

Business Students' Perceptions of AI in Higher Education: An Analysis Using the Technology Acceptance Model

Jade S. Cervantes*, Emmalyn J. Navarro

Davao Oriental State University-Cateel Campus, Cateel, Davao Oriental, Philippines

*Corresponding Author Email: jadecervantes1201@gmail.com

Date received: March 26, 2025

Date revised: April 14, 2025

Date accepted: May 4, 2025

Originality: 94%

Grammarly Score: 99%

Similarity: 6%

Recommended citation:

Cervantes, J., & Navarro, E. (2025). Business students' perceptions of AI in higher education: An analysis using the Technology Acceptance Model. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 3(6), 6-12, <https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2025.194>

Abstract. This study explores business students' perceptions of artificial intelligence (AI) in education, utilizing the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) to assess perceived usefulness (PU), perceived ease of use (PEOU), and intention to use AI. The questionnaire, developed based on key TAM constructs, underwent pilot testing to ensure the validity and reliability of the instrument. Conducted among Bachelor of Science in Business Administration students at Davao Oriental State University-Cateel Campus, the research employed a predictive correlational design and collected data using the validated survey instrument. Findings reveal that students perceive AI tools as intuitive and beneficial to their learning, with ChatGPT being the most popular. However, effective use of AI requires active engagement and critical thinking. Regression analysis indicates that PU significantly predicts students' intention to use AI, while PEOU has a lesser influence. The study highlights the importance of AI literacy programs, ethical frameworks, and institutional guidelines for adopting responsible AI. Recommendations include integrating AI-focused education and further investigating factors such as trust and data privacy concerns in AI acceptance.

Keywords: Artificial intelligence; Technology Acceptance Model; Business students; AI in education; Higher education; Perceptions of AI.

1.0 Introduction

The exceptional evolution of artificial intelligence (AI) is transforming various industries, including education, where AI-powered tools are innovating pedagogical approaches and learning experiences (Luckin et al., 2018). As AI applications are increasingly adopted in education, such as personalized learning applications, automated grading, and intelligent tutoring systems, new opportunities and challenges emerge for students and teachers (Chen et al., 2020). That is why, as AI challenges traditional teaching methods, understanding how students perceive its role in education will be critical to ensuring successful implementation and maximizing its benefits.

However, despite its many advantages, AI is perceived by some students as a controversial or contentious technology, raising concerns regarding its reliability, ethical issues, and potential for abuse (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019). Some students are less inclined to use AI-powered teaching tools because they are concerned that it will replace human intelligence or lead to academic dishonesty. Such skepticism and varying levels of digital literacy create uncertainty. In this case, it is unclear whether AI will be seen as a threatening disruption in education or a helpful learning resource (Selwyn, 2021). As a result, despite being able to boost learning effectiveness, some learners are still reluctant to adopt AI.

Since business students will be future workers in a technology-driven economy, they would need to be well-informed about the role of artificial intelligence in education and how it may impact their willingness to use it in terms of perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and intention to use. Through its application, the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), developed by Davis in 1989, offers a theoretical basis to understand how individuals accept and utilize new technology. TAM determines that the most important elements that play a role in driving a person's behavioral intention to use a technology are perceived usefulness (PU) and perceived ease of use (PEOU) (Venkatesh & Davis, 2000). Students' acceptance of AI tools in education may depend on how simple they believe the technology to be, how helpful they believe it is for their academic performance, and whether they have ethical apprehensions.

While the use of this technology in higher education has increased dramatically, specific insights into business students' perceptions remain limited, particularly in developing country contexts. Research shows that, although AI will likely improve the effectiveness of learning and engagement (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019), students may not be prepared or willing to use AI-based tools as much as possible. As a result, this study examines business students' perceptions of AI in education through the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) lens. Thus, the study specifically aims to examine the students' perception of perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and intention to use AI and whether demographic variables, including type of AI tools used, and frequency of use of AI, will affect the perception. The following study of this output may provide valuable insights on how AI can be utilized in business education and facilitate its adoption strategies.

2.0 Methodology

2.1 Research Design

A predictive correlational research design was used to study the relationship between Perceived Ease of Use, Perceived Usefulness, and Intention to Use AI among business students. Likewise, a descriptive research design was implemented to systematically gather data and describe students' demographic characteristics (including AI tools and frequency of use). Descriptive research answers the “what,” “when,” “where,” and “how” questions related to the study, not “why” (causation) (Chaudhari, 2022). It also employed a correlational research design to explore the associations among variables without direct manipulation. According to Bhandari (2022), this research design assesses the magnitude and type of association between two or more variables. This study performed a correlation analysis to reveal whether PEOU and PU significantly correlate with Intention to use AI. In addition, a predictive approach was used to determine which among the independent variables is the strongest predictor of students' intention to use AI.

2.2 Research Locale

The study was conducted at Davao Oriental State University – Cateel Campus under the Bachelor of Science in Business Administration (BSBA) major in Financial Management program. As a primary institution in the community, the university plays an integral role in professional development through holistic education that combines theoretical knowledge with practical skills essential for each graduate's career path. The research setting was chosen due to the significance of the BSBA program, which accounts for most of the school's student population, with 708 currently enrolled students for the second semester of the 2024-2025 school year.

2.3 Research Participants

The respondents of this study were Bachelor of Science in Business Administration major in Financial Management (BSBA-FM) students. The researchers employed a simple random sampling technique in selecting the 100 respondents for the study. To ensure randomization, the lottery method was used, wherein the names of all qualified students were placed in a container and drawn randomly until the required number was reached. The sample size of 100 was determined using Slovin's Formula with a 10% margin of error, based on a total population of 708 BSBA-FM students enrolled in the second semester of the school year 2024-2025. Although the computed sample size was 88, the researchers increased it to 100 for a more adequate representation. This approach ensured that every student had an equal chance of being selected, thereby enhancing the representativeness and transparency of the sampling process.

2.4 Research Instrument

The survey questionnaire used in this study was developed based on the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), focusing on its core constructs: Perceived Ease of Use, Perceived Usefulness, and Intention to Use. The initial questionnaire comprised 15 items, each measured using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). Additionally, demographic variables such as year level, gender, and frequency of AI usage were included to provide contextual insights into respondents' backgrounds. To ensure the instrument was appropriate, it underwent a comprehensive validation process, including expert validation and statistical testing for construct validity and reliability. Expert validation was sought to assess the relevance and clarity of the questionnaire about the study's objectives. Based on the feedback received, adjustments were made to enhance the instrument's suitability for the business students' context.

Following this, using Principal Component Analysis (PCA) with Varimax Rotation, Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was performed to evaluate the instrument's construct validity and underlying factor structure. Specifically, the analysis examined factor loadings to identify item alignment with the theoretical constructs while assessing the sampling adequacy and data suitability for factor analysis. A meritorious sampling adequacy score of 0.814 was obtained using the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Measure of Sampling Adequacy. Bartlett's Test of Sphericity also showed significant results ($\chi^2 = 296.049$, $df = 105$, $p < 0.001$), indicating that the dataset was appropriate for factor analysis.

The scree plot analysis suggested a three-factor solution, supporting the retention of Perceived Ease of Use, Perceived Usefulness, and Intention to Use as distinct constructs. Factor loadings were examined, and items were retained based on acceptable thresholds (typically ≥ 0.40). However, one item under Perceived Usefulness exhibited weak factor loadings during factor extraction and was consequently removed. This refinement resulted in a final instrument with 14 items. To ensure the reliability of the revised questionnaire, Cronbach's Alpha was computed for the remaining 14 items, yielding a high internal consistency coefficient of 0.934. This indicates excellent reliability, ensuring the instrument consistently measures the intended constructs.

2.5 Data Gathering Procedure

In gathering the needed data for the study, the researchers adhered to proper procedures to collect data from the respondents. The researchers asked permission from the Campus Administrator to conduct the study. After that, the researchers asked for approval from the program head of the chosen program. Then, the researchers randomly selected 100 respondents for the study. The researchers asked the selected respondents for their participation in the survey. The researchers then distributed the survey questionnaire to gather the information needed for the study.

2.6 Statistical Tools

The following statistical tools were used in the study: Frequency analysis was applied to examine the distribution of AI tools used and the frequency of AI tool usage. The mean was calculated to describe the Perceived Ease of Use, Perceived Usefulness, and Intention to Use. Standard Deviation was used to measure the consistency and variability of responses from the respondents. Finally, Multiple Regression Analysis was employed to determine which constructs, Perceived Ease of Use or Perceived Usefulness, best predict Intention to use.

2.7 Ethical Considerations

In conducting this study, the researchers ensured strict adherence to ethical considerations. Participation was entirely voluntary, and respondents were treated with the utmost respect. Any concerns raised were promptly addressed, and personal information was handled with the highest level of confidentiality. Respondents were also free to withdraw from the survey at any time should they experience any inconvenience. Furthermore, the survey questionnaire was designed to exclude degrading, discriminatory, or offensive language. Data collection was conducted meticulously to ensure relevance, and extra precautions were taken to safeguard respondents' well-being. The researchers strictly adhered to the principles of privacy and confidentiality as mandated by the Data Privacy Act of 2012 (Republic Act 10173) of the Philippines. Lastly, respondents were assured that the study's findings would be used solely for academic and educational purposes.

3.0 Results and Discussion

Table 1 presents AI tools used by students. This table highlights the distribution and frequency of various AI tools utilized by the respondents, providing insights into the tools most commonly accessed by students. In this portion, respondents were given the option to choose more than one tool, which explains why the total frequency count is 172, while the overall number of respondents is 100. This should be taken into account when interpreting the results.

Table 1. *Distribution of AI Tools Used by Students*

AI Tools Used	Frequency	Percent
Chatgpt	88	51.20%
Gemini	21	12.20%
Quillbot	33	19.20%
Grammarly	25	14.50%
Cici	4	2.30%
MetaAi	1	0.60%

The result showed that ChatGPT was the most frequently used AI tool, with 51.2%. This suggests that ChatGPT's versatility, accessibility, and conversational nature make it the preferred AI tool. Additionally, the popularity of Quillbot (19.2%) and Grammarly (14.5%) highlights students' focus on improving writing quality, paraphrasing, and grammar checking. This implies that AI tools are frequently used to refine academic work rather than generate content. Conversely, the lower statistics of Gemini (12.2%), Cici (2.3%), and MetaAI (0.6%) indicate students are either not familiar with these tools or do not find them as beneficial for their academic requirements. Moreover, these findings highlight the increasing dependence on AI-powered tools in education, stressing the necessity of integrating AI literacy initiatives and ethical frameworks to safely and effectively maximize the advantages of such technologies.

Table 2 shows the frequency of AI tool usage among students. The results reveal that respondents were evenly split between weekly users (37%) and rare users (37%), with daily users (16%) and monthly users (10%) constituting the minority. These results suggest that while AI tools are integrated into students' academic routines, they are not yet universally relied upon daily.

Table 2. *Frequency of AI Tools Usage*

AI Tools Usage	Frequency	Percent
Daily	16	16.00%
Weekly	37	37.00%
Monthly	10	10.00%
Rarely	37	37.00%

The relatively lower percentage of daily users (16%) implies that AI tools may serve as supplementary aids rather than primary resources for most students. Meanwhile, the presence of monthly users (10%) suggests that some students engage with AI tools only when necessary, possibly for specific academic tasks. The relatively rare use of monthly usage could be influenced by factors such as a lack of awareness about AI tools, limited exposure to their potential benefits, or a preference for traditional learning methods. Additionally, students may perceive AI tools as specialized resources only useful for particular tasks, rather than general study aids. These insights indicate a need for further exploration into the barriers that prevent more frequent use of AI tools among students.

Table 3 presents the results for Perceived Ease of Use as reported by the respondents. It explores how students view the ease of using AI tools in their academic routines, which is a key factor in determining their willingness to adopt and integrate these tools into their learning processes.

Table 3. *Perceived Ease of Use*

No.	Statements	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1	AI tools are easy to learn and use for academic tasks.	4.25	0.73	Very High
2	AI tools can be used effectively without the need for extensive training.	3.82	0.77	High
3	The interfaces of AI tools are user-friendly and accessible.	4.13	0.76	High
4	AI tools help complete academic tasks with minimal effort.	3.79	0.78	High
5	AI tools are easy to understand and use for learning.	4.23	0.66	Very High
Overall Mean		4.04	0.74	High

The results highlight that students have a high perceived ease of use (Overall Mean = 4.04, SD = 0.74), indicating that most respondents find AI tools intuitive and accessible. Among the specific statements, the highest-rated item was "AI tools are easy to learn and use in for academic tasks" (M = 4.25, SD = 0.73), followed by "AI tools are easy to understand and use for learning" (M = 4.23, SD = 0.66), both interpreted as "Very High." This suggests that most students feel confident navigating AI tools with minimal learning effort. However, the item "AI tools help complete academic tasks with minimal effort" (M = 3.79, SD = 0.78) received the lowest rating, implying that while students find AI tools user-friendly, they may still require active engagement and critical thinking to effectively apply them in academic work.

The result underscores the importance of AI literacy, ensuring students maximize the benefits of these tools without over-relying on automation. These results are supported by several studies that highlight the intuitive nature of these technologies in educational contexts. For instance, the study of (Yang et al., 2024), found that perceived ease of use significantly influences students' acceptance and motivation to engage with AI tools. Likewise, Chandrasekera et al. (2024) revealed that students generally recognize the usability of AI tools, which aligns with the Technology Acceptance Model, emphasizing the importance of perceived ease of use in technology adoption. Further, Keuning et al. (2024) indicated that while students find these tools user-friendly, they still require active engagement to utilize them in academic tasks effectively. Conversely, Li et al. (2024) indicated that despite high perceived ease of use, students may still experience uncertainty or reluctance to fully adopt AI tools due to perceived risks and responsibilities associated with their use.

Table 4 presents the respondents' ratings on the perceived usefulness of AI and highlights their views on how AI tools contribute to their academic activities. Understanding students' perspectives on the practical benefits of AI can offer valuable insights into how these tools address their learning needs and shape their intention to use them.

Table 4. *Perceived Usefulness*

No.	Statements	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1	AI can enhance the ability to complete academic work more efficiently.	4.00	0.74	High
2	AI provides helpful insights and suggestions for academic studies.	4.04	0.69	High
3	AI contributes to better decision-making in both academic and business-related tasks.	4.02	0.79	High
4	AI tools positively impact academic performance and the overall learning experience.	4.07	0.66	High
Overall Mean		4.03	0.72	High

The result revealed that students generally perceive AI tools as highly useful in their academic tasks, as reflected in the overall mean rating of 4.03. The highest-rated statement, emphasizing AI's positive impact on academic performance and learning experience (M = 4.07), suggests that students recognize AI as a valuable support system for their studies. Additionally, the strong agreement with AI's role in providing helpful insights and suggestions (M = 4.04) highlights its perceived effectiveness in enhancing learning processes. The study of M and Quraishi (2024) revealed that students rated AI's impact on academic performance, indicating a strong belief in its benefits for learning outcomes. Similarly, the study of Almassaad et al. (2024) rated high on AI's role in providing helpful insights, suggesting that students find these tools effective in improving their learning processes. These results imply that AI tools have become integral to students' academic experiences, facilitating knowledge acquisition and skill development. However, while students acknowledge their usefulness, the standard deviations indicate some variation in perceptions, suggesting that factors such as familiarity, accessibility, or individual learning styles may influence AI adoption. Given these insights, educational institutions may consider integrating AI literacy programs to maximize AI's responsible and effective use in academic settings.

Table 5 presents the respondents' ratings on their intention to use AI tools in the future. It provides insight into students' level of interest and willingness to incorporate AI into their academic routines. As presented in Table 5, the overall intention to use AI was rated high (M = 4.04, SD = 0.74), indicating that most students are willing to continue using AI in their academic activities. The highest-rated item was "I am open to exploring more AI applications for my studies" (M = 4.04, SD = 0.75), while "AI will be an essential part of the learning experience in the future" (M = 4.04, SD = 0.72) also scored highly. The high intention to use AI among students suggests a growing reliance on AI tools for academic support, highlighting the need for responsible integration and guidance to maximize its benefits while maintaining academic integrity. The result supports the study of Otermans et al. (2025), suggesting that students are increasingly open to engaging with AI technologies in their studies. Also,

Balabdaoui et al. (2024) reported that most students expressed a desire for AI integration into their academic work, indicating a proactive approach towards utilizing AI tools for educational enhancement.

Table 5. *Intention to Use (IU)*

No.	Statements	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1	I intend to continue using AI tools for academic work.	4.03	0.80	High
2	I am open to exploring more AI applications for my studies.	4.04	0.75	High
3	I recommend AI tools to my classmates for academic purposes.	4.04	0.70	High
4	AI will be an essential part of the learning experience in the future.	4.04	0.72	High
5	AI should be integrated into the business education curriculum.	4.04	0.71	High
Overall Mean		4.04	0.74	High

A regression analysis was conducted to determine which factor best predicts intention to use AI (Table 6). The findings show that Perceived Usefulness (PU) was a significant predictor ($\beta = 0.567$, $t = 5.870$, $p < 0.001$), while Perceived Ease of Use (PEOU) was not significant ($\beta = 0.176$, $t = 1.825$, $p = 0.071$). The model had an R value of 0.696, indicating a strong positive correlation between the predictor variables and intention to use AI. In contrast, the R^2 value of 0.484 suggests that the predictors can explain 48.4% of the variance in students' intention to use AI.

Table 6. *Significance of the Perceived Ease of Use and Perceived Usefulness towards Intention to Use*

Intention to Use	Beta	t	p-value	Remarks
Perceived Ease of Use	.176	1.82	.071	Not Significant
Perceived Usefulness	.567	5.87	.000	Significant
r = .696				
r ² = .484				
p = .000				
F = 45.575				

These findings indicate that students are more likely to use AI tools if they perceive them as beneficial, rather than merely easy to use. This aligns with the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), which emphasizes that Perceived Usefulness is the strongest determinant of behavioral intention (Venkatesh & Davis, 2000). Institutions aiming to enhance AI adoption should focus on demonstrating the academic benefits of AI tools rather than just improving their usability.

To summarize the results, the study highlights that business students generally view AI tools as valuable and accessible, with ChatGPT emerging as the most preferred platform due to its versatility and ease of interaction. While many students find AI tools helpful in enhancing academic performance and efficiency, their usage remains moderate, suggesting that these technologies are still regarded as supplementary rather than essential tools. Importantly, the regression analysis affirms that perceived usefulness significantly influences students' intention to use AI more than ease of use, emphasizing that students are more inclined to adopt AI when they clearly recognize its academic value. These insights underscore the importance of enhancing the usability of AI tools and ensuring that their educational benefits are effectively communicated. As institutions move toward deeper AI integration in education, these findings can guide the development of targeted AI literacy programs and policies that foster responsible, meaningful, and sustained engagement with AI technologies among students.

4.0 Conclusion

This study investigated the students' perceptions of AI in education using the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM). The results revealed that students generally perceive AI tools as highly useful and easy to use, with a firm intention to continue using them in their academic activities. The most frequently used AI tool was ChatGPT, followed by Quillbot and Grammarly, indicating a preference for tools that enhance writing and content refinement. Despite the high perceived ease of use, students acknowledged that AI tools still require active engagement and critical thinking to maximize their effectiveness. Regression analysis confirmed that Perceived Usefulness (PU) significantly influences students' intention to use AI, while Perceived Ease of Use (PEOU) was not a strong predictor. This suggests that students are more likely to adopt AI tools when they perceive them as beneficial to their academic success rather than simply user-friendly.

Based on the results of the study, the following recommendations are drawn to enhance the effective and responsible use of AI in education: To encourage responsible AI use, several measures should be adopted, starting

with the implementation of mandatory AI ethics and application training sessions for students from various disciplines., where students will gain comprehensive knowledge of various AI technologies, including ethical considerations, limitations, and best practices. In addition, business education programs must also introduce subjects related to artificial intelligence, so that students know how to use AI instruments in their education and work in the future. Additionally, institutions must implement clear guidelines and policies that encourage the responsible use of AI, so students view these tools as aids to learning, not as a way to replace academic engagement. Faculty development seminars focused on the pedagogical integration of AI are equally essential to guide students in using AI technology responsibly. Additionally, professionalism in educating educators about the introduction of AI tools should be prioritized. Last but not least, for a more comprehensive perspective on students' views about AI in education, further research should be conducted to examine other factors influencing AI adoption, including trust, data privacy concerns, and institutional support. These initiatives will maximize AI benefits while addressing potential adoption problems.

5.0 Contributions of Authors

All authors contributed to the study's conceptualization. Author 1 led research design, data analysis, and manuscript finalization, while Author 2 was responsible for data collection.

6.0 Funding

This research was conducted without the support of any funding agency.

7.0 Conflict of Interests

The authors assert the absence of any conflicts of interest regarding the completion and publication of this manuscript.

8.0 Acknowledgment

The researchers extend their heartfelt gratitude to all individuals who contributed to the successful completion of this study. First and foremost, sincere appreciation is given to the validators, whose expertise and insights greatly enhanced the quality of this research. Their invaluable feedback and recommendations played a crucial role in refining the study's methodology and instrument. The researchers also express their profound gratitude to Prof. Richard C. Maravillas, Campus Administrator, for his unwavering support and permission to conduct the study. His encouragement and facilitation of the research process were instrumental in its completion. Lastly, thanks are extended to the BSBA-FM students, whose participation as respondents made this study possible. Your willingness to share your time and perspectives in answering the survey questionnaire is deeply appreciated. Your contributions have provided meaningful insights that will help shape the understanding of AI adoption in education

9.0 Reference

- Almassaad, A., Alajlan, H., & Alebaikan, R. (2024). Student perceptions of generative artificial intelligence: Investigating utilization, benefits, and challenges in higher education. *Systems*, 12(10), 385. <https://doi.org/10.3390/systems12100385>
- Balabdaoui, F., Dittmann-Domenichini, N., Grosse, H., Schlienger, C., & Kortemeyer, G. (2024). A survey on students' use of AI at a technical university. *Discover Education*, 3(1), 51. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-024-00136-4>
- Bhandari, P. (2022). Correlational Research | When & How to Use. Scribbr. Retrieved from <https://tinyurl.com/2c6d8z43>
- Chaudhari, A. (2022). Descriptive Research Design. Voxco. Retrieved from <https://tinyurl.com/2s3668tp>
- Chandrasekera, T., Hosseini, Z., Perera, U., & Hyscher, A. B. (2024). Generative artificial intelligence tools for diverse learning styles in design education. *International Journal of Architectural Computing*. 14780771241287345. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14780771241287345>
- Chen, X., Xie, H., Zou, D., & Hwang, G. J. (2020). Application and theory gaps during the rise of artificial intelligence in education. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 1, 100002. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2020.100002>
- Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly*, 13(3), 319-340. <https://doi.org/10.2307/249008>
- Keuning, H., Alpizar-Chacon, I., Lykourantzou, I., Beehler, L., Köppe, C., Imke, D. J., & Sosnovsky, S. (2024). Students' perceptions and use of generative AI tools for programming across different computing courses. *arXiv*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2410.06865>
- Li, H., Ren, T., & Zhang, Z. (2024). Assistive tools or insecurity: The impact of technological readiness on willingness to use AI. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2024.2443802>
- Luckin, R., Holmes, W., Griffiths, M., & Forcier, L. B. (2018). Artificial intelligence and the future of learning. The Brookings Institution.
- M, R., & Quraishi, A. H. (2024). Leveraging artificial intelligence for student performance monitoring. *International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews*, 5(5), 9642-9645. <https://doi.org/10.55248/gengpi.5.0524.1364>
- Otermans, P. C., Roberts, C., & Baines, S. (2025). Unveiling AI perceptions: How student attitudes towards AI shape AI awareness, usage, and conceptions. *International Journal of Technology in Education*, 8(1), 88-103. <https://doi.org/10.46328/jite.995>
- Selwyn, N. (2019). Should robots replace teachers? AI and the Future of Education. (1st ed.) Polity Press.
- Venkatesh, V., & Davis, F. D. (2000). A theoretical extension of the technology acceptance model: Four longitudinal field studies. *Management Science*, 46(2), 186-204. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.46.2.186.11926>
- Yang, Y., Sun, H., Chai, Z., Jiang, G., & Estigoy, E. (2024). Usefulness, ease-of-use, and acceptance towards generative AI in language learning of non-language majors: A TAM-based study. *International Journal of Advanced Engineering Research and Science*, 11(6), 01-10. <https://doi.org/10.22161/ijaers.116.1>
- Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V. I., Bond, M., & Gouverneur, F. (2019). Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 16, 39. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0>