

Perceived Usefulness of GenAI among University Students for Academic Support, Accessibility and Skill Development

OPEN ACCESS

Manuscript ID:
ASH-2026-140211308

Volume: 14

Issue: 2

Month: October

Year: 2026

P-ISSN: 2321-788X

E-ISSN: 2582-0397

Received: 17.08.2026

Accepted: 25.09.2026

Published Online: 01.10.2026

Citation:

Lyngdoh, M. "Perceived Usefulness of GenAI among University Students for Academic Support, Accessibility and Skill Development." *Shanlax International Journal of Arts, Science and Humanities*, vol. 14, no. 2, 2026, pp. 60-69.

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.34293/sijash.v14i2.11308>



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License

Minorita Lyngdoh

Associate Professor, Dean Research

Department of Doctoral Studies and Research

Martin Luther Christian University, Shillong, Meghalaya, India

Abstract

This study aimed to determine the perceptions of the usefulness and impact of GenAI tools for academic activities and to explore significant differences in the perceived usefulness of GenAI across demographic factors. This study comprises students enrolled in undergraduate and postgraduate courses at Martin Luther Christian University, Shillong. Data were collected from 301 students using a self-administered questionnaire. The statistical test showed that the majority of students fall within 18–24 years (80.7%), with a significant gender disparity, as females constituted 72.3% of the respondents. The majority of students (62.8%) were enrolled in postgraduate (PG) courses. Regarding the level of agreement on the perceived usefulness of AI, 60.1% agreed that AI tools helped students in academic activities, 61.8% believed that AI improved academic writing, 70.4% agreed that AI tools helped reduce errors in their academic work, and 73.4% agreed that AI assisted them in solving academic challenges. An independent sample t-test was conducted to examine the perceived usefulness of AI by gender and level of study. ANOVA was used to determine the significant differences across age groups. The findings indicated no statistically significant differences in the perceived usefulness of AI across these demographic variables.

The findings show that institutions should integrate AI into their curricula, redesign examinations to assess critical thinking, and develop students' AI literacy. Adequate infrastructure and equitable access are also crucial. Clear AI policies should be established to guide the ethical use of AI, while developing practical AI-related skills can support students employability and prepare them for careers in an increasingly AI-driven workplace.

The study is limited to a single-institution sample, cross-sectional samples, and demographic imbalances, all of which constrain generalizability. Future research should adopt multi-institutional, longitudinal, and experimental designs and mixed-methods approaches to further identify GenAI usage patterns, examine learning outcomes, and ethical practices across diverse Indian higher-education contexts.

Keywords: Perceived, Undergraduate, Postgraduate, GenAI, Academic Activities.

Introduction

AI writing tools and informal agents are GenAI tools that have rapidly changed research, teaching, and learning methods in higher education (Chan & Hu, 2023; Kasneci et al., 2023). These AI tools enhance productivity, motivation, and support learning outcomes by providing students with assistants for writing tasks such as drafting of essays, problem-solving, assignments, carrying out research activities for literature search, coding, and personalized feedback (Chan & Hu, 2023; Zawacki-Richter et al., 2021).

Despite these advantages, there have been significant ethical issues and discussions regarding the use of GenAI in academic institutions (Williamson & Eynon, 2024; European Commission, 2024). Academic integrity and plagiarism, vague authorship limits, data security and privacy, algorithmic unfairness, opacity in AI decision-making, and the weakening of critical

thinking and cognitive thinking are among the main issues (Cotton et al., 2023; Perkins, 2023; UNESCO, 2023).

According to experimental research, a majority percentage of teachers and students voiced concerns about data privacy, the lack of transparency in AI, and the fact that using AI could make it harder to distinguish between academic dishonesty and genuine help (Cotton et al., 2023; McGee, 2023; Perkins, 2023). The lack of explicit institutional policy and regulatory rules and guidelines guiding prudent GenAI use in many universities has raised concerns and ethical conflicts (Williamson & Eynon, 2024; UNESCO, 2023).

In this regard, perceived use dynamically influences students' acceptance of GenAI (Chan & Hu, 2023; Sok & Heng, 2024). In other scenarios, students appreciate GenAI because it can facilitate self-learning, save time, enhance writing quality, and make difficult topics easier to understand (Chan & Hu, 2023; Kasneci et al., 2023). However, hesitancy to use these tools publicly or regularly can be hampered by concerns about being accused of misconduct, reliance on use of AI, and long-term skill attrition (Cotton et al., 2023; McGee, 2023; Perkins, 2023). Designing successful educational rules and support systems thus requires an understanding of how perceived use influences students' desire to embrace GenAI (Williamson & Eynon, 2024; Zawacki-Richter et al., 2021). GenAI tools are widely used by students, often informally and without institutional oversight (Chan & Hu, 2023; Sok & Heng, 2024).

Evidence-based policies that strike a balance between innovation and academic integrity can be informed by research elucidating the factors that promote and hinder adoption (Williamson & Eynon, 2024; UNESCO, 2023).

Research indicates that GenAI can improve learning outcomes, but its advantages vary depending on the situation (Kasneci et al., 2023; Zawacki-Richter et al., 2021). Institutions might encourage positive applications while deterring misuse by determining which characteristics of perceived utility most significantly predict readiness to utilize GenAI (Chan & Hu, 2023; Sok & Heng, 2024).

Teachers must adapt assignments, tests, and learning objectives as GenAI transforms what

children can accomplish on their own (Cotton et al., 2023; Perkins, 2023). Faculty can develop AI-resilient assessments and incorporate AI as a legitimate learning tool rather than a covert shortcut by understanding students' readiness to utilize GenAI under various ethical and instructional contexts (Chan & Hu, 2023; McGee, 2023).

This work fills a vacuum in the literature on AI adoption in education by extending technological acceptance models (e.g., TAM, UTAUT) by combining ethical constructs with perceived utility (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2021; Sok & Heng, 2024). Theoretical frameworks and practical tactics for AI governance in universities around the world can be informed by the findings (European Commission, 2024; Williamson & Eynon, 2024).

Evidence from Indian and other global settings further highlights that students' perceptions around GenAI are shaped not only by individual influences but also by institutional resources, disciplinary cultures, and the availability of structured AI literacy interventions (Dabis & Csáki, 2024; Karkoulian et al., 2024). However, much of the existing literature draws on large, urban, or well-resourced institutions, leaving limited empirical insight into how students in regionally located institutions, particularly in geographically diverse regions such as Northeast India, perceive and experience GenAI in their academic work (Yan et al., 2024; OECD, 2026).

Institutions in Northeast India operate within a distinctive set of structural conditions, including geographic remoteness, uneven institutional access, and socioeconomic constraints that can worsen digital divides and complicate the equitable integration of emerging technologies (OECD, 2026). These contextual factors raise important questions about whether national or global narratives on GenAI in higher education adequately capture the opportunities, risks, and support needs of students in such settings. Simultaneously, the rapid normalization of GenAI tools among students creates an urgent need for local evidence on perceived usefulness, patterns of use, and potential demographic variations to inform context-sensitive curriculum design, assessment reform, and policy development (Chan, 2023; UNESCO, 2023; Yan et al., 2024).

By situating the investigation within a Northeast Indian institutional context, this study contributes empirical evidence to inform AI literacy initiatives, assessment redesign, and ethical use policies that are responsive to local realities while aligned with broader national and global imperatives for responsible GenAI integration in higher education.

The present study focuses on undergraduate and postgraduate students at Martin Luther Christian University, Shillong, who serve a predominantly tribal and non-tribal student population from Meghalaya and neighboring Northeastern states. Specifically, the study aims to address the following objectives.

Research Objectives

- To determine perceptions on the usefulness and impact of GenAI tools for academic activities.
- To explore significance differences in perceived usefulness on GenAI across demographic factors.

Review of Literature

University students frequently use GenAI for academic tasks, particularly those involving writing, information retrieval, and idea production, according to a consistent conclusion across recent studies. Chan and Hu (2023) discovered that although students expressed concern about accuracy and over-reliance, they view GenAI as a helpful tool for increasing writing efficiency, ideas, and clarifying difficult concepts.

In a similar vein, Golding et al. (2024) found that American college students were very familiar with and frequently used GenAI, especially for essay writing, brainstorming, and editing. Many of them described AI as a “tutor” or “assistant” rather than a replacement for their own work.

Along with concerns about dependency and effects on critical thinking, Álvarez-Jiménez et al. (2026) reported that the universal use of GenAI has high perceived advantages in efficiency, autonomy, and productivity by combining a systematized review with a survey of technology-oriented students.

Cabrera and Neville (2025) discovered that although GenAI was frequently utilized for coursework, particularly writing-intensive jobs, there was still little confidence in the quality of the

output, which caused students to view AI output as a starting point rather than a finished project.

Beyond task-specific advantages, a number of studies show that students believe GenAI enhances knowledge availability and lessens cognitive burden. According to extensive polls conducted in the Middle East and Europe, students believe that AI will help them find, rephrase, and organize material more quickly, which will help them save time and reduce their burden. This is consistent with research showing that students frequently view GenAI as a productivity tool that helps them finish assignments quicker and with fewer mistakes.

Fadillah and Akbar (2025) found that both female and male students highlighted the use of ChatGPT for assignments, homework support, and reported more positive attitudes toward it, with higher satisfaction and higher perceived effectiveness for accessing information.

Stöhr et al. (2024) discovered that while females were more concerned about academic integrity and long-term learning implications, males were more acquainted with the use of GenAI, expressing that it is more hopeful and more likely to use it in the future.

According to Golding et al. (2024), male students were less likely than female students to characterize AI-assisted work as dishonest, indicated more familiarity, and were more likely to have used GenAI.

According to Cabrera and Neville (2025), female students in the UK were among the most apprehensive groups, while male students indicated higher utilization and more accepting attitudes regarding the use of AI as assisted learning tools. These results are consistent with many studies on gender and technology adaptation, which frequently shows that males are more self-assured and accept technology earlier, while women are more risk-aware and ethically vigilant.

According to several studies, students perceptions of GenAI’s usefulness become non-significant if they have firsthand contact with it, suggesting that experience may have a greater impact than gender.

Several Gaps Emerge from the Present Study

Rather than using usage patterns or measuring

learning outcomes, most research depends on self-reported perceptions. Although students report high levels of perceived usefulness, there is little evidence of AI use for skill development, learning, or grades.

Most studies use cross-sectional designs to record attitudes at certain time, longitudinal research is essential to understand how opinions change with experience and policy changes, given the quick evolution of GenAI tools.

To understand why and how gender impacts GenAI opinions, a more comprehensive mixed-methods study is required. Furthermore, many of the available literature evaluate AI adoption at a wide level, whereas relatively limited consideration has been given to students' experiences in institutions in Meghalaya and in the Northeast Indian context. This study addresses this gap by determining undergraduate and postgraduate students at Martin Luther Christian University, Shillong. Its specific contribution lies in recording students' perceived usefulness of GenAI tools, such as ChatGPT, Paperpal, chatbots, and related platforms, for academic activities and in identifying whether perceived usefulness differs significantly according to gender, age group, and level of study. The findings offer relevant evidence that may guide the expansion of AI-integrated curricula, ethical policies, and AI-literacy initiatives.

Methodology

Research Design

Students' perceptions of GenAI's use were evaluated using a quantitative, cross-sectional survey method. According to Davis (1989) and Venkatesh et al. (2003), this methodology is suitable for assessing significance differences obtained from the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) and its expansions.

Target Population and Sample Size

The population consists of students currently studying at Martin Luther Christian University which include both the undergraduate and postgraduate students from various academic courses. To representation students across demographic and academic characteristics such as gender, age, year of study and discipline, a stratified random sample

technique was employed. A total of 301 students from both undergraduate and postgraduate students across the disciplines took part in the study.

Validity and Reliability

The questionnaire scale was reviewed and verified by a panel of 3 experts whose expertise are in educational technology, AI and psychometrics to confirm item importance and clarity. Internal consistency and Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.847$ indicated an acceptable level of reliability. Further a pilot study with 30 students was carried out to refine item wording, assess and completion time.

Ethical Consideration

The study obtained ethical clearance from the University Research Ethics Committee of the Martin Luther Christian University. Informed consent was obtained from all students, with assurances of anonymity and voluntary participation.

Result

Objectives 1: 1. To determine perceptions on the usefulness and impact of GenAI tools for academic activities.

Table 1 Demographic representation by Age (N=301)

Age	Frequency	Percentage
18-24	243	80.7
25-35	54	17.9
36-40	3	1.0
40+	1	0.3
Total	301	100

Table 1 shows that the majority of students fall within the 18–24 years age, accounting for 80.7% of the population, however 17.9% are in the 22–35 years age group.

Table 2 Demographic Representation by Gender (N=301)

Gender	Frequency	Percent
Female	217	72.3
Male	83	27.7
Total	301	100

Table 2 shows that majority are females (72.3%) being significantly more than males (27.7%).

Table 3 Level of Study (N=301)

Level of Study	Frequency	Percent
PG	189	62.8
UG	112	37.2
Total	301	100

Table 3 shows that 189 students (62.8%) were enrolled in postgraduate (PG) courses, while 112 students (37.2%) were enrolled in undergraduate (UG) courses. This shows that the majority of the students were pursuing postgraduate studies.

Table 3.1: Cross Tabulation between the Age and Level of Study

Age	UG	PG	Total
18-24	100 (41.2%)	143 (58.8%)	243
25-35	12 (22.2%)	42 (77.8%)	54
36-40	0 (0%)	3 (100%)	3
40+	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	1
Total	112	189	301

The findings indicate that the majority of students aged 18–24 years (58.8%) and 25–35 years (77.8%) falls within the postgraduate age groups.

Table 4 Department (N=301)

Department	Frequency	Percent
AHS	81	27.2
SW	69	23.2
SECM	40	13.3
ENG	29	9.6

PSY	29	9.6
SOCIOLOGY	19	6.3
THEOLOGY	11	3.7
MUSIC	11	3.7
TOURISM	5	1.7
EDUCATION	5	1.7
DETE	2	0.7
Total	301	100

Table 4 shows the distribution of Department for students. The largest percentage of students were from the Allied Health Sciences (AHS) department (n = 81, 27.2%), followed by Social Work (SW) department (n = 69, 23.2%), and School of Economics, Commerce and Management (SECM) students (n = 40, 13.3%). Students from English and Psychology (PSY) each reported for 9.6% (n = 29) of the sample. The remaining students were distributed among Sociology (n = 19, 6.3%), Theology (n = 11, 3.7%), Music (n = 11, 3.7%), Tourism (n = 5, 1.7%), Education (n = 5, 1.7%), and DETE (n = 2, 0.7%).

Table 5 Semester (N=301)

Semester	Frequency	Percent
Second Semester	186	61.8
Fourth Semester	32	10.6
Sixth Semester	83	27.6
Total	301	100

Table 5 shows the distribution of semester. Out of the 301 students surveyed, 61.8% (n = 186) were in the 2nd semester, 27.6% (n = 83) were in the 6th semester, and 10.6% (n = 32) were in the 4th semester.

Table 6 Perceived Usefulness of AI

Statements	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
AI tools (e.g., ChatGPT, paperpal, chatbots) help students in regular academic activities.	112(37.2%)	181 (60.1%)	7 (2.3%)	1 (0.3%)
Open-source AI tools could be made more accessible to students.	59 (19.6%)	228 (75.7%)	13 (4.3%)	1 (0.3%)
AI tools enhance students productivity in completing academic activities.	47 (15.6%)	222(73.8%)	31 (10.3%)	1(0.3%)

AI tools improve academic writing by enhancing clarity, grammar and structure.	76 (25.2%)	186(61.8%)	36(12.0%)	3 (1.0%)
AI tools assist in reducing errors in academic work through automated error detection.	38(12.6%)	212(70.4%)	51(16.9%)	-
AI helps students solve academic challenges effectively.	44(14.6%)	221(73.4%)	35(11.6%)	1 (0.3%)
AI technology makes it easier for students to access the content and information they need.	75(24.9%)	199(66.1%)	26(8.6%)	1 (0.3%)
AI play a significant role in shaping job opportunities for future graduates.	16(5.3%)	135(44.9%)	139(46.2%)	11(3.7%)
AI play a bigger role in academic growth and skill development in the future.	29(9.6%)	163(54.2%)	96(31.9%)	13(4.3%)

Table 6 presents students the perceived usefulness of GenAI in higher education. The majority of students (60.1%) agree that AI tools support them in their regular academic activities. Furthermore, the majority of students (75.7%) agree that open-source AI tools should be made more accessible to students.

The majority of students (73.8%) agreed that AI tools enhanced their productivity in completing academic tasks. Of the respondents, 61.8% believed that AI improves academic writing by enhancing clarity, grammar, and structure, while a majority of students (70.4%) agreed that AI tools help reduce errors in their academic work and (73.4%) agreed that AI helps them in solving academic challenges.

A majority of students (66.1%) believe that AI tools make it easier to access relevant content and resources. A dissimilarity of (46.2%) disagreed that AI plays a significant role in shaping job opportunities for future graduates, while a similar percentage (44.9%) agreed with this statement. 54.2% agree that AI will play a major role in their academic growth and skill development in the future.

Overall, the findings indicate strong student agreement on the perceived usefulness of AI in higher education.

Objective 2: To explore significance difference in perceived usefulness on GenAI across the demographic factors.

Table 7 Perceived usefulness of AI among the Male and Female Students

Independent t-test		df	Significant Value (p)	Cohen's d
Gender	0.849	299	0.397	0.110
Perceived Usefulness				

An independent sample t-test was conducted to examine whether there was a significant difference in perceived usefulness based on gender. The results showed no statistically significant difference between male and female students, $t(299) = 0.849$, $p = 0.397$. This suggests that gender does not play a significant role in the perceived usefulness of GenAI among the students. The effect size was very small; Cohen's $d = 0.110$, suggesting that gender accounts for a negligible difference in the perceived usefulness of AI.

Table 8 Homogeneity of Variances Test across Gender

Lavene's Test	F	df	Significant Value (p)
Gender	1.49	1	0.223

Levene's test was conducted to assess the assumption of homogeneity of variances across gender. The results were not significant, $F(1) = 1.49$, $p = 0.223$, indicating that the variances between male and female groups were equal.

Table 9 Perceived usefulness of AI among the UG and PG students

Independent t-test		df	Significant Value (p)	Cohen's d
UG and PG	0.273	299	0.785	0.0325
Perceived Usefulness				

An independent sample t-test was conducted to examine whether there was a significant difference in perceived usefulness based on UG and PG students. The results showed no statistically significant difference between undergraduate and postgraduate students, $t(299) = 0.273$, $p = 0.785$. This suggests that undergraduate and postgraduate students do not play a significant role in the perceived usefulness of AI.

Table 10 Homogeneity of Variances Test across UG and PG

Lavene's Test	F	df	Significant Value (p)
UG and PG	1.59	1	0.209

Levene's test was conducted to assess the assumption of homogeneity of variances across undergraduate and postgraduate students. The results were not significant, $F(1) = 1.59$, $p = 0.209$, indicating that the variances between UG and PG students were equal.

Table 11 Perceived Usefulness of AI among the Age Group

ANOVA	Mean Score	F	df	Significant Value (p)
18-24	2.99	0.415	2	0.674
25-35	3.02			
36-45	3.11			

A one-way ANOVA test was conducted to examine whether there was a significant difference in perceived usefulness based on age. The results showed no statistically significant difference between the age groups of the students, $F(2) = 0.415$, $p = 0.674$. This suggests that age does not play a significant role in the perceived usefulness of AI.

Table 12 Homogeneity of Variances Test across the Age

Lavene's Test	F	df	Significant Value (p)
Age	0.342	2	0.711

Levene's test was conducted to assess the assumption of homogeneity of variances for perceived use of AI across age group of the students. The results were not significant, $F(2) = 0.342$, $p = 0.711$, indicating that the variances between age group among the students were equal.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the perceived usefulness of GenAI tools for academic activities among university students. According to the findings, the majority of students view GenAI (such as ChatGPT, Paperpal, and chatbots) as helpful for regular academic tasks, productivity, writing quality, error reduction, and information access. However, opinions on AI's potential involvement in future employment opportunities are more divided. The fact that the majority of students concur that AI increases productivity, improves writing (clarity, grammar, and structure), lowers errors, and makes content easier to access indicates that students view these tools mainly as academic support systems.

Chan and Hu (2023) found that students from various academic disciplines viewed AI as helpful for writing assistance, idea creation, and learning efficiency, but they also expressed concerns about accuracy and over-reliance on these tools. Similarly, Golding et al. (2024) found that students frequently used GenAI, especially for writing tasks.

Overall, studies show that open-source AI tools should be more accessible and available. Studies also indicate that students understand the benefits of these tools as well as the challenges, such as cost, institutional restrictions, and uneven access.

Álvarez Jiménez et al. (2026) also reported that GenAI use and perceived increases in efficiency and self-sufficiency, combined with issues such as self-reliance and effects on critical thinking.

However, AI plays a substantial role in determining future career prospects, with 46% disagreeing vs. 45% agreeing, as shown in the present study. Although students may perceive AI

as instantly helpful for their academics, they are still unclear about how AI tools will impact their employability, necessary skill sets, or future paths.

Recommendations for Further Research

Building on these constraints and the objectives of the study, more research could:

- Connect perceptions to real-world applications and educational results
- Experimental and longitudinal research designs approach
- Qualitative research and mixed methodologies
- Comparisons between various institutions and cultures
- Prioritize equal access and open-source

Conclusion

Summary of Main Findings

The present study indicates that the majority of students fall within the 18–24 years age range, accounting for 80.7% of the total population.

A significant gender disparity was observed among the students, with 72.3% female students. Furthermore, the distribution of the level of study of the students showed that 189 students (62.8%) were enrolled in postgraduate (PG) programs.

The largest proportion of students were from the Allied Health Sciences (AHS) department ($n = 81$, 27.2%), followed by Social Work (SW; $n = 69$, 23.2%).

The majority of students (60.1%) agreed that AI tools, such as ChatGPT, Paperpal, chatbots, and similar platforms, support their regular academic activities. Additionally, most students (75.7%) agreed that open-source AI tools should be made more accessible to students.

A large proportion of students (73.8%) also agreed that AI tools enhance their productivity in completing academic tasks. Furthermore, 61.8% believed that AI improves academic writing, and a majority of students (70.4%) agreed that AI tools help reduce errors in their academic work and (73.4%) agreed that AI assists them in solving academic challenges.

Regarding access to information, (66.1%) of students believed that AI technology made it easier to access relevant content and resources. In contrast,

(46.2%) disagreed that AI plays a significant role in shaping job opportunities for future graduates, while a similar proportion (44.9%) agreed with this statement. More than half of the students (54.2%) agreed that AI would play a major role in their academic growth and skill development in the future.

The results on the perceived usefulness of AI showed no statistically significant difference between male and female students ($t(299) = 0.849$, $p = 0.397$). Further, the assumption of homogeneity of variances across gender was not significant ($F(1) = 1.49$, $p = 0.223$).

The results on the perceived usefulness of AI showed that there was no statistically significant difference between undergraduate and postgraduate students, $t(299) = 0.273$, $p = 0.785$. Additionally, the assumption of homogeneity of variances across undergraduate and postgraduate students showed that the results were not significant, $F(1) = 1.59$, $p = 0.209$.

Furthermore, the results on the perceived usefulness of AI showed that there was no statistically significant difference between the age groups of the students, $F(2) = 0.415$, $p = 0.674$. Furthermore, the assumption of homogeneity of variances across the different age groups of the students proved that they were not significant, $F(2) = 0.342$, $p = 0.711$.

Implications

Curriculum integration: Given the high perceived use of AI, it is no longer feasible to ignore GenAI use in the classroom. Rather, the curriculum should emphasise higher-order skills such as critical evaluation, synthesis, and original argumentation that AI cannot fully mimic while clearly integrating GenAI as a tool.

Reforming examination: It should focus on process-oriented work such as draft submissions, reflections, and oral defences that make the use of AI seeming and controllable if students currently rely on GenAI for drafting and editing.

AI literacy and responsibility: The findings highlight the need of giving awareness and teaching to students regarding the responsible use of AI, including how to successfully prompt, authenticate outputs, identify bias, and disclose AI help in an ethical manner.

Infrastructure and access: A perceived access shortfall is indicated by the significant support for more accessible open-source tools. To achieve equitable benefits, institutions may need to offer campus-wide access to specific GenAI tools.

Clarity of policy: Positive attitudes regarding AI for academic writing and error correction highlight the need for academic integrity policies that differentiate between acceptable support such as grammar checking and brainstorming and unacceptable misuse such as turning in work created by AI as one's own.

To prepare for a career: Students may not be fully prepared to think deliberately about GenAI in their professions or opinions on AI's role in future employment prospects. This gives faculty and career facilitators the opportunity to:

- Talk about how certain occupations are being affected by GenAI.
- Assist students in identifying "AI complementary" talents, such as interpersonal skills, creativity, and subject competence.
- Include AI related skills in the learning objectives of the program.

Limitations of the Study

Single-institution sample: The study was conducted in one private university in Shillong, Meghalaya, which limited institutional diversity and restricted the generalizability of findings to other higher institutions.

Cross-sectional design: Data were collected at a single point in time, precluding causal inferences about the relationship between GenAI use and academic outcomes.

Demographic imbalance: The sample is predominantly female (72.3%), aged 18–24 years (80.7%), and postgraduate (62.8%), which may reduce statistical power for detecting subgroup differences and constrain applicability to more gender-balanced populations.

Limitations to generalizability: Because the study focuses on perceptions rather than observed behaviors or learning gains, the results primarily reflect subjective experiences and stated beliefs about GenAI, not its actual pedagogical effectiveness or long term academic impact; multi institutional,

longitudinal, and mixed methods research is needed to build a more robust and generalizable evidence base.

Self-reported measures: The reliance on self-reported perceptions of usefulness and self-assessed impacts introduces potential social desirability bias, recall bias, and limited insight into actual learning effects.

References

- Álvarez Jiménez, M., et al. "Generative AI in Technology-Oriented Higher Education: A Systematized Review and Survey on Students' Perceptions of Performance, Autonomy, and Ethical Implications." *Computers*, vol. 15, no. 7, 2026, article 466.
- Cabrera, C., and R. Neville. "Widely Used but Barely Trusted: Understanding Student Perceptions on the Use of Generative AI in Higher Education." *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*, 2025, advance online publication.
- Chan, C. K. Y. "A Comprehensive AI Policy Education Framework for University Teaching and Learning." *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, vol. 20, no. 1, 2023, article 38.
- Chan, C. K. Y., and W. Hu. "Students' Voices on Generative AI: Perceptions, Benefits, and Challenges in Higher Education." *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, vol. 20, no. 1, 2023, article 43.
- Cotton, D. R. et al. "ChatGPT and Academic Integrity: A Systematic Review of the Implications for Higher Education." *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, vol. 48, no. 1, 2023, pp. 1-15.
- Dabis, M., and L. Csáki. "Generative AI in Higher Education: Opportunities, Challenges, and Policy Responses." *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, vol. 21, no. 3, 2024, pp. 1-19.
- Davis, F. D. "Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, and User Acceptance of Information Technology." *MIS Quarterly*, 1989, pp. 319-340.
- European Commission. *Ethics Guidelines for*

- Trustworthy AI in Education*. Publications Office of the European Union, 2024.
- Fadillah, M. A., and M. F. Akbar. "From the Gender Lens: Student Perceptions of ChatGPT in Higher Education." *Advances in Mobile Learning Educational Research*, vol. 5, no. 1, 2025, pp. 1413-1424.
- Golding, J. M., et al. "Generative AI and College Students: Use and Perceptions." *Teaching of Psychology*, 2024, advance online publication.
- Karkouljian, C., et al. "Generative AI in Higher Education: Faculty Perspectives on Benefits, Risks, and Policy Needs." *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, vol. 49, no. 5, 2024, pp. 678-692.
- Kasneci, E., et al. "ChatGPT for Good? On Opportunities and Challenges of Large Language Models for Education." *Learning and Individual Differences*, vol. 103, 2023, article 102274.
- McGee, P. "Academic Integrity in the Age of AI: Challenges and Opportunities for Higher Education." *Educational Technology Research and Development*, vol. 71, no. 2, 2023, pp. 1-12.
- OECD. *Generative AI in Higher Education: Policy Priorities for Responsible Adoption*. OECD Publishing, 2026.
- Perkins, M. "Academic Integrity Considerations of AI Large Language Models in the Post-Pandemic Era: ChatGPT and Beyond." *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, vol. 20, no. 2, 2023, article 07.
- Sok, S., and K. Heng. "Opportunities, Challenges, and Strategies for Using ChatGPT in Higher Education: A Literature Review." *Journal of Digital Education Technology*, vol. 4, no. 1, 2024, article ep2401.
- Stöhr, K., et al. "Large Swedish Student Survey on Generative AI." *Education Sciences*, 2024, advance online publication.
- UNESCO. *Guidance for Generative AI in Education and Research*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 2023.
- Venkatesh, V., et al. "User Acceptance of Information Technology: Toward a Unified View." *MIS Quarterly*, vol. 27, no. 3, 2003, pp. 425-478.
- Williamson, B., and R. Eynon. "AI and Ethics: Investigating the First Policy Responses of Higher Education Institutions to the Challenge of Generative AI." *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, vol. 11, no. 1, 2024, article 892.
- Yan, L., P. Sha, and X. Li. "Trust and Governance of Generative AI in Higher Education: A Global Delphi Study." *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, vol. 21, no. 1, 2024, article 12.
- Zawacki-Richter, O., et al. "Systematic Review of Research on Artificial Intelligence Applications in Higher Education – Where Are the Educators?" *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, vol. 18, no. 1, 2021, article 1.

Authors Details

Dr. Minorita Lyngdoh, Associate Professor, Dean Research, Department of Doctoral Studies and Research, Martin Luther Christian University, Shillong, Meghalaya, India, **Email ID:** mily.lynz@gmail.com/minorita@mlcuniv.in