European Economic Letters
ISSN 2323-5233
Vol 15, Issue 2 (2025)
http://eelet.org.uk

Awareness and Use of AI in Education with Reference to Management Education

[1]Dr. Rita Kakade
Assistant Professor
ASM'S Institute of Business Management
and Research Pune, ritakakade107@gmail.com

[2]Dr. Nilesh Anute
Associate Professor
Balaji Institute of Management
and Human Resource Development
Sri Balaji University Pune.
nileshanute@gmail.com

[3]Dr. Dashrath Gaikwad
Assistant Professor
PCET's Pune Business School
Nigdi Pune, dashrath88@gmail.com

Abstract
Education is not the only sector where Artificial Intelligence (AI) has become a transformative force. AI tools are being increasingly used in management education to improve learning results, expedite administrative procedures, and provide individualized student experiences. With an emphasis on identifying potential and limitations for its successful application, this study examines the awareness and use of AI in education, particularly in management institutions. A systematic questionnaire was used to acquire statistics from 225 respondents. The results show that even as there's an affordable degree of awareness, the usage of AI tools continues to be relatively new and has a whole lot of room to develop. The findings also emphasize the crucial elements affecting AI adoption, such as perceived advantages, simplicity of use, and institutional support.

Keywords : Artificial Intelligence, Management Education, Awareness, Adoption, Educational Technology.

1. Introduction

Artificial intelligence (AI) is transforming industries and reinventing traditional methods as a key component of technological innovation. AI in education presents previously unheard-of possibilities to increase administrative effectiveness, foster more engaging learning environments, and provide educators and students individualized assistance. Because the sector requires a dynamic fusion of theoretical knowledge, practical application, and decision- making abilities, the integration of AI into management education is very important. The adoption of AI in this setting has the ability to alter traditional teaching strategies and provide students the technical know-how they need to succeed in a cutthroat commercial world.

Common elements of management education include complex problem-solving, making choices in the face of uncertainty, and emphasizing strategic thinking and leadership. Artificial intelligence (AI) technology, may facilitate those processes by presenting actual-time comments, facilitating adaptive gaining knowledge of, and improving aid management effectiveness. For instance, AI-enabled learning management systems (LMS) may also tune each scholar's development, discover their areas of weak point, and provide custom designed getting to know guides. Similarly, AI- powered chatbots would possibly reduce teacher workloads, help with administrative tasks, and boost student engagement.

Notwithstanding these advantages, there is still disparity in management education's awareness and adoption of AI. The challenges of using AI tools, such as financial ramifications, technological obstacles, and instructor and student opposition to change, are faced by many institutions. Furthermore, worries about data privacy and the moral application of AI have become important challenges that must be resolved in order to promote acceptance and confidence.

The degree of awareness and use of AI in management education is examined in this study, with an emphasis on the benefits it offers and the challenges that prevent its adoption. The study assesses the present level of AI integration in management education by gathering primary data and consulting the body of existing literature. It explores the elements that affect AI adoption, such as perceived advantages, simplicity of use, and institutional support, while also looking at possible obstacles, such as infrastructure, technical know-how, and a lack of awareness.

In order to better comprehend the role of AI in transforming the learning environment, this study's results seek to provide useful insights for educational institutions, policymakers, and stakeholders in management education. This

study highlights the significance of strategic planning and cooperation so that one can fully use AI in training by means of bridging the awareness and implementation gap.

2. Review of Literature

Crompton and Burke (2023) saw a tremendous boom in publications in 2021 and 2022, indicating heightened interest and studies in this discipline, in their systematic evaluation of AI applications in higher education from 2016 to 2022. The need of greater methodological rigor, ethical issues, and cooperation in AI research in higher education was also emphasized by Bond et al. (2024).

The use of AI in management education is evolving. The 2024 Financial Times article compared the arrival of generative AI to the transition from typewriters to word processors in order to illustrate the revolutionary potential of this technology in banking. Business school courses are using AI more and more often. AI-focused courses are being offered by organizations such as the Wharton School and American University's Kogod School of Business, in line with the Wall Street Journal (2024), demonstrating a willpower to instructing students for a enterprise global driven by AI.

YouTube has been identified as the most helpful source of information on e-learning organizations (Ghewari, Anute, 2021). Customers are somewhat content with LinkedIn and Twitter, but they are very delighted with the information about an organization that offers e-learning on Facebook, Instagram, and YouTube. Byjus is the top e-learning organization on social media, according to our study, with White Hat Junior, Unacademy, Vedantu, and Khan Academy following closely behind. For online learning organizations, Facebook is the most widely used social media platform, followed by Instagram and YouTube. Twitter and LinkedIn are somewhat less helpful.

The integration of AI in education poses challenges despite its promise. Mallik and Gangopadhyay (2023) conducted a study that found barriers include high expenses, technological challenges, and instructor and student opposition to change. Data privacy and the need of using AI responsibly are two ethical issues that are also very important. The need of putting safeguards in place to stop AI abuse in educational contexts was underlined by Kamalov et al. (2023).

The direction of AI in education points to a change toward more effective and individualized learning opportunities. The transformative influence of generative AI in education was examined in a recent study that was published in Williamson & Eynon (2020), which promoted its multifarious and sustainable integration. Additionally, as AI applications in education continue to develop, Kamalov et. al. (2023) emphasized the necessity for a strong conceptual foundation and urged greater ethical considerations and collaboration in AI research.

3. Research Objective:

The primary objectives for the paper are:

- To determine how well-informed academic administrators, instructors, and students are about AI technologies in management education.
- To assess how widely AI is being used in management education.
- To determine the alleged advantages and difficulties of using AI in management education.
- To examine the demographic factors influencing awareness and usage of AI tools in management education.

4. Research Methodology

A cross-sectional survey research technique has been considered appropriate for the current study. In order to examine the awareness and use of AI in education, a sample size of 225 respondents was selected, comprising academic administrators, management students, and instructors from various educational institutions, particularly in management education. Institutions providing undergraduate, graduate, and executive management programs throughout India's urban and semi-urban areas were represented by the diversified sample.

To get a representative sample, stratified random sampling was used. Based on academic roles (educators, students, administrators) and institutional type (private, public, and autonomous institutions), the population was classified into strata. In order to preserve proportionate representation, respondents were chosen at random within each stratum. This approach made positive that the viewpoints of many control education stakeholders have been accurately represented.

An online survey disseminated via social media and e-mail served as the primary device for gathering statistics. An on-line survey made it feasible to collect data from a geographically scattered population in an effective way. Twenty-three closed-ended questions covering respondents' awareness, attitudes, and use patterns of AI tools in management education were included of the structured questionnaire. In order to contextualize the results and examine demographic variations, 5 questions related to demographic were also included. These questions covered age, gender, role, institutional type, and familiarity with AI tools.

Hypotheses of the Study

The hypotheses tested in this study are as follows:

Hypothesis 1:

- H_0: "There is no significant relationship between the awareness of AI and its adoption in management education."
- H_1: "There is a significant relationship between the awareness of AI and its adoption in management education."

- Hypothesis 2:
- H_0: "There is no significant difference in the awareness of AI among educators, students, and academic administrators."
- H_2: "There is a significant difference in the awareness of AI among educators, students, and academic administrators."
- Hypothesis 3:
- H_0: "Demographic factors such as age, role, and institutional type do not significantly influence the perception of AI in management education."
- H_3: "Demographic factors such as age, role, and institutional type significantly influence the perception of AI in management education."

5. Empirical Results

Table 1: Age Group

Age Group	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
18–25 years	37	16.44%	16.44%	16.44%
26–35 years	46	20.44%	20.44%	36.88%
36–45 years	82	36.44%	36.44%	73.33%
Above 45 years	60	26.67%	26.67%	100.00%
Total	225	100.0%	100.0%	

With 36.44% of respondents falling into this age group, the age group of 36–45 years old makes up the largest component of the sample. Individuals with significant professional expertise are well represented in this way. The age range of 26 to 35 years old makes up the second largest group, accounting for 20.44%. With 16.44% of the population, the 18–25 age group is the lowest, suggesting that younger age groups may be underrepresented in the study. A significant percentage, 26.67%, is held by the category of individuals over 45 years old.

Table 2: Gender

Gender	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Male	125	55.56%	55.56%	55.56%
Female	98	43.56%	43.56%	99.12%
Other	2	0.88%	0.88%	100.00%
Total	225	100.0%	100.0%	

The gender distribution shows a higher proportion of male respondents at 55.56%, while female respondents make up 43.56%. The "Other" category is minimal, with only 0.88% representation, highlighting a predominantly male and female sample.

Table 3: Qualification

Highest Qualification	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Bachelor's Degree	80	35.56%	35.56%	35.56%
Master's Degree	120	53.33%	53.33%	88.89%
PhD or Higher	25	11.11%	11.11%	100.00%
Total	225	100.0%	100.0%	

A majority of the respondents hold a Master's degree (53.33%), followed by those with a Bachelor's degree at 35.56%. Only 11.11% of respondents have a PhD or higher qualification, indicating a strong presence of mid-level professionals in management education.

Table 4: Current Role

Current Role	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Student	70	31.11%	31.11%	31.11%
Faculty	110	48.89%	48.89%	80.00%
Administrative Staff	35	15.56%	15.56%	95.56%
Industry Professional	10	4.44%	4.44%	100.00%
Total	225	100.0%	100.0%	

The largest group of respondents are faculty members, comprising 48.89% of the sample. Students make up 31.11%, indicating a strong participation from those pursuing management education. Administrative staff and industry professionals account for smaller shares, with 15.56% and 4.44%, respectively.

Table 5: Years of Experience in Education/Management

Years of Experience in Education/Management	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Less than 2 years	20	8.89%	8.89%	8.89%
2–5 years	70	31.11%	31.11%	40.00%
6–10 years	80	35.56%	35.56%	75.56%
More than 10 years	55	24.44%	24.44%	100.00%
Total	225	100.0%	100.0%	

The majority of respondents have between 2 to 10 years of experience in education/management, with 31.11% having 2–5 years and 35.56% having 6–10 years. A significant portion (24.44%) has over 10 years of experience, while 8.89% of respondents have less than 2 years of experience, suggesting a balanced representation across different career stages.

Table 6: To what extent do you understand the idea of artificial intelligence in education?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Not familiar	46	20.44%	20.44%	20.44%
Slightly familiar	62	27.56%	27.56%	48.00%
Moderately familiar	80	35.56%	35.56%	83.56%
Very familiar	37	16.44%	16.44%	100.00%
Total	225	100.0%	100.0%	

The majority of respondents (35.56%) are moderately familiar with AI in education, while 27.56% are slightly familiar. A smaller proportion, 20.44%, reported being not familiar with AI, and 16.44% are very familiar. This indicates that while AI is increasingly recognized, full familiarity remains limited.

Table 7: Are you aware of AI tools specifically designed for management education?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Yes	185	82.22%	82.22%	82.22%
No	40	17.78%	17.78%	100.00%
Total	225	100.0%	100.0%	

A significant majority (82.22%) of respondents are aware of AI tools designed specifically for management education, indicating that AI tools are becoming well recognized in this domain. However, 17.78% are unaware, suggesting room for improvement in awareness efforts.

Table 8: Have you attended any sessions/workshops on AI in education?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Yes	121	53.78%	53.78%	53.78%
No	104	46.22%	46.22%	100.00%
Total	225	100.0%	100.0%	

Over half of the respondents (53.78%) have attended sessions or workshops on AI in education, indicating a relatively high level of engagement with AI-related educational initiatives. However, 46.22% have not participated, suggesting that more educational events on AI could help increase exposure.

Table 9: How often do you encounter discussions about AI in your academic or professional environment?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Rarely	37	16.44%	16.44%	16.44%
Occasionally	90	40.00%	40.00%	56.44%
Frequently	98	43.56%	43.56%	100.00%
Total	225	100.0%	100.0%	

The results show that 43.56% of respondents frequently encounter discussions about AI in their academic or professional environment, indicating its growing relevance. Meanwhile, 40.00% encounter such discussions occasionally, and 16.44% rarely engage in these conversations.

Table 10: Do you presently use any AI tools for education?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Yes	132	58.67%	58.67%	58.67%
No	93	41.33%	41.33%	100.00%
Total	225	100.0%	100.0%	

A majority of respondents (58.67%) reported using AI tools for educational purposes, suggesting a substantial adoption of AI in this domain. However, 41.33% of participants do not use such tools, reflecting potential barriers or lack of awareness.

Table 11: If yes, which tools do you use most frequently?

AI Tool	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Learning Management Systems (LMS) with AI features	48	36.36%	36.36%	36.36%
AI-based tutoring systems	30	22.73%	22.73%	59.09%
ChatGPT or similar tools	37	28.03%	28.03%	87.12%
Others	17	12.88%	12.88%	100.00%
Total	225	100.0%	100.0%	

Among those using AI tools, Learning Management Systems with AI features are the most commonly used (36.36%), followed by ChatGPT or similar tools at 28.03%. AI-based tutoring systems account for 22.73%, and 12.88% of respondents use other tools.

Table 12: What is the primary purpose of using AI tools in your role?

Purpose	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Enhancing learning outcomes	72	54.55%	54.55%	54.55%
Administrative efficiency	30	22.73%	22.73%	77.27%
Research and analytics	20	15.15%	15.15%	92.42%
Others	10	7.58%	7.58%	100.00%
Total	225	100.0%	100.0%	

The primary purpose for using AI tools is to enhance learning outcomes (54.55%). Administrative efficiency and research and analytics follow at 22.73% and 15.15%, respectively. A smaller portion of respondents (7.58%) use AI tools for other purposes.

Table 13: How often do you include AI tools into your regular professional or academic tasks?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Rarely	40	17.78%	17.78%	17.78%
Occasionally	100	44.44%	44.44%	62.22%
Frequently	85	37.78%	37.78%	100.00%
Total	225	100.0%	100.0%	

A significant portion of respondents (44.44%) use AI tools occasionally, while 37.78% use them frequently. Those who rarely use these tools account for 17.78%.

Table 14: How much do you think AI improves the quality of education?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly disagree	5	2.22%	2.22%	2.22%
Disagree	10	4.44%	4.44%	6.67%
Neutral	35	15.56%	15.56%	22.22%
Agree	120	53.33%	53.33%	75.56%
Strongly agree	55	24.44%	24.44%	100.00%
Total	225	100.0%	100.0%	

The majority of respondents (53.33%) agree that AI improves the quality of education, and 24.44% strongly agree. A smaller portion, 15.56%, remain neutral, while only 6.67% disagree or strongly disagree.

Table 15: Do you think AI has the potential to make management education more personalize?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Yes	185	82.22%	82.22%	82.22%
No	40	17.78%	17.78%	100.00%
Total	225	100.0%	100.0%	

A vast majority (82.22%) believe AI can personalize the learning experience in management education, indicating strong optimism about its capabilities. However, 17.78% do not share this view, highlighting some skepticism or potential barriers to personalization.

Table 16: Does AI help reduce the workload of faculty and administrative staff?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Yes	136	60.44%	60.44%	60.44%
No	89	39.56%	39.56%	100.00%
Total	225	100.0%	100.0%	

A majority of respondents (60.44%) believe that AI helps reduce the workload of faculty and administrative staff, highlighting its potential to streamline operations. However, 39.56% do not perceive such benefits, indicating varying levels of adoption and effectiveness.

Table 17: How effective is AI in improving decision-making in educational institutions?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Not effective	15	6.67%	6.67%	6.67%
Slightly effective	45	20.00%	20.00%	26.67%
Moderately effective	90	40.00%	40.00%	66.67%
Highly effective	75	33.33%	33.33%	100.00%
Total	225	100.0%	100.0%	

The results indicate that 40.00% of respondents find AI moderately effective in improving decision-making in educational institutions, while 33.33% rate it as highly effective. A smaller portion, 20.00%, finds it slightly effective, and only 6.67% believe it is not effective.

Table 18: What is the biggest challenge in adopting AI in education?

Challenge	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Lack of awareness	52	23.11%	23.11%	23.11%
High cost	63	28.00%	28.00%	51.11%
Technical difficulties	56	24.89%	24.89%	76.00%
Resistance to change	54	24.00%	24.00%	100.00%
Total	225	100.0%	100.0%	

High cost (28.00%) emerged as the most significant challenge in adopting AI in education, followed closely by technical difficulties (24.89%) and resistance to change (24.00%). Lack of awareness (23.11%) is also a notable barrier, indicating the need for better communication and support.

Table 19: Are privacy concerns a barrier to using AI in education?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Yes	132	58.67%	58.67%	58.67%
No	93	41.33%	41.33%	100.00%
Total	225	100.0%	100.0%	

Privacy concerns are seen as a barrier by 58.67% of respondents, highlighting the need for robust data protection measures. On the other hand, 41.33% do not perceive privacy issues as a major hindrance, suggesting that some institutions have mitigated these challenges.

Table 20: Does the lack of technical expertise hinder AI adoption in your institution?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Yes	140	62.22%	62.22%	62.22%
No	85	37.78%	37.78%	100.00%
Total	225	100.0%	100.0%	

A significant majority (62.22%) believe that the lack of technical expertise hinders AI adoption in their institution, underlining the importance of skill development. Meanwhile, 37.78% feel technical expertise is not a barrier, which may reflect differences in institutional readiness.

Table 21: Does your institution encourage the adoption of AI tools?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Yes	148	65.78%	65.78%	65.78%
No	77	34.22%	34.22%	100.00%
Total	225	100.0%	100.0%	

Institutional support for AI tool adoption is evident, with 65.78% of respondents affirming that their institutions encourage the use of AI tools. However, 34.22% do not receive such support, suggesting variability in institutional priorities.

Table 22: Have you received any training or support to use AI in education?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Yes	121	53.78%	53.78%	53.78%
No	104	46.22%	46.22%	100.00%
Total	225	100.0%	100.0%	

The data shows that 53.78% of respondents have received training or support to use AI in education, indicating progress in capacity building. However, 46.22% have not received such support, emphasizing the need for broader training programs to enhance AI adoption.

Table 23: How would you rate your institution's infrastructure for AI-based education?

Rating	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Poor	47	20.89%	20.89%	20.89%
Average	74	32.89%	32.89%	53.78%
Good	66	29.33%	29.33%	83.11%
Excellent	38	16.89%	16.89%	100.00%
Total	225	100.0%	100.0%	

The majority of respondents (32.89%) rate their institution's infrastructure for AI-based education as average, with a significant portion (29.33%) considering it good. Only 16.89% rate it as excellent, while 20.89% perceive it as poor, indicating the need for infrastructure improvements.

Table 24: Would you like to learn more about AI applications in education?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Yes	163	72.44%	72.44%	72.44%
No	62	27.56%	27.56%	100.00%
Total	225	100.0%	100.0%	

A vast majority (72.44%) expressed interest in learning more about AI applications in education, indicating a strong desire for knowledge enhancement. However, 27.56% showed no interest, which may reflect satisfaction with their current understanding or a lack of perceived relevance.

Table 25: Do you anticipate that during the next five years, AI will play an integral role in management education?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Yes	171	76.00%	76.00%	76.00%
No	54	24.00%	24.00%	100.00%
Total	225	100.0%	100.0%	

According to the results, 76.00% of respondents think AI will play an integral role in management education during the next five years, showing optimism about AI's growing role. Meanwhile, 24.00% are skeptical, potentially due to challenges in adoption or awareness.

Table 26: Would you recommend the use of AI tools to colleagues or peers?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Yes	182	80.89%	80.89%	80.89%
No	43	19.11%	19.11%	100.00%
Total	225	100.0%	100.0%	

A strong majority (80.89%) are willing to recommend AI tools to colleagues or peers, reflecting their positive experiences or expectations. On the other hand, 19.11% would not recommend them, possibly due to dissatisfaction or lack of awareness.

Table 27: What is your preferred method for learning about AI in education?

Method	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Workshops	68	30.22%	30.22%	30.22%

Online courses	72	32.00%	32.00%	62.22%
Peer learning	48	21.33%	21.33%	83.56%
Industry collaborations	37	16.44%	16.44%	100.00%
Total	225	100.0%	100.0%	

Online courses (32.00%) and workshops (30.22%) are the most preferred methods for learning about AI in education, while peer learning (21.33%) and industry collaborations (16.44%) have less appeal, suggesting a preference for structured learning formats.

Table 28: What additional features would you like AI tools to offer for educational purposes?

Feature	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Advanced analytics	74	32.89%	32.89%	32.89%
Real-time feedback	62	27.56%	27.56%	60.44%
Enhanced personalization	59	26.22%	26.22%	86.67%
Others	30	13.33%	13.33%	100.00%
Total	225	100.0%	100.0%	

The most desired feature in AI tools is advanced analytics (32.89%), followed by real-time feedback (27.56%) and enhanced personalization (26.22%). A smaller segment (13.33%) suggested other features, indicating a broad range of expectations for AI tools in education.

Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis 1

- H_0: "There is no significant relationship between the awareness of AI and its adoption in management education".
- H_1: "There is a significant relationship between the awareness of AI and its adoption in management education".

Table 29: Chi-Square Test for Relationship Between Awareness of AI and Its Adoption in Management Education

Value	df	Asymp. Sig.
Pearson Chi-Square	24.301	2
Likelihood Ratio	25.512	2
N of Valid Cases	225	

The Pearson Chi-Square value is 24.301 with 2 degrees of freedom and an asymptotic significance (p-value) of 0.000, which is less than the standard significance level of 0.05. This indicates a highly significant relationship between awareness of AI and its adoption in management education.

The null hypothesis (H0) is rejected, and the alternate hypothesis (H1) is accepted, suggesting that awareness of AI significantly influences its adoption in management education.

Hypothesis 2

- H_0: "There is no significant difference in the awareness of AI among educators, students, and academic administrators".
- H_2: "There is a significant difference in the awareness of AI among educators, students, and academic administrators".

Table 30: Chi-Square Test for Differences in Awareness of AI Among Educators, Students, and Academic Administrators

Value	df	Asymp. Sig.
Pearson Chi-Square	19.284	4
Likelihood Ratio	20.103	4
N of Valid Cases	225	

The Pearson Chi-Square value is 19.284 with 4 degrees of freedom and an asymptotic significance (p-value) of 0.001. As the p-value is less than 0.05, it indicates a statistically significant difference in the awareness of AI among educators, students, and academic administrators.

The null hypothesis (H0) is rejected, and the alternate hypothesis (H1) is accepted. There is a significant difference in the awareness of AI among these groups.

Hypothesis 3

- H_0: "Demographic factors such as age, role, and institutional type do not significantly influence the perception of AI in management education".

- H_3: "Demographic factors such as age, role, and institutional type significantly influence the perception of AI in management education".

Table 31: Chi-Square Test for Influence of Demographic Factors on Perception of AI in Management Education

df	Asymp. Sig.
26.874	6
28.005	6
225	

The Pearson Chi-Square value is 26.874 with 6 degrees of freedom and an asymptotic significance (p-value) of 0.000. As the p-value is below 0.05, this indicates that demographic factors significantly influence the perception of AI in management education.
The null hypothesis (H0) is rejected, and the alternate hypothesis (H1) is accepted, confirming that age, role, and institutional type significantly influence how AI is perceived in the context of management education.

6. Conclusion

The current research examined the connection between AI awareness and adoption in management education, finding significant correlations between awareness and the use of AI tools. Significant disparities in educators', students', and educational administrators' focus of AI were also observed inside the examine, highlighting the disparities in publicity and comprehension throughout numerous academic positions. Furthermore, views of AI in training were proven to be notably inspired by demographic parameters along with age, role, and institutional type, highlighting the importance of these factors in forming attitudes closer to era integration.
According to the results, artificial intelligence (AI) is becoming more popular in management education; nevertheless, the advantages and adoption of AI differ based on the roles, awareness, and institutional support of individuals. In order to promote a more inclusive and successful integration of AI tools into the academic environment, the research indicates a great need for focused awareness campaigns and training programs that may close the knowledge gap in AI amongst various groups within educational institutions.
Because the study mostly used self-reported data, biases based on respondents' subjective opinions and impressions of AI in education may have been introduced, which can be considered the biggest limitation of the present study. Furthermore, only certain educational institutions were included in the sample, which could not accurately reflect the larger global context of AI adoption in education. Future studies need to expand the pattern to include respondents from different geographic regions and a greater numerous ranges of instructional establishments.
Future research may look at the lengthy-time period results of AI adoption on schooling outcomes in addition to the way it affects teaching techniques and student learning studies. Studies might also look at possible obstacles to AI integration, such institutional opposition, financial limitations, or ethical issues, and provide ways to get around them. Insights into best practices for AI adoption in management education might also be gained from a comparative study of various educational institutions.

References

1. Alam, A., & Mohanty, A. (2022), Foundation for the future of higher education or 'misplaced optimism'? Being human in the age of artificial intelligence. In M. Panda, S. Dehuri, M. R. Patra, P. K. Behera, G. A. Tsihrintzis, S.-B. Cho, & C. A. Coello Coello (Eds.), Innovations in intelligent computing and communication (pp. 17–29). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-23233-6_2
2. Algabri, H. K., Kharade, K. G., & Kamat, R. K. (2021), Promise, threats, and personalization in higher education with artificial intelligence. Webology, 18(6), 2129–2139.
3. Bahroun, Z., Anane, C., Ahmed, V., & Zacca, A. (2023), Transforming education: A comprehensive review of generative artificial intelligence in educational settings through bibliometric and content analysis. Sustainability, 15(17), 12983. https://doi.org/10.3390/su151712983
4. Bearman, M., Ryan, J., & Ajjawi, R. (2023), Discourses of artificial intelligence in higher education: A critical literature review. Higher Education, 86(2), 369–385. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-022-00937-2
5. Bond, M., Khosravi, H., De Laat, M., et al. (2024), A meta systematic review of artificial intelligence in higher education: A call for increased ethics, collaboration, and rigour. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 21(4). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00436-z
6. Business schools are going all in on AI. (2024, April 10), The Wall Street Journal. https://www.wsj.com/tech/ai/generative-ai-mba-business-school-13199631
7. 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

8. Ghewari A, Anute N (2021), Social Media Marketing Strategies of E-Learning Organizations with Special Reference to Elementary Education, Ilkogretim Online - Elementary Education Online, 20(6), 3593-3600.
9. Hinojo-Lucena, F.-J., Aznar-Diaz, I., Romero-Rodríguez, J.-M., & Cáceres-Reche, M.-P. (2019), Artificial intelligence in higher education: A bibliometric study on its impact in the scientific literature. Education Sciences. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci9010051
10. Kamalov, F., Santandreu Calonge, D., & Gurrib, I. (2023), New era of artificial intelligence in education: Towards a sustainable multifaceted revolution. Sustainability, 15(16), 12451. https://doi.org/10.3390/su151612451
11. Mallik, S., & Gangopadhyay, A. (2023), Proactive and reactive engagement of artificial intelligence methods for education: A review. arXiv Preprint, arXiv:2301.10231. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2301.10231
12. Thirst for AI knowledge drives growth in executive courses. (2024, June 15), Financial Times. https://www.ft.com/content/86b76229-bd48-4c07-8c8f-3b0cbf340a55
13. Williamson, B., & Eynon, R. (2020), Historical threads, missing links, and future directions in AI in education. Learning, Media & Technology, 45(3), 223–235. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2020.1798995
14. 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. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0