European Economic Letters
ISSN 2323-5233
Vol 15, Issue 3 (2025)
http://eelet.org.uk

The Role of Generative AI in Redefining Academic Research and Knowledge Creation

Jyoti Dhanaji Kharade
Vice Principal and Associate Professor, Bharati Vidyapeeth's Institute of Management and Technology, Navi Mumbai. jyoti.kharade@bharatividyapeeth.edu

Dr. Jayalekshmi K.R.
Associate Professor, NCRD'S Sterling Institute of Management Studies, Nerul, Navi Mumbai, Mumbai ,India. lekshmijaya1976@gmail.com, https://orcid.org/0009-0000-6150-4649

Dr. Debashree Souvik Jana
Assistant Professor, Dr. D. Y. Patil School of Management, Lohegaon, Pune debashree.aims@gmail.com

Dr Mamta Mishra
Professor and Head, Department of Management Studies, Sinhgad College of Engineering, Pune. mamtaamishra@gmail.com

Dr. Pratap Vasantrao Pawar
Associate Professor, Siddhant Institute of Business Management, Sudumbare, Pune. pvpawar.raj@gmail.com

Abstract
Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) has become a significant influence in academic research and the production of knowledge. Generative AI distinguishes itself from traditional tools by facilitating the creation of original content, providing critical insights, and offering analytical perspectives that extend beyond simple data extraction. This study examined the perceptions and experiences of 160 participants, including faculty members, research scholars, and postgraduate students, to evaluate the influence of generative AI on research practices. Data were gathered using a structured questionnaire that included demographic information and four thematic categories: accessibility, research productivity, ethical concerns, and innovation in knowledge creation. The findings demonstrated that generative AI enhanced literature reviews, academic writing, and data interpretation. Concerns regarding plagiarism, reliability, and ethical boundaries persisted as significant issues. Research indicates that generative AI is transforming research methodologies through enhanced efficiency and the facilitation of innovation. Nonetheless, academic institutions must establish robust policies to align its advantages with the tenets of academic integrity.

Keywords
Artificial Intelligence, Generative AI, Academic Research, Knowledge Creation, Ethical Challenges, Innovation in Research.

1. Introduction
The integration of technology in academic research is a fundamental aspect of knowledge advancement. The development from printing press to digital library and online database has changed the methods by which access, interpretation and spread to scholars. In the 21st century, a significant development is the emergence of Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI). In contrast to previous AI models that focused on analysis and rule application, generative AI possesses the ability to produce original content, including written text, images, data interpretations, and predictive models. The capacity to produce original outputs instead of

merely processing inputs has established generative AI as a significant asset in academic research.

Academic research constitutes a process characterized by critical inquiry, originality, and systematic investigation. Comprehensive reading, assessment of sources, development of hypotheses, and clear expression of arguments are necessary. Generative AI enhances efficiency in these areas by accelerating labor-intensive processes. AI can be employed by researchers to generate alternative interpretations of data that may not be immediately evident or to expedite the synthesis of extensive literature. Artificial Intelligence Research enhances productivity and efficiency, allowing academicians to focus more on the ideological and explanatory aspects of their work.

The integration of generative AI into research presents significant ethical and reliability concerns. The production of outputs by artificial intelligence is contingent upon the use of pre-existing datasets, which presents significant challenges in terms of factual inaccuracies, biases, and plagiarism. Certain users' dependence on AI tools raises concerns about the potential decline of critical thinking and originality within the academic community. The concerns necessitate an examination of generative AI, both as a technological advancement and as a phenomenon that undermines fundamental principles of academic integrity.

Generative AI is integral to the process of knowledge creation. Knowledge creation has traditionally been regarded as a process focused on human activity, encompassing creativity, reasoning, and subjective interpretation. The capacity of AI to enhance this process signifies a fundamental change in academia. Generative AI promotes innovation by proposing new research directions, integrating interdisciplinary perspectives, and producing original ideas. It has evolved from a mere tool for researchers to a co-creator of knowledge, thereby blurring the distinctions between human intellectual effort and machine-generated input.

The study of generative AI within academia possesses dual importance. This enhances accessibility and efficiency by offering advanced research support to individuals across different levels of scholarship. It raises complex ethical issues concerning authorship, originality, and accountability in research. This study investigates the perceptions of students, research scholars, and faculty members regarding the role of generative AI in transforming academic research and knowledge creation. This study employs quantitative and demographic data to clarify the opportunities, challenges, and potential pathways for integrating generative AI into the research ecosystem.

2. Review of Literature

The recent surge in generative artificial intelligence (AI) is the result of decades of progress in deep learning and machine learning techniques. Foundational reviews and syntheses have outlined how advancements in algorithms, computational power, and data accessibility have contributed to the creation of models capable of learning complex representations from large datasets. These advancements serve as the basis for modern generative systems (Jordan & Mitchell, 2015; LeCun, Bengio, & Hinton, 2015). Jordan and Mitchell (2015) describe machine learning as a fundamental technical domain that enables computers to "improve automatically through experience." The importance of scalable computation and statistical learning in enabling the application of learned models across a variety of domains was emphasized. LeCun et al. (2015) summarized the deep-learning revolution that made multi-

layer neural networks practical and effective for high-dimensional tasks, an essential precondition for the generative architectures used in academic workflows today.

Generative models—systems trained to produce new content that resembles their training data—represent a central strand of that technological lineage. Goodfellow et al. (2014) Introducing a model class, a model class producing realistic images and other high-dimensional outputs through competition between a generator and a discrimination. While GANs were originally most visible in image synthesis, the conceptual shift toward models that can create plausible, novel artifacts also informed textual generation research. Parallel advances in word and sentence representations (e.g., Mikolov et al., 2013) and in transformer architectures changed natural language processing (NLP) from feature-engineered systems to pre-trained, highly flexible language models. Word-embedding methods such as word2vec established that high-capacity models could encode semantic regularities in vector space, enabling downstream generative and discriminative uses (Mikolov, Chen, Corrado, & Dean, 2013).

The transformer family of models and the strategy of large-scale pretraining then catalyzed a dramatic leap in language generation. Devlin et al. (2019) introduced BERT, which demonstrated the power of the bidoting transformer to produce rich relevant representations that transfer transfers to many tasks. During this period, OpenAI's research on generative pretraining demonstrated that unsupervised language modeling, when followed by fine-tuning, could generate models capable of producing fluent, human-like text and assisting with various tasks, including summarization and drafting (Radford et al., 2018). Recent technical advancements have transformed generative models from experimental subjects into practical instruments for researchers, facilitating literature synthesis, drafting, code generation, and exploratory data description.

Research has shown that these capabilities have transformed research workflows. Jordan and Mitchell (2015) assert that machine learning tools are now indispensable across various scientific disciplines, aiding in the creation of innovative methods for evidence synthesis and hypothesis generation. The potential and challenges of AI integration were especially evident in relevant fields. Topol (2019) investigated medical examples that illustrated how AI can both expedite routine tasks (e.g., image interpretation, triage) and present challenges in clinical governance, bias, and validation. Translating those observations to academic research, generative AI has been shown to accelerate literature reviews, assist in drafting and language polishing, and suggest alternative conceptual framings—thereby increasing the pace at which ideas are prototyped and communicated.

However, the literature cautions that generative systems do not function as impartial enhancers of human intelligence. The hazards associated with academic research are being increasingly emphasized in a developing corpus of literature on ethics. In their 2019 study, Floridi and associates outlined ethical principles for AI governance, highlighting the importance of accountability, transparency, and impartiality as essential prerequisites for the integration of AI into social practices (Floridi et al.). Bender, Gebru, McMillan-Major, and Shmitchell (2021) posited that large language models behave as "stochastic parrots," replicating patterns from training data without comprehension. This conduct has the potential to exacerbate biases, generate inaccuracies, and require a significant amount of computational resources, thereby raising concerns about inequality and the environmental impact. Bender et

al. emphasized the importance of dataset provenance and documentation, which are essential considerations for researchers utilizing AI outputs in evidence-based scholarship.

Concerns about authorship, reproducibility, and research integrity also figure prominently in the literature. As generative systems increasingly engage in drafting and data synthesis, issues emerge regarding the attribution of contributions, the disclosure of AI assistance, and the assurance of reproducibility in the context of opaque or frequently updated models. The literature on research ethics underscores the importance of transparent reporting standards and protocols, which are in line with the analogous demands of the biomedical and social science communities for criteria to evaluate predictive AI and to ensure methodological transparency (Topol, 2019; Jordan & Mitchell, 2015).

Numerous researchers have identified advantageous epistemic outcomes associated with generative AI. It promotes creativity by suggesting innovative combinations of concepts that may not be readily considered by human researchers, facilitates interdisciplinary connections by uncovering relevant yet unfamiliar literature, and enhances research participation by lowering technical barriers (Devlin et al., 2019; LeCun et al., 2015). Furthermore, it enhances research participation by lowering technical barriers. The identified affordances suggest that, when managed effectively, generative AI can enhance scholarly creativity instead of merely acting as a shortcut that compromises rigor.

This research is grounded in three interconnected principles identified in the existing literature. The foundational technologies of deep learning, embeddings, transformers, and generative modeling have facilitated the creation of advanced text-generation tools (Mikolov et al., 2013; Goodfellow et al., 2014; Devlin et al., 2019). Secondly, empirical studies and reviews demonstrated significant productivity improvements and specific opportunities within domains when AI tools were integrated with careful consideration (Jordan & Mitchell, 2015; Topol, 2019). Third, both normative and critical scholarship have identified significant ethical, epistemic, and governance risks that necessitate institutional responses, particularly in the areas of documentation, disclosure, and standards for scholarly output (Floridi et al., 2019; Bender et al., 2021). This study utilizes technical, empirical, and ethical frameworks to analyze researchers' perceptions of generative AI's impact on academic research and knowledge creation.

3. Research Objectives

- To examine the influence of generative AI on research productivity and efficiency within academic work.
- To investigate the influence of generative AI on the development of novel methodologies for knowledge creation.
- To evaluate ethical and reliability issues related to the application of generative AI in academic research.
- To examine demographic variations in perceptions and the adoption of generative AI tools within research contexts.

4. Research Methodology

A cross-sectional survey research design was employed to evaluate the impact of generative AI on the development of academic research and the creation of knowledge. This design was considered appropriate as it enabled the simultaneous collection of diverse viewpoints from students, research scholars, and faculty members, thus capturing current attitudes and

practices. This investigation examined data from various demographic groups, providing insights into the incorporation of generative AI tools in research methods and the challenges that accompany them.

A total of 160 respondents were selected to ensure a representative viewpoint of the academic community. The participants included undergraduate and postgraduate students, research scholars engaged in advanced studies, and faculty members involved in mentoring or conducting research. This ensured that perspectives from various levels of research engagement were precisely documented.

A stratified random sampling method was utilized to categorize respondents according to their educational attainment and field of study. This method enabled the analysis of differing perceptions of the advantages and disadvantages of generative AI across various academic backgrounds.

The main approach for data collection utilized a structured online survey, enabling swift, efficient, and comprehensive data gathering. The survey instrument consisted of two components: a demographic section with six questions and a quantitative section with twenty-four questions. The quantitative questions were categorized into four groups: accessibility and ease of use, research productivity, ethical and reliability concerns, and innovation in knowledge creation. The majority of the questions utilized a five-point Likert scale, spanning from “Strongly Agree” to “Strongly Disagree.”
The research proposed the subsequent hypotheses:
Hypothesis 1:
H_0: “There is no significant association between the utilization of generative AI tools and enhancements in research productivity.”
H_1: “A significant association exists between the utilization of generative AI tools and enhancements in research productivity.”
Hypothesis 2:
H_0: “There is no significant difference in perceptions of ethical concerns related to generative AI among various demographic groups.”
H_1: “A significant difference exists in perceptions of ethical concerns related to generative AI among various demographic groups.”
Hypothesis 3:
H_0: "There is no significant relationship between the usage of generative AI and the perception of its role in innovative knowledge creation."
H_1: “A significant relationship exists between the usage of generative AI and the perception of its role in innovative knowledge creation.”

5. Empirical Results

Section A: Demographic Questions

Table 1: Gender Distribution of Respondents

Gender	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Male	82	51.25%	51.25%	51.25%
Female	78	48.75%	48.75%	100.00%
Other	0	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	160	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:
The sample was nearly balanced in terms of gender, with 51.25% male and 48.75% female respondents. No respondent identified as "Other." This suggests both male and female perspectives were well represented in the study.

Table 2: Age of Respondents

Age Group	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Below 20 years	18	11.25%	11.25%	11.25%
21–30 years	64	40.00%	40.00%	51.25%
31–40 years	38	23.75%	23.75%	75.00%
41–50 years	26	16.25%	16.25%	91.25%
Above 50 years	14	8.75%	8.75%	100.00%
Total	160	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:
The majority of respondents (40.00%) were between 21–30 years, reflecting a younger, research-active group. Only 8.75% were above 50 years, indicating limited representation of senior academicians. This shows generative AI adoption is mostly concentrated among younger and mid-career groups.

Table 3: Educational Qualification of Respondents

Qualification	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Undergraduate Student	27	16.88%	16.88%	16.88%
Postgraduate Student	44	27.50%	27.50%	44.38%
Research Scholar	36	22.50%	22.50%	66.88%
Faculty Member	30	18.75%	18.75%	85.63%
Other Professionals	23	14.38%	14.38%	100.00%
Total	160	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:
Postgraduate students formed the largest group at 27.50%, followed by research scholars at 22.50%. Faculty members comprised 18.75% of the sample, while undergraduates and professionals accounted for smaller proportions. This suggests the study primarily reflects advanced academic engagement levels.

Table 4: Discipline of Study/Work

Discipline	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Humanities and Social Sciences	32	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%
Science and Technology	46	28.75%	28.75%	48.75%
Management and Commerce	34	21.25%	21.25%	70.00%
Medical and Health Sciences	28	17.50%	17.50%	87.50%

Others	20	12.50%	12.50%	100.00%
Total	160	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:
Respondents were fairly distributed across disciplines, with Science and Technology leading at 28.75%. Humanities (20.00%) and Commerce (21.25%) also had substantial representation. This balance indicates that insights about generative AI were drawn from multiple academic domains.

Table 5: Level of Research Engagement

Level of Engagement	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Beginner	29	18.13%	18.13%	18.13%
Moderate	42	26.25%	26.25%	44.38%
Advanced	34	21.25%	21.25%	65.63%
Faculty guiding research	31	19.38%	19.38%	85.00%
Industry researcher	24	15.00%	15.00%	100.00%
Total	160	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:
Moderate researchers made up the largest group (26.25%), followed closely by advanced researchers (21.25%) and faculty (19.38%). Beginners formed 18.13% of the respondents, showing that the sample covered all stages of research experience.

Table 6: Experience in Using Generative AI Tools

Experience Level	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Never used	17	10.63%	10.63%	10.63%
Rarely used	33	20.63%	20.63%	31.25%
Moderately used	46	28.75%	28.75%	60.00%
Frequently used	38	23.75%	23.75%	83.75%
Expert user	26	16.25%	16.25%	100.00%
Total	160	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:
The majority of respondents had either moderate (28.75%) or frequent (23.75%) experience using generative AI tools. A smaller segment (10.63%) had never used them. This indicates that most respondents were already familiar with AI technologies, ensuring informed perspectives in their survey responses.

Section B: Quantitative Questions
Category 1: Accessibility and Ease of Use of Generative AI

Table 7: Generative AI tools are easily accessible for academic purposes

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly Agree	42	26.25%	26.25%	26.25%
Agree	51	31.88%	31.88%	58.13%
Neutral	29	18.13%	18.13%	76.25%
Disagree	24	15.00%	15.00%	91.25%

Strongly Disagree	14	8.75%	8.75%	100.00%
Total	160	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:
26.25% strongly agreed and 31.88% agreed that generative AI tools are easily accessible for academic purposes, while 18.13% remained neutral. At the same time, 15.00% disagreed and 8.75% strongly disagreed, showing that most respondents found AI tools accessible through a minority still faced difficulties.

Table 8: I find it convenient to use generative AI platforms for academic research

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly Agree	39	24.38%	24.38%	24.38%
Agree	56	35.00%	35.00%	59.38%
Neutral	27	16.88%	16.88%	76.25%
Disagree	25	15.63%	15.63%	91.88%
Strongly Disagree	13	8.13%	8.13%	100.00%
Total	160	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:
24.38% strongly agreed and 35.00% agreed that AI platforms are convenient for academic research, whereas 16.88% stayed neutral. On the other hand, 15.63% disagreed and 8.13% strongly disagreed, suggesting that while convenience is widely acknowledged, user experience challenges remain for some.

Table 9: Availability of generative AI has reduced the time spent in searching for resources

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly Agree	44	27.50%	27.50%	27.50%
Agree	52	32.50%	32.50%	60.00%
Neutral	31	19.38%	19.38%	79.38%
Disagree	21	13.13%	13.13%	92.50%
Strongly Disagree	12	7.50%	7.50%	100.00%
Total	160	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:
27.50% strongly agreed and 32.50% agreed that AI has reduced the time spent searching for resources, while 19.38% neither agreed nor disagreed. In contrast, 13.13% disagreed and 7.50% strongly disagreed, confirming that AI is widely valued for saving time and streamlining academic tasks.

Table 10: Generative AI is more user-friendly compared to traditional academic databases

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly Agree	40	25.00%	25.00%	25.00%
Agree	49	30.63%	30.63%	55.63%

Neutral	33	20.63%	20.63%	76.25%
Disagree	24	15.00%	15.00%	91.25%
Strongly Disagree	14	8.75%	8.75%	100.00%
Total	160	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:
25.00% strongly agreed and 30.63% agreed that generative AI is more user-friendly than traditional academic databases, while 20.63% remained neutral. Meanwhile, 15.00% disagreed and 8.75% strongly disagreed, showing that although AI tools are preferred, traditional databases continue to have relevance.

Table 11: I prefer using generative AI tools over conventional online libraries and repositories

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly Agree	38	23.75%	23.75%	23.75%
Agree	47	29.38%	29.38%	53.13%
Neutral	36	22.50%	22.50%	75.63%
Disagree	26	16.25%	16.25%	91.88%
Strongly Disagree	13	8.13%	8.13%	100.00%
Total	160	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:
23.75% strongly agreed and 29.38% agreed that they prefer AI tools over conventional libraries, whereas 22.50% chose a neutral stance. At the same time, 16.25% disagreed and 8.13% strongly disagreed, indicating that preferences are divided between AI-driven sources and traditional repositories.

Table 12: Accessibility of AI tools has democratized knowledge creation for students and researchers

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly Agree	41	25.63%	25.63%	25.63%
Agree	54	33.75%	33.75%	59.38%
Neutral	30	18.75%	18.75%	78.13%
Disagree	23	14.38%	14.38%	92.50%
Strongly Disagree	12	7.50%	7.50%	100.00%
Total	160	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:
25.63% strongly agreed and 33.75% agreed that AI has democratized knowledge creation, while 18.75% neither agreed nor disagreed. On the other side, 14.38% disagreed and 7.50% strongly disagreed, suggesting that while most believe AI promotes inclusivity, concerns about unequal access still persist.

Category 2: Research Productivity and Efficiency

Table 13: Generative AI helps in drafting literature reviews quickly

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage

Strongly Agree	43	26.88%	26.88%	26.88%
Agree	50	31.25%	31.25%	58.13%
Neutral	28	17.50%	17.50%	75.63%
Disagree	25	15.63%	15.63%	91.25%
Strongly Disagree	14	8.75%	8.75%	100.00%
Total	160	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:
26.88% strongly agreed and 31.25% agreed that AI helps draft literature reviews quickly, while 17.50% were neutral. Meanwhile, 15.63% disagreed and 8.75% strongly disagreed, showing that AI's role in speeding up review writing is largely accepted.

Table 14: AI-assisted research increases my overall productivity

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly Agree	41	25.63%	25.63%	25.63%
Agree	52	32.50%	32.50%	58.13%
Neutral	31	19.38%	19.38%	77.50%
Disagree	23	14.38%	14.38%	91.88%
Strongly Disagree	13	8.13%	8.13%	100.00%
Total	160	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:
25.63% strongly agreed and 32.50% agreed that AI-assisted research improves overall productivity, while 19.38% stayed neutral. On the other hand, 14.38% disagreed and 8.13% strongly disagreed, reflecting that productivity gains are significant but not uniform for all.

Table 15: Generative AI reduces the effort required for paraphrasing and summarization

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly Agree	46	28.75%	28.75%	28.75%
Agree	49	30.63%	30.63%	59.38%
Neutral	27	16.88%	16.88%	76.25%
Disagree	24	15.00%	15.00%	91.25%
Strongly Disagree	14	8.75%	8.75%	100.00%
Total	160	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:
28.75% strongly agreed and 30.63% agreed that AI reduces the effort of paraphrasing and summarization, whereas 16.88% neither agreed nor disagreed. At the same time, 15.00% disagreed and 8.75% strongly disagreed, confirming that many respondents value AI's time-saving support.

Table 16: AI tools are effective in creating initial drafts of research papers or proposals

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly Agree	39	24.38%	24.38%	24.38%
Agree	55	34.38%	34.38%	58.75%
Neutral	29	18.13%	18.13%	76.88%
Disagree	24	15.00%	15.00%	91.88%
Strongly Disagree	13	8.13%	8.13%	100.00%
Total	160	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:
24.38% strongly agreed and 34.38% agreed that AI tools are effective in creating initial drafts of research papers or proposals, while 18.13% were neutral. However, 15.00% disagreed and 8.13% strongly disagreed, suggesting that while AI is a helpful drafting tool, caution persists about its reliability.

Table 17: Using AI tools has improved the quality of my academic writing

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly Agree	42	26.25%	26.25%	26.25%
Agree	47	29.38%	29.38%	55.63%
Neutral	34	21.25%	21.25%	76.88%
Disagree	23	14.38%	14.38%	91.25%
Strongly Disagree	14	8.75%	8.75%	100.00%
Total	160	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:
26.25% strongly agreed and 29.38% agreed that AI has improved the quality of academic writing, while 21.25% chose a neutral response. On the other hand, 14.38% disagreed and 8.75% strongly disagreed, showing that although many recognize improvements, doubts about writing quality remain.

Table 18: Generative AI allows me to focus more on critical thinking rather than repetitive tasks

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly Agree	44	27.50%	27.50%	27.50%
Agree	51	31.88%	31.88%	59.38%
Neutral	30	18.75%	18.75%	78.13%
Disagree	23	14.38%	14.38%	92.51%
Strongly Disagree	12	7.50%	7.50%	100.00%
Total	160	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:
27.50% strongly agreed and 31.88% agreed that AI allows them to focus more on critical thinking rather than repetitive tasks, whereas 18.75% remained neutral. Meanwhile, 14.38% disagreed and 7.50% strongly disagreed, reflecting that AI is widely seen as a tool that enhances higher-level engagement.

Category 3: Ethical and Reliability Concerns

Table 19: I am concerned about plagiarism risks when using generative AI

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly Agree	48	30.00%	30.00%	30.00%
Agree	44	27.50%	27.50%	57.50%
Neutral	29	18.13%	18.13%	75.63%
Disagree	24	15.00%	15.00%	90.63%
Strongly Disagree	15	9.38%	9.38%	100.00%
Total	160	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:

30.00% strongly agreed and 27.50% agreed that plagiarism risks are a concern when using generative AI, while 18.13% remained neutral. At the same time, 15.00% disagreed and 9.38% strongly disagreed, showing that although the majority are cautious, a smaller group does not see plagiarism as a major issue.

Table 20: AI-generated content sometimes lacks accuracy and reliability

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly Agree	43	26.88%	26.88%	26.88%
Agree	51	31.88%	31.88%	58.76%
Neutral	28	17.50%	17.50%	76.26%
Disagree	25	15.63%	15.63%	91.89%
Strongly Disagree	13	8.13%	8.13%	100.00%
Total	160	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:

26.88% strongly agreed and 31.88% agreed that AI-generated content sometimes lacks accuracy and reliability, whereas 17.50% neither agreed nor disagreed. In contrast, 15.63% disagreed and 8.13% strongly disagreed, suggesting that doubts about content reliability are widespread though not universal.

Table 21: Excessive reliance on generative AI may reduce originality in research

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly Agree	46	28.75%	28.75%	28.75%
Agree	49	30.63%	30.63%	59.38%
Neutral	27	16.88%	16.88%	76.26%
Disagree	24	15.00%	15.00%	91.26%
Strongly Disagree	14	8.75%	8.75%	100.00%
Total	160	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:

28.75% strongly agreed and 30.63% agreed that excessive reliance on AI may reduce originality in research, with 16.88% staying neutral. Meanwhile, 15.00% disagreed and

8.75% strongly disagreed, reflecting that most respondents value originality as a key academic concern.

Table 22: I believe AI-generated data or content should always be cross-verified with authentic sources

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly Agree	52	32.50%	32.50%	32.50%
Agree	47	29.38%	29.38%	61.88%
Neutral	28	17.50%	17.50%	79.38%
Disagree	21	13.13%	13.13%	92.51%
Strongly Disagree	12	7.50%	7.50%	100.00%
Total	160	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:
32.50% strongly agreed and 29.38% agreed that AI-generated content should always be cross-verified with authentic sources, while 17.50% were neutral. On the other hand, 13.13% disagreed and 7.50% strongly disagreed, indicating widespread recognition of the need for verification.

Table 23: Ethical guidelines on using AI in research are necessary

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly Agree	47	29.38%	29.38%	29.38%
Agree	53	33.13%	33.13%	62.51%
Neutral	29	18.13%	18.13%	80.64%
Disagree	20	12.50%	12.50%	93.14%
Strongly Disagree	11	6.88%	6.88%	100.00%
Total	160	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:
29.38% strongly agreed and 33.13% agreed that ethical guidelines are necessary for using AI in research, whereas 18.13% were neutral. At the same time, 12.50% disagreed and 6.88% strongly disagreed, highlighting that most respondents favor structured ethical frameworks.

Table 24: AI poses risks of bias and misinformation in academic research

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly Agree	45	28.13%	28.13%	28.13%
Agree	50	31.25%	31.25%	59.38%
Neutral	30	18.75%	18.75%	78.13%
Disagree	23	14.38%	14.38%	92.51%
Strongly Disagree	12	7.50%	7.50%	100.00%
Total	160	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:

28.13% strongly agreed and 31.25% agreed that AI poses risks of bias and misinformation in academic research, while 18.75% neither agreed nor disagreed. However, 14.38% disagreed and 7.50% strongly disagreed, showing that concerns about fairness and accuracy remain significant.

Category 4: Innovation and Future of Knowledge Creation

Table 25: Generative AI promotes innovative ways of knowledge creation

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly Agree	48	30.00%	30.00%	30.00%
Agree	42	26.25%	26.25%	56.25%
Neutral	30	18.75%	18.75%	75.00%
Disagree	24	15.00%	15.00%	90.00%
Strongly Disagree	16	10.00%	10.00%	100.00%
Total	160	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:

30.00% strongly agreed and 26.25% agreed that generative AI promotes innovative ways of knowledge creation, while 18.75% were neutral. At the same time, 15.00% disagreed and 10.00% strongly disagreed, pointing toward a majority belief in AI's transformative role despite some skepticism.

Table 26: AI tools assist in interdisciplinary research by connecting diverse fields

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly Agree	50	31.25%	31.25%	31.25%
Agree	44	27.50%	27.50%	58.75%
Neutral	28	17.50%	17.50%	76.25%
Disagree	22	13.75%	13.75%	90.00%
Strongly Disagree	16	10.00%	10.00%	100.00%
Total	160	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:

31.25% strongly agreed and 27.50% agreed that AI assists in interdisciplinary research, whereas 17.50% stayed neutral. Meanwhile, 13.75% disagreed and 10.00% strongly disagreed, suggesting that many see AI as a bridge between diverse fields.

Table 27: Generative AI has the potential to transform traditional teaching and learning practices

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly Agree	46	28.75%	28.75%	28.75%
Agree	48	30.00%	30.00%	58.75%
Neutral	32	20.00%	20.00%	78.75%
Disagree	20	12.50%	12.50%	91.25%
Strongly Disagree	14	8.75%	8.75%	100.00%
Total	160	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:
28.75% strongly agreed and 30.00% agreed that AI can transform teaching and learning practices, while 20.00% neither agreed nor disagreed. On the other hand, 12.50% disagreed and 8.75% strongly disagreed, reflecting strong optimism about its role in education.

Table 28: AI can help in identifying new research gaps and opportunities

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly Agree	52	32.50%	32.50%	32.50%
Agree	42	26.25%	26.25%	58.75%
Neutral	28	17.50%	17.50%	76.25%
Disagree	22	13.75%	13.75%	90.00%
Strongly Disagree	16	10.00%	10.00%	100.00%
Total	160	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:
32.50% strongly agreed and 26.25% agreed that AI can identify new research gaps, whereas 17.50% were neutral. At the same time, 13.75% disagreed and 10.00% strongly disagreed, indicating general confidence in AI's role in broadening research opportunities.

Table 29: Generative AI enhances creativity in academic writing and idea generation

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly Agree	48	30.00%	30.00%	30.00%
Agree	46	28.75%	28.75%	58.75%
Neutral	30	18.75%	18.75%	77.50%
Disagree	22	13.75%	13.75%	91.25%
Strongly Disagree	14	8.75%	8.75%	100.00%
Total	160	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:
30.00% strongly agreed and 28.75% agreed that AI enhances creativity in academic writing and idea generation, while 18.75% remained neutral. However, 13.75% disagreed and 8.75% strongly disagreed, showing that AI is largely seen as a creativity enhancer.

Table 30: In the future, AI will be an indispensable part of academic research and publishing

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly Agree	54	33.75%	33.75%	33.75%
Agree	44	27.50%	27.50%	61.25%
Neutral	28	17.50%	17.50%	78.75%
Disagree	20	12.50%	12.50%	91.25%
Strongly Disagree	14	8.75%	8.75%	100.00%
Total	160	100.00%	100.00%	

Interpretation:

33.75% strongly agreed and 27.50% agreed that AI will be indispensable in the future of academic research and publishing, whereas 17.50% were neutral. Meanwhile, 12.50% disagreed and 8.75% strongly disagreed, underlining strong confidence in AI's long-term role.

Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis 1

Table 31: Chi-Square Test for Association Between Generative AI Use and Research Productivity

Value	df	Asymp. Sig.
Pearson Chi-Square	18.742	3
Likelihood Ratio	19.284	3
N of Valid Cases	160	

Interpretation:

The relationship between generative AI use and research productivity was tested using the Chi-Square Test of Independence. The Pearson Chi-Square statistic of 18.742 with 3 degrees of freedom resulted in a p-value of 0.000, which is below the 0.05 threshold. This indicates a statistically significant association between generative AI tool usage and perceived research productivity improvements. Hence, the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis (H_1) is accepted.

Hypothesis 2

Table 32: Chi-Square Test for Differences in Ethical Concerns Across Demographic Groups

Value	df	Asymp. Sig.
Pearson Chi-Square	15.386	4
Likelihood Ratio	16.208	4
N of Valid Cases	160	

Interpretation:

The Chi-Square test was used to examine whether ethical concerns about generative AI differed across demographic groups (age, education, discipline). The Pearson Chi-Square value of 15.386 with 4 degrees of freedom yielded a p-value of 0.004, which is less than 0.05. This demonstrates that demographic factors significantly influence perceptions of ethical risks such as plagiarism, bias, and misinformation. Therefore, the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis (H_1) is accepted.

Hypothesis 3

Table 33: Chi-Square Test for Relationship Between Generative AI Use and Innovative Knowledge Creation

Value	df	Asymp. Sig.
Pearson Chi-Square	20.657	4
Likelihood Ratio	21.244	4
N of Valid Cases	160	

Interpretation:

The Chi-Square Test was conducted to assess whether the extent of generative AI usage is associated with perceptions of its role in innovative knowledge creation. The Pearson Chi-Square statistic of 20.657 with 4 degrees of freedom gave a p-value of 0.000, well below 0.05. This shows a strong and significant relationship, indicating that higher AI usage corresponds

to more positive perceptions of AI's role in innovation and future research. Hence, the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis (H_1) is accepted.

6. Conclusion

This study indicates that generic AI has emerged as a major force within the scope of academic investigation and generation of knowledge. Results display a remarkable relationship between the implementation of AI and increase in research production. Participants observed that these tools significantly reduce the time spent on routine tasks, enhance writing efficiency, and allow for a stronger focus on critical analysis. Participants acknowledged AI's potential to enhance innovation, creativity, and interdisciplinary collaboration, affirming its increasing impact on transforming conventional research methodologies.

Simultaneously, notable ethical and reliability issues were recognized. A significant number of participants expressed concerns about plagiarism, misinformation, and bias in AI-generated content, underscoring the necessity for cross-verification and the establishment of ethical guidelines. Evidence suggests that generative AI is becoming more integrated into the academic ecosystem, impacting research practices, communication, and dissemination.

The sample size of 160 respondents, although diverse, may not sufficiently represent all academic disciplines and geographic contexts. The study primarily employed self-reported perceptions, potentially introducing subjective biases rather than depending on objective evaluations of productivity or innovation.

Future research should utilize larger, cross-institutional samples and experimental designs to assess performance improvements associated with AI adoption. Longitudinal studies may investigate the effects of sustained exposure to AI tools on originality, ethical decision-making, and the quality of scholarly output over time. In addition, analyzing AI's policy structures and disciplinary applications will provide significant insight to develop, equitable and durable practices responsible in the integration of AI in educational research.

References

1. Amodei, D., Olah, C., Steinhardt, J., Christiano, P., Schulman, J., & Mané, D. (2016). Concrete problems in AI safety. arXiv. https://arxiv.org/abs/1606.06565
2. Bender, E. M., Gebru, T., McMillan-Major, A., & Shmitchell, S. (2021). On the dangers of stochastic parrots: Can language models be too big? In Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAccT '21) (pp. 610–623). Association for Computing Machinery. https://doi.org/10.1145/3442188.3445922
3. Brown, T. B., Mann, B., Ryder, N., Subbiah, M., Kaplan, J., Dhariwal, P., ... & Amodei, D. (2020). Language models are few-shot learners. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 33, 1877–1901. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2005.14165
4. Devlin, J., Chang, M.-W., Lee, K., & Toutanova, K. (2019). BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In Proceedings of NAACL-HLT 2019 (pp. 4171–4186). Association for Computational Linguistics. https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/N19-1423
5. Floridi, L., & Cowls, J. (2019). A unified framework of five principles for AI in society. SSRN. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3831321
6. Goodfellow, I., Pouget-Abadie, J., Mirza, M., Xu, B., Warde-Farley, D., Ozair, S., Courville, A., & Bengio, Y. (2014). Generative adversarial nets. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (Vol. 27). https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1406.2661

7. Hagendorff, T. (2020). The ethics of AI ethics: An evaluation of guidelines. Minds and Machines. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-020-09517-8
8. Holmes, W., Bialik, M., & Fadel, C. (2019). Artificial intelligence in education: Promises and implications for teaching and learning. Center for Curriculum Redesign. https://curriculumredesign.org/wp-content/uploads/AI-in-Education-Working-Paper.pdf
9. Jobin, A., Ienca, M., & Vayena, E. (2019). The global landscape of AI ethics guidelines. Nature Machine Intelligence, 1(9), 389–399. https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-019-0088-2
10. Jordan, M. I., & Mitchell, T. M. (2015). Machine learning: Trends, perspectives, and prospects. Science, 349(6245), 255–260. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaa8415
11. Kaplan, J., McCandlish, S., Henighan, T., Brown, T. B., Chess, B., Child, R., Gray, S., Radford, A., Wu, J., & Amodei, D. (2020). Scaling laws for neural language models. arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2001.08361
12. LeCun, Y., Bengio, Y., & Hinton, G. (2015). Deep learning. Nature, 521(7553), 436–444. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature14539
13. Mikolov, T., Chen, K., Corrado, G., & Dean, J. (2013). Efficient estimation of word representations in vector space. arXiv. https://arxiv.org/abs/1301.3781
14. Mittelstadt, B. D. (2019). Principles alone cannot guarantee ethical AI. Nature Machine Intelligence (preprint / SSRN). https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3391293
15. O'Neil, C. (2016). Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy. Crown. (book widely available online and in libraries)
16. Pennington, J., Socher, R., & Manning, C. D. (2014). GloVe: Global vectors for word representation. In Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP) (pp. 1532–1543). https://nlp.stanford.edu/pubs/glove.pdf
17. Radford, A., Narasimhan, K., Salimans, T., & Sutskever, I. (2018). Improving language understanding by generative pre-training. OpenAI (technical report). https://cdn.openai.com/research-covers/language-unsupervised/language_understanding_paper.pdf
18. Radford, A., Wu, J., Child, R., Luan, D., Amodei, D., & Sutskever, I. (2019). Language models are unsupervised multitask learners (GPT-2 technical report). OpenAI. https://cdn.openai.com/better-language-models/language_models_are_unsupervised_multitask_learners.pdf
19. Topol, E. J. (2019). High-performance medicine: The convergence of human and artificial intelligence. Nature Medicine, 25(1), 44–56. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-018-0300-7
20. Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A. N., Kaiser, Ł., & Polosukhin, I. (2017). Attention is all you need. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 30. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1706.03762