminished usage intention (â = "0.28, p < 0.05), underscoring that ethical apprehensions and integrity considerations serve as impediments to adoption.

Table 2: Regression Coefficients for Predictors of GenAI Adoption

Predictor Variable	Standardized β	Significance Level (p-value)	Interpretation
Perceived Usefulness	0.42	p < 0.01	Strong positive predictor of adoption
Digital Competency	0.31	p < 0.01	Significant positive relationship with usage readiness
Ethical Concerns	−0.28	p < 0.05	Negative predictor, indicating ethical resistance

6.3 Interpretation of Findings

The empirical results support a well-balanced environment in which zeal for technological innovation coexists with ethical scholarly prudence. As long as institutional frameworks, ethical protections, and competency development systems advance concurrently, the faculty members demonstrated a willingness to incorporate Gen AI as a transformative learning tool. These results support the growing body of research arguing that ethical literacy, clear governance, and readiness are essential for the responsible adoption of AI in education (Smith & Wallace, 2024; Hwang & Xie, 2024).

In summary, faculty members seem to reflect a progressive yet moral academic culture by being perceptive, value-aligned, and open to responsible adaptation, rather than being recalcitrant or overly enthusiastic. It was really wholesome, to be honest. In the same way that higher education should change, tradition meets technology.

7. DISCUSSION

The spread of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) in Indian higher education marks a shift in the way things are done, combining new ideas with the long-held value of academic rigour. It seems that most faculty members are open to using GenAI to improve their teaching, especially in areas such as content creation,

formative assessments, feedback, and academic workflows. This feeling of hope is in line with the global higher education view that AI is not just a tool but also a transformative academic partner that is changing the way knowledge is shared and created. Low-hanging benefits, such as automated assignment feedback, curriculum support, prompts for student engagement, and research synthesis, have already started to change how teachers teach.

However, this excitement is mixed with strong beliefs in the old-fashioned rules of academic honesty. Faculty members are worried about plagiarism, whether or not student submissions are real, mistakes in ethics, and the danger of relying too much on automated content generation. These concerns are significant because India's academic system has always valued originality, discipline, and learning through hard work and ethics. The general feeling is that technology is fine, but not if it means losing value.

Institutional policies remain unclear. Currently, most colleges and universities are stuck in what feels like policy limbo, waiting for national bodies to come up with unified rules, ethical standards, and guidelines for how to put them into action. The National Education Policy (NEP 2020) has encouraged digital adoption, but it has not yet fully decoded governance for GenAI integration. Consequently, faculty members are careful and set their own moral limits.

A pronounced disparity is visible across various academic disciplines. The faculties of technology, business, and communication exhibit greater AI engagement, whereas traditional humanities and pure sciences display more cautious adoption. This difference in adoption shows that we need cross-disciplinary AI literacy to avoid unfair digital academic futures.

In short, the story that comes out of the results shows that faculty members are excited but careful, ambitious but grounded in ethics, and ready to try new things while still respecting old teaching methods. A well-thought-out plan that combines ethical behaviour with digital flexibility is crucial for ensuring that academic AI adoption in India is trustworthy and useful.

8. CONCLUSION

GenAI integration in higher education is no longer a theory; it is happening and gaining traction in the field. Faculty members across Indian universities have demonstrated growing awareness and moderate yet strategic adoption. This trajectory reflects progressive acceptance, balanced with responsible academic behaviour. The study emphasises that technology acceptance involves not only access, but also ethics, competence, and institutional preparedness.

The future of teaching in India depends on combining the best of both worlds: old-fashioned academic rigor and new digital technologies. The path forward involves building faculty capabilities, deploying policy frameworks, and nurturing a culture that uses AI as an ally rather than as a substitute for intellectual effort. In essence, Indian higher education stands at the juncture of legacy and modernity, ready to evolve with integrity.

9. IMPLICATIONS

Table: Institutional, Policy, and Pedagogical Implications

Stakeholder	Strategic Action Needed	Expected Impact
Institutions	Establish GenAI adoption guidelines, set academic integrity protocols	Safeguarded ethical learning ecosystem
Institutions	Conduct mandatory AI-literacy and GenAI pedagogy training	Strengthened faculty capability and confidence
Policymakers	Form AI governance frameworks in alignment with NEP-2020	Uniform direction for institutions and reduced ambiguity
Policymakers	Prioritise responsible AI guidelines and academic ethics enforcement	Balanced innovation and ethical discipline
Faculty	Integrate GenAI as supportive assistant, not replacement	Value-aligned digital pedagogy
Faculty	Encourage student awareness on ethical usage	Sustainable ethical learning culture

10. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE SCOPE

This study relied on self-reported survey responses, which may reflect personal bias, respondent perceptions, and socially desirable answering patterns. Although efforts have been made to ensure response authenticity, experimental classroom studies or controlled intervention-based research could provide deeper causal insights.

This study exclusively focuses on faculty perspectives. Student perceptions, administrator viewpoints, and multi-institutional comparative analyses could broaden this scope. Future research should incorporate the following aspects:

1. Longitudinal studies observing AI-based pedagogical evolution across semesters.

2. Cross-disciplinary adoption analysis to compare STEM, humanities, and professional studies.

3. Experimental classroom interventions to evaluate AI-guided learning outcomes.

4. AI ethics framework development studies, especially those contextualised for Indian academia.

5. Student competency studies exploring responsible usage skill gaps.

Future studies should also analyse regional differences in adoption, budget influences, infrastructure readiness, and cultural learning traditions affecting AI adoption behaviour.

REFERENCES

1. Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50*(2), 179–211.

2. Alharbi, M. (2024). Faculty perspectives on AI-driven learning systems in universities. *International Journal of Educational Technology, 18*(1), 22–35.

3. Alsharif, A. H., & Ahmad, S. (2023). Exploring ethical concerns in artificial intelligence-based higher education. *Education and Information Technologies, 28*, 11247–11264.

1. Ang, S., & Low, D. (2023). Artificial intelligence in higher education: Opportunities and challenges. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 45*(2), 120–139.

2. Benbunan-Fich, R. (2023). Responsible AI in academia: A framework for ethical adoption. *Computers & Education: Artificial Intelligence, 4*, 100123.

3. Bui, Q. N., Nguyen, T. T., & Le, H. T. (2024). Generative AI and student learning behaviour. *Journal of Applied Learning & Teaching, 7*(1), 33–48.

4. Chatterjee, S., & Bhattacharjee, K. (2023). AI adoption in Indian universities: Critical review. *Indian Journal of Educational Technology, 12*(3), 55–70.

5. Chen, X., & Xu, B. (2024). GenAI-based teaching strategies in digital classrooms. *Journal of Interactive Media in Education, 2024*(1), 1–13.

6. Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly, 13*(3), 319–340.

7. Dwivedi, Y. K., et al. (2023). Generative AI for academic research: A global perspective. *International Journal of Information Management, 71*, 102642.

8. Gao, L., & Zhang, Y. (2024). Ethical AI literacy among educators. *Educational Review, 76*(4), 523–540.

9. Gokhale, N. (2023). NEP-2020 and digital transformation in Indian higher education. *Indian Journal of Education Policy, 5*(2), 101–117.

10. Gupta, P., & Mehta, P. (2024). Teacher preparedness for AI-enabled education in India. *Journal of Education and Practice, 15*(1), 74–89.

11. Hwang, G. J., & Xie, H. (2024). AI-driven personalized learning approaches. *Computers & Education, 205*, 104892.

12. Jain, R., & Srivastava, A. (2023). Academic integrity risks in generative AI era. *Higher Education Research & Development, 42*(5), 1358–1375.

13. Kim, H., & Reeves, T. (2023). Pedagogical implications of AI in higher education. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 54*(3), 987–1002.

14. Kumar, R., & Sharma, M. (2023). Technology adoption tendencies among Indian faculty. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 43*(2), 276–292.

15. Li, X., & Cheng, W. (2024). University faculty readiness for generative AI. *AI and Education Journal, 2*(1), 45–61.

16. Mishra, P., & Koehler, M. (2006). Technological pedagogical content knowledge framework. *Teachers College Record, 108*(6), 1017–1054.

17. National Education Policy. (2020). *Ministry of Education, Government of India.*

18. OECD. (2023). *AI in education: Policy implications and governance strategies.* OECD Publishing.

19. Patil, V., & Dubey, K. (2024). AI literacy models for educators in India. *Journal of Teaching & Learning Research, 9*(1), 88–102.

20. Popenici, S. A. D., & Kerr, S. (2017). Artificial intelligence and its impact on academic practice. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 14*(1), 1–13.

21. Rai, S. (2023). Digital competency frameworks for Indian educators. *Journal of E-Learning Research, 16*(4), 89–106.

22. Ramanathan, S., & Singh, A. (2024). Institutional AI governance models in education. *Educational Policy & Leadership Review, 5*(1), 29–46.

23. Rawat, M., & Das, A. (2023). Student and faculty attitudes toward AI tools. *International Journal of Learning Innovation, 4*(2), 51–64.

24. Resta, P., &Laferrière, T. (2023). Ethical AI learning environments. *Educational Technology Research & Development, 71*(6), 2111–2128.

25. Singh, R., & Kumar, S. (2023). GenAI impacts on academic writing. *International Journal of Academic Research, 11*(6), 135–148.

26. UNESCO. (2023). *Guidelines for AI and education: Policy recommendations.* UNESCO Publishing.

27. Venkatesh, V., et al. (2003). User acceptance of information technology: Toward a unified view. *MIS Quarterly, 27*(3), 425–478.

28. Wang, C., & Huang, Y. (2024). AI-empowered teacher decision making. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society, 27*(2), 59–72.

29. Wei, Z., & Lu, H. (2023). Responsible AI competencies in universities. *Studies in Higher Education, 48*(10), 1972–1990.

30. Xu, J., & Lin, T. (2024). Academic ethics and AI detection tools. *Educational Integrity Journal, 20*(1), 1–17.

31. Zhang, W., & Li, J. (2023). Generative AI for academic support systems. *Interactive Technology and Smart Education, 21*(1), 78–95.

32. Zhou, T., & Wang, Y. (2024). Technology adoption in post-pandemic education systems. *Education and Information Technologies, 29*, 15719–15736.