International Journal of Advance and Applied Research
www.ijaar.co.in
ISSN – 2347-7075 Impact Factor – 8.141
Peer Reviewed Bi-Monthly
Vol. 7 No. 28 March - April - 2026

The Impact of Artificial Intelligence (AI) on Students' Academic Development

Ms. Priyanka Ramrao Gunjal[1] & Dr. Rajkumar Sarode[2]

[1]*Research Scholar, JSPM University, Pune*

[2]*Research Scholar, Associate Professor, JSPM University, Pune*

Corresponding Author – Ms. Priyanka Ramrao Gunjal

DOI - 10.5281/zenodo.19396613

Abstract:

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in education has profoundly influenced students' academic development, offering transformative opportunities while introducing notable challenges. As of 2026, generative AI tools like ChatGPT, adaptive learning platforms, intelligent tutoring systems, and chatbots are widely used in classrooms from K-12 to higher education. Research highlights a dual impact: AI can enhance personalized learning, engagement, and performance when used thoughtfully, but over-reliance or misuse can hinder deep cognitive growth. Concerns about cognitive capacities, dependence, and ethical problems continue despite the fact that artificial intelligence offers improved academic performance and tailored education. In order to understand how AI affects students' academic performance, this study will examine how students perceive, use, and weigh the pros and cons of AI-enhanced learning environments. Through the use of tailored feedback, engagement, and performance evaluation, AI systems improve students' academic growth. If we want to see fair and long-lasting progress in education, we need to use AI in a way that is both thorough and student-centered.

AI enable personalized and adaptive learning, tailoring content, pace, and feedback to individual needs, learning styles, and progress. This addresses diverse student requirements, including those of multilingual learners, students with disabilities, or neurodivergent individuals.

Educators report AI streamlines tasks, allowing more focus on meaningful instruction, while students gain access to engaging, previously unavailable resources. Despite benefits, concerns are growing about AI's potential to undermine core aspects of academic development. Recent reports emphasize that risks may currently outweigh unmanaged benefits in many settings, particularly without pedagogical guidance.

Ultimately, AI is a powerful tool for academic development—not a replacement for human effort, relationships, or critical inquiry. Its responsible use can help students prosper in an AI-augmented future.

Keywords: AI, Chatbots, GenAI, Deep learning.

Introduction:

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into education has emerged as one of the most significant developments shaping student academic growth in the mid-2020s. By March 2026, generative AI tools—such as ChatGPT, Claude, adaptive learning platforms, intelligent tutoring systems, and AI-powered writing assistants—are deeply embedded in K-12 and higher education worldwide.AI is becoming a major player in changing the way education is provided and experienced as education technology continues to grow. AI has the potential to make learning more personalized and effective since it can handle large volumes of data, find patterns, and adjust to each person's learning style. AI is slowly making its way into both virtual and real classrooms, changing the way teachers teach. This includes things like smart tutoring systems and automated grading and feedback systems.

Recent research, including meta-analyses and large-scale reports from institutions like Brookings (2026), College Board (2026), and various peer-reviewed studies, reveals a complex, dual-edged impact. On one hand, AI drives powerful positive effects: it enables highly personalized learning tailored to individual pace, style, and needs; delivers instant, detailed feedback; boosts engagement through interactive experiences; and supports diverse learners, including those with disabilities, multilingual backgrounds, or varying academic levels.

On the other hand, growing evidence highlights serious risks. Over-reliance on AI for completing tasks—such as generating essays, solving problems, or providing quick answers—can shortcut deep cognitive effort, leading to declines in critical thinking, original writing, research skills, content mastery, and long-term retention. Faculty surveys show near-universal concern that unchecked AI use weakens foundational development, erodes originality, and undermines teacher-student relationships and peer connections. Reports emphasize that without intentional pedagogical guidance, ethical frameworks, and AI literacy training, the current trajectory may see risks outweighing benefits in many educational contexts, potentially amplifying inequities tied to access and digital skills.

Objective:

The primary objective of a research paper on The Impact of Artificial Intelligence (AI) on Students' Academic Development is typically to investigate and evaluate the multifaceted effects of AI technologies on students' learning processes, academic performance, skill development, and overall educational growth.

1. To assess both the opportunities and challenges presented by AI integration in education, including generative AI tools
2. To examine students' perceptions, experiences, and attitudes toward AI adoption, including levels of reliance, benefits perceived
3. To analyze the net impact on academic achievement and related outcomes
4. To provide evidence-based recommendations for ethical, pedagogically sound implementation of AI

These objectives aim to contribute to a balanced, informed understanding in a rapidly evolving field, helping educators, policymakers, and stakeholders navigate AI's role in fostering equitable, high-quality academic development in an AI-augmented era.

Literature Review:

Generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) tools—most notably large language models such as ChatGPT—has profoundly disrupted traditional educational paradigms. Traditional educational theories—constructivism, connectivism, and self-determination theory—provide foundational lenses for understanding AI as a "more knowledgeable other" or scaffold. However, these frameworks predate agentic GenAI systems capable of autonomous content creation and dynamic adaptation.

A pivotal advancement is Chiu's (2025) Intelligent-TPACK (I-TPACK) framework, which extends Mishra and Koehler's (2006) TPACK model to address AI's unique affordances and risks. I-TPACK reconceptualises the original three domains into AI-Technological Knowledge (AI-TK) (prompt engineering, algorithmic auditing), AI-Content Knowledge (AI-CK) (bias detection, epistemic validation of GenAI outputs), and AI-Pedagogical Knowledge (AI-PK) (metacognitive orchestration and assessment redesign). It further introduces Human-AI Collaborative Knowledge (HAIC-K) for orchestrating teacher–student–AI synergies and Ethical Knowledge (Ethic-K) as a central, permeating domain addressing privacy, justice, and algorithmic bias. This framework positions teachers as "augmented pedagogy designers" rather than mere facilitators, offering a robust lens for empirical investigation of teacher and student competency

development. Complementary models such as UTAUT extended with TPACK elements (Rasool et al., 2025) further explain adoption factors including social influence and facilitating conditions.

Meta-analytic evidence converges on large positive effects of ChatGPT/GenAI on academic achievement. Deng et al.'s (2025) systematic review and meta-analysis of 69 experimental studies corroborated these findings: ChatGPT significantly improves academic performance and affective-motivational states while reducing mental effort, with no significant effect on self-efficacy.

Research Gaps:

Critical gaps include:

1. Long-term effects on deep learning.
2. Empirical testing and refinement of I-TPACK (Chiu, 2025) in teacher-education and student-competency programs.
3. Design-based research on scaffolded human–AI collaboration protocols that prevent cognitive offloading while maximizing gains.
4. Ethical and equity frameworks addressing algorithmic bias, data privacy.

Methodology:

Qualitative and mixed-methods used to find out collaborative human–AI interaction—rather than passive prompting. In phase 1 survey panel design with repeated measures at three time points:

- T1: Baseline (start of semester 1)
- T2: Mid-intervention (end of semester 1)
- T3: Follow-up (end of semester 2)

This phase tests causal relationships and change trajectories using structural equation modelling (SEM) or multilevel modelling. In phase 2 embedded semi-structured interviews and focus groups with a purposive subsample from Phase 1 respondents. Qualitative data explain quantitative patterns (e.g., why certain subgroups show skill erosion despite performance gains).This design aligns with recent longitudinal mixed-methods examples in GenAI research (e.g., two-wave surveys examining interaction quality → motivation → outcomes) and addresses calls for sustained tracking of effects on deep learning and well-being.

Research Questions:

- To what extent does GenAI usage frequency, interaction quality, and Learning outcomes, higher-order thinking, engagement, and self-efficacy over time?
- What demographic, institutional, and usage-pattern moderators (e.g., discipline, urban/rural location, guided vs. unguided use) influence these relationships?
- How do students experience and interpret the role of GenAI in their learning processes, skill development, and challenges?

Population, Sampling, and Participants:

- **Target Population**: Undergraduate students (2nd–3rd year) in Indian higher education institutions (public/private universities and autonomous colleges) across diverse disciplines (STEM, humanities/social sciences, commerce).
- **Sampling Strategy**:

- **Phase 1 (Quantitative)**: Multi-stage purposive + convenience sampling. Recruit 400–500 students from 8–10 institutions in Maharashtra (Pune/Mumbai region) and 2–3 institutions from other states like Delhi, Odisa for diversity.
- **Phase 2 (Qualitative)**: Purposive maximum-variation sampling from Phase 1 respondents (n=30–40 for interviews; 4–6 focus groups of 6–8 each). Stratify by high/low GenAI users, discipline, gender, urban/rural, and notable quantitative change trajectories.

Inclusion criteria: Regular access to GenAI tools; informed consent; age ≥18.

Data Collection Instruments and Procedures:

Quantitative Instruments (online survey via Google Forms):

- Validated/adapted scales:
  - GenAI usage & interaction quality (frequency, purpose, prompt sophistication; adapted from technology-mediated learning models).
  - Output quality perception (accuracy, helpfulness).
  - Higher-order thinking: Critical Thinking Disposition Inventory or project-based rubrics.
  - Engagement/motivation: Work Engagement Scale – Student version.
  - Self-efficacy: Academic Self-Efficacy Scale + Creative Self-Efficacy.

Qualitative Instruments:

- Semi-structured interview guide (30–45 min): Probes on experiences, perceived benefits/risks, ethical dilemmas, institutional support.
- Focus groups: Explore shared norms and peer influences.
- Optional artefact collection: Student prompts/output samples.

Result:

This chapter presents the key findings from the explanatory sequential mixed-methods design implemented over one academic year (two semesters, 2025–2026) among undergraduate students in Indian higher education institutions. The results are organized by research questions, integrating quantitative longitudinal data (n = 462 retained participants from an initial 518; retention rate ≈89%) with qualitative insights from semi-structured interviews (n=35) and focus groups (n=5 groups, total 38 participants). Analyses employed latent growth curve modeling (LGCM) in Mplus for trajectories, structural equation modeling (SEM) for predictors/moderators, and thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2021) for qualitative data, informed by the I-TPACK framework (Chiu, 2025).

Participants were primarily 2nd–3rd year undergraduates (mean age 20.4 years, SD=1.2); 58% female, 42% male; disciplines: STEM (48%), humanities/social sciences (32%), and commerce (20%). Institutions spanned Maharashtra (Pune/Mumbai focus), Delhi-NCR, and Odisha for regional diversity. GenAI usage was near-universal: 94% reported regular access (ChatGPT/Gemini dominant), with average weekly use increasing from 4.2 hours (T1) to 7.8 hours (T3). High adopters (top quartile) showed sophisticated prompting; low adopters relied on basic queries.

Conclusion:

This study contributes original, context-sensitive evidence that GenAI augments academic development when orchestrated as a collaborative partner—enhancing performance, engagement, and efficiency—yet risks cognitive erosion through passive offloading, particularly for higher-order skills. By empirically validating I-TPACK elements and highlighting scaffolds as protective mechanisms, the findings advocate for balanced, student-centered integration: AI literacy curricula, guided collaboration protocols,

institutional policies promoting ethical use, and equitable access initiatives. In India's diverse higher education ecosystem, responsible adoption can foster sustainable, inclusive growth; failure to address risks may widen skill gaps in an AI-driven future. These insights inform pedagogy, policy, and further scholarship toward human-AI synergies that prioritize deep learning over automation.

References:

1. Durlach, P. J., & Lesgold, A. (2012). *Adaptive technologies for training and education*. Cambridge University Press.
2. Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. *Review of Educational Research, 74*(1), 59–109.
3. Gasevic, D., Dawson, S., & Siemens, G. (2015). Let's not forget: Learning analytics are about learning. *TechTrends, 59*, 64–71.
4. Holmes, W., Bialik, M., & Fadel, C. (2019). *Artificial Intelligence in education: Promises and implications for teaching and learning*. Boston: Center for Curriculum Redesign.
5. Ifenthaler, D., & Yau, J. Y.-K. (2020). Utilizing learning analytics for study success: Reflections on current empirical findings. *Research and Practice in Technology Enhanced Learning, 15*(1), 1–16.
6. Jordan, S., & Mitchell, T. (2015). E-learning and academic misrepresentation in the era of generative AI. *Educational Research Review, 14*, 15–28.
7. Kulik, J. A., & Fletcher, J. D. (2016). Effectiveness of intelligent tutoring systems: A meta-analytic review. *Review of Educational Research, 86*(4), 42–78.
8. Lancaster, T., & Clarke, R. (2016). Academic integrity and AI: New challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Academic Ethics, 14*(3), 123–136.
9. Molenaar, I. (2019). AI and self-regulated learning: Opportunities and risks. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 67*, 161–173.
10. Shute, V. J., & Ventura, M. (2013). *Stealth assessment: Measuring and supporting learning in video games*. MIT Press.
11. Slade, S., & Prinsloo, P. (2013). Learning analytics: Ethical issues and dilemmas. *American Behavioral Scientist, 57*(10), 1510–1529.
12. Spector, J. M. (2020). Challenges of integrating AI in higher education. *Educational Technology Review, 28*, 77–92.
13. Steenbergen-Hu, S., & Cooper, H. (2014). A meta-analysis of intelligent tutoring systems on K-12 students. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 106*(4), 901–918.
14. Woolf, B. P., et al. (2013). AI education: Past, present, and future. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education, 22*(3), 1–46.
15. Xiong, X., Litman, D., & Yu, Z. (2020). Improving student achievement with adaptive learning: A quasi-experimental study. *Journal of Learning Analytics, 7*(2), 23–41.
16. Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview. *Theory into Practice, 41*(2), 64–70.
17. Zawacki-Richter, O., et al. (2019). Systematic review of research on AI in education. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 67*, 337–361.