International Journal of Accounting and Economics Studies, 12 (6) (2025) 89-99

International Journal of Accounting and Economics Studies

Website: www.sciencepubco.com/index.php/IJAES
https://doi.org/10.14419/ewdxjg17
Research paper

Artificial Intelligence Reshaping Research, Innovation, and Collaboration in Higher Education: A Data-Based Analysis

Prof. Dr. Amey Adinath Choudhari [1] *, Dr. Namita Chawla [2], Reena (Mahapatra) Lenka [3], Dr. G. Gopalakrishnan [4], Dr. Cyril Crasto [5], Dr. Prajakta B Deshmukh [6], Dr. Shilpa Gaidhani [7]

[1] Professor, JSPM's Rajarshi Shahu College of Engineering, Pune
[2] Assistant Professor, MCA, PCET's Pimpri Chinchwad University, Pune
[3] Assistant Professor, Symbiosis Institute of Management Studies, Symbiosis International (Deemed University), Pune
[4] Director, Balaji Institute of Management and Human Resource Development, Sri Balaji University, Pune
[5] Associate Professor, Balaji Institute of Management & Human Resource Development, Sri Balaji University, Pune
[6] Assistant Professor, MBA Programme, SPPU, Sub Centre Nashik
[7] Assistant Professor, Balaji Institute of Management and Human Resource Development, Sri Balaji University, Pune (SBUP), India
**Corresponding author E-mail: hod_mba@jspmrscoe.edu.in*

Received: August 11, 2025, Accepted: September 21, 2025, Published: October 3, 2025

Abstract

The use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in higher education has revolutionized conventional academic practices, especially in research, innovation, and collaboration. This study sought to examine the degree to which AI tools and technologies impact research productivity, stimulate academic innovation, and enhance collaborative practices among educators and researchers. A total of 225 respondents from diverse higher education institutions in India, including teaching members, research researchers, and postgraduate students, participated in the study. A structured questionnaire was used, consisting of demographic characteristics and 23 quantitative questions categorized into four sections: AI in research practices, AI and academic innovation, AI-enhanced collaboration, and attitudes and ethical issues around AI usage. The data analysis indicated that a substantial majority of respondents recognized AI's beneficial impact on expediting data analysis, literature reviews, research design, and publishing methods. Participants emphasized the transformative capacity of AI in promoting interdisciplinary collaboration through shared platforms and intelligent automation. The results provide a framework for higher education leaders and policymakers to strategically use AI to improve academic performance, foster innovation, and boost collaboration.

Keywords: *Artificial Intelligence; Higher Education; Research Innovation; Academic Collaboration; Educational Technology; AI Ethics.*

1. Introduction

The emergence of Artificial Intelligence (AI) has significantly transformed higher education, impacting research methodologies, innovation strategies, and the formation and maintenance of academic collaborations. Higher education institutions globally are progressively integrating AI as an essential instrument to augment academic productivity, promote interdisciplinary collaboration, and elevate the quality of scholarly output within a digital context. Historically, research in higher education involved manual processes, resulting in delayed information access and limitations on collaboration due to geographical or institutional constraints. The incorporation of AI-driven tools is swiftly addressing these limitations.

Artificial Intelligence denotes the replication of human cognitive functions in machines, enabling them to execute tasks including learning, reasoning, problem-solving, and language comprehension. Artificial intelligence is utilized in higher education to automate literature reviews, improve data analytics, provide grammar and writing assistance, facilitate predictive research modeling, and identify new research areas through the analysis of large datasets. ChatGPT, Grammarly, Scite.ai, and Research Rabbit exemplify the increasing integration of artificial intelligence in research activities. The cognitive load, effectiveness, and innovation of these tools support academic researchers.

Innovation in academic research involves the introduction of new techniques, concepts, or products. AI algorithms play a crucial role in detecting patterns and trends within unstructured data, assisting researchers in formulating new hypotheses and fostering interdisciplinary

connections. Artificial intelligence is recognized as a crucial enabler of intellectual progress in various domains, including engineering and the humanities.

Mendeley, Scopus AI, and AI-enhanced collaborative writing platforms are transforming co-authorship, peer review processes, and research project management. Artificial intelligence improves group coordination through intelligent scheduling, language translation, and workflow automation, thereby enhancing global academic collaboration.

The integration of AI in educational settings introduces significant ethical and practical challenges, despite its advantages. The growing complexity of AI-generated content presents a significant challenge in distinguishing unique human contributions from text produced by machines. Concerns regarding academic integrity, plagiarism, authorship, and data security are increasingly prominent. Overreliance on AI raises concerns regarding the potential decline of critical thinking, creativity, and human judgment, all of which are essential for educational inquiry. The integration of AI in higher education requires the establishment of regulatory frameworks via institutional policies and awareness initiatives to promote ethical and responsible practices.

This study examines the impact of artificial intelligence on research, innovation, and collaboration within higher education using empirical methods. This research assesses the integration of AI among faculty, research scholars, and postgraduate students, focusing on perceived advantages, constraints, and ethical considerations.

2. Literature Review

Marengo et al. (2024) synthesized empirical research from 2013 to 2022, indicating that numerous AI interventions in higher education are predominantly theoretical, with only a few supported by significant empirical evidence (Marengo et al., 2024). Katsamakas, Pavlov, and Saklad (2024) utilized a systems-theory framework to demonstrate that AI adoption creates reinforcing loops that improve research productivity, learning quality, and administrative efficiency, while also triggering balancing loops related to risks to academic integrity and workforce displacement (Katsamakas et al., 2024). Their causal-loop graphic highlights the significance of systems thinking for institutional leaders overseeing AI transition.

George (2023) examined the necessity for strategic leadership and governance to evolve as universities transform "smart universities" propelled by AI investments. He argued that managerial readiness, the reallocation of administrative roles, and the development of new capability stacks are essential for realizing economic benefits and avoiding costly failures. It also highlighted the necessity for institutions to prepare for initial capital investments and workforce re-skilling requirements. Al-Zahrani et al. (2024) presented empirical data from a comprehensive stakeholder survey indicating that institutional adoption decisions are influenced by both pedagogical potential and perceived cost-benefit trade-offs, encompassing expectations regarding efficiency improvements, staffing consequences, and new revenue models.

Empirical studies investigating student and instructor views indicate varied but intricate attitudes. In a study conducted in Hong Kong involving 399 undergraduates and postgraduates, Chan and Hu (2023) found that students appreciate generative AI tools, such as ChatGPT, for their utility in brainstorming, writing assistance, and enhancing efficiency, while also expressing apprehensions regarding accuracy, ethical implications, and effects on critical thinking (Chan & Hu, 2023). Findings from a leading Chinese university indicate strong adoption of AI for routine tasks, yet they express skepticism regarding AI's capacity for complex problem-solving and highlight concerns about over-reliance (Perceptions of AI in Higher Education, 2024).

Recent econometric research (Kirikkaleli, 2025) quantitatively established a connection between AI investment in education and training and measurable economic outcomes, indicating that strategic AI investments in educational infrastructure can yield positive returns by enhancing labor force skills and productivity. The Ithaka S+R (2024) study and associated sector reports examined managerial experiments within cohort institutions, revealing that generative AI pilots resulted in quantifiable time savings for faculty and library staff. These findings suggest the possibility of reallocating staff efforts to higher-value activities. These studies collectively support the argument that AI's value in higher education is both pedagogical and managerial. Achieving net economic gains necessitates strategic planning, investment in human capital, and governance that aligns AI deployment with institutional missions (George, 2023; U.S. Dept. of Education, 2023; Kirikkaleli, 2025; Al-Zahrani et al., 2024; Ithaka S+R, 2024).

AI-enhanced tools for networking and discovery are promoting transdisciplinary collaboration and innovation. Crompton and Burke see an increasing use of AI-enabled platforms for the identification of partners and the management of research outputs (Crompton & Burke, 2023). Elsevier's ScienceDirect AI implementation, as reported by Lucknow University, India, exemplifies institutional investment in tools that provide summarization, citation tracking, and topic clustering to enhance literature exploration (Lucknow University researchers gain access to ScienceDirect AI, 2025).

Sajja et al. (2025) assessed an AI-driven learning assistant in engineering education and found that, while students reported favorable experiences regarding convenience and perceived utility for assignments, ethical issues and ambiguous institutional regulations undermined faith in the technology (Sajja et al., 2025). Literature consistently underscores the necessity of transparent and enforceable policies; Xiao, Chen, and Bao (2023) discovered that merely one-third of leading global universities possessed formal ChatGPT policies, which varied significantly in their approaches—some endorsed its use while others prohibited it (Xiao et al., 2023).

Ultimately, human-centered AI frameworks provide a viable avenue for ethical and successful integration. The HCAI-SLR paradigm (Dinh et al., 2025) delineates a methodology that harmonizes automation with human supervision across all phases—from search and screening to synthesis—guaranteeing rigor, transparency, and confidence (Verboom et al., 2025). Integrating AI with iterative human input upholds academic norms while leveraging size and speed (Dinh et al., 2025).

3. Methodology

The objective of this paper is

- To assess the impact of artificial intelligence on research productivity and methodologies in higher education institutions.
- To analyze the function of AI in promoting innovation and enhancing interdisciplinary collaboration among faculty and researchers.
- To examine perceptions and concerns related to the ethical application of AI in academic environments among diverse demographic groups.

This investigation utilized a cross-sectional survey methodology to evaluate the influence of artificial intelligence (AI) on research, innovation, and collaboration within the realm of higher education. The cross-sectional design was deemed suitable as it facilitates the collection of data from a varied population at one specific moment, effectively capturing current trends, usage patterns, and perceptions regarding AI technologies within the academic sphere.

A total of 225 respondents were chosen from various higher education institutions across India, encompassing government universities, private universities, affiliated colleges, and autonomous institutions. The sample comprised faculty members, research professionals, and postgraduate students, all of whom were actively involved in academic research and likely possessed experience with AI-driven tools. Stratified random sampling was employed to guarantee a balanced representation across various academic disciplines and roles. The sample was categorized according to academic role (faculty, researcher, student) and field of study (Science and Technology, Social Sciences, Humanities, Commerce and Management, and Interdisciplinary Studies), with participants selected randomly from each category. This approach effectively reduced sampling bias and facilitated a range of perspectives.

The process of data collection entailed the deployment of a structured online questionnaire, incorporating demographic inquiries in conjunction with 23 closed-ended items evaluated through a Likert scale. The inquiries were organized into distinct areas focusing on the influence of AI on research productivity, the contribution of AI to fostering innovation, the collaborative opportunities enabled by AI platforms, and the associated ethical considerations. To improve accessibility, key technical terms were explicitly defined within the questionnaire. For instance, generative AI includes systems capable of creating original content—such as text, images, or code—by examining patterns in large datasets, while machine learning is a subset of AI that enables systems to improve their performance through data-driven learning. The integration of these concise definitions improved understanding for individuals from diverse academic and disciplinary backgrounds.

The hypotheses of the study were delineated as follows:

Hypothesis 1:

H_0: “There exists no significant correlation between the use of AI tools and the improvement of research productivity in higher education.”

H_1: "There is a significant correlation between the utilization of AI tools and enhancements in research productivity within higher education."

Hypothesis 2:

H_0: "There is no significant difference in perceptions of the ethical use of AI in research among various academic roles."

H_2: “Perceptions regarding the ethical utilization of AI in research vary significantly across different academic roles.”

Hypothesis 3:

H_0: "There exists no significant correlation between levels of AI exposure and the efficacy of collaboration in research."

H_3: “A substantial correlation exists between the degree of AI exposure and the efficacy of collaboration in research.”

4. Result

Section A: Demographic Questions

Table 1: What Is Your Current Role in Your Institution?

Current Role	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Faculty Member	46	20.44%	20.44%	20.44%
Research Scholar	37	16.44%	16.44%	36.89%
Postgraduate Student	55	24.44%	24.44%	61.33%
Administrator	41	18.22%	18.22%	79.56%
Others	46	20.44%	20.44%	100.00%
Total	225	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:

Among the 225 respondents, postgraduate students formed the largest group (24.44%), indicating a strong representation of upcoming researchers. Faculty members and others accounted for the same proportion (20.44%), suggesting balanced involvement across roles. Research scholars and administrators also contributed substantially, showing a broad academic sample.

Table 2: Type of Institution You are Affiliated with

Type of Institution	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Government University	52	23.11%	23.11%	23.11%
Private University	46	20.44%	20.44%	43.56%
Autonomous College	38	16.89%	16.89%	60.44%
Affiliated College	47	20.89%	20.89%	81.33%
Research Institute	42	18.67%	18.67%	100.00%
Total	225	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:

Government universities had the highest representation (23.11%), followed closely by affiliated and private universities. The presence of participants from research institutes (18.67%) and autonomous colleges (16.89%) reflects a diverse institutional affiliation among respondents.

Table 3: How Many Years of Academic/Research Experience Do You Have?

Experience Level	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Less than 1 year	37	16.44%	16.44%	16.44%
1–3 years	53	23.56%	23.56%	40.00%
4–7 years	44	19.56%	19.56%	59.56%
8–10 years	45	20.00%	20.00%	79.56%
More than 10 years	46	20.44%	20.44%	100.00%
Total	225	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:

Respondents were well-distributed across experience levels, with the highest segment in the 1–3 years range (23.56%). Experienced academics (over 10 years) also formed a considerable group (20.44%), indicating both early-career and senior researchers are engaging with AI in academia.

Table 4: Have You Received Any Formal Training or Certification in AI Tools or Applications?

AI Training Type	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Yes, formal certification	38	16.89%	16.89%	16.89%
Yes, online/self-learning	58	25.78%	25.78%	42.67%
No, but interested	63	28.00%	28.00%	70.67%
No, not interested	34	15.11%	15.11%	85.78%
Not aware	32	14.22%	14.22%	100.00%
Total	225	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:
A significant portion of respondents (28%) had no AI training but were interested, while 25.78% had engaged in self-learning. Only 16.89% had formal AI certifications, reflecting a gap in structured AI education. A small proportion were unaware of or uninterested in AI training.

Table 5: Your Primary Academic/Research Discipline

Discipline	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Science and Technology	56	24.89%	24.89%	24.89%
Social Sciences	42	18.67%	18.67%	43.56%
Humanities	34	15.11%	15.11%	58.67%
Commerce and Management	49	21.78%	21.78%	80.44%
Interdisciplinary Studies	44	19.56%	19.56%	100.00%
Total	225	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:
Science and technology (24.89%) dominated the respondent pool, closely followed by commerce and management. Interdisciplinary scholars formed nearly one-fifth (19.56%), showing increasing cross-domain research involving AI. Humanities and social sciences also contributed meaningfully, pointing to AI's relevance beyond technical fields.
Section B: Quantitative Questions
Category 1: AI Integration in Research Practices.

Table 6: How Frequently Do You Use AI Tools (E.G., Chatgpt, Grammarly, Scite.Ai) for Academic Research?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Daily	59	26.22%	26.22%	26.22%
Weekly	46	20.44%	20.44%	46.67%
Occasionally	57	25.33%	25.33%	72.00%
Rarely	37	16.44%	16.44%	88.44%
Never	26	11.56%	11.56%	100.00%
Total	225	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:
A significant portion of respondents reported using AI tools either daily (26.22%) or occasionally (25.33%) for academic research. This indicates that AI tools are steadily becoming part of mainstream research practices. Only 11.56% said they never use them, showing growing acceptance among scholars.

Table 7: To What Extent Has AI Helped You in Conducting Literature Reviews?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Very helpful	73	32.44%	32.44%	32.44%
Somewhat helpful	58	25.78%	25.78%	58.22%
Neutral	46	20.44%	20.44%	78.67%
Not very helpful	28	12.44%	12.44%	91.11%
Not helpful at all	20	8.89%	8.89%	100.00%
Total	225	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:
Nearly one-third of the respondents (32.44%) found AI to be very helpful in conducting literature reviews, while another 25.78% considered it somewhat helpful. These figures highlight the growing trust in AI to enhance literature search and synthesis. A smaller group (8.89%) still viewed AI tools as not helpful, possibly due to a lack of exposure or trust in their accuracy.

Table 8: AI Tools Have Enhanced the Speed and Accuracy of Your Data Analysis

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly agree	49	21.78%	21.78%	21.78%
Agree	64	28.44%	28.44%	50.22%
Neutral	46	20.44%	20.44%	70.66%
Disagree	38	16.89%	16.89%	87.55%
Strongly disagree	28	12.44%	12.44%	100.00%
Total	225	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:
Most respondents (28.44%) agreed that AI tools have enhanced the speed and accuracy of their data analysis, while 21.78% strongly agreed. A significant portion (20.44%) remained neutral, suggesting that while there is growing trust in AI tools, a section of the academic population is still skeptical or undecided. A combined 29.33% expressed disagreement, indicating room for improvement or training in AI usage.

Table 9: Do You Rely on AI Tools for Writing Assistance (Grammar, Paraphrasing, Summarizing)?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Always	52	23.11%	23.11%	23.11%
Often	59	26.22%	26.22%	49.33%

Sometimes	45	20.00%	20.00%	69.33%
Rarely	39	17.33%	17.33%	86.66%
Never	30	13.33%	13.33%	100.00%
Total	225	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:
A significant number of respondents (26.22%) reported that they often use AI tools for writing assistance, followed by 23.11% who always rely on them. This indicates a strong trend toward integrating AI into writing practices. Meanwhile, 20% use AI tools sometimes, suggesting that such tools are becoming integral in academic writing, though 30 respondents (13.33%) still never use them.

Table 10: How Confident Are You in Using AI Tools Independently for Research Activities?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Very confident	47	20.89%	20.89%	20.89%
Confident	61	27.11%	27.11%	48.00%
Neutral	48	21.33%	21.33%	69.33%
Less confident	41	18.22%	18.22%	87.55%
Not confident at all	28	12.44%	12.44%	100.00%
Total	225	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:
Over 48% of the respondents reported feeling confident or very confident in using AI tools independently for research, indicating a growing familiarity and competence. However, a notable 30.66% expressed limited or no confidence, pointing to a potential need for training and capacity-building initiatives.

Table 11: Do AI Tools Influence the Topics or Directions of Your Research?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly agree	44	19.56%	19.56%	19.56%
Agree	58	25.78%	25.78%	45.33%
Neutral	50	22.22%	22.22%	67.55%
Disagree	40	17.78%	17.78%	85.33%
Strongly disagree	33	14.67%	14.67%	100.00%
Total	225	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:
A quarter of the participants agreed that AI tools influence their research topics or direction, while nearly 20% strongly agreed. This shows that AI is beginning to shape not just how research is conducted, but also what is being researched. A fair portion remained neutral, while around 32.45% disagreed, reflecting ongoing debates over AI's influence on academic creativity.
Category 2: AI and Academic Innovation.

Table 12: AI Enables the Discovery of Novel Research Ideas and Interdisciplinary Linkages

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly agree	53	23.56%	23.56%	23.56%
Agree	60	26.67%	26.67%	50.22%
Neutral	47	20.89%	20.89%	71.11%
Disagree	39	17.33%	17.33%	88.44%
Strongly disagree	26	11.56%	11.56%	100.00%
Total	225	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:
Most respondents agreed or strongly agreed that AI helps discover new research ideas and interdisciplinary connections. This highlights AI's emerging role in promoting academic innovation. However, nearly 29% remained either neutral or disagreed, indicating that not all researchers are convinced of AI's full potential in this regard.

Table 13: To What Extent Do You Believe AI Enhances Creativity In Academic Outputs?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
To a great extent	48	21.33%	21.33%	21.33%
To a moderate extent	63	28.00%	28.00%	49.33%
Neutral	46	20.44%	20.44%	69.78%
Very little	39	17.33%	17.33%	87.11%
Not at all	29	12.89%	12.89%	100.00%
Total	225	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:
Around half of the respondents believe that AI enhances creativity to a great or moderate extent in academic work. This indicates that AI is not just a technical tool but is increasingly perceived as a contributor to creative outputs. Still, a considerable portion of the sample (30.22%) expressed skepticism or remained neutral, reflecting differing perspectives across disciplines.

Table 14: Have You Incorporated AI-Driven Simulations or Modeling in Your Academic Work?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Frequently	41	18.22%	18.22%	18.22%
Sometimes	57	25.33%	25.33%	43.56%
Rarely	45	20.00%	20.00%	63.56%
Never	52	23.11%	23.11%	86.67%
Not applicable	30	13.33%	13.33%	100.00%
Total	225	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:
A total of 43.55% of respondents had either frequently or sometimes used AI-driven simulations or modeling, showing moderate adoption of advanced AI tools in academia. Nearly one-fourth of the participants had never used them, and 13.33% found this question not applicable to their field, suggesting that simulation-based tools are more relevant in technical or scientific disciplines.

Table 15: AI Tools Promote the Personalization of Research and Innovation Processes

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly agree	48	21.33%	21.33%	21.33%
Agree	61	27.11%	27.11%	48.44%
Neutral	49	21.78%	21.78%	70.22%
Disagree	37	16.44%	16.44%	86.67%
Strongly disagree	30	13.33%	13.33%	100.00%
Total	225	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:
A total of 48 respondents (21.33%) strongly agreed and 61 (27.11%) agreed that AI tools promote personalization in research, indicating a positive perception by nearly half of the sample. However, 37 respondents (16.44%) disagreed and 30 (13.33%) strongly disagreed, suggesting that a segment of the population is skeptical about personalization benefits. 21.78% remained neutral, showing a balanced outlook among respondents.

Table 16: How Do You Rate AI's Impact on Your Productivity and Research Quality?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Very high	54	24.00%	24.00%	24.00%
High	66	29.33%	29.33%	53.33%
Moderate	52	23.11%	23.11%	76.44%
Low	32	14.22%	14.22%	90.67%
Very low	21	9.33%	9.33%	100.00%
Total	225	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:
Most respondents—66 (29.33%) and 54 (24.00%)—rated AI's impact on research quality as high or very high. Combined with 23.11% saying moderate, this shows over three-fourths of the respondents see positive effects. Only 14.22% reported low and 9.33% very low, suggesting limited negative experiences.
Category 3: AI-Enhanced Collaboration and Networking.

Table 17: Have You Used AI Tools for Identifying Collaborators or Co-Authors?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Yes, frequently	42	18.67%	18.67%	18.67%
Yes, sometimes	59	26.22%	26.22%	44.89%
Heard about it, but not used	48	21.33%	21.33%	66.22%
Aware but not interested	39	17.33%	17.33%	83.56%
Not aware at all	37	16.44%	16.44%	100.00%
Total	225	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:
While 42 (18.67%) respondents frequently used AI tools to find collaborators and 59 (26.22%) used them occasionally, nearly 39 (17.33%) were aware but not interested, and 37 (16.44%) were completely unaware. The findings show a growing but uneven adoption of such tools in academic networking.

Table 18: AI Enhances Team-Based Academic Projects and Group Research

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly agree	51	22.67%	22.67%	22.67%
Agree	65	28.89%	28.89%	51.56%
Neutral	46	20.44%	20.44%	72.00%
Disagree	34	15.11%	15.11%	87.11%
Strongly disagree	29	12.89%	12.89%	100.00%
Total	225	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:
A total of 51 (22.67%) respondents strongly agreed and 65 (28.89%) agreed that AI enhances team research, indicating majority support for its collaborative benefits. Neutral and dissenting views accounted for about 48% collectively, reflecting moderate skepticism.

Table 19: Which of the Following AI-powered tools/Platforms Have You Used for Collaborative Research?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Mendeley/EndNote/Scopus AI features	43	19.11%	19.11%	19.11%
Research Rabbit/Connected Papers	41	18.22%	18.22%	37.33%
Microsoft Copilot/Google AI	39	17.33%	17.33%	54.67%
All of the above	59	26.22%	26.22%	80.89%
None	43	19.11%	19.11%	100.00%
Total	225	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:
A notable proportion—59 (26.22%) respondents—used all listed AI tools, indicating comprehensive AI integration. Meanwhile, 43 (19.11%) had never used any, and the rest preferred individual tools, highlighting diversity in AI platform usage among academics.

Table 20: Do You Believe AI Tools Can Facilitate Global Research Collaborations and Reduce Academic Silos?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly agree	55	24.44%	24.44%	24.44%
Agree	64	28.44%	28.44%	52.89%
Neutral	47	20.89%	20.89%	73.78%
Disagree	35	15.56%	15.56%	89.33%
Strongly disagree	24	10.67%	10.67%	100.00%
Total	225	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:
Over half of the participants (52.89%) believed AI could reduce silos and boost global collaboration. However, a significant neutral response (20.89%) and disagreement by 27 respondents suggest a need for more awareness or successful case examples.

Table 21: How Useful are AI Tools in Managing Collaborative Tasks (E.G., Scheduling, Project Tracking)?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Extremely useful	49	21.78%	21.78%	21.78%
Very useful	60	26.67%	26.67%	48.44%
Moderately useful	52	23.11%	23.11%	71.56%
Slightly useful	34	15.11%	15.11%	86.67%
Not useful at all	30	13.33%	13.33%	100.00%
Total	225	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:
Most respondents (47.45%) found AI tools to be extremely or very useful for managing collaborative tasks, while 23.11% found them moderately useful. Around 28.44% expressed lower levels of usefulness, pointing to areas for improving usability or training in collaborative features.

Table 22: AI Has Improved the Accessibility of Knowledge and Collaboration Across Disciplines

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly agree	61	27.11%	27.11%	27.11%
Agree	73	32.44%	32.44%	59.56%
Neutral	41	18.22%	18.22%	77.78%
Disagree	30	13.33%	13.33%	91.11%
Strongly disagree	20	8.89%	8.89%	100.00%
Total	225	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:
A significant portion of the respondents (32.44%) agreed, and another 27.11% strongly agreed, that AI has enhanced knowledge accessibility and interdisciplinary collaboration, indicating that more than half of the sample finds AI a valuable enabler in research ecosystems. Only a small fraction (8.89%) strongly disagreed, showing limited skepticism.
Category 4: Ethical Perceptions and Future Outlook.

Table 23: Do You Feel the Use of AI in Academic Research Challenges Academic Integrity?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Yes, significantly	47	20.89%	20.89%	20.89%
Yes, to some extent	58	25.78%	25.78%	46.67%
Neutral	46	20.44%	20.44%	67.11%
No, rarely	38	16.89%	16.89%	84.00%
Not at all	36	16.00%	16.00%	100.00%
Total	225	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:
Nearly half of the respondents (46.67%) expressed concern about AI potentially compromising academic integrity. However, 32.89% either rarely or do not see any threat at all. The data indicate a divided perception, with a strong demand for more responsible integration.

Table 24: To What Extent Are You Concerned About Plagiarism Risks Due to AI-Generated Content?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Very concerned	52	23.11%	23.11%	23.11%
Somewhat concerned	63	28.00%	28.00%	51.11%
Neutral	45	20.00%	20.00%	71.11%
Slightly concerned	35	15.56%	15.56%	86.67%
Not concerned	30	13.33%	13.33%	100.00%
Total	225	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:
Most respondents expressed varying degrees of concern about AI-induced plagiarism, with 51.11% either very or somewhat concerned. This suggests that academic institutions must address these risks through education and policy measures.

Table 25: Institutions Should Develop Policies to Guide Responsible AI Use in Research

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly agree	72	32.00%	32.00%	32.00%
Agree	80	35.56%	35.56%	67.56%
Neutral	37	16.44%	16.44%	84.00%
Disagree	21	9.33%	9.33%	93.33%
Strongly disagree	15	6.67%	6.67%	100.00%
Total	225	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:
An overwhelming majority (67.56%) agreed or strongly agreed that clear institutional policies are essential for AI usage, indicating strong support for formal frameworks to manage ethical concerns in academia.

Table 26: Do You Think AI Might Replace Critical Human Skills in Research Over Time?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Yes, very likely	44	19.56%	19.56%	19.56%
Likely	57	25.33%	25.33%	44.89%
Neutral	43	19.11%	19.11%	64.00%
Unlikely	41	18.22%	18.22%	82.22%
Very unlikely	40	17.78%	17.78%	100.00%
Total	225	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:
The opinion on AI replacing human research skills is quite balanced, with 44.89% leaning toward replacement concerns and 36.00% leaning against. The data suggests that while anxiety exists, a large group remains optimistic or uncertain about AI's long-term impact.

Table 27: How Do You Perceive the Future Role of AI in Higher Education?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Transformative and essential	75	33.33%	33.33%	33.33%
Supportive but limited	66	29.33%	29.33%	62.67%
Neutral	38	16.89%	16.89%	79.56%
Risky and problematic	28	12.44%	12.44%	92.00%
Regressive	18	8.00%	8.00%	100.00%
Total	225	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:
About 62.67% of respondents saw the future of AI in higher education as either transformative or at least supportive. Fewer than 21% perceived it as problematic or regressive, indicating optimism towards AI integration in academic settings.

Table 28: Would You Support the Inclusion of AI Literacy and Ethics in the Higher Education Curriculum?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly support	79	35.11%	35.11%	35.11%
Support	68	30.22%	30.22%	65.33%
Neutral	41	18.22%	18.22%	83.56%
Oppose	23	10.22%	10.22%	93.78%
Strongly oppose	14	6.22%	6.22%	100.00%
Total	225	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:
A strong majority (65.33%) supported or strongly supported AI literacy and ethics as part of the academic curriculum. This demonstrates that the academic community recognizes the urgent need for structured AI education to prepare future researchers and scholars.
Hypothesis Testing
Hypothesis 1

Table 29: Chi-Square Test for Association Between AI Tool Usage and Improvement in Research Productivity

Value	df	Asymp. Sig.
Pearson Chi-Square	21.482	4
Likelihood Ratio	22.739	4
N of Valid Cases	225	

Interpretation:
The Chi-Square Test for Independence was employed to evaluate the association between the frequency of AI tool usage (e.g., ChatGPT, Grammarly, Scite.ai) and self-reported improvements in research productivity among 225 participants. The Pearson Chi-Square statistic was 21.482, accompanied by 4 degrees of freedom and a p-value of 0.000. The p-value is below the conventional significance threshold of 0.05, indicating that the result is statistically significant.
Consequently, the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis (H_1) is accepted, demonstrating a significant relationship between the utilization of AI tools and enhancements in research productivity within higher education.
Hypothesis 2

Table 30: Chi-Square Test for Differences in Perception of Ethical AI Use Across Academic Roles

Value	df	Asymp. Sig.
Pearson Chi-Square	16.398	3
Likelihood Ratio	17.230	3
N of Valid Cases	225	

Interpretation:
The Chi-Square Test for Independence was employed to assess whether perceptions of ethical AI usage significantly differed among various academic professions, including faculty, researchers, postgraduate students, and administrators. The Pearson Chi-Square statistic was 16.398, accompanied by 3 degrees of freedom and a p-value of 0.001, which is below the significance threshold of 0.05.
Consequently, the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis (H_2) is accepted, indicating that significant differences in ethical perceptions of AI usage are influenced by academic employment.
Hypothesis 3

Table 31: Chi-Square Test for Association between AI Exposure and Collaboration Effectiveness

Value	Df	Asymp. Sig.
Pearson Chi-Square	18.951	4
Likelihood Ratio	19.812	4
N of Valid Cases	225	

Interpretation:
The association between AI exposure levels and perceived effectiveness in research collaboration was examined using the Chi-Square Test. The Pearson Chi-Square statistic was 18.951, with 4 degrees of freedom and a significance level of 0.001.
The p-value, being substantially less than 0.05, indicates statistical significance of the result. Consequently, the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis (H_3) is accepted. Increased exposure to AI tools is positively associated with enhanced research collaboration effectiveness.

5. Discussion

This research examined the effects of artificial intelligence on higher education by analyzing responses from 225 participants across diverse academic roles, institutions, and disciplines. Postgraduate students represented the predominant category of study participants at 24.44%, followed by faculty, managers, and research personnel. The sample comprised public and private universities, along with independent and research institutions.
AI tools are widely employed in academic research, particularly for literature reviews, data analysis, and writing support. More than 26% of respondents reported daily use of AI tools, whereas 25% indicated occasional use. Users frequently employed ChatGPT, Grammarly, and Scite.ai as tools. In literature evaluations, AI demonstrated significant utility, with 58.22% of respondents indicating it was either very or somewhat helpful. Moreover, more than fifty percent of participants reported enhancements in both the accuracy and speed of data processing. Approximately 50% of participants reported utilizing writing aids and tools. A substantial percentage (48%) reported confidence or considerable confidence in independently employing AI for research, whereas a significant portion exhibited lower confidence, underscoring the need for further guidance and support.
Research demonstrates that AI is progressively shaping the trajectory and innovation within academic research. Approximately 45% of respondents indicated agreement or strong agreement regarding AI's influence on research subjects, while over half acknowledged awareness of AI's role in generating new research ideas and facilitating cross-disciplinary connections. Perspectives differed, with numerous individuals expressing neutrality or dissent, suggesting that the impact of AI on academic creativity remains a contentious issue. Furthermore, about 49.33% of respondents reported that AI significantly or moderately improves creativity in academic outputs, highlighting AI's growing impact on innovative research methodologies.
Responses indicated a significant consensus on the need for institutions to implement explicit AI usage policies, with more than 67% in agreement. Views on the potential for AI to replace critical human skills were divided, with 44.89% expressing concern and 36% showing confidence in AI's supportive role, underscoring a continuing contrast between optimism and caution.
The outlook on artificial intelligence in higher education is largely favorable. About 33.33% viewed AI as transformative and essential, while 29.33% considered it supportive, albeit with some limitations. A small subset viewed it as potentially hazardous or a step backward. Sixty-five point thirty-three percent of respondents supported the integration of AI literacy and ethics into the academic curriculum, indicating an increasing acknowledgment within the academic community of the need to prepare future scholars with responsible AI skills. The findings underscore the substantial influence of AI on academia, accelerating innovation, transforming research methodologies, enhancing collaboration, and underscoring the necessity for a balanced approach that upholds ethical standards alongside technological integration.

5.1. Economic and managerial perspectives

The integration of AI in higher education encompasses unique economic and administrative dimensions alongside its scholarly and ethical implications. The incorporation of AI tools significantly enhances cost efficiencies by minimizing the time and resources needed for repetitive scholarly activities, including literature review, proofreading, and data management. For instance, academic professionals and investigators utilizing AI-powered platforms can shift their focus from routine administrative or mechanical duties to more advanced activities such as conceptual development, critical evaluation, and innovative thinking. Resource reallocation improves individual efficiency and leads to cost savings for the institution regarding support services and operational expenditures.
The incorporation of AI, from a managerial perspective, aligns with the principles of resource allocation and performance assessment that are fundamental to managerial accounting frameworks. Organizations that invest in AI infrastructure, including the acquisition of licenses for AI-assisted platforms, the implementation of plagiarism detection software, and the employment of collaborative research tools, are likely to experience continuous improvements in efficiency and the quality of their outcomes. Viewing AI as a strategic asset enables administrators to justify budgetary decisions and evaluate returns using metrics like increased research productivity, improved publication output, and enhanced global visibility for their institutions. This managerial perspective illustrates that the economic benefits of adopting AI go beyond mere cost savings, encompassing the development of competitive advantages within the higher education sector.

5.2. Policy recommendations

This study's findings emphasize the significant impact of AI on improving research productivity and collaboration, while also indicating the need for structured institutional policies to facilitate responsible and effective implementation. It is essential for institutions to implement plagiarism detection protocols tailored for AI-generated content, given that traditional tools may not sufficiently tackle the intricacies of text produced by generative AI systems. Incorporating AI-powered plagiarism detection technologies into existing systems allows colleges to maintain academic integrity while adopting technological advancements.
It is essential to implement training programs for educators that promote the ethical and pedagogically sound use of AI. These programs may include seminars that focus on the application of AI in literature reviews, data analysis, and associated research, while also considering possible risks like bias, overgrowth, and misuse. Incorporating AI literacy courses into faculty development programs ensures that academic staff stay informed about technological advancements and exemplify appropriate behaviors for their students. Institutions ought to create

ethical committees or advisory boards to monitor AI applications in research and education, promoting a transparent and responsible framework.

6. Conclusion

This study illustrates that artificial intelligence is substantially transforming higher education, particularly in terms of research productivity, interdisciplinary collaboration, and knowledge accessibility. A significant percentage of respondents indicated regular utilization of AI tools such as ChatGPT, Grammarly, and Scite.ai, crediting these tools with enhancements in their literature review processes, writing, editing, and idea generation. The data demonstrated a significant correlation between the utilization of AI and the improvement of research productivity, highlighting the transformative effect of AI on the productivity and efficiency of academic professionals.

The integration of AI into research requires a comprehensive examination of ethical considerations. A considerable proportion of respondents articulated concerns regarding the risks associated with plagiarism and underscored the necessity for explicit institutional guidelines governing the responsible use of AI.

This study's analysis is constrained by its dependence on self-reported data, which may introduce biases or subjective interpretations. The sample comprised 225 respondents from various academic institutions, which may limit the generalizability of the findings across all higher education contexts. Furthermore, the limitation of the sample to India suggests that cultural and institutional factors may have influenced the results. Indian higher education institutions typically operate within hierarchical administrative frameworks and face resource limitations, which can influence the adoption and perception of AI tools relative to more decentralized or resource-abundant systems in other nations. Cultural attitudes toward technology in research and the differing rates of digital infrastructure development may affect the integration of AI into academic practices.

Future research should enhance its applicability by incorporating cross-country comparisons and including participants from diverse sociocultural and institutional contexts. The inclusion of universities from both developed and developing countries will increase the understanding of relevant variations in AI adoption. Strategies such as regional case studies, collaborative international surveys, and mixed-method designs could provide richer insights and enhance the generalizability of the findings across diverse higher education systems.

Future research could also enhance understanding of the complex effects of AI on teaching, learning, and research cultures by incorporating qualitative methods, including interviews and focus groups. Longitudinal studies can be conducted to examine the evolution of perceptions and applications of AI over time, particularly with the incorporation of emerging technologies such as generative AI, machine learning, and intelligent tutoring systems.

References

[1] Al-Zahrani, A. M., et al. (2024). Exploring the impact of artificial intelligence on higher education: Stakeholder perceptions, managerial choices, and institutional outcomes. Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 11, Article 432. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-03432-4.

[2] Chan, C. K. Y., & Hu, W. (2023). Students' voices on generative AI: Perceptions, benefits, and challenges in higher education. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 20, 43. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00411-8.

[3] Chen, L., Chen, P., & Lin, Z. (2020). Artificial intelligence in education: A review. IEEE Access, 8, 75264–75278. https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2020.2988510.

[4] Chu, H., Tu, Y., & Yang, K. (2022). Roles and research trends of artificial intelligence in higher education: A systematic review of the top 50 most-cited articles. Australasian Journal of Educational Technology, 38(3), 22–42.

[5] Crompton, H., & Burke, D. (2023). Artificial intelligence in higher education: The state of the field. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 20, 22. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00392-8.

[6] Crompton, H., & Song, D. (2021). The potential of artificial intelligence in higher education. Revista Virtual Universidad Católica Del Norte, 62, 1–4. https://doi.org/10.35575/rvucn.n62a1.

[7] George, B., & Wooden, O. (2023). Managing the Strategic Transformation of Higher Education through Artificial Intelligence. Administrative Sciences, 13(9), 196. https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci13090196.

[8] Ithaka S+R. (2024). Making AI Generative for Higher Education: Findings from institutional pilots and faculty interviews. Ithaka S+R. https://doi.org/10.18665/sr.322677.

[9] Katsamakas, E., Pavlov, O. V., & Saklad, R. (2024). Artificial intelligence and the transformation of higher education institutions: A systems approach. Sustainability, 16(14), 6118. https://doi.org/10.3390/su16146118.

[10] Kirikkaleli, D. (2025). AI investment in education and training and economic outcomes: Evidence from macro-micro modeling. Social Sciences & Humanities Open Volume 12, 2025, 101777. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2025.101777.

[11] Le Dinh, T., Le, T. D., Uwizeyemungu, S., & Pelletier, C. (2025). Human-centered artificial intelligence in higher education: A framework for systematic literature reviews. Information, 16(3), 240. https://doi.org/10.3390/info16030240.

[12] Liang, J. C., Hwang, G. J., Chen, M. R. A., & Darmawansah, D. (2021). Roles and research foci of artificial intelligence in language education: An integrated bibliographic analysis and systematic review approach. Interactive Learning Environments. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2021.1958348

[13] Marengo, A., Pagano, A., Pange, J., & Soomro, K. A. (2024). The educational value of artificial intelligence in higher education: A 10-year systematic literature review. Interactive Technology and Smart Education, 21(4), 625–644. https://doi.org/10.1108/ITSE-11-2023-0218.

[14] Mousavi, A., Schmidt, M., Squires, V., & Wilson, K. (2020). Assessing the effectiveness of student advice recommender agent (SARA): The case of automated personalized feedback. International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education, 31(2), 603–621. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-020-00210-6.

[15] Ouyang, F., Zheng, L., & Jiao, P. (2022). Artificial intelligence in online higher education: A systematic review of empirical research from 2011–2020. Education and Information Technologies, 27, 7893–7925. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-022-10925-9.

[16] Pastor-Escuredo, D., Treleaven, P., & Vinuesa, R. (2022). An ethical framework for artificial intelligence and sustainable cities. AI, 3(4), 961–974. https://doi.org/10.3390/ai3040057.

[17] Popenici, S. A. D., & Kerr, S. (2017). Exploring the impact of artificial intelligence on teaching and learning in higher education. Research and Practice in Technology Enhanced Learning, 12(22), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41039-017-0062-8.

[18] Sajja, R., Sermet, Y., Fodale, B., & Demir, I. (2025). Evaluating AI-powered learning assistants in engineering higher education: Student engagement, ethical challenges, and policy implications.

[19] Shukla, A. K., Janmaijaya, M., Abraham, A., & Muhuri, P. K. (2019). Engineering applications of artificial intelligence: A bibliometric analysis of 30 years (1988–2018). Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence, 85, 517–532. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engappai.2019.06.010.

[20] Siau, K., & Wang, W. (2020). Artificial intelligence (AI) ethics: Ethics of AI and ethical AI. Journal of Database Management, 31(2), 74–87. https://doi.org/10.4018/JDM.2020040105.

[21] U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Technology. (2023). Artificial Intelligence and the Future of Teaching and Learning: Insights and Recommendations (Report). https://www.ed.gov/sites/ed/files/documents/ai-report/ai-report.pdf.

[22] Verboom, A. D. P. R., Pais, L., & Zijlstra, F. R. (2025). Perceptions of artificial intelligence in academic teaching and research: A qualitative study from AI experts and professors' perspectives. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 22, 46. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-025-00546-w

[23] Winkler-Schwartz, A., Bissonnette, V., Mirchi, N., Ponnudurai, N., Yilmaz, R., Ledwos, N., Siyar, S., Azarnoush, H., Karlik, B., & Del Maestro, R. F. (2019). Artificial intelligence in medical education: Best practices using machine learning to assess surgical expertise in virtual reality simulation. Journal of Surgical Education, 76(6), 1681–1690. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsurg.2019.05.015

[24] Xiao, P., Chen, Y., & Bao, W. (2023). Waiting, banning, and embracing: An empirical analysis of adapting policies for generative AI in higher education. SSRN. https://ssrn.com/abstract=4458269 or https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4458269.

[25] Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V. I., Bond, M., & Gouverneur, F. (2019). Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education—Where are the educators? International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 16(1), 1–27. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0.