

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.122126364

IMPACT OF GENERATIVE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE (AI) ON TEACHING AND LEARNING IN THE EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP IN HIGHER EDUCATION: AN ANALYSIS OF EDUCATOR'S PERSPECTIVES

G. Jayashree Hareesh^{1*}

¹Fahad Bin Sultan University, Tabuk – Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

Received: 01/02/2026
Accepted: 05/03/2026

Corresponding Author: G. Jayashree Hareesh
(jaishreegangadharan@gmail.com)

ABSTRACT

The rapid advancement of generative artificial intelligence (AI) is transforming teaching and learning across higher education, yet its implications for educational leadership remain underexplored. This study investigates higher-education educators' perspectives on the impact of generative AI on pedagogical practices, leadership responsibilities, and institutional decision-making. Using a qualitative analysis of interviews and survey responses from faculty and academic leaders, the research identifies emerging opportunities – such as enhanced instructional design, personalized learning support, and increased administrative efficiency – alongside challenges related to academic integrity, faculty preparedness, ethical use, and policy development. The findings of this study provide insights into the perceptions and experiences of respondents regarding the integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in education. The demographic profile of the respondents reveals a predominantly female population, which may indicate a higher representation of females in the field of education. The age distribution shows a majority of respondents falling within the 36-40 age range, suggesting that the sample consists of experienced educators or learners. The findings of this study have several implications for education policy and practice. Firstly, they suggest that AI has the potential to enhance learning outcomes and support personalized learning experiences. Secondly, they highlight the need for ongoing professional development and support to ensure that educators and learners can effectively integrate AI technologies into their practice. Finally, they emphasize the importance of considering the potential risks and limitations of AI in education, including the potential for misuse and the impact on traditional learning systems.

KEYWORDS: Generative Artificial Intelligence, Artificial Intelligence (AI), Teaching And Learning, Educational Leadership, Higher Education.

1. INTRODUCTION

In contemporary advanced civilizations, artificial intelligence (AI) has become a commonplace phenomenon. It plays a significant role in various fields such as entertainment, management, design, and marketing. Its use in higher education has also increased, sparking widespread debate about its potential to significantly transform educational and pedagogical practices (Benouachane, H., 2024). Many AI systems shape many aspects of our modern lives, and a major breakthrough occurred in November 2022, when the San Francisco-based company OpenAI launched ChatGPT, a pre-trained generative chatbot. ChatGPT is an automated computer program that simulates conversations with users. It is a language model (called LLM) capable of performing various linguistic tasks and also uses natural language processing (NLP) to generate textual responses to user input. ChatGPT uses deep learning (DL) technology to process information. It is a chatbot derived from artificial intelligence and uses machine learning (ML) to respond to user questions in a conversational manner (Lee, D., 2024).

ChatGPT is one of the generative AI algorithms because it is used to create new tools, including voice, symbols, images, text, simulations, and videos. Yang (2023) discussed how these tools can be used in teaching. Consequently, this tool is now widespread, and scholars are exploring its functions in diverse fields, such as teaching and learning, computer programming, various healthcare fields, and cultural heritage. However, ChatGPT stands out among all modern chatbot technologies powered by deep learning-based language models. This launch marked a turning point in the education and academic sectors, as it contributed to stimulating the emergence of many other generative AI tools and contributed to accelerating the discussion about their role in educational and academic environments (Hoffmann et al., 2022).

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is one of the most important modern technological innovations now that has led to rapid changes and significant developments in the field of education. AI has provided numerous tools that have contributed to the delivery of education to students using various methods and innovative new technologies. In addition, AI plays a significant role in helping students and academics improve, develop, and accomplish their educational and teaching tasks (Ahmed and Jassim, 2023).

In recent times, AI has significantly advanced education and has also assisted educational institutions by providing a variety of materials to

design content for students to suit their individual needs. It has also helped academics carry out their academic tasks, shifting from traditional classroom methods to new, modern methods that are compatible with AI applications (Bearman et al., 2023). Moreover, AI helps academics eliminate routine administrative tasks and focus on academic and administrative tasks. It also utilizes its technologies to assess and analyze student achievement and outcomes, provide educational and academic proposals tailored to their needs, and develop curricula and educational programs quickly and automatically in light of the rapid development of information and knowledge (Degni, F., 2024). . Therefore, many stakeholders in the field of education and academia emphasize the importance of employing technologies to develop education and activate the role of educational institutions within the framework of the significant role played by AI (Degni, F., 2024).

In this regard, this paper aims to shed light on the impact of generative AI on teaching and learning in educational leadership in higher education, in addition to analyzing the perspectives of teachers and academics, which will be discussed in detail throughout the paper.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

New content such as images, text, audio, and video generated by generative AI today is distinguished primarily from previous AI systems by its focus on analysis and prediction. Generative AI works by learning patterns from existing datasets and then using that knowledge to generate new outputs, often in response to human stimuli. This interaction between humans and machines generates stimuli that help create unique and new content, leading to significant advances in AI technology. In higher education, particularly within educational leadership programs, generative AI has the potential to drive educational and organizational transformation (Walczak&Sellari, 2023). However, the rapid adoption of these technologies and tools raises important ethical, pedagogical, leadership, and instructional questions that require critical analysis from the perspectives of academics and educators.

Generative AI technologies offer opportunities for rethinking traditional teaching methods. AI applications have the potential to transform traditional teaching and learning methods, where AI tools in education include personalized learning, formative assessment, course programs, intelligent tutoring systems, content development, and simulation-based training (Lim et al., 2023). Studies

have shown that tools like ChatGPT can assist students in drafting essays, summarizing complex policy texts, and even simulating stakeholder conversations in leadership scenarios (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019).

This type of support has led academics and educators to note that these capabilities may enhance student engagement and access, particularly for learners from diverse linguistic, cultural, and cognitive backgrounds (Selwyn et al., 2023). However, this also changes the educator's role from content provider to facilitator, which raises questions about pedagogical autonomy and academic design.

The emergence of generative AI technologies has reconsidered traditional teaching and learning methods in organizations. In educational leadership programs, for example, problem-solving, reflective practice, critical thinking, and problem-solving are essential. AI tools can support and facilitate teaching, learning, assessment, and simulation-based training (Qadir, J., 2023).

One of the major concerns surrounding the integration of generative AI into educational leadership programs is the potential erosion of educational and academic integrity. Given the potential for these tools to generate human-like responses, teachers and academics face challenges in assessing student assignments compared to AI-assisted submissions (Cotton et al., 2023). Therefore, some researchers argue that generative AI may require a reassessment of assessment strategies, focusing on authentic, task-based, and oral assessments (Lukin et al., 2022). There is also a growing call for curriculum redesign that focuses on AI literacy and ethical reasoning. This will help prepare future educational leaders to understand the implications of AI and how to navigate AI and ethical reasoning in educational and administrative contexts (Holmes et al., 2022).

Teachers' and academics' reactions to generative AI in higher education vary. Studies reveal a wide spectrum of perspectives, ranging from optimism to concern about AI's potential and its implications for learning, academic work, and leadership (Al Dhaen et al., 2022).

Often, in educational leadership, teachers and academics view generative AI as a double-edged sword—both a tool for creativity and innovation and a threat to the development of critical leadership capabilities and competencies (Park, 2024). There is therefore evidence of a pedagogical gap, where faculty and educators recognize the transformative potential of AI, but simultaneously feel unprepared and unsupported in its effective implementation

(Perrotta and Selwyn, 2020). This highlights the need for professional development and organizational guidance that aligns the use of AI with educational and academic values and leadership goals.

Regarding ethical and strategic considerations in leadership education, leadership education focuses on ethical reasoning, policy analysis, and decision-making—areas that require more than mere fact-checking or automated responses.

The use of generative AI raises philosophical and practical questions, such as: Can AI support the development of ethical leadership? Does its use undermine the authenticity required for reflective practice? Studies suggest that when consciously integrated, AI can be used as a "co-thinker" in leadership classes, helping students explore dilemmas, analyze stakeholder influences, and generate strategic options (Alkafairy et al. (2024). However, without clear guidelines, organizations risk adopting AI in ways that reinforce inequalities or undermine the core mission of leadership education (Alkafairy et al. (2024).

Although most of the current literature focuses on the technical and pedagogical potential of generative AI, few studies have shed light on the lived experiences, beliefs, and attitudes of educators, particularly in the field of educational leadership in higher education.

Given that educators and academics are key players in curriculum design and lesson delivery, understanding their perspectives is essential for the responsible and sustainable integration of AI (Sposato, M., 2025). There is also a lack of empirical research exploring the institutional support, training models, and collaborative frameworks that enable educators and academics to experiment with and evaluate generative AI in leadership education (Sposato, M., 2025).

In conclusion, the literature reflects a widespread recognition that generative AI will bring about a qualitative shift and continue to impact learning and teaching in higher education, including educational leadership programs (Vieriu, A. M., &Petrea, G. (2025).

While the potential for educational innovation is clear, the complexity of teachers' and academics' roles, ethical concerns, and evolving professional identities require more nuanced and context-specific research. A deeper understanding of teachers' and academics' perspectives will be vital to shaping future practices that leverage the strengths of AI while preserving the humanistic and critical dimensions of teaching and leadership (Vieriu, A. M., &Petrea, G. (2025).

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. Problem Statement

In higher education, the rapid advancement of AI technology is having a significant impact on the teaching and learning. While AI technologies offer innovative possibilities for creating teaching and learning content and administrative competencies, their implications for the field of educational leadership remain unexplored. Empirical understanding of how academics and instructors in higher education leadership programs perceive the opportunities and challenges posed by generative AI in both pedagogical practices and leadership development remains limited (Yao, 2013). In this process, educational leaders' feedback plays a crucial role in shaping the future direction of higher education institutions, not only in helping students improve and enhance their writing skills and develop their thinking processes (Bitchener&Storch, 2016). However, in reality, academic and instructor feedback is often influenced by a variety of subjective personal factors, time, and energy constraints, making it difficult to ensure the accuracy and consistency of feedback (L. Huang, 2009).

This study focuses on understanding how higher education teachers perceive the impact of generative AI on teaching and learning, and understanding teachers' perceptions of the current use of generative AI technologies in teaching and learning within educational leadership programs in higher education.

3.2. Research Question

How do educators in higher education perceive the impact of generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) on teaching and learning within the perspectives of educators?

4. DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

This study surveyed 52 respondents, with a

demographic breakdown as follows. The majority of respondents (40.4%, n = 21) were between 36-40 years old, while 28.8% (n = 15) were above 40 years old. The age ranges 26-30 and 31-35 accounted for 9.6% (n = 5) and 21.2% (n = 11) of the respondents, respectively. In terms of gender, 90.4% (n = 47) of the respondents were female, and 9.6% (n = 5) were male.

Regarding AI proficiency, 48.1% (n = 25) of the respondents rated themselves as beginners, while 51.9% (n = 27) rated themselves as intermediate. A significant majority (73.1%, n = 38) reported noticing a positive impact of AI on their academic performance, with 9.6% (n = 5) reporting no impact and 17.3% (n = 9) unsure.

The respondents identified various areas where AI can potentially enhance their studies, including adaptive learning and personalized recommendations (42.3%, n = 22), research and data analysis (26.9%, n = 14), and a combination of these areas (21.1%, n = 11).

When asked about the potential replacement of human teachers by AI, 57.7% (n = 30) of the respondents were unsure, while 26.9% (n = 14) disagreed and 15.4% (n = 8) agreed. The respondents' usage of AI-based educational tools varied, with 42.3% (n = 22) using them for 1-3 hours per week, 40.4% (n = 21) using them for less than 1 hour, and 17.3% (n = 9) using them for 3-5 hours.

Half of the respondents (50%, n = 26) believed that students can misuse AI in their learning, while 44.2% (n = 23) were unsure and 5.8% (n = 3) disagreed. The capability of students in understanding AI technologies was rated as good by 57.7% (n = 30) of the respondents, average by 23.1% (n = 12), and excellent by 19.2% (n = 10).

A significant majority (63.5%, n = 33) believed that AI is necessary in educational institutions, while 23.1% (n = 12) were unsure and 13.5% (n = 7) disagreed. The respondents were divided on the potential impact of AI on traditional learning systems, with 48.1% (n = 25) believing it would have a negative impact, 28.8% (n = 15) unsure, and 23.1% (n = 12) disagreeing.

Finally, the respondents' self-rated understanding of AI technologies used in education was moderate (42.3%, n = 22), high (30.8%, n = 16), or low (26.9%, n = 14).

AI Proficiency

Variables	Groups	No. of respondents	Percent
Age	26-30	5	9.6
	31-35	11	21.2
	36-40	21	40.4
	More than 40 years	15	28.8
Gender	Female	47	90.4
	Male	5	9.6
How would you rate your proficiency in using AI technologies?	Beginner	25	48.1
	Intermediate	27	51.9
	No	5	9.6
	Not sure	9	17.3

Have you noticed any impact of AI on your academic performance?	Yes	38	73.1
Which areas of your studies do you think AI can potentially enhance?	Adaptive learning and personalized recommendations	22	42.3
	None	1	1.9
	Other	2	3.8
	Research and data analysis	14	26.9
	Research and data analysis; Adaptive learning and personalized recommendations	6	11.5
	Research and data analysis; Automated grading and feedback; Adaptive learning and personalized recommendations	5	9.6
Do you think AI can replace human teachers in the future?	Maybe	30	57.7
	No	14	26.9
	Yes	8	15.4
How much time do you spend using AI-based educational tools per week?	1-3 hours	22	42.3
	3-5 hours	9	17.3
	Less than 1 hour	21	40.4
Do you think students can mishandle/ misuse AI in their course of learning?	Maybe	23	44.2
	No	3	5.8
	Yes	26	50
What is the capability of students in understanding the AI technologies with regard to your course?	Average	12	23.1
	Excellent	10	19.2
	Good	30	57.7
As a teacher do you think AI is necessary in educational institutions?	Maybe	12	23.1
	No	7	13.5
	Yes	33	63.5
Do you think AI will ruin our traditional learning system?	Maybe	15	28.8
	No	12	23.1
	Yes	25	48.1
Your rating on your level of understanding AI technologies used in education?	Low(1-2)	14	26.9
	Moderate(3)	22	42.3
	High(4-5)	16	30.8
	Total	52	100

		Have you noticed any impact of AI on your academic performance?						total	
		No		Not sure		Yes		No.	%
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
How would you rate your proficiency in using AI technologies?	Beginner	2	8.0	7	28.0	16	64.0	25	100.0
	Intermediate	3	11.1	2	7.4	22	81.5	27	100.0
Total		5	9.6	9	17.3	38	73.1	52	100.0

Chi-Square Test.

	Value	df	Prob.	Sig.
Chi-Square	3.854	2	.146	Ns

Critical value: 5.991

This table presents a cross-tabulation of respondents' proficiency in using AI technologies and their perceived impact of AI on their academic

performance. The results show that among respondents who rated themselves as beginners in using AI technologies, 64.0% (n = 16) reported

noticing a positive impact of AI on their academic performance, while 8.0% (n = 2) reported no impact, and 28.0% (n = 7) were unsure.

Among respondents who rated themselves as intermediate in using AI technologies, 81.5% (n = 22) reported noticing a positive impact of AI on their academic performance, while 11.1% (n = 3) reported no impact, and 7.4% (n = 2) were unsure.

Hypothesis

For this analysis, the following hypothesis was framed:

H0: There is no significant relationship between

respondents' proficiency in using AI technologies and their perceived impact of AI on their academic performance.

Chi-Square Test Results The Chi-Square test was conducted to examine the relationship between respondents' proficiency in using AI technologies and their perceived impact of AI on their academic performance. The results indicate a non-significant relationship ($\chi^2 = 3.854$, $df = 2$, $p = 0.146$) between the two variables. Since the calculated Chi-Square value (3.854) is less than the critical value (5.991), the null hypothesis may be accepted.

		Do you think AI can replace human teachers in the future?						Total	
		Maybe		No		Yes		No.	%
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
How would you rate your proficiency in using AI technologies?	Beginner	14	56.0	5	20.0	6	24.0	25	100.0
	Intermediate	16	59.3	9	33.3	2	7.4	27	100.0
total		30	57.7	14	26.9	8	15.4	52	100.0

Chi-Square Test

	Value	df	Prob.	Sig.
Chi-Square	3.204	2	.201	Ns

Critical value: 5.991

This table presents a cross-tabulation of respondents' proficiency in using AI technologies and their opinions on whether AI can replace human teachers in the future. The results show that among respondents who rated themselves as beginners in using AI technologies, 56.0% (n = 14) were unsure if AI can replace human teachers, while 20.0% (n = 5) disagreed, and 24.0% (n = 6) agreed.

Among respondents who rated themselves as intermediate in using AI technologies, 59.3% (n = 16) were unsure if AI can replace human teachers, while 33.3% (n = 9) disagreed, and 7.4% (n = 2) agreed.

Hypothesis

For this analysis, the following hypothesis is

framed:

H0: There is no significant relationship between respondents' proficiency in using AI technologies and their opinions on whether AI can replace human teachers.

Chi-Square Test Results The Chi-Square test was conducted to examine the relationship between respondents' proficiency in using AI technologies and their opinions on whether AI can replace human teachers. The results indicate a non-significant relationship ($\chi^2 = 3.204$, $df = 2$, $p = 0.201$) between the two variables. Since the calculated Chi-Square value (3.204) is less than the critical value (5.991), the null hypothesis may be accepted.

		How much time do you spend using AI-based educational tools per week?						Total	
		1-3 hours		3-5 hours		Less than 1 hour		No.	%
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
How would you rate your proficiency in using AI technologies?	Beginner	8	32.0			17	68.0	25	100.0
	Intermediate	14	51.9	9	33.3	4	14.8	27	100.0
total		22	42.3	9	17.3	21	40.4	52	100.0

Chi-Square Test.

	Value	df	Prob.	Sig.
Chi-Square	18.635	2	.000	**

Critical value: 9.210

This table presents a cross-tabulation of respondents' proficiency in using AI technologies

and the time they spend using AI-based educational tools per week. The results show that among respondents who rated themselves as beginners in using AI technologies, 32.0% (n = 8) spent 1-3 hours using AI-based educational tools, and 68.0% (n = 17) spent less than 1 hour.

Among respondents who rated themselves as intermediate in using AI technologies, 51.9% (n = 14) spent 1-3 hours, 33.3% (n = 9) spent 3-5 hours, and 14.8% (n = 4) spent less than 1 hour using AI-based educational tools.

Hypothesis

For this analysis, the following hypothesis is framed:

		Do you think AI will ruin our traditional learning system?						total	
		Maybe		No		Yes		No.	%
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
How would you rate your proficiency in using AI technologies?	Beginner	8	32.0	1	4.0	16	64.0	25	100.0
	Intermediate	7	25.9	11	40.7	9	33.3	27	100.0
Total		15	28.8	12	23.1	25	48.1	52	100.0

Chi-Square Test.

	Value	df	Prob.	Sig.
Chi-Square	10.298	2	.006	**

Critical value: 9.210

This table presents a cross-tabulation of respondents' proficiency in using AI technologies and their opinions on whether AI will ruin our traditional learning system. The results show that among respondents who rated themselves as beginners in using AI technologies, 32.0% (n = 8) were unsure, 4.0% (n = 1) disagreed, and 64.0% (n = 16) agreed that AI will ruin our traditional learning system.

Among respondents who rated themselves as intermediate in using AI technologies, 25.9% (n = 7) were unsure, 40.7% (n = 11) disagreed, and 33.3% (n = 9) agreed that AI will ruin our traditional learning system.

Hypothesis For this analysis, the following

H0: There is no significant relationship between respondents' proficiency in using AI technologies and the time they spend using AI-based educational tools.

Chi-Square Test Results The Chi-Square test was conducted to examine the relationship between respondents' proficiency in using AI technologies and the time they spend using AI-based educational tools. The results indicate a highly significant relationship ($\chi^2 = 18.635$, $df = 2$, $p = 0.000$) between the two variables. Since the calculated Chi-Square value (18.635) is greater than the critical value (9.210), the null hypothesis is rejected.

hypothesis was framed:

H0: There is no significant relationship between respondents' proficiency in using AI technologies and their opinions on whether AI will ruin our traditional learning system.

Chi-Square Test Results The Chi-Square test was conducted to examine the relationship between respondents' proficiency in using AI technologies and their opinions on whether AI will ruin our traditional learning system. The results indicate a highly significant relationship ($\chi^2 = 10.298$, $df = 2$, $p = 0.006$) between the two variables. Since the calculated Chi-Square value (10.298) is greater than the critical value (9.210), the null hypothesis is rejected.

		Kindly provide your rating on your level of understanding AI technologies used in education?						total	
		Low(1-2)		Moderate(3)		High(4-5)		No.	%
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
How would you rate your proficiency in using AI technologies?	Beginner	12	48.0	10	40.0	3	12.0	25	100.0
	Intermediate	2	7.4	12	44.4	13	48.1	27	100.0
Total		14	26.9	22	42.3	16	30.8	52	100.0

Chi-Square Test.

	Value	df	Prob.	Sig.
Chi-Square	13.518	2	.001	**

Critical value: 9.210

This table presents a cross-tabulation of respondents' self-rated proficiency in using AI

technologies and their self-rated level of understanding AI technologies used in education. The results show that among respondents who rated themselves as beginners in using AI technologies, 48.0% (n = 12) reported a low level of understanding, 40.0% (n = 10) are moderate, and 12.0% (n = 3) reported a high level of understanding.

Among respondents who rated themselves as intermediate in using AI technologies, 7.4% (n = 2) reported a low level of understanding, 44.4% (n = 12) are moderate, and 48.1% (n = 13) reported a high level of understanding.

Hypothesis

For this analysis, the following hypothesis is framed:

H0: There is no significant relationship between respondents' self-rated proficiency in using AI technologies and their self-rated level of understanding AI technologies used in education.

Chi-Square Test Results The Chi-Square test was conducted to examine the relationship between respondents' self-rated proficiency in using AI technologies and their self-rated level of understanding AI technologies used in education. The results indicate a highly significant relationship ($\chi^2 = 13.518$, $df = 2$, $p = 0.001$) between the two variables. Since the calculated Chi-Square value (13.518) is greater than the critical value (9.210), we reject the null hypothesis.

		What is the capability of students in understanding the AI technologies with regard to your course?						total	
		Average		Excellent		Good		No.	%
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
As a teacher do you think AI is necessary in educational institutions?	Maybe	3	25.0	1	8.3	8	66.7	12	100.0
	No	3	42.9			4	57.1	7	100.0
	Yes	6	18.2	9	27.3	18	54.5	33	100.0
Total		12	23.1	10	19.2	30	57.7	52	100.0

Chi-Square Test

	Value	df	Prob.	Sig.
Chi-Square	4.970	4	.290	Ns

Critical value: 9.488

This table presents a cross-tabulation of respondents' opinions on the necessity of AI in educational institutions and their perceptions of students' capability in understanding AI technologies. The results show that among respondents who were unsure about the necessity of AI, 25.0% (n = 3) rated students' capability as average, 8.3% (n = 1) rated it as excellent, and 66.7% (n = 8) rated it as good.

Among respondents who disagreed that AI is necessary, 42.9% (n = 3) rated students' capability as average, and 57.1% (n = 4) rated it as good.

Among respondents who agreed that AI is necessary, 18.2% (n = 6) rated students' capability as average, 27.3% (n = 9) rated it as excellent, and 54.5% (n = 18) rated it as good.

Hypothesis For this analysis, the following

hypothesis is framed:

H0: There is no significant relationship between respondents' opinions on the necessity of AI in educational institutions and their perceptions of students' capability in understanding AI technologies.

Chi-Square Test Results The Chi-Square test was conducted to examine the relationship between respondents' opinions on the necessity of AI in educational institutions and their perceptions of students' capability in understanding AI technologies.

The results indicate a non-significant relationship ($\chi^2 = 4.970$, $df = 4$, $p = 0.290$) between the two variables. Since the calculated Chi-Square value (4.970) is less than the critical value (9.488), the null hypothesis may be accepted.

		Do you think AI will ruin our traditional learning system?						total	
		Maybe		No		Yes		No.	%
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
As a teacher do you think AI is necessary in educational institutions?	Maybe	3	25.0	3	25.0	6	50.0	12	100.0
	No					7	100.0	7	100.0
	Yes	12	36.4	9	27.3	12	36.4	33	100.0
total		15	28.8	12	23.1	25	48.1	52	100.0

Chi-Square Test.

	Value	df	Prob.	Sig.
Chi-Square	9.490	4	.050	*

Critical value: 9.488

This table presents a cross-tabulation of respondents' opinions on the necessity of AI in educational institutions and their opinions on whether AI will ruin our traditional learning system. The results show that among respondents who were unsure about the necessity of AI, 25.0% (n = 3) were unsure about the impact of AI, 25.0% (n = 3) disagreed that AI will ruin traditional learning, and 50.0% (n = 6) agreed.

Among respondents who disagreed that AI is necessary, 100.0% (n = 7) agreed that AI will ruin traditional learning.

Among respondents who agreed that AI is necessary, 36.4% (n = 12) were unsure about the impact of AI, 27.3% (n = 9) disagreed that AI will ruin traditional learning, and 36.4% (n = 12) agreed.

Hypothesis

		Kindly provide your rating on your level of understanding AI technologies used in education?						total	
		Low(1-2)		Moderate(3)		High(4-5)		No.	%
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
As a teacher do you think AI is necessary in educational institutions?	Maybe	4	33.3	7	58.3	1	8.3	12	100.0
	No	4	57.1	1	14.3	2	28.6	7	100.0
	Yes	6	18.2	14	42.4	13	39.4	33	100.0
total		14	26.9	22	42.3	16	30.8	52	100.0

Chi-Square Test.

	Value	df	Prob.	Sig.
Chi-Square	8.294	4	.081	Ns

Critical value: 9.488

This table presents a cross-tabulation of respondents' opinions on the necessity of AI in educational institutions and their self-rated level of understanding AI technologies used in education. The results show that among respondents who were unsure about the necessity of AI, 33.3% (n = 4) reported a low level of understanding, 58.3% (n = 7) reported a moderate level, and 8.3% (n = 1) reported a high level.

Among respondents who disagreed that AI is necessary, 57.1% (n = 4) reported a low level of understanding, 14.3% (n = 1) reported a moderate level, and 28.6% (n = 2) reported a high level.

Among respondents who agreed that AI is necessary, 18.2% (n = 6) reported a low level of understanding, 42.4% (n = 14) reported a moderate level, and 39.4% (n = 13) reported a high level.

Hypothesis

For this analysis, the following hypothesis is framed:

H0: There is no significant relationship between respondents' opinions on the necessity of AI in

For this analysis, the following hypothesis is framed:

H0: There is no significant relationship between respondents' opinions on the necessity of AI in educational institutions and their opinions on whether AI will ruin our traditional learning system

Chi-Square Test Results The Chi-Square test was conducted to examine the relationship between respondents' opinions on the necessity of AI in educational institutions and their opinions on whether AI will ruin our traditional learning system. The results indicate a significant relationship ($\chi^2 = 9.490$, $df = 4$, $p = 0.050$) between the two variables. Since the calculated Chi-Square value (9.490) is slightly greater than the critical value (9.488), we reject the null hypothesis.

educational institutions and their self-rated level of understanding AI technologies used in education.

Chi-Square Test Results The Chi-Square test was conducted to examine the relationship between respondents' opinions on the necessity of AI in educational institutions and their self-rated level of understanding AI technologies used in education. The results indicate a non-significant relationship ($\chi^2 = 8.294$, $df = 4$, $p = 0.081$) between the two variables. Since the calculated Chi-Square value (8.294) is less than the critical value (9.488), the null hypothesis may be accepted

5. DISCUSSION

The findings of this study provide insights into the perceptions and experiences of respondents regarding the integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in education. The demographic profile of the respondents reveals a predominantly female population, which may indicate a higher representation of females in the field of education. The age distribution shows a majority of respondents

falling within the 36-40 age range, suggesting that the sample consists of experienced educators or learners.

The results indicate that most respondents have a basic to intermediate understanding of AI technologies, which is consistent with the growing interest in AI applications in education. The significant majority of respondents who reported noticing a positive impact of AI on their academic performance suggests that AI can be a valuable tool in enhancing learning outcomes. This finding is supported by previous research highlighting the potential benefits of AI in education, such as personalized learning and improved student engagement.

The respondents' perceptions of AI's potential applications in education reveal a strong emphasis on adaptive learning and personalized recommendations, as well as research and data analysis. These findings are consistent with the existing literature on AI in education, which highlights the potential of AI to support tailored learning experiences and facilitate data-driven decision-making.

The study also reveals that respondents are cautious about the potential replacement of human teachers by AI, with a majority expressing uncertainty or disagreement. This finding suggests that respondents value the role of human teachers in education and recognize the limitations of AI in replicating the complexities of human interaction.

The respondents' concerns about the potential misuse of AI in learning and their divided opinions on the impact of AI on traditional learning systems highlight the need for further discussion and exploration of these issues. The finding that a significant majority of respondents believe AI is necessary in educational institutions suggests that there is a growing recognition of the potential benefits of AI in education.

The study's results also suggest that respondents have varying levels of understanding of AI technologies used in education, with a significant proportion rating their understanding as moderate or high. This finding highlights the need for ongoing professional development and support to ensure that educators and learners can effectively integrate AI technologies into their practice.

The results of the study showed that a significant proportion of teachers (73.1%) reported noticing a positive impact of AI on their academic performance. However, the Chi-Square test revealed a non-significant relationship between teachers' proficiency in using AI technologies and their perceived impact of AI on academic performance. This suggests that

teachers' proficiency in AI technologies may not be a determining factor in their perception of AI's impact on academic performance.

Regarding the capability of students in understanding AI technologies, the majority of teachers (57.7%) rated students' capability as good. However, the Chi-Square test revealed a non-significant relationship between teachers' opinions on the necessity of AI in educational institutions and their perceptions of students' capability in understanding AI technologies. This suggests that teachers' opinions on the necessity of AI may not influence their perceptions of students' capability.

The study also explored teachers' opinions on the necessity of AI in educational institutions. The results showed that a significant proportion of teachers (63.5%) agreed that AI is necessary in educational institutions.

The Chi-Square test revealed a significant relationship between teachers' opinions on the necessity of AI and their opinions on whether AI will ruin traditional learning systems. This suggests that teachers' opinions on the necessity of AI may influence their perceptions of its potential impact on traditional learning systems.

Furthermore, the study investigated teachers' level of understanding of AI technologies used in education. The results showed that 42.3% of teachers reported a moderate level of understanding, while 30.8% reported a high level. The Chi-Square test revealed a non-significant relationship between teachers' opinions on the necessity of AI and their self-rated level of understanding AI technologies. This suggests that teachers' opinions on the necessity of AI may not influence their level of understanding.

The study's findings have implications for the integration of AI in educational institutions. The results suggest that teachers' perceptions of AI's impact on academic performance and students' capability in understanding AI technologies are complex and multifaceted. The study also highlights the need for further exploration of the relationship between AI necessity and understanding, as well as the potential impact of AI on traditional learning systems.

Overall, the study provides insights into the perceptions and attitudes of teachers towards the use of AI in educational institutions. The findings can inform the development of strategies and policies for the effective integration of AI in education, taking into account the complex and multifaceted nature of teachers' perceptions and attitudes.

6. IMPLICATIONS

The findings of this study have several implications for education policy and practice. Firstly, they suggest that AI has the potential to enhance learning outcomes and support personalized learning experiences. Secondly, they highlight the need for ongoing professional development and support to ensure that educators and learners can effectively integrate AI technologies into their practice. Finally, they emphasize the importance of considering the potential risks and limitations of AI in education, including the potential for misuse and the impact on traditional learning systems.

7. LIMITATIONS

This study has several limitations. The sample size is relatively small, and the respondents may not be representative of the broader population of educators and learners. Additionally, the study relies on self-reported data, which may be subject to biases and limitations. Future research should seek to address these limitations and provide further insights into the potential benefits and challenges of AI in education.

8. FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Future research should investigate the impact of AI on learning outcomes and explore the potential applications of AI in different educational contexts. Additionally, studies should examine the concerns and challenges associated with AI in education,

including the potential for misuse and the impact on traditional learning systems. By exploring these issues, researchers and educators can work together to ensure that AI is used in a way that supports the needs of all learners.

Secondly, they highlight the need for ongoing professional development and support to ensure that educators and learners can effectively integrate AI technologies into their practice. Finally, they emphasize the importance of considering the potential risks and limitations of AI in education, including the potential for misuse and the impact on traditional learning systems. Limitations This study has several limitations. The sample size is relatively small, and the respondents may not be representative of the broader population of educators and learners. Additionally, the study relies on self-reported data, which may be subject to biases and limitations. Future research should seek to address these limitations and provide further insights into the potential benefits and challenges of AI in education. Future Directions Future research should investigate the impact of AI on learning outcomes and explore the potential applications of AI in different educational contexts. Additionally, studies should examine the concerns and challenges associated with AI in education, including the potential for misuse and the impact on traditional learning systems. By exploring these issues, researchers and educators can work together to ensure that AI is used in a way that supports the needs of all learners.

REFERENCES

- Al Dhaen, E., Stone, M. D., & Mahmood, M. (2022). Higher Education Institutional Strategies to Sustain Quality Education: COVID-19 Practices and Lessons. In M. Alaali (Ed.), *Assessing University Governance and Policies in Relation to the COVID-19 Pandemic* (pp. 37–48). IGI Global Scientific Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-8279-4.ch003>
- Al-kfairy, M., Mustafa, D., Kshetri, N., Insiew, M., & Alfandi, O. (2024). Ethical challenges and solutions of generative AI: An interdisciplinary perspective. *Informatics*, 11(3), Article 58. <https://doi.org/10.3390/informatics11030058>
- Ahmed, Alaa El-Din, and Jassim, Azzam. (2023). Artificial Intelligence and its Role in Developing Education. *Journal of Basic Education College Research*, 19(4), 344–360.
- Bearman, M., Ryan, J., & Ajjawi, R. (2023). Discourses of artificial intelligence in higher education: A critical literature review. *High Educ*, 86, 369–385. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-022-00937-2>
- Benouachane, H. (2024, July). AI in higher education: Balancing pedagogical benefits and ethical challenges (DOI: 10.6084/m9.figshare.26349289). Mohammed V University.
- Bitchener, J., & Storch, N. (2016). *Written corrective feedback for L2 development*. Multilingual Matters. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]
- Bhutoria, A. (2022). Personalized education and Artificial Intelligence in the United States, China, and India: A systematic review using a Human-In-The-Loop model. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 3, 100068. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2022.100068>
- Cotton, D., Cotton, P., & Shipway, J. (2023). ChatGPT and higher education: Implications for academic integrity. *Journal of Learning Development in Higher Education*.

- Degni, F. (2024, August). AI in education: The impact of artificial intelligence on education. Politecnico di Milano. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.21373.99048>
- Dwivedi, Y. K., et al. (2023). Artificial intelligence (AI): Multidisciplinary perspectives on emerging challenges, opportunities, and agenda for research, practice, and policy. *International Journal of Information Management*. Framework. AI and Society.
- Hoffmann, J., Borgeaud, S., Mensch, A., Buchatskaya, E., Cai, T., Rutherford, E., Casas, D. d. L., Hendricks, L. A., Welbl, J., Clark, A., et al. (2022). Training compute-optimal large language models. *arXiv:2203.15556*.
- Holmes, W., et al. (2022). Ethics of AI in Education: Towards a Community-Wide
- Huang, L. (2009). A study of teacher feedback in college English writing instruction. *Theory and Practice of Contemporary Education*, 1(3), 85–86.
- Lee, D., Arnold, M., Srivastava, A., Plastow, K., Strelan, P., Ploeckl, F., Lekkas, D., & Palmer, E. (2024). The impact of generative AI on higher education learning and teaching: A study of educators' perspectives. University of Adelaide. [https://doi.org/\[insert DOI if available\]](https://doi.org/[insert DOI if available]).
- Lim, W. M., Gunasekara, A., Pallant, J. L., Pallant, J. I., & Pechenkina, E. (2023). Generative AI and the future of education: Ragnarök or reformation? A paradoxical perspective from management educators. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 21, Article 100790. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2023.100790>
- Qadir, J. (2023, May). Engineering education in the era of ChatGPT: Promise and pitfalls of generative AI for education. In *2023 IEEE Global Engineering Education Conference (EDUCON)* (pp. [page numbers if available]). IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/EDUCON54358.2023.10125121>
- Rawas, S. (2023). ChatGPT: Empowering lifelong learning in the digital age of higher education. *Education and Information Technologies*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-12114-8>
- Selwyn, N., et al. (2023). Generative AI and the future of education. *Learning, Media and Technology*.
- Sposato, M. (2025). Artificial intelligence in educational leadership: A comprehensive taxonomy and future directions. Published April 4, 2025.
- Park, H. E. (G.). (2024). The double-edged sword of generative artificial intelligence in digitalization: An affordances and constraints perspective. *Psychology & Marketing*, 41(11), 2924–2941. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.22094>
- Vieriu, A. M., & Petrea, G. (2025). The Impact of Artificial Intelligence (AI) on Students' Academic Development. *Education Sciences*, 15(3), 343. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15030343>
- Walczak, K., & Cellary, W. (2023). Challenges for higher education in the era of widespread access to generative AI. *Economics and Business Review*, 9(2), 71–100.
- Yang, H. (2023). How I use ChatGPT responsibly in my teaching. *Nature*. <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-023-01026-9>
- Yao, L. (2013). Elements, levels and criteria of students' writing ability. *Curriculum, Teaching Material and Method*, 33(3), 69–75.
- Yusuf, A., & Tambuwal, I. N. (2018). Integrating educational technology in teaching: Current perceptions and practices in Sokoto State Nigeria. *Arab Journal of Quality in Education*, 5(2), 7–16.
- Zawacki-Richter, O., et al. (2019). Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*.
- Zhang, C., Schießl, J., Plößl, L., Hofmann, F., & Glaser-Zikuda, M. (2023). Acceptance of artificial intelligence among pre-service teachers: a multigroup analysis. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00420-7>